
ICANN Transcription**GNSO Council****Thursday, 16 May 2019 at 1200 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/7chaageXjtD577e0lfIMzryKmnXiTQj6Q8nLdSHzyXHBVrA1n6MsenG_-HPouUN2

Zoom Recording: <https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/lq2BOBvQgxP-sxa3gV83usay3x1qn3pyfkEXpSh2FAkIRgOlyC8fLG7Y9jXboPqO?continueMode=true>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Erika Mann (apology sent)

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Pam Little, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Carlos Raul Gutierrez

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Scott McCormick, Philippe Fouquart, Osvaldo Novoa, Paul McGrady, Flip Petillion

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Elsa Saade, Tatiana Tropina, Rafik Dammak, Ayden Férdeline, Arsène Tungali

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Syed Ismail Shah

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Julf (Johan) Helsingius– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon – ccNSO observer (present for the first hour of the meeting)

Guests: Brian Aitchison,- ICANN Org, Mandy Carver - ICANN org, David McCauley - Chair of the IRP Implementation Oversight Team, Chris Disspain – ICANN Board, Samantha Eisner – ICANN Org, James Gannon – CSC on behalf of the GNSO, Brian Cute – Independent facilitator

ICANN Staff

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager,
ICANN Regional
Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support – GNSO
Mary Wong – Vice President, Strategic Community Operations, Planning and Engagement
Julie Hedlund – Policy Director
Steve Chan – Policy Director
Berry Cobb – Policy Consultant
Emily Barabas – Policy Manager
Ariel Liang – Policy Support Specialist
Caitlin Tubergen – Policy Senior Manager (apology sent)
Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations
Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator
Sara Caplis – Technical Support

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody.
Welcome to the GNSO council meeting on the 16th of May 2019.
Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank
you ever so much. Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Rubens Kuhl.

RUBENS KUHL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Darcy Southwell.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Michele Neylon.

MICHELE NEYLON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Carlos Gutierrez.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Here. Good morning, everybody.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Carlos. Marie Pattullo. Marie did send a note saying she might be a few minutes late. Scott McCormick. I don't see Scott in the room. We'll ping him. Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Elsa Saade.

ELSA SAADE: Present. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you also. Arséne Tungali.

ARSÉNE TUNGALI: I'm here, Nathalie. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Arséne. Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here. Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Osvaldo Novoa. I don't see Osvaldo in the room either. We'll send him a quick e-mail. Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Here. Good afternoon, everyone.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Martin Silva Valent.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Ayden Férdeline.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ: I'm present. Thanks very much.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Syed Ismail Shah.

SYED ISMAIL SHAH: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Here, Nathalie. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Erika Mann. I don't see Erika in the Zoom room. We'll try to get hold of her. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here. Good whatever time of the day it is for you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Maarten Simon.

MAARTEN SIMON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. And Maarten has told us that he will be present for the first half of the call only. We have guest speakers today too. We have James Gannon, Chris Disspain, Brian Cute, David McAuley, and from ICANN Org, Samantha Eisner, Brian Aitchison, Mandy Carver, and Elizabeth Le.

From staff, we have apologies from Caitlin Tubergen, and on the call, we have David Olive, Marika Konings, Steve Chan, Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Ariel Liang, Sara Palis, technical support, Terri Agnew, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes, and with your permission, Keith, I'd just like to do a quick Zoom intro. [It might be best] to do it now rather than at the need of the administrative matters.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Okay. Perfect. Thank you, Keith. A few of you, I believe, have already been in Zoom rooms, maybe recently. However, for those of you who haven't, what you've got in front of you logically should be your participant pod and your chat pod on the right-hand side.

To do this, you need to go to the bottom of the Zoom room and hover over the black toolbar that you see and click on "participants

and chat.” These will be seen only by yourself, so you don’t need to worry about sharing anything. It’s completely independent, so it’s very different from the AC room.

Let me just get my slides up. It would be a lot more helpful. There we go. So as you’ll have seen when we started, you’ll get an audio option menu with three options. You have the computer audio that’s a lot better quality than the Adobe Connect room was, so that’s a huge improvement. You have the option to have the room dial out to you, which is the “call me” option. There are quite a few numbers available there. And you have the phone call, which means you would use your phone to dial into the room.

Obviously, this should lessen then number of dial outs compared to what we used to have with Verizon, but there are unfortunately a couple of council members who do not have their locations represented by Zoom yet, so we are working to get those numbers added to the access telephone numbers from Zoom.

In the meantime, we’re still using Verizon for audio cast purposes, and therefore we will be getting operators to dial out to those who cannot use Zoom.

So moving forward, as you’ve seen and as I was telling you, this is how you bring up the participant list. You’re free to do so or not. If you do, click on the red button to close the participant list. You can always bring it back up. There’s nothing you can do in your Zoom room except leave the meeting, which is final. And here it is with the chat.

A little bit of information regarding the chat. The full transcript of the chat will be circulated obviously at the end of the meeting as per usual. However, participants are only able to see the content of the chat from the moment they connect to the Zoom room.

So this can be a bit unfortunate if you do join 10 to 20 minutes late. Please don't worry, we will be circulating the whole transcript immediately after the meeting, and also, Zoom are working on this. So this is hopefully a temporary glitch.

Adjusting the size of the documents. I know when I shared the agenda, a few of you were surprised that it full screened immediately. You are able to fix the size of the document, which can be quite convenient. For that, you would go to "view options," and then adjust the size of the document being shared.

Just a last little word on documents. As you may have gathered, Zoom is all about screen sharing and not about document uploading. This means obviously that you no longer have scrolling rights on the document being shared, given that it's a screen share. So what we've tried to work on to make it as convenient as possible for community members is that staff will share documents that are a couple of pages long, for example agendas or one or two pages.

Regarding full documents such as reports, those will be posted in the chat, so you'll see a URL, and equally, we will always make sure to have all the documents that council members need during a call posted to the document Wiki page. I think Marika posted a link to that in the chat. For latecomers, Terri, if you'd like to post it again, that would be great.

There is no fix for this, but it does mean that you are a lot more independent to scroll documents at your ease, and you'll possibly be able to view them better on your screen than in the Zoom room.

That's all I had to say for now. Please reach out by private chat to Terri and myself if you're having issues. There will also be on Monday – so this coming Monday on the 20th of May from 13:00 UTC to 15:00 UTC a Zoom drop-in session, which means that at any time during those two hours, if you want to drop into a Zoom room, play around, ask whatever question, one of us will be in the room ready to assist you. So please don't hesitate to do that if you're having issues.

Thank you very much for that, Keith, and over to you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you very much, Nathalie. Much appreciated. Obviously, it'll take us all some time to get used to switching from Adobe Connect to Zoom, but I think once we do get used to it, it'll be a positive experience. Thanks very much for that.

So with that, let's get to the agenda. Next item on the agenda is updates to statements of interest. So if I could ask anyone who has an update to their statement of interest to please let us know at this time.

Not seeing any – I do have a hand. Paul McGrady. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Keith. Most of you know this already, but I switched law firms recently. My new law firm is Taft Stettinius & Hollister. I'm still in the Chicago office. So that's an update and it's reflected in the SOI. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Paul. Much appreciated. And congratulations on your move. Any other statement of interests updates? Alright, I don't see any other hands and no additional typing in chat, so let's then move on.

We will review any amendments to the agenda. With this, I will run through quickly the items that we have today for everybody's benefit that we do have, as Nathalie mentioned, quite a number of guests who are going to be joining us. So I think this is a great opportunity for us to get some important updates from subject matter experts, and you won't have to listen to me all meeting, so added bonus there.

We also, as everybody knows – I'm sure you saw the ICANN board voted yesterday to act on the EPDP phase one recommendations. I sent an e-mail to the list and it was also forwarded to the EPDP team last night or earlier today depending on where you are. So we will add that to AOB at the end of the call, so any council discussion about next steps related to the board's resolution on the EPDP phase one recommendations.

So with that, we'll go briefly through the projects and action list focusing on the open issues. after that, we will get to the consent agenda, which has two items: confirmation of Julf to serve on the

CCWG on auction proceeds replacing Stephanie Perrin, and then confirmation of the recommendations report to the ICANN board regarding the adoption of recommendations one through four on the IGO/INGO CRP PDP.

So those are both on the consent agenda. If anybody would like to remove either of those from the consent agenda, please let me know. Following that, we'll get to a council discussion on the amendments to the RPM PDP charter to integrate recommendation number five from the IGO/INGO CRP final report. This is the referral of recommendation five over to the RPM group. Mary from staff has circulated some language to the list. I think there were a couple of folks, including Paul, who responded to that. So we'll have a discussion there. That's not a decision at this point but to make sure that everybody is up to speed on sort of next steps on the IGO/INGO issue in the RPM group.

Next, we'll move to a council discussion about the IRTP, the intragastric transfer policy status report. There we'll get a report from Brian Aitchison from ICANN Org and have some discussion.

Next, we'll move to a council discussion on the legislative and regulatory report. This is an update from Mandy Carver at ICANN Org on the government engagement team's work and give us an opportunity to kick around how the council can be more engaged, more involved and make sure that we're on the same page in terms of next steps on the legislative and regulatory reporting.

Then we'll talk about the GNSO's input to the IRP standing panel. With that, we'll have several folks joining us: Sam Eisner, Chris Disspain and David McAuley to discuss current status on the IRP

standing panel issue. And after that, we will move to a council discussion update on the non-registry GNSO liaisons on the Customer Standing Committee. That's James Gannon, he'll give us a briefing on past work, and then we'll look ahead to potentially a reappointment of James for that role moving forward.

Then, council discussion on the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model of governance. This is Brian Cote's effort, and looking ahead to ICANN 65 in Marrakech and next steps in that project. So we'll get an update from Brian there.

Under Any Other Business, we've got just an update on the GNSO chair election timeline, possible next steps for IDN guidelines in the variant TLD recommendations that we dealt with over the last several weeks, and then finally, AOB item that I just added on the EPDP board resolution.

So we've got a very busy agenda today. Any suggested edits, any questions, any additions? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands, so let's move on. Thank you.

Alright, so moving over – I guess we'll note the status of the minutes for the previous council meeting's minutes for the March 13th meeting were posted on the 30th of March, and the minutes for the 16th of April meeting were posted on the 4th of May. So those are done. Thank you.

Alright, so let's move to a quick review of the action items list. And again, I'll just go through the ones that are sort of open or have some pending action items. And this is just to close this one out, the council liaison to the EPDP IRT, this is the implementation

team for the EPDP phase one work. Rubens had volunteered to be the council liaison to the informal IRT for the phase one, but now that the board has actually approved the recommendations for phase one, the informal IRT will become a formal IRT, and I guess this is, Rubens, just a quick check and confirmation that you're prepared to continue as the council liaison to the full IRT.

And Rubens has said "IRT looks fine to me as well," so thank you very much, Rubens. You can check that one off as confirmed.

Next item is on managing the IDN variant TLDs. We need to pull together a small group of councilors to convene and to coordinate with ICANN Org on further understanding on this issue. There's an action item for staff to develop an options paper to support the small group effort.

I think I've seen one person volunteer. I think it was Maxim. So if there is anyone else who would be available and interested to participate in a small group of councilors to work on the IDN variants issue, that would be much welcome. And Maxim is noting that one person does not form a group usually.

Okay, so Rubens has typed in the chat that he's volunteering, and Philippe as well. That's excellent. Thank you, Philippe. Thank you, Rubens. Thank you, Maxim. Very good. We do have some work to do on that, and we do need to engage with ICANN Org to get a fuller understanding of the impact of the IDN guidelines issue at the second level and how that impacts the IDN variants at the top level and what the correlation there is. So I appreciate everybody's cooperation and engagement on the issue and fairly quick turnaround over the last couple of weeks. But we'll dig into

this a little bit more and make sure that we're fully informed before we make any further decisions.

Okay, next item is the CSC effectiveness review final report. I believe this one is mostly done. So I've got here in accordance with the terms of the review template, the chair of the GNSO council, chair of the ccNSO are requested [to recommend a report] to IANA naming functions review team as soon as that is established.

Okay. I'm not sure if there's any further action on that one at this point. Next item on the agenda, comment on ICANN's 2021 to 2025 strategic plan, FY20 operating plan and budget. This was an action item that came from our discussion with the ccNSO in Kobe, and we had agreed that the SCBO would do analysis between the ccNSO and GNSO comments to identify any elements where there might be common cause.

I know that Berry Cobb has followed up on the list. Ayden, I think this was an action item for you and the SCBO, so if we can make sure that we take some action on this one and move this one forward, that would be much appreciated. And feel free, Ayden, to reach out to Berry and to sync up with him and the rest of the SCBO to make sure that we can cross this off the action items list.

Next item, PDP update, discussion of the SubPro progress. This specifically acme out of discussions in Kobe where we needed to better understand, at least from the board's perspective, any intersection between the name collision analysis project and the subsequent procedures PDP. I had a brief conversation with Jeff Neuman last week in Bangkok at the GDD summit where he

agreed that it would be appropriate for the council to reach out to the board and ask for further understanding or clarification of the board's views on this, and he and I agreed that we would work on some language together, so I've got an action item to follow up with Jeff on that and get a communication off of the board.

Moving on, the next item is the IFRT, this is the IANA functions review team. There's ongoing discussion from the ccNSO about the appointments of ccNSO members to the IANA functions review team. They, as everybody should remember, are going through a process of requesting a change to the bylaws to allow for the three ccTLD members of the IANA functions review team to be ccNSO members, and rather than having a requirement for one to be a non-ccNSO ccTLD manager, I think at this point, they're likely to be moving forward with that barring any formal objection from anyone. So I think that's moving forward in terms of the need to seat that review team. It was supposed to have been formed in October of last year, so we're already quite a bit late in terms of getting that review team formed and formalized.

Okay, and then most of the next items are actually on our agenda for today, legislative tracker, IRTP policy status report, curative rights issue. I will note that I did finally send the letter to the cross-community engagement group on Internet governance, so that's done. So I think I'll stop there. Are there any other questions or comments related to the action item list?

Not seeing anybody in chat. I lost my participants pod. There we go. Okay, no hands either. So let's then move on back to the agenda. So that gets us to our consent agenda, so again, as I noted earlier, there are two items, the confirmation of Julf to serve

on the CCWG Auction Proceeds, and then the confirmation that the recommendations report to the board about recommendations one through four from IGO INGO CRP.

So Nathalie, with that, I will hand it over to you. I did not see any requests to remove those items from the consent agenda, so I think we can go forward with the formal vote.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks very much, Keith, and I would like to note for the record that Osvaldo Novoa is absent from today's call. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Hearing no one, would all those in favor of the motion please say aye?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Aye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. No abstention, no objection. The motion passes. Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie, and thanks to all. So with that, thank you, Julf, for volunteering for that important position. Alright,

so with that, let's move to item number four on our council agenda, which is the council discussion on the amendments to the RPM PDP charter to integrate recommendation five from IGO INGO curative rights. So with this, at some point, Mary, I'm probably going to turn to you for some help in terms of laying out the current state of affairs, but essentially, what we're looking at here is trying to find the most appropriate way to charter the work of the recommendation number five within the RPM PDP working group.

So there's some good work that's been put into it. I encourage everybody to read that. Mary, maybe I could hand it over to you at this point just to give a brief update as to the work that you've done and where the work stands?

MARY WONG:

Sure. Thank you, Keith, and hi, everybody. I think we're going to try and put the document that was circulated to you on the screen. There it is, you should be seeing Steve Chan's screen now. So just a couple of really quick pointers. As Keith said, the easiest way for you to review, ask questions, discuss will be if you actually go through the text, and hopefully it's not that long or difficult to do. But just a couple of things.

One is that you'll notice that we phrased it as an addendum to the RPM charter. Typically, amendments to charters are done within the body of the original charter document, but for this particular item, we thought that it would be easier as an addendum for a number of reasons.

One, it is the nature of the recommendation that you have referred to this PDP, and secondly, the thought that for this particular type of work, the composition of the team, maybe the working methods, the deliverables, and certainly the timeline of that work would make it easier if you actually had a separate document.

So it's phrased as an addendum, and essentially, how this would be done would be kind of like a contract amendment. If you were to pass this addendum and whatever its final form turns out to be, your motion would probably add a sentence or two to the original charter that fully and formally incorporates this addendum into the work of the PDP.

So basically, the original charter and this addendum would be read as a single comprehensive document. And I see that some people are having some difficulties with the screen, but please put in chat if you're still having problems, because you should be seeing the document now.

So the second observation I'll make, Keith, is that if you've looked at this document, you've seen that certainly on pages one and two, what we have done is to put in the sources from which we're suggesting this work be done in the following way. The sources include the terms of reference for Work Track 5 of the SubPro PDP. The methodology and some of the lessons from the EPDP, it takes into account the advice that you received from ICANN Legal a while ago about enforceability of the standards of behavior, and it certainly tries to take into account the spirit and the ongoing work as well as the implementation exercises being done now for PDP 3.0.

So you'll see things that you may not have typically seen in PDP charters, but from our perspective, things like the problem statement, the team composition and so forth, those are drawn from the sources and the lessons learned from all of that.

I know that Marie had put a comment in the council list saying that – she has some comments, I'll let her speak for that, but I will say that in respect of the problem statement in section three, we've tried to be succinct here, but we certainly expect that if and when the work gets underway, that a more comprehensive, detailed one will be prepared. And what we have in mind for those of you who remember that far back, is the problem statements that were developed for the facilitated discussion way back on the Red Cross for example.

So the other point then I'll point out, Keith, and hand it back to you, is that we have made this a representative model. The numbers per SG are suggested based on parity needs as well as on previous groups like this, like the EPDP, but you'll see that we've set it up to X numbers of representatives per stakeholder group for example. So you don't have to appoint three, you can have up to three. That's obviously just a starting point for everybody.

And then secondly, I think the most notable part about team composition here is that based on our experiences as support staff for the curative rights PDP, we do suggest that some, if not all, of the representatives have specific expertise, and we've listed the kind of expertise we think will be relevant for this type of work.

So that's an introduction. Hopefully, I didn't go on too long. Back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks so much, Mary, and thanks to you and Steve for all the work that you've put into this to help give us something to consider as councilors. I'll follow up with a few comments, but I see Paul has his hand up. So Paul, please.

PAUL MCGRADY: Sorry about that. So I guess I'm trying to understand why this document and now, because it seems like it does a couple of things, one of which – well, I think two things which seem to be fairly premature. One is it looks like we're grafting in PDP 3.0 mechanisms to a PDP that was set up under the old way of doing things.

There has been some talk about shifting phase two of the RPMs PDP to a PDP 3.0 approach. That makes sense to me. But essentially, the way that I'm reading this, it makes it look like right now, we're suggesting we would do that only for this particular, specific issue. That may not be the case, but we're jumping ahead to make that decision, and if it turns out that the council doesn't decide to make phase two operate under PDP 3.0 principles, then we have one issue that's operating under those principles and the rest of the issues that are not.

And then secondly, this seems to me to be premature in the sense that I think that there's some talk – and I'll be gone unless we do it now, I'll be off council – of looking at the charter for phase two of the RPMs PDP, and bringing it in line with PDP 3.0 principles, making sure that we have the right issues, maybe even revisiting

the charter questions, because there was quite a bit of pushback from the team in phase one, and frankly, a lot of time was lost on rewriting the questions in the charter because the team didn't like them.

So it seems to me that this particular thing that we're doing here could just be part of that overall exercise looking at the charter for phase two. Since phase one – the current timeline has us done April 2020, maybe the time – instead of working on this document separately and then going back and looking at the umbrella document, the umbrella charter for phase two, maybe we just start working on the charter. We'll look at revising the charter for phase two and incorporating these ideas into it instead of doing an addendum. And why not get that done three or four months in advance of when we expect phase one to be done so that phase two can then pick up the day after phase one is done?

So anyway, that's kind of my thinking. Thanks a lot, guys.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, Paul. I see Darcy has her hand up, but let me respond just briefly, and then we can carry on the conversation. So Paul, I think you've raised a bunch of good questions, and this is a starting point for council consideration. I think a couple of factors worth noting.

I think while we discussed moving this topic, this particular, specific issue to phase two during our council deliberations and discussions previously, I think my recollection was that was really to try to ensure that the delivery of phase one recommendations

from the RPM group weren't delayed and weren't impacted negatively or that it didn't become a distraction from the work of phase one.

And so I think the expectation is that if this group were to start its work sooner, that its delivery of the work would not necessarily need to be tied to phase one's delivery, but it could actually be incorporated in whatever comes out of the phase two work on UDRP and, well, specifically UDRP I guess.

And so I think the way that this document has been drafted and sort of structured is that it creates this new essentially standalone subgroup that would be operating independent of a phase one work, and really, potentially independent of the phase two work unless there was overlap.

So for that reason, I think we thought that there was an opportunity to introduce some of the PDP 3.0 things that we've got in the hopper and also some experience from the EPDP phase one work to try to give the group an opportunity to get its work started relatively soon, but not to impact negatively the output of phase one.

And if Mary wants to jump back in here at some point, Mary, feel free to do so. But I think that was some of the thinking behind this, and that also the group could be expanded to cover both the impacts of UDRP and URS if needed. But let me stop there and see. Darcy, you go next. Paul, is that an old hand or would you like to get back in? Let's hand it over to Darcy now.

PAUL MCGRADY: I'd like to get back in when I can. Sorry.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. No problem. We'll get [to you, back] to Paul. Thanks.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks, Keith. I actually have to echo a lot of what Paul said. I guess when I look at this, one of my concerns is that having a subteam working on something related to UDRP when the rest of phase two is also working on UDRP, and it's structured very differently, the expectations being placed on it are quite different, and it just seems to me we're setting ourselves up for a very difficult phase two overall to manage from the council's perspective. And I think at this point, it looks to me like the better choice actually is to kind of cut off phase one and recharter all of phase two, because there's a lot of great stuff in this addendum that we've talked about, PDP 3.0 and otherwise, about how we actually manage PDPs to have effective, efficient, timely outcomes and working groups that are focused on consensus, etc.

I'm worried that we're setting up this one little group to maybe do that, and then we've left ourselves under an old charter, unable to manage that work. And I would just suggest that we consider stepping back since we have time and looking at the idea of rechartering what was originally phase two for RPM and doing it in one bucket rather than having this dedicated subgroup that is so unique and so different. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Darcy. Paul, go ahead and go next, and then I've got Mary.

PAUL MCGRADY: Darcy said it so brilliantly that I'm reduced to ditto.

KEITH DRAZEK: Alright. Well done, Darcy. Thanks, Paul. So I'm hearing some concern, or at least I think agreement that we do need as council to look at the rechartering of phase two at a minimum, and that the setting up of this subgroup could – and potentially should – be a part of that effort. So Mary, over to you.

MARY WONG: Sure. Thank you, and thanks, everybody. Obviously, staff is not in a position to suggest that it's better that you do it now or later, and we're certainly not saying that you should not relook the charter of phase two or indeed any other PDP or working group based on the work that you do in PDP 3.0 at the appropriate time.

So I just want to offer two additional considerations. One is related to the timing issue, which is obviously workload for the community, for the experts that you might want to appoint for staff and yourselves, and secondly, perhaps more fundamentally, by doing the work at a certain date, whether it's now, in a few months, next year or at the end of phase two in a few years, the impact will be that this particular issue of overall IGO protections, not just the specific issue of curative rights but overall, because there are outstanding recommendations, there are outstanding issues with

GAC advice, and the board has said previously that it wants to act on all the outstanding issues, pretty much in a holistic way, then obviously, pushing off will have an impact on resolving the overall topic as well as board action. So this is just another implication that I thought might be helpful for you to consider as you think about this. Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Mary. Thanks very much. Maxim, you're next. Go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, as a participant in RPM PDP, I can say that if we have additional parallel group devoted to URS and UDRP, at the same time, we might face lack of basically volunteers to participate properly in it, because currently, the group gives you quite a load of items you need to do, and the current methods of working, like you have to participate in e-mails and also in conf calls, etc., it takes time.

And if we don't have enough of good volunteers, I mean qualified, we might face the same situation we saw in IGO, I mean the recommendation five thing, and it's better to avoid this. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Maxim. I see a hand up still, but I think that's an old one. Anybody else like to get in queue? Again, this topic, this is the first time we kicked this off as far as considering possible next steps and a path forward. Obviously, hearing some good

feedback here today, and clearly, we need to start looking at the rechartering of phase two as a priority now.

so we need to move on here shortly. I've got a couple more hands, and then in the interest of time for our very fully agenda, we'll table this one and then continue discussion. So Marie, and then Martin, and then we'll move on.

MARIE PATTULLA: Thanks, Keith. Can you hear me okay?

KEITH DRAZEK: I sure can.

MARIE PATTULLA: Great. Thank you. Thank you to Mary [inaudible] all the work on this. Picking up on Maxim's last point, I completely understand what he's saying about bandwidth. My understanding is that this group does not necessarily have to be drawn from the current members of the RPM working group. In fact, it should be people with specific knowledge in the legal international complexities we're talking about here. So that is something we can consider when we find out who is in the group.

What I'm trying to say with that is it wouldn't necessarily go to the same people, so cut across the same workspace. Mary also referenced e-mail that I've already sent you guys which I don't need to repeat. It was just an input going forward.

But having said that, I'm very glad to hear, Mary, that you're considering a way that we can develop a clearer problem statement, and as you know, one of my thoughts on this is there's been so much work that has, I believe, been documented within the GAC or the communique, the legal advice, the stuff that came out for the small group, all of these things that would be good, I think, if we can put that together so we're all starting from the same baseline and we don't have to spend the first year of the subgroup rediscussing the discussions that we discussed during the first discussions.

And then the only other thing is on composition. Now, as I've put into the e-mail, I'm not sure that we need such a big group on this as we did on the EPDP. [Parity,] yes, but of course, we have to go to the people who have the knowledge and want to be involved, so this may also, I hope, allay some of Maxim's concerns about volunteer time. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Marie. Very helpful input. And yeah, so we'll take that onboard and consider as we move forward. And I think that to the point where the idea here at least was to charter a subgroup of really separate individuals, separate from phase one, separate from phase two potentially, but obviously, we need to continue to look at that. So, Martin, I have you next, and then we'll move on.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT:

Thank you very much. It was just to echo on other councilors' concerns and to call all other councilors as well to be very careful

on how we modify and make things [inaudible] for RPMs. I know that sometimes looking from far away, things look like we can just get in, change things, make things better. This is a very complex problem, and working inside of it for this long, I learned that the balance is very fragile. It's very difficult to get it right. So let's take it with a lot of [conscious and a lot of pace.]

I wouldn't hurry to solve this unless we are very certain that we are not messing things up. And I would try to get as much feedback as I can from the actual people working on these issues and not just trying to start it out in the [lab,] from outside, behind a desk, but try to understand the actual dynamics of how this is going to work with actual people and try to make a process that is going to be good for them and that they are going to really use it, because if not, we can be stuck for years in these things. Just from the lessons learned in the actual RPM.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Martin. I think all good points. Maxim, last word on this, and then we really do need to move on.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Short notice. We have to have people with operational knowledge there too, because URS UDRP is not limited to sending e-mails. There are things which have to be done by registries, by registrars, and only they have operational and technical knowledge of how it should be done and what can be done at all. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Maxim. Alright, I've noted that Paul has suggested in chat that perhaps we ought to call for a drafting team to look at the RPM phase two rechartering, and certainly open to that if there are interested parties who would like to engage on that. We'll take an action item to circulate a call for that. I think if there's energy and focus around the issue, let's grab it and take the opportunity to start looking at that and coming up with a really solid charter moving forward.

So, okay, with that, we need to move on. Next item on the agenda is council discussion on the IRTP policy status report. And as I noted earlier, we have Brian Aitchison from ICANN Org joining us for this session. Brian, thanks for your patience, and as soon as we have the – I'm not sure if there's a presentation or not, but I'll hand it over to you at this point. So, Brian.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Hi, Keith. I'm just trying to share my document here. Bear with me one moment. Can you see my presentation here?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay. It's just a short one, because this time should really be reserved for your discussion. So I'll just go over what's kind of already been written about the interregistrar transfer policy, policy status report in terms of next steps. So we have the consensus policy implementation framework, which basically just says the

status report can serve as a basis for further review of the policy recommendations, or perhaps revisions to the policy recommendations if you think it's appropriate.

Going into what was presented in the PSR, we just kind of riffed off that first point. We thought there could be a further review of the transfer policy, especially in light of this EPDP recommendation 25, which requests that the council review the implications of the transfer policy in light of GDPR. So that could be sort of an extension of this report, or perhaps a separate report. There may be some kind of policy work or input that the council may want to provide as a result of the PSR, one of these input guidance processes. Or perhaps there are other options.

So the ball is really in your court in terms of what you want to do with this PSR and how you want to act on it. So I'm happy to take any questions, but otherwise, I think this time should be reserved for your discussion. So, thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Brian. And trying to get my participant pod back up. So if anybody would like to ask any questions of Brian or there's any discussion around this, next steps as it relates to the review of the transfer policy, now is the time to kick it around. And I don't have my participant pod up in Zoom so I can't see if anybody's hands are going up. I'm not sure what happened there.

PAM LITTLE:

Hi, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Hey, Pam. Go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Hi. Thank you, Keith. Hey, Brian. Thank you for the updated policy status report you submitted to the council. I believe that was late April. The Registrar Stakeholder Group has had a look at the updated status report. We also have had some discussion within the Registrar Stakeholder Group and also the recent GDD summit last week as to what will be the approach or the next step for this review.

And given that we already kickstarted the review process, even before the EPDP phase one recommendation about a kind of more specific or narrow review of the transfer policy because of the GDPR, so I think we can actually merge the EPDP 1 recommendation 25 of the narrow scope review and the broader review that was already started as a policy review exercise, however, the Registrar Stakeholder Group-feels that there is an issue that could probably be addressed in the EPDP phase one implementation work, which concerns the requirement under the current transfer policy about the gaining registrar sending the form of authorization to the existing registrant.

And as many of you know, under the temporary specification, and now that is confirmed by the EPDP phase one final report, if in a transfer scenario where the gaining registrar does not have access or is not able to get access to the WHOIS information of

the registrant, there's no way for the gaining registrar to send that form of authorization to have that confirmed by the registrant.

And because of the specific language in the temporary specification, it actually has caused a lot of implementation issues for registrars, and then subsequently also some compliance issues.

The language in the temporary specification says if the gaining registrar [cannot gain] access to the registration data, then it doesn't have to send the FOA to the registrant. But given our experiences among registrars, nine out of ten, you don't really see the registrant data anymore. It's either redacted or replaced by a kind of [inaudible] or other format that the registrars have implemented the temporary specification.

So that really is causing an issue, and we are hoping that issue can be addressed as part of the EPDP phase one implementation. And the rest of the review would carry on in one of those mechanisms that Brian, in your final status report, pointed out.

And it appears to us that the EPDP might be the most appropriate mechanism but we are happy to see whether other councilors have a different view of ideas. So I'll pause there. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Pam. And I'm looking again for – okay, I've got another hand, and it is Michele. Go ahead, Michele. Thanks.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks. Pam, I think, covered it very well, but just to make sure that we're very clear. In terms of the FOAs, which is standard form of authorization, the contact data, the contact point that is causing the issue is the e-mail address. We don't need the other data. That's completely irrelevant.

The issue being, I think as Pam explained, but just to kind of reinforce it, is that now in many cases, there's either no e-mail address or the e-mail address isn't a real e-mail address or it's pointing to a URL. So operationally, technically, it's a challenge. Well, I think "challenge" is a polite way of putting it. It becomes impossible for us to send e-mails to those [inaudible].

I think this wasn't intentional when the temp spec was being drafted. The temp spec was a kind of 11th hour type scenario. Most of it was operationally possible. This bit kind of slipped through the cracks. So the idea here was to fix this in the phase one implementation. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Michele, and thanks, Pam. So I guess then – and Brian, feel free to jump in here at any point if you'd like to respond or react. I take your point earlier that this is really essentially in the hands of council now to try to figure out next steps.

So Pam, I might come back to you and/or Michele in terms of a quick summary as it relates to what would the recommendations be for our next steps as council. Pam, I see your hand. Go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Keith. I think there seem to be two parts of this. One is about how to address the form of authorization, the FOA e-mail issue Michel spoke to, and so did I, and [inaudible] we would appreciate maybe guidance from staff. Maybe that would be in the form of the GNSO guidance process. I'm not quite sure about that one. So the council can actually write to ICANN board. I'm not quite sure, so correct me if I'm wrong. Basically, there would be some sort of guidance from the council saying this is how you'll implement recommendation 24 of EPDP phase one, and this is the council's guidance to how to address this FOA issue.

So that's one part of this review that would address an immediate pressing issue. Then we'll kick off an EPDP for the board review of the transfer policy, but we think that EPDP should also have a very narrow scope, because we now already have the issues identified in a status report, we don't think we need to open up a kind of full-blown wide-scope PDP. So I hope that is clear, sort of two parts to address this or two different components. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Pam. That's really helpful. And so I guess specifically on the first topic, the FOA issue as impacted by the temp spec and the phase one recommendations, it sounds like this is something that we probably need to at least initiate a conversation with the implementation review team, if I'm not mistaken. And as you said, there may need to be some council guidance in terms of how that should be handled. But does it seem logical that we would at least initiate a conversation with Dennis Chang in the phase one implementation review team? Obviously, Rubens is now our liaison from council to that group,

but does at least having that conversation sort of help the council better understand what the path forward might be? And Pam, I guess that's a question for you.

PAM LITTLE: Yes, I think it would, Keith. And also, maybe with staff and policy support staff as well to give us some guidance how to go about addressing that issue as part of the implementation rather than push it to the EPDP as part of the broader review.

KEITH DRAZEK: Got it. Thanks, Pam. Much appreciated.

PAM LITTLE: No problem.

KEITH DRAZEK: So it sounds like we have an action item there to help better inform the council as to what possible next steps would be as it relates to the FOA issue and the impact of temp spec, and then we have a separate issue where the council needs to start considering the chartering of an EPDP focused on overall review of the transfer policy with a narrow scope, to Pam's point.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hi, everybody.

KEITH DRAZEK: Hi, Chris. Welcome.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much. [inaudible].

KEITH DRAZEK: Sure. We're just finishing up discussion on IRTP.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. I shall [inaudible].

KEITH DRAZEK: Very good .Alright, so I think we have an action item, possibly two action items there, so we'll take that. Any other discussion on the IRTP policy status report? Any final questions on this one for Brian today? And Brian, I'll give you the last word if there's anything further from you.

BRIAN AITCHISON: No, nothing substantive, Keith. Just to say thanks for reviewing it and we'll look forward to hearing what decision you all come to.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Brian, and thanks so much for joining us today. Much appreciated. And thanks, of course, for all the work that you've put into this effort.

Alright, with that, let's move on to the next item on the agenda, which is council discussion on the legislative and regulatory reporting. With this, I'll shortly hand it over to Mandy. But let me just tee this up briefly by saying that the discussion that we had in Kobe around this I think recognized that there's good work going on in terms of tracking and developing a better understanding of various developments in the legislative and regulatory space around the world, but that some councilors expressed a desire to help take this effort to the next level and to better, I guess, integrate or engage to identify areas where certain things may have an impact on GNSO policy work.

So this is essentially the next conversation in that effort where we're looking to understand ICANN Org's efforts here and also to figure out where appropriately the GNSO or the GNSO council could fit in. So with that, let me hand it over to Mandy. Thank you.

MANDY CARVER:

Hello. Apologies, I've got a bit of a cough and cold. Firstly, thank you for giving me the opportunity to attend your call, and this is as much a listening exercise for me to hear your further input as it is for me to provide an update. But just to briefly frame the current situation, and as it is set out in the intro in your agenda, in response to the GDPR experience, about 18 months ago, we began to focus an internal discussion in org about how to use existing tools and field teams in a more focused effort to monitor legislative and regulatory activity as well as IGO resolutions.

And this is work that historically we have been doing, but this was an evolution, and this is work that is often carried out by the

government engagement team as well as the Global Stakeholder Engagement staff in the regions.

So the goal was to try and focus information gathering to prioritize pending or developing activities, whether those are legislative, regulatory dialogs in certain fora about resolutions or norms or principles that [inaudible] ICANN Org's remit or the ability of the ICANN community to make bottom-up consensus-based policy.

What we're looking for is a sort of early warning system or tripwire that would make ICANN Org more aware of what was going on in various processes, so we might be able to take, where appropriate, corrective [inaudible] steps in those spaces, or to have general conversations within ICANN Org so that we could flag potential negative impacts on the operation of the DNS or the development of policy.

As it shows in your [inaudible] there have been three sort of executive summary reports that came out of that [process] thus far. These had been aligned with the production of [CEO] reports to the board.

Based on the feedback that we've received from these reports, particularly the most recent report and the response to the posting of a draft charter on the legislative tracking initiative, we've heard the community response [inaudible] pause this whole process so that we can better incorporate community responses and reset the process to be more useful to everyone.

Particularly, we've heard the request and the reaction that it's important to engage the community in the efforts that were laid out

in the legislative tracking initiative, [which we want to do.] We're looking for not only feedback mechanisms for amending the draft charter and looking at the process, but also developing the interface with the community around issues.

Because this is about flagging [inaudible] the legislative tracking initiative [flagging] things that impact ICANN's operational remit and the capacity to develop policy, but it is not about developing policy itself. We're not necessarily looking for a mechanism that would require constituencies to develop consensus. What we're looking for is a mechanism that would allow us to be aware of what's going on in the community to capture this information and share it in a useful mechanism.

And what I'd like to do is take this opportunity to hear what you all have to say with feedback, your ideas about the legislative tracking initiative, and the charter.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Mandy. Yeah, so thank you very much for that, for the setup and for joining us today, obviously, but I think that was a really helpful overview or summary as to where things stand. And I know from a GNSO council perspective, as I said at the outset, we're very interested in ensuring that we can be, I guess, effective consumers of the work that you all are doing, but also to try to find the best ways to provide our input and to have sort of an ongoing engagement so it's not sort of a unidirectional communication but that there is an opportunity early in the process and as things are flagged for the council to be able to

coordinate out consideration of issues that might have an impact on GNSO policy development work.

And I think we're not looking for ICANN Org to necessarily tell us that there may be impacts, but rather to have some sort of a collaborative approach where we can work together to identify where those overlaps or intersections might be.

So I think this really does need to be a collaborative effort moving forward, and I think what you've described sort of gives us the opportunity to do that. So I've got Ayden in the queue. Go ahead, Ayden.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN: Thanks, Keith. Hi. [inaudible]

KEITH DRAZEK: Ayden, I'm sorry to interrupt, your audio is cutting out on us. It's almost impossible to understand what you're saying, so I don't want you to keep going on.

AYDEN FÉRDELIN: [inaudible] try changing [inaudible].

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks. So we'll come back to you as soon as you reconnect. Carlos, I see you're next, and then Elsa, and then we'll get to Ayden as soon as he rejoins. Thanks. Carlos. Carlos, we

can't hear you if you're speaking. Carlos' hand went down. Elsa, over to you.

ELSA SAADE: Hi. Thanks, Keith.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Sorry.

ELSA SAADE: Oh. [inaudible].

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: No, go ahead, Elsa. Go ahead.

ELSA SAADE: I'll wait. Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Just very shortly, sorry about that, I'm getting used to the new buttons here. Yes, thank you very much, Mandy. I like very much the word that you use, engage the community, because for me, the GAC is part of the community, and if there are government officers interested in the DNS, they will probably show up in the GAC, and they come to the meetings, and as I said before, we should start there. Thank you very much. Elsa, go ahead, please.

ELSA SAADE:

Thanks, Carlos. And I'm actually very happy that you went before me, because my comment comes quite in parallel to yours. So thank you, Mandy, for the presentation, and I'd like to just note just a small concern for us going forward.

GDPR was only applicable because it was the strongest regional union in the world, basically, with the power to effect extraterritorial effects, basically, and many as and registries, I'm sure you can confirm, are located in that region.

So it's not about all local laws, which we've seen in the report. It's also about the laws in the regions that have blanket effect and extraterritorial effects.

So I just want to note down my concern that by giving so much importance to local laws, those efforts could be coopted in a way. So I just want to make sure that whatever executive summary report's coming in and whatever laws we would flag, of course, helping develop these executive summaries, would not necessarily impact our policy development process, taking into consideration every single local law out there or every single overarching law similar to GDPR, but making sure that we prioritize the laws that have a blanket effect and extraterritorial effect on our policy development processes. I don't know if that makes sense, but I just wanted to note down my concern so that we would be flagging this as we go forward, though I really appreciate the effort you're actually putting down on developing the legislations we have, and I'd be very happy to help out. However, it's good to mention that we should be careful that we do not take into account certain things that shouldn't be taken into account. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks very much, Elsa. Ayden, are you back on?

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ: I will try. Can you hear me now, Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, much better. Thanks, Ayden. Go right ahead.

AYDEN FÉRDELINÉ: Perfect. Hi, everyone. And thank you, Mandy, for the introduction, because I was curious as to what this was on our agenda, because I really appreciate the framing.

A comment that I wanted to make was you said that you want to better engage the community, and I realize in Keith's comments as well, a comment along those lines was also made.

I almost disagree though. I feel like this is something that I do not necessarily want to be involved in. I think that if ICANN is a professional organization for professional staff, then this is something that the community should not be doing, because what happened initially, we had these three previous reports that were sent to us, and it seemed to be sort of a crowdsourced approach that was used, that the community was expected to flag omissions or errors in the reports. And I just don't think that's the best way for this to be produced. What I would really like to see is that there be proper regulatory impact assessments that are being carried out periodically by ICANN staff. I don't think it has to be for every

region in the world, but certainly for key regions where there are likely to be legislative impacts.

So really, I'm wanting to understand what is the rationale for a law, directive, regulation, what are specific extracts of that law that could have implications on activities that are within ICANN's remit and in particular the GNSO's remit, and I'd like to sort of see concretely what are some implications that are anticipated for ICANN, and maybe a roadmap or timeline for when this could come into effect, and where appropriate, some specific recommendations of actions that we should be taking.

And I don't think that this is something that the community should be doing. I think that this is something that given the potential threats to ICANN Org, I think this is something that ICANN needs to be doing in and keeping us updated on.

Carlos before mentioned that we should be working more with the GAC. And sure, they are an important partner, and I think that maybe there's a role for them to be involved here. But ultimately, I don't think that the GAC has been very successful in the past at alerting ICANN to potentially problematic legislation. I don't even know that members of the GAC are always aware. Members of the GAC have a lot of responsibilities themselves, governments have many different proposals that are being worked on on many different issues.

I'm just not sure that the GAC is ever really going to be in a position to be as helpful there as we might like.

But certainly, the process of conducting a regulatory impact assessment is something that multinational corporations deal with every day. We don't really need to be reinventing the wheel here. Maybe ICANN needs to get a monitoring agency or something to assist with this, but I think this is something that should be done internally, and I think that the amount of collaboration that is required between ICANN and the community here should really be very minimal. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Ayden. And of course, I'll just note briefly that any sort of additional monitoring or analysis service or contracting comes with expense. Obviously, we understand the situation right now with ICANN's budget, but just to put that note down.

So thank you, Ayden. Much appreciate the comments. Elsa, I think – that was an old hand, if I'm not mistaken. So now I have Tatiana and Philippe.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Keith. Hi all. I sort of want to echo what Else and Ayden said, but in a bit of a different way.

what I see right now in this report is quite a good summary. So I see different laws from all around the world, some [inaudible] organizations like European Union.

And I look at the summary, and my question is, so what? Why am I seeing this or that law? Why was it put there in the first place? How does it actually affect ICANN mission? If it does.

So what I see lacking here is what Ayden said, I think I picked up the word in his intervention which was “assessment,” and I think this is a key word, because otherwise, it looks like a lot of effort put to make this quite excellent summary which leaves more questions than answers, because different parts of the community have to read it and guess how it actually going to affect ICANN mission. And then of course, I can't say that community or ICANN will be on the same page after looking at this report, because all we can do is just guess how it is going to affect.

To me, it is not obvious from this report. And so I really want to see at least one sentence in this report why this law was put there, what could be the implication for ICANN, why ICANN thought it was important to point out this law.

And honestly, I don't think there is a need for monitoring agency or any additional staff full-time or whatever, because if the law was put there in the first place, there was a reason. Why can't we see this reason? Why can't we ensure that we are on the same page in terms of thinking how these regulatory developments are going to affect the ICANN mission? At least for the start.

I understand that there is a huge gap between requiring to make a full regulatory monitoring which would be my preference, but I understand it's additional budget, additional resources. Between this full regulatory impact assessment, monitoring, whatever activity and what we have now, there are different steps that can actually be taken at least to make it more informative than just the summary. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Tatiana, for the concrete suggestion. I'll come to Philippe next, and then Mandy, I'll hand it back over to you for any reaction or feedback. But I think Tatiana's suggestion that an additional column or additional field that describes sort of the rationale as to why it was included in the list and where the correlation with ICANN's mission or bylaws or activities or policymaking would be a helpful next step.

But again, I would go back to the point that I think that that's probably a conversation, and maybe the inclusion of that assessment is the beginning of that conversation, because I do think that from a GNSO perspective, the GNSO council is the manager of our policy processes, is the group who should be making this determination as to whether a particular law or particular regulation or regulatory development has the potential to impact our work in collaboration with Org, perhaps.

So my feeling is that, yeah, Tatiana's suggestion about an additional column or field is a really constructive sort of concrete next step, but again, speaking personally, I think that it does provide the opportunity for council and the GNSO community to sort of have a part of that conversation rather than expecting ICANN Org to be telling us what impact it might have on our work and our remit.

So Philippe, over to you, then Michele, then we probably need to move on. And then I do want to hand it back over to Mandy for a reaction and final words.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. My [common sense comment] would probably echo Tatiana's observation. I think there r two different things, and there's a difference between monitoring the legislation on one hand and assessing whether it has an impact on the other. So I understand that this exercise is trying to build up from the experience from the GDPR/EPDP and avoid the trauma of that exercise.

I'm just reading the report, I'm wondering whether, had this sort of thing been in place at the time, whether we had avoided it. I'm not sure, because there is a need for the assessment. It can be a huge task. I remember reading these reports. The only tangible elements that were in it were references to IP addresses and domain names in some legislations, and that was about it, really.

So I think moving forward, we will need to consider how far we want to go into that assessment and whether that's relevant. It can be a huge task, and demanding in terms of resources. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks very much, Philippe. Michele, over to you, and then we'll hand it back to Mandy.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. First off, obviously, Mandy, we appreciate the update. I think it's helpful to get a kind of idea of where this came from. I don't really agree with most of what Ayden and others have been saying about this. I think some people are kind of overcomplicating what this could and should be.

Going down the path of doing legal analyses and impact assessments and everything else would be absolutely insane, it would cost an absolute fortune and would be a waste of resources. It makes sense when there is something specific that has been clearly flagged as having a massive impact where such investment makes sense. But as a general rule, I think what's really needed is more a small bit of context, as in – this is something I've been saying for a long time with regards to a lot of documents that ICANN produces and asks for feedback on, just some basic kind of taxonomy as in who would be impacted by something or potentially impacted, why people should care, why it's on anybody's radar as opposed to diving deep into the specifics of that.

There's a lot of services out there that will help to monitor [themes.] I'm sure quite a few people who are on this call are subscribed to a lot of them. You choose a bunch of themes that are of interest to you and then you get e-mails once a day or once a week with relevant articles, etc. Using that kind of thing probably would be a good starting point.

But I think going deep into this kind of legal analysis concept would just be a really bad idea. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Michele. Mandy, I'm going to hand it back over to you for any final words or reaction or thoughts, or any follow-up questions for the council. We're over by about eight or nine minutes at this point, so we'll look to wrap this one up, but you get the last word.

MANDY CARVER:

Well, then my last word is thank you very much for very useful and actionable feedback. We will incorporate all of this in process of both revising the process and revising the reports, and I'm grateful [we have taken] the time to discuss it. And these are very useful comments that touch on a number of the points that we've flagged and tried to deal with internally. So I thank you for the time, thank you for the information. We will incorporate this, and there'll be further communication with the community as it develops. But thank you.

And we're also always available to hear more. So thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Very good. Thanks so much, Mandy. Much appreciate all your work and your time today. So we'll look forward to further communication on this, and I guess the action item or the takeaway from the conversation at a minimum was to have a little bit more of a rationale answering the question of why was a particular regulatory development or piece of legislation included in the list as it relates to ICANN's mission and bylaws. I think that'll take us to the next step, at least. So thanks so much, Mandy.

Okay, let's move on. The next item on our agenda is council discussion about GNSO's input to the IRP standing panel. And with that, as I noted earlier, we have David McAuley, Samantha Eisner and Chris Disspain joining for this group, so I will hand it over to you all. David or Sam, I'm not sure which one of you wants to lead off, but over to you.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Keith. Sam, why don't you go first?

SAMANTHA EISNER: Thank you, David. Hi. This is Sam Eisner from ICANN Legal. I also have my colleague, Liz Le on the line from ICANN Legal, and Chris Disspain is here as well.

As it relates to the standing panel, we do have some updates for you. One of the reasons that we asked Chris to come in is he is a member of the board's accountability mechanisms committee, and that committee is the committee of the board that's responsible for the oversight of the accountability mechanisms, and that includes helping us with the evolution of the IRP as well. So the BAMC has started taking a stronger and more active role in this and we're trying to look at how they can be supported by Org in trying to move some of these items, because the IRP really is such an essential part of ICANN's accountability structures.

So with [this same] panel, as you know, we've put out a call through a blog from Göran about six weeks or so ago asking for some inputs on how we could develop the standing panel, and so we've received a list of probably around four to five inputs from different groups within the organization.

It's been very helpful. We haven't received any individual responses. We've received some collective inputs from different parts of the organization, including SSAC, IPC, the Registry Stakeholder Group and the ccNSO. I believe those are the ones we've seen so far, and there are some differences among them,

but there are also some trends such as when it comes to the point of motivating the community to come together and make a panel selection for example.

We haven't seen any support yet for the idea that that should be done through individual SO and AC-level consultations, and instead, using some form of a group, be it a representative advisory council of SO and AC members, or independent experts who are versed in this type of panel selection.

I think we're seeing some trends. We're also seeing the need to focus heavily on conflicts of interest and independence when you get to the panels. So I think we're seeing [a place where] we can start moving [inaudible] and one of the things that we've heard from the BAMC – and Chris can give us any inputs on that he might want – is that we'd really like [you] to start moving quickly, and so we think that it's important to move to a point where we're not waiting to solve all of the community correction issues before we're able to go out for a call for expressions of interest, so we can hopefully dual track this to get to something quicker.

The BAMC is also looking more specifically at how to do the board's role within the bylaws on conflicting with the SOs and ACs on the repopulation of the IOT, because one of the things you would have seen through the community digest is that we've been putting out some calls for people to come and participate in the IOT. We do need more people there. We had people there for a couple of years, they've done a lot of work, but we have very low participation and at times have trouble getting to quorum. We still have a fair amount of work to do to really get the IRPs to where we want it to go.

So the BAMC has been working with Org, and I think you'll start seeing some more [targeted] communications. I think there are some questions raised about what process we want to see used after the call for expressions of interest, so we're finalizing on a couple of those points, and those will be coming out in very short order. With that, why don't I turn it to Chris for a brief moment? And then I think we go to David.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Sam. Hello, everybody, and thank you so much for [inaudible] detail on this. I'll be very brief. I just wanted to really sort of reinforce what Sam has said and say that we really are taking this incredibly seriously. It's got to be dealt with. We need to have the standing panel in place and the IOT needs to do its job properly. So it would be great if we could get some more volunteers, people who are capable of doing the work that's necessary to be done, and we can get this done as quickly as possible so that no one is disadvantaged by us having an operational [—one of our major] accountability mechanisms being properly operational.

But I'll leave it at that for now, and I'll happily answer any questions if anybody has any.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Chris.

DAVID MCAULEY:

[inaudible] thanks. Keith, why don't I go ahead? I'll just make a few comments. I'm speaking to the group as a member of the IRP implementation oversight team. I'm actually an employee of Verisign, I work on Keith's policy team, but I'm speaking today in my individual capacity, in my personal capacity, and not as the chair of the IOT.

And I have a couple slides – we can go to the next one – that will just put the IOT in context and I think will underscore what Sam and Chris just said about the importance of the work that you all are going to do on adding members to the IOT and taking part in standing up the standing panel.

The first slide simply shows the history of the IRP. It was created in 2002, it had a major overhaul in 2016 when the IANA transition completed, and in that slide, if you go get the slides, you can get a link to Annex 7 to the CCWG accountability work. Those of us who were in that CCWG laid out our rationale for changes to the IRP in that annex, and that'll explain it all. Next slide, please.

The next slide is just a little bit of highlights what pre-IANA transition IRP looked like for a compare and contrast view. The IRP used to be simply a review of board decisions. It had a narrow standard of review, such as was there a conflict of interest in reaching decision, did the board have sufficient facts, did it exercise independent judgment? It wasn't a substantive review. And back then, the IRP panel could simply issue decisions that the board had an obligation to consider. Next slide, please.

Following the transition, things have changed drastically. The IRP panel can now review actions as well as inactions, and not just by

the board but also directors, officers and staff members. And it's expanded a little bit to include review of things like not just are these actions or inactions consistent with bylaws, but also, did ICANN fail to enforce the IANA naming functions contract? There's a way to review PTI service complaints, and there are certain exemptions from IRP review.

The one that I'll mention here that's pertinent is an independent community IRP cannot be reviewed by the panel if it deals with the results of the PDP and the SO that developed that PDP does not consent to the IRP.

But today's – the new IRP has a de novo standard of review, it's a substantive review from the ground up, it has broader interim relief authority, and most importantly, panel decisions are made by a panel of three IRP members who were selected from the standing panel, but a panel decision is subject to appeal to the full standing panel and panel decisions are final, binding and enforceable following appeal. Next slide, please.

As you know, IRP is a form of arbitration. The intent here is to be efficient and an alternative to litigation. The claimants can include specifically empowered community, supporting organization, advisory committees, but because any legal entity can bring a claim, that means constituencies like stakeholder group, if they incorporate, can also do that. The rest of this slide we've just spoken about. Next slide, please.

Here are the things that are coming to you. Chris and Sam mentioned them. One is a selection of the standing panel. Here, you'll see a site to bylaw section 4.3 J which explains what's

involved. Next is adding new members to the IRP IOT. We can certainly use them, as Sam said. And then one thing to be aware of is the GNSO will be involved in empowered community claims at IRP, and so there you want to become familiar over time with Annex D section 4.2.

Finally, as Sam mentioned – next slide – there is more work for the IOT to do. Here's a list of it. We have to finish our supplementary rules of procedure. We've done most of the rules, but there are one or two left to be finished. We have to work on a cooperative engagement process, which is a form of trying to get the parties to settle. We have to do recommended training – we have to recommend training for the standing panel.

This sort of underscores how important that standing panel is, and over time, they are going to become familiar with ICANN and the work that ICANN does. That's part of the benefit of the standing panel. And you'll see there's a list there of other things that the IOT has to do. So we have a lot on our plate, and amongst them is adding members to the standing panel. So I wish this supporting organization, the GNSO, well in its endeavors to assist in that process. I'll leave it there, Keith, and happy also to answer questions.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Great. Thank you very much, David, and thanks, Sam and Chris as well for the words. So I want to just leave up the slide that's before us right now for a moment. And I just want to flag it for everybody. So the key here is that there has been a call for additional members for the implementation [inaudible].

So we need to take a look at this list of action items and things that need to be done, and there will need to be members of our community, whether it's councilors or members of our stakeholder groups and constituencies, to basically volunteer to help move this work forward. So please look at the list of things in front of us, try to think about who might be a good person to add to the implementation oversight team, because this is really important work as was noted by all three of our guests. It's an incredibly important accountability mechanism, and we really do need to sort of jump start the work, and to do that, the implementation oversight team needs new contributors.

So with that, let me see if there's anybody who would like to get in the queue. Okay, I'm not seeing any hands. Any questions for Chris, Samantha or David? I'm seeing no hands. Oh, there you go, Pam. Thank you very much. Go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Keith, and thank you, David, Sam and Chris for the briefing. It's very helpful, and this is really very important. If we are to call to the attention of our respective stakeholder group or constituency to join the IOT, what can we tell them about the workload, the time commitment or expectation and the expertise you are expecting? And who are actually on the IOT right now, and how many would you actually like, or additional members you'd like to have? Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Pam. All good questions. I don't know, David, Sam, you want to tackle that one?

DAVID MCAULEY: Maybe we both will, Keith. Let me go first. And Pam, as I mentioned, I'm currently the chair of the IOT, so I can provide some information. I'll come and send to Keith so he can send to the list a link to the members of the IOT. I don't have that in hand right now.

But it started in CCWG accountability as a small group. It was capped at 25. That no longer needs to be the case. Its formation was informed by people with legal background. That's not a requirement, but legal knowledge is probably very important to this process. This is a very intensely legal – it sits atop the accountability structures of ICANN. It's similar to litigation but not quite the same.

The time commitment, you can see on that last slide there's a lot of work to do, and this gets very nuanced and very involved. But the time requirement hasn't been all that great. We would like to sort of accelerate, and I would guess the time requirement might be a couple of hours a week, less than five, certainly, but that's just a guess. I'd be interested in Sam's insights on this too. Thanks.

SAMANTHA EISNER: I'm actually going to turn the floor over to Liz. Liz, are you able to speak?

ELIZABETH LE:

Yes. Hi. Thank you, Sam. So in terms of addressing the expertise that we are looking for to join the IoT, I think we are looking for people with expertise in IRP experience or in judicial or legal experience, or even alternative dispute resolution, or also people who have familiarity with ICANN's accountability mechanisms.

One of the things that we're looking for is to add – we have a lot of holes that we're seeing in our first IRP with respect to the interim supplementary procedures that have been put in place while the IOT finishes the work of updating the supplementary procedure. So we think that there might just be a few more members that need to be added and we definitely need to finish up the work that is needed, and of course, with the members, the right amount of expertise added to the group.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Liz, and thanks to you all. I don't see any other hands in chat, and we are a bit over time, so I'm going to thank each of you for coming to join us today, and we look forward to engaging from a council perspective in terms of helping get our constituencies and stakeholder groups to contribute some folks to the IOT recognizing that these are really important issues and an important accountability mechanism.

So thanks to Sam, David, Chris, Liz, much appreciated. Okay, so let's move on then. [inaudible].

CHRIS DISSPAIN: [Thanks a lot.]

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes. Thanks, all. Next item on our agenda is an update from James Gannon as the GNSO liaison to the Customer Standing Committee. I should say non-registry GNSO liaison to the Customer Standing Committee. So James, thanks for your patience. Much appreciated. Let me hand it over to you.

JAMES GANNON: No worries. Thanks, Keith. So yes, after three long years almost, the time's come for council to have a discussion, I think, about the future of the CSC non-registry liaison.

Back in, I'm going to say October 2016, I was appointed as the first non-registry liaison to the Customer Standing Committee. For councilors who may not have had experience with the CSC, this was a creation of the IANA transition, and it's quite a procedural committee. It's not very exciting, I will say. But it serves quite an important function.

The CSC currently oversees the implementation and the SLAs that are contained within the IANA functions contract between ICANN Org and PTI. So the CSC had, I would say in our first year, a lot of work to do. We had a lot of procedural rules to create, similar to actually the previous topic. You know there was a lot of procedural work that had to be generated.

But at this stage, much of that work is now complete. The CSC is operated quite well and very efficient. It's a small group. We have

two members representing the Registry Stakeholder Group, and then I serve as the liaison representing the rest of the GNSO.

At this time, I have served almost three years on the CSC as the liaison, and my term will come to an end technically in October, but I would assume that that will be melded in with the AGM in November, and the next steps, I suppose, are for council to decide if they wish for me to stay on in this role or if we want to seek additional candidates.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, James. Much appreciated, and thank you for your service over the last almost three years, and also for your expression of willingness to continue in the role if that's the wish of the council. So I think we have an opportunity to discuss this, it's not a decision that needs to be made today or even in the next coming weeks, but I wanted to give the council the opportunity to ask any questions of James or if there's anything further James would like to share with us substantively, procedurally or sort of how you think it's gone. And feel free to do that, but let me see if there are any questions at this time for James related to the Customer Standing Committee.

JAMES GANNON:

I see a question from Rubens. I believe there is a two-term limit, so I would be eligible to serve a second term if council did choose for me to do that.

Just to Keith's point on any substantial updates, not particularly, to be honest. The work of the committee is quite procedural, as I

said. On a monthly basis, you actually get the reports [from Bart] outlining the CSC's review of the SLAs on a monthly basis. So as I said, it's not the most exciting committee, but it is very important from a procedural point of view. But at this stage, the CSC is operating quite efficiently, and yeah, there have been no major changes in the past year, I would say, for example.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Great. Thanks, James, and thanks for noting the question in the chat. Would anybody like to ask any questions? Okay, I'm not seeing anything, so James, any final words? I guess we'll take it on to have a further conversation with council. Really do appreciate your service and your willingness to continue. So we'll take that on as an action item and try to resolve this moving forward. Rafik, I see your hand. Thank you. Go ahead head.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. Sorry for being late here. Just I want to ask a question to James. Thanks for the brief explanation about activity in the CSC SC, but just to know more from your experience, what do you think is kind of the profile that is needed for such role? And I also want to ask you, what do you think that you would like to be asked from the council? So since you are liaison here, what are your expectations from the council in terms of questions and so on.

JAMES GANNON:

Very briefly, if the council decides not to immediately reappointment and does wish to go through a selection process, I

would say that knowledge of the activities that happened during CWG stewardship and the IANA transition in general are incredibly important. Much of the procedural work that we do do is based on the outputs of CWG stewardship. Also a very intimate understanding of the IANA functions contract is a very good basis for anybody that wishes to serve on the CSC.

We do have a formal set of criteria that can be shared with the council if we do need to go through a selection procedure, but I would say that the biggest thing for me, at least on a practical basis, to be efficient and to serve on the CSC is a deep understanding of the activities that took place during the IANA transition.

As for the ask from Council, at the moment, my biggest thing is just I want to support council in making the decision on whether to reappoint me or to select an additional candidate. If there is going to be another person taking over, this is something that I would want to have a shadowing period potentially where I can do some knowledge transfer and hand over to the next liaison.

To Arsène's point in the chat, he's just asking what's the average time commitment, we do meet monthly for a 90-minute to 2:30 call depending on what's on the agenda, and then depending on what the actual liaison wants to do in regards to additional work, there is the opportunity to work in some small groups on topics such as revising SLAs and some of the liaison work with ICANN Legal and the ICANN Org as well.

KEITH DRAZEK: Very good. Thanks so much, James. And again, thanks for your willingness to join us today to give us an update and a briefing, and we'll take the action item and get back to you as soon as we can.

JAMES GANNON: Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: So in the interest of time – yeah, thanks so much, James, I really do appreciate everything you've done in this particular role. And if there are any follow-up questions for James, we can follow up via e-mail.

So with that, we can move to the next agenda item. We have just over ten minutes left on our call, and so I'd like to welcome Brian Cute for a discussion on the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model of governance. I think as everybody recalls, there was a high-interest topic session in Kobe, there's going to be another one scheduled for Marrakech. This is as Brian will describe, as he did in two webinars this week, go over sort of the project plan and next steps on this effort that really is an important one for the community.

So Brian, over to you. Welcome.

BRIAN CUTE: Thanks, Keith. Can you all hear me well enough?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, sure can.

BRIAN CUTE: Okay. Great. And I'll work within the time constraints. Greetings, everyone. My name is Brian Cute, I'm with the Eastham Group. I am a facilitator for this Work Stream. Very specifically, this Work Stream is in support of ICANN's strategic plan for 2021 to 2025, and specifically developing inputs for strategic objective number two on governance. The work of this Work Stream will become part of the operational plan at the end of the year, and let me walk you through where we are and where we're going.

First of all, we have a public comment period that's open from the 25th of April to the 4th of June. I encourage you all to file your comments. As Keith noted, I just held two webinars this week to get inputs into the process and to stir interest in the public comment period. If you could roll to the next slide, number four, Nathalie.

Community engagement and discussion in Barcelona and Kobe. This is the list of issues that's been developed to date. So there's really two objectives in this Work Stream: one is to develop an issues list. What are the issues that the community believes may be hampering the effective and efficient functioning of the multi-stakeholder model. This is a list that is a work in progress. The community is invited through public comment to clarify, specify, use examples so we can define the issues and understand how they're affecting the work of the community, and then phase two will be once these issues have been defined, consolidated and

prioritized, the final list, which I expect to present in Marrakech or just before Marrakech, will be mapped to a workplan.

So we'll take an issue and we're going to say who should own this within the context of the operational plan and the strategic plan, which entity should take on this issue and develop a solution, develop a new approach, develop a methodology, and we'll be asking within the five-year strategic plan timeframe when will this group deliver a solution.

And then the final question the work plan will be, what resources do you need to deliver this? That's phase two. In Marrakech, we'll begin to populate the workplan, and that's phase two through Montréal. So for every organization, stakeholder group, AC, SO, the board, the org, there may be an opportunity here to take on an issue and come up with a solution.

The important piece of that is that the work plan, as I said, will become part of the operational plan, and that'll give ICANN staff the opportunity to cost out these activities and the development of these solutions [that will improve the] working of the model.

If you could just slowly roll through, Nathalie, until slide 12. So this was for the webinar. What I've done is I'm showing the issues, I'm showing a couple of pieces of community input that we've received to date that define the issue and how it affects the working of the model, and you can just scroll through until slide 12 slowly.

This is to stir discussion, to provoke thinking and inputs and comments from the community. That was the purpose of the

webinar. I want to say at the outset that in my role, I'm to be a neutral facilitator of the community discussion, conversation on this. Part of that role is the responsibility to make sure that this is done with respect to all the other work that's going on in the community, which is quite heavy. And also to ensure that this work doesn't unnecessarily duplicate good work that's being done in other places or doesn't conflict with it.

So for example PDP 3.0, ATRT3, Work Stream 2, the review of the reviews. What I'm doing as a matter of course is mapping the work that's been done in PDP 3.0, ATRT3, Work Stream 2 and other areas, and creating a mapping to see where there's commonality on this issues list. I will work with the community to ensure that the final list does not conflict, does not replicate, and is consolidated and prioritized so that it is addressing the needs of the strategic plan, which is what this work is all about, and adding value and solutions that help the work become more effective and more efficient over time.

So I'll stop there and take any questions you have. I do want to reserve just two minutes at the end, Keith, so I can hit the last slide and let folks know what the next steps are.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Brian. Sounds great. Tatiana is in the queue. Go right ahead.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much. I have one concern regarding all this. I do understand that maybe we need to improve multi-stakeholder

model and all that, but I know that the community developed recommendations about ICANN accountability and further improvements in the Work Stream 2, and this set of recommendations is still not confirmed by the board. And it is still not clear what resources we will need to implement them and what would be the sequence of implementation. And now I think that in addition to all that, we are working on the improvement of multi-stakeholder model and revamping it. Brian or anyone, could you explain my how this is actually correlated with the Work Stream 2 accountability processes? Are we discarding them, are we going to provide any input between the two if there's any overlap?

I understand that we don't have enough time, so maybe it's a question for the future to answer. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE:

I'll take a crack at it. No, nothing is being discarded. This work is specifically to support the delivery of strategic objective number two of the strategic plan. It is not a replacement for any of the other Work Streams, it is intended to deliver on those goals, and at the same time, to be compatible.

I [note] what you said about the Work Stream 2 recommendations have not been taken on yet by the board for full implementation. I will point you to one of the issues that's on this list, is the timing of decision making. Another issue that's on this list is prioritization of work. Another issue that is on this list is costs. All of those issues, based on comments received to date – and yours now – relate to the dynamics that are taking place across the community.

So I would encourage you to file comments, to make these points. But to be clear, this does not replace, this is to deliver on strategic objective number two within the plan, and I'm responsible in working with the GNSO and with ATRT3 and the community on Work Stream 2 to ensure that this work moves forward without unnecessarily duplicating or conflicting with other Work Streams.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, Brian, and thanks, Tatiana for the question. We need to move on. Michele, you're next, and then we'll get it back to Brian for the last slide, and then we need to do some wrap up.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Yeah. Thanks. Thanks, Brian, for the presentation. And thanks for kind of leaving the door wide open for me to ask the obvious question: how much is this actually costing, this entire project that you're involved in? What is the cost for this?

And secondly, while you might not feel that this is conflicting with other Work Streams, I think for those of us on the inside, it does seem to be a little bit confusing that there are multiple projects, streams – I don't know what word people are comfortable with – that seem to all be trying to address the same topic but in different ways. That's more of a comment than a question, but the first one was a question. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thanks, Michele. So on the cost, it's the cost [–I'm engaged as] a consultant, and it's also the cost of staff time and supporting. I am working with MSSl. They are supporting me in terms of putting together the webinars, putting together the meetings at the ICANN meetings, the sessions that I'll be holding.

And with respect to your point about there's commonality, there is commonality. I see the commonality in leading this and in referring to and working with the other Work Streams, there are points of commonality.

I think two things are important. One is what is the purpose of the Work Stream, so in the case of GNSO PDP 3.0, it's clearly around improving the effectiveness of the PDPs. There's [inaudible] scope around this work for the strategic plan.

From this Work Stream, I'm [endeavoring] in coordination to ensure this Work Stream does not duplicate unnecessarily other work that's being done. So when this issues list is prioritized and consolidated, it should not be duplicating other work that's being done across the community. There may still be commonalities, but if the purpose is different, if the deliverable is specific, it could [inaudible] add value. I hope that [inaudible].

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Brian. Michele, thanks for the question. Tatiana, thanks for the question. Everybody, we have to wrap up this call now because the same bridge is needed for the EPDP call that's getting ready to begin. So I regret we didn't get a chance to discuss the board's letter regarding the EPDP phase

one resolutions. I will take an action item to schedule a separate special call for us to review that and discuss that at council further.

So Brian, thank you very much for joining. I apologize we ran out of time. Thanks for your input, thanks for the questions, everybody, and please, let's watch for your e-mail for scheduling a separate discussion on the EPDP phase one resolutions.

So, thanks, everybody. Appreciate you joining today. We'll close the call.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's call. Have an excellent rest of your day. Goodbye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]