
MARRAKECH – GNSO Council Meeting
Wednesday, June 26, 2019 - 13:00 to 15:00 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

KEITH DRAZEK: Perfect timing. Thank you.

All right. Hi, everybody. Thanks very much. This is Keith Drazek. Welcome to the GNSO Council formal meeting of ICANN65 in Marrakech. And with that, if I could hand it over to Nathalie for roll call.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Keith.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 26th of June 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.

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.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Rubens Kuhl.

RUBENS KUHL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Darcy Southwell.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Michele Neylon.

MICHELE NEYLON: Here in body.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Carlos Gutierrez.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Here, thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Scott McCormick.

SCOTT McCORMICK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady.

PAUL McGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: We have apologies from Elsa Saade. Her temporary alternate for ICANN65 is Robin Gross. Robin Gross?

ROBIN GROSS: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Arsene Tungali.

I don't see Arsene in the room yet.

Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Martin Silva Valent.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Ayden Ferdeline.

AYDEN FERDELINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Syed Ismail Shah has sent his apologies. He has given his proxy to Rafik Dammak.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr is not here yet. She'll be arriving a few minutes late.

Erika Mann.

ERIKA MANN: Not quite here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Sort of.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maarten Simon.

MAARTEN SIMON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. We also have GNSO support staff in the room, minus David Olive who sends his apologies.

I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for recording purposes. Thank you ever so much, and over to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Nathalie. So, again, good afternoon, all.

At this point, I will ask if there are any updates to Statements of Interest before we move to a review of the agenda for today's meeting.

So any updates to the Statements of Interest?

And from a process perspective, today we're going to try something different, and I'm going to keep the queue by people putting up their

flags rather than using the hands in Zoom. Okay? So use your name tag if you have an interest and I'll do my best to keep things in order. We'll see how that works. If it doesn't, we'll revert back for next meeting.

So no updates to the Statements of Interest, I see. Thank you very much.

We will move, then, to a review of the agenda for today's meeting. On the screen in front of you we have the list of 11 items, and I want to note that at the end of this meeting we are going to reserve ten minutes, 15 if we have time, for an open mic. So for those in the room, anybody who comes in late, there's an opportunity at the end of this meeting for an open mic.

We have been unsuccessful in managing -- or I should say I have been unsuccessful in managing our timing for previous meetings. We've always run out of time for that, but that's my commitment today, is to get through this with at least ten minutes at the end for open mic.

So, item 1, administrative matters. I think that's primarily what we've covered. And then next item on our agenda will be, well, administrative matters, opening remarks. We have nothing on the consent agenda, so zero minutes for that one.

Item 4, we will have a Council discussion on repopulating the IRP Implementation Oversight Team, the OIT. The GNSO will be required to provide input to the process eventually for establishing the standing panel.

And we have Sam Eisner in the room from ICANN org for the law department to answer any questions as well. So thank you, Sam. Much appreciated that you're here for that.

Item number 5 will be a Council discussion on IGO-INGO access to curative rights. We, as the Council, I think everybody knows, everybody was invited but we had a small team of Council working with some other invited experts, including Heather Forrest and Susan Kawaguchi. Avri Doria was there from the Board, worked with the GAC and interested parties from the IGOs to discuss next steps on the formulation and the chartering of a subgroup to look at recommendation number 5. We'll give an update on that.

Item number 6 will be a Council discussion on next steps for the IDN issue that we have to deal with. As just a reminder, we have a resolution from the ICANN Board in Kobe that requires us to engage considering policy implications of the IDN variants at the top level and to coordinate with the ccNSO. We need to discuss that as well as any implications for the IDN guidelines.

Item number 7 will be a Council discussion on the Board -- the discussion that we have had so far with the Board on the expedited -- sorry, the EPDP phase 1 recommendations. Everybody should recall that the Board did not accept two of the 27 recommendations in full, which puts the Council in a position of having to engage in a dialogue, consultation, whatever we want to call it with the Board on those two recommendations. And we've had some conversations this week, including during our working session over the weekend.

Council discussion item number 8 will be consideration of updates from PDPs. As everybody should recall, we had webinars, or a webinar prior to Marrakech where the PDP leadership provided updates. This is an opportunity for anybody to flag concerns or questions that they have where the Council might need to engage with PDP leadership to -- you know, to deal with any issues that have been identified.

Item number 9 is Council discussion on the referred recommendations by the Board from the CCT-RT, anything that the Council needs to focus on there.

And then item number 10 is a Council update on implementation of PDP 3.0. That's also something that we discussed with -- during our working session over the weekend, so we may not need to spend a lot of time on that.

And then item 11, any other business.

Would anybody like to suggest any changes, any comments or questions or additions to the agenda for today?

Okay. Seeing no flags, next slide, please.

Okay. So we have a review of the action items list is where I'll focus.

I'm just going to go through the action items that we have, not including the ones that are on today's agenda. The first is the Council will need, in the future, in the coming weeks, to focus on the evolution of the multistakeholder model of governance process. This is the effort that was initiated by the Board and is being run by Brian Cote. Obviously,

there was a high-interest topic session yesterday, and this is something that we'll need to talk about during an upcoming call, to see if there are any positions that the Council needs to take or any input that we would want to provide.

The RPM, sorry, next item, RPM charter amendments. This is actually somewhat related to the discussion we will have on IGO curative rights recommendation number 5, but we have acknowledged that the PDP for RPMs, you know, we have discussed rechartering that group for phase 2, and that that's something we'll need to continue to work on. Currently the phase 1 work is expected to conclude in April 2020, so to the extent that we're going to have a charter ready for phase 2, we indeed to start discussing that and start working towards that.

Next item is the legislative tracker. I think as we all know, ICANN org has undertaken, in the recent -- I guess over the last year, to start tracking developing regulation and legislation internationally that might have an impact on ICANN, and of course our interest is specifically on gTLD policy as the GNSO Council. We did have a discussion with the GAC yesterday where this topic was one of our topics of discussion, and we -- in response to some of the questions that have come up here on Council about this issue, about whether the GAC has a role to play in contributing to a better understanding of evolving and developing regulation and legislation around the world. And I think as everybody knows, there was -- there was a meeting of the CCWG-IG this week where ICANN org and ICANN board members participated. And there's some discussion now about whether that group might be rechartered to provide a venue or a forum for ICANN Board, ICANN org, ICANN

community, and potentially the GAC as part of that community to come together and have interaction and dialogue about this question of tracking legislation and regulation that might impact ICANN. So very brief update on that one. So something that we'll need to continue to focus on.

Next item, we'll have to focus on it in our upcoming meetings, CSC effectiveness review final report.

Next item, comments on ICANN's 2021-25 strategic plan, FY20 operating plan and budget, common concerns. This was a discussion that we had had with the ccNSO to try to identify any common areas of concern where, you know, we need to consider joint engagement or perhaps common comments.

Next item we have, this is just basically another update, PDP on sub pro. And of course as I said, we have the webinar prior to Marrakech on that. That's available for anybody to review. I expect we'll have another one coming out of Marrakech in very short order.

Okay. Next item, IANA functions review team. I think as most folks know, the ccNSO has been unable to identify a non-ccNSO CCT ccTLD registry to fill one of the three slots allocated to them, and they are going through a bylaw change request process. So the IANA Functions Review Team composition is currently on hold.

Next item.

Okay. Next item is the -- Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Michele for the record.

I believe that the status of the finding a non-ccNSO member might actually be in flux, because I've heard via back channels that they may have found somebody.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Michele. I had heard that there may have been some expressions of interest as well, but that from the ccNSO perspective, even if they were to consider a new candidate, they would have to go through the call for interest again, which, you know, potentially could have some delay impacts as well. But thank you for that. That's -- if that's the case, then -- let me just point out, I'm not sure that that will change the ccNSO's view of going through the bylaw change request. It might allow the IANA Functions Review Team to begin more quickly, but I think they're still pursuing the path of the bylaw change.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah, I think -- this is Michele again for the record. I think you're right. The -- changing the bylaws is obviously not a simple, straightforward, quick process. And while it might be painful to go through some -- go through (indiscernible) process to choose somebody for a particular review, that will be a hell of a lot easier than making bylaw change.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Michele. And I will take a moment to pause to see if anybody else's cards are up.

I don't see any. Philippe, go right ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Philippe Fouquart. Just a completely different point, but on the CSC report, I guess they reason why it's not complete that we're still waiting for the IANA Function Review to actually start, because the work has been done. It's just a matter of conveying the report as anything else as anything else. There's nothing left to do for us, I think.

Just make sure I've got that understanding correctly.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Philippe. That's a good question. So the work of the CSC review is done. It has not been transmitted because of the lack of the IANA Functions Review Team composition. And if we have any of that wrong, I'm sure staff will correct us, but thank you.

Okay. The next item on the agenda -- or, sorry, the action items list is the drafting team on the charter related to next steps for ICANN's procedure of handling WHOIS conflicts. This is on hold until the conclusion of the EPDP phase 2 unless councillors and Council decides that this needs to be elevated or accelerated in terms of urgency. I have heard none of that at this point, so this is currently on hold.

Next item.

Okay. And finally, the last item on the action items list that's not currently on our agenda for today is a review -- sorry, it's the IRTF policy

status report, the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy status report. And I think we have an action to determine next steps for the transfer policy.

This actually is part of the discussion for tomorrow's high-interest topic cross-community session on impacts of EPDP phase 1 on existing policies, procedures, and contractual provisions. So just want to take a moment to remind everybody that tomorrow I will be moderating a community input session on just that. There's a list of approximately 13 or 14 different items that people will have the opportunity to contribute to in terms of identifying impacts, identifying inconsistencies or incompatibilities between recommendations coming from the new EPDP phase 1 consensus policy and where there are implementation issues, conflicts with other existing policies and procedures and contractual provisions. So there's essentially three categories.

What we care most about, you know, on the front line as the Council is where are there existing consensus policies that are impacted by the new consensus policy, and how are we going to deal with that and deal with that list. This is the beginning of a really significant work effort, so I hope everybody can be there. If you can't be there, encourage other members of your constituencies and stakeholder groups to participate and contribute.

I know it's late in the last day of the meeting, but this is an important effort.

Thank you. Okay. So let's move on, then.

So the blue items on the screen in front of you are those that are on our agenda today, so we're going to skip through those.

So if we can go back to the agenda, please. Okay.

PAUL McGRADY: Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Paul.

PAUL McGRADY: I hate to do this, but I want to go back to something that we touched on briefly, which was the phase 2 for RPM PDP rechartering. That will probably naturally come up in our conversations later.

But I got the sense from our small-group meeting yesterday that there's -- there's a sense of urgency here that may not be looking at April 2020. And so I just wanted to flag that now, sort of a precursor. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Paul. And we will get to the discussion of the IGO/INGO curative rights discussion with the GAC yesterday. So let's make sure we come back to that at that point.

You are absolutely right. We had -- just for everybody's benefit, that was -- the recommendation -- sorry. The resolution we passed on this issue basically said we would be looking to incorporate Recommendation

Number 5 in a subgroup under phase 2. And the plan at that point was to charter it and have it ready to go.

There is some ongoing discussion about creating the subgroup perhaps earlier to that. We will get to that in a minute.

Thanks, Paul.

Okay. Next item.

Council discussion -- so, yeah, consent agenda. There's nothing on it.

Move on to the next. Agenda Item Number 4 is the repopulation of the independent review panel, IRT -- IOT, IRP IOT and questions about GNSO input on this.

And I'm sure Sam Eisner will correct me if I'm wrong. Feel free to join us at the table. But my understanding is that we are soon to see -- if it hasn't come out already, soon to see a communication from the ICANN Board on this topic. I think that the IRP IOT has been under way for quite a while now, coming out of the ICANN Accountability Work Stream 1 effort. It's continued on through the Work Stream 2 effort. And there is more work yet to be done.

And we really have two issues here that I'll tee up and then maybe hand over to Sam. One is the implementation oversight team. I think as we have discussed before, the IOT started out with approximately 25 members, which was what was sort of called for coming out of the Accountability Work Stream 1. And over time, it has dwindled in terms of participation, activity, and, you know, contributors with expertise.

And so there is -- I think has been a recognition within ICANN and within the IOT itself that we need to inject some additional, you know, sort of life to the group and to bring in some new people to help populate a group with, as I said, the expertise and, you know, the ability to contribute in a timely manner. So that's one component that we'll talk about.

And the second is about the establishment of a standing panel. As is called for and required by the ICANN bylaws coming out of the IANA transition, there is a requirement for a standing panel for IRPs. And the community and the Board need to go through a process of identifying how we move forward on this standing panel establishment, how to identify the panelists and the procedures that need to be put in place.

And so that's my setup. And I hope that's clear enough for purposes of this discussion.

SO, Sam, if I can hand it over to you and maybe we can open it up for just a little bit of Q&A.

SAMANTHA EISNER:

Thanks, Keith. I'm Sam Eisner. I'm with the ICANN legal department.

And so Keith is right, there are really two things that are on the table that we're looking for community input on right now.

And so on the first topic, the IRP IOT, there's -- you probably saw over the past couple months there's something in the community digest that goes out to the SO/AC leadership -- and then I understand it's circulated

more broadly to membership -- identifying that there is a need for more participation because there are about five to six active members in the IOT. And so they have trouble reaching quorum. There's trouble advancing the work.

So the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee, which is the committee that's charged with the oversight of ICANN's accountability mechanisms has really started taking a very renewed and active interest in making sure that the IRP gets to the place that we've all hoped it would be in the wake of the changes that were made during the accountability process that happened alongside the transition.

And so they are probably -- hopefully hours, if not just a day away or so, of sending a letter out to the SO/AC leadership specifying a little bit more because we realize one of the problems with the call for people to get interested and submit their information didn't really have enough process around it. And so we were asked to provide clarity.

And so the communication that will come from the BAMC will provide that clarity, will provide a process, will help give the SOs and ACs some information about how the ICANN Board is looking to consult with the SOs and ACs to get people onto that.

So when you see that, if you have any questions, you can always go to the BAMC. You can always come to me. I will help get whatever answers you might need on them.

But we would ask that you really try to find people who understand international arbitrations, dispute resolution and the like, or

specifically ICANN's accountability mechanisms and how they run to try to bring really good expertise to join the group and work alongside all the membership and actively working so far.

But, again, it's just a small group of people who have been active to get the rules finalized so that they can be in line with international arbitration standards and do the other work that still remains because there's actually still a whole other group of work that remains. So that's the first issue.

And then on the standing panel, I think it was at the -- around the end of April or beginning of May, Goran put out a blog regarding how we need to move forward on getting the standing panel put together. And the important part of that is there's a community component of that, and the community still needs to figure out amongst yourselves with whatever support you need from us from org side or from the Board side as well on how to meaningful contribute to the process of identifying a panel of people to come and serve as the standing panel.

It's a stage process, but there is a specific role for the community in taking those who have already been deemed as highly qualified and coming up with a panel for Board approval.

And so we've tried to push out some questions for discussion. There was an open call for responses to that. We received some responses. I know I've talked to some people who wrote after the deadline and said, you know, could you still consider them.

Anything you have in response to those questions, if there's a council-level input you want to give, please send. We'll continue to take that into consideration.

And then we'll be moving forward from the ICANN side, again, under the oversight of the BAMC in trying to move out with an expression of interest so we can try to kind of panel this on a dual track and not create as long of a tail so we don't continue having a dependency of closing all the discussions we might need in the community before we go out for what might be an extended process in trying to get interested people to come and serve on that panel.

And then as that's going on, we will continue to work with the community in order to get the questions about the community's role in helping select the panel after we get their names to move forward.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Sam.

And I'll open the queue now. But just to sort of put a point on this, as Sam noted, the IRP is an incredibly important accountability mechanism. It is essentially the ultimate accountability mechanism after all other mechanisms have failed or have gone through the process. And so this is really, really critical in terms of establishing sort of the foundation for ICANN's future and accountability.

So I think we should take an action item to identify a small group of councillors to review the questions that were put out by Goran. Again,

I know that our respective stakeholder groups and constituencies have, in some cases, responded and in some cases maybe not.

But I think we as the council probably should look at this from a council perspective to identify if there are any issues that we'd like to comment on.

So would anybody like to get in queue? I don't see any questions.

Paul, go right ahead. Thank you.

PAUL McGRADY:

Thank you. This is Paul McGrady. Just a really pedestrian question, which is: What's the time frame on this? Have you guys said, like, this has to be done by this date? Because we're now, like, in year three or so since the Obama administration didn't renew the agreement. So we figure -- this needs to get done. I don't mean that in a snarky way. We just found -- I just found over the years that if something has a hard deadline, that seems to motivate people. Thanks.

SAMANTHA EISNER:

Thanks, Paul.

That is something that we're really trying to focus on now. The BAMC is really trying to look and see how they can try to help the community stage its work, so it gets done quickly. So while there's not a hard outside deadline right now, they will be suggesting a deadline of when they'd like to see new volunteers come forward to participate in the IRP.

And then once we get there, I expect that we'll have a more rigorous work plan that we're working against so that we have some end dates that we're trying to hit to get to a final set of rules.

We do have an interim set of rules that's in operation right now, and we have mechanisms to make the IRP work. We just want to make it work exactly as intended and not just use some of the gap measures that we have right now.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Sam. I have got Flip in queue.

I'm sorry. Paul, you want to just respond?

PAUL McGRADY: Just a short response to emphasize that I don't mean that sneakily, that we actually have some anti-poster child PDPs when it comes to deadlines and timing and finishing things up. I really just wanted to -- it was meant in good faith. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Paul.

So I'll just respond, then we will go to Flip, and then to Greg at the microphone.

One of the things -- I had a conversation with Chris Disspain a couple of weeks ago on this topic. He's obviously on the Board Accountability

Mechanisms Committee. And we did have Sam and David McAuley and Chris join one of our recent council calls where this was discussed.

One thing that Chris and I discussed was the need for some sort of deadline for a nomination or an appointment cycle for the IOT and then to start putting out some, you know, parameters for the following work. So I think that's definitely recognized as a need.

And you're absolutely right. Unless we have some deadlines or targets, there's so much on our plates right now, it's hard to actually focus on anything without that forcing mechanism. So thank you.

Flip and then Greg.

FLIP PETILLION:

Flip Petillion. Thank you, Keith.

I'm absolutely ready to help and to share my views. But as you know, and as I have disclosed, I have probably been counsel to half of the parties in the current IRPs.

So if the council accepts that, I would definitely be willing to share my views from a rather neutral and academic point of view. But if the council would object to that, I would have no problem with that and I would refrain from sharing my views.

But you were asking for expertise and I think it would be natural that I offer at least.

SAMANTHA EISNER:

I'm not in any way speaking for the council. However, even from the very first meetings of the IOT, even before the transition proposal was completed and everything, one of the things that was recognized is that those who have participated in IRPs are very -- from our aspect are very well-suited to provide that sort of expertise.

So I think from the ICANN side, we wouldn't see that as a bar for participation. We would welcome the kind of experience specifically with ICANN accountability mechanisms as well as with the resume' that you bring with you could bring to the group.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Flip and Sam.

Greg, I am going to come to you at the mic. But just to note, we are taking open mic at the end of the session. But since Sam is here and may not be able to stay for the whole thing, we'll give you the opportunity. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I'll be brief. I stand here as one of the few members of the IRP IOT participating since the beginning, still participating. It's incredibly important that we finish our work.

Our work is very close to finished. Unfortunately, due to falling away of membership, we've actually had to cancel multiple meetings for lack of a quorum. I would love nothing more than a time frame, but a time frame is useless without a working group. And a working group can't

work without people. And we have an incredible amount of expertise. And not just Flip but others here who would be able to give.

There's in a sense not a lot of work left. There's clearly substantial work left. And with as many of these, some difficult work left. But nonetheless, we really just need to populate this. Thank you very much.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Greg. All well said and completely agree.

Any final questions or comments on this one? Take advantage of the fact that we have Sam here. No? All right. Thank you very much, Sam. Appreciate it.

Okay. Let's move on to our next agenda item which is the council discussion on the IGO/INGO curative rights issue.

So I will take the opportunity to provide an update on the conversation we had yesterday with members of the GAC and the IGOs. And I will certainly turn to Pam who was there, as council leadership Rafik unfortunately had a conflict that was unavoidable. We did have a conversation this morning to make sure that we were all sort of in sync.

So I think as everybody knows, we have had a long-running discussion on this particular topic. Back in April, we approved a council resolution that forwarded four recommendations to the ICANN Board for action and then referred a fifth recommendation to the RPM PDP working group for further consideration because in that case, the recommendation suggested some impacts to UDRP, which is the subject and focus of the phase 2 of the RPM group.

We also, as council, determined that that Recommendation Number 5 was out of scope for the curative rights PDP, and that's sort of where we ended up.

Just prior to this meeting, we received -- we, the council, and the GAC received a joint letter from the ICANN Board indicating they had received Recommendations 1 through 5 and were intending to put those recommendations out for a public comment period, which is, of course, you know, part of the process for Board review before taking any action.

And so at the time, the Board indicated that it was not at this time prepared to engage in a facilitated dialogue with the GAC and the GNSO Council. The reason that would be an issue is that because the Recommendations 1 through 4 were not consistent with previous GAC advice.

So the Board is in a situation now where it will either approve Recommendations 1 through 4 and have to engage with the GAC in explaining why it did not accept GAC advice, or it will return those Recommendations 1 through 4 to us for further consideration and further work.

The message as I take it from the Board and as we've had conversations is, you know, we're going to consider this. We're not ready to take an action at this time. And you, the GNSO Council and the GAC and IGOs, have an opportunity to engage in some further discussion and dialogue on this.

The opportunity that we took yesterday, and as we set up the conversation with Manal and the GAC and the IGOs, was we, as the council, really wanted the conversation to focus on the work ahead on the RPM -- or the chartering effort and the scoping effort for the dedicated sub-team under the umbrella of the RPM PDP.

I apologize for all the acronyms.

But this was the focus and the intended focus of the conversation from our perspective. Of course, as we went into the conversation, as is not surprising, the IGOs and the members of the GAC wanted to discuss the Recommendations 1 through 4 that are currently with the Board.

Leading into Marrakech and during that meeting, we made it very clear that the GNSO Council's process around Recommendations 1 through 4 is complete, that those recommendations are now with the Board and our focus is on coming up with the scoping effort around the RPM PDP working group and this dedicated sub-team to look at this particular issue triggered by the referral of Recommendation 5.

So my goal -- and our goal coming out of that meeting yesterday was to secure some expression of interest or willingness from the IGOs in particular, and members of the GAC, to contribute to our work in chartering that group. In other words, if we're going to go through a process of chartering a sub-team, which is something relatively new, and to focus on this very specific and nuanced issue, very complex legal issue, that we wanted to ensure that, A, we had the input from the GAC and the IGOs as we chartered the group and scoped the group and decided how it was going to be comprised and that they would commit

to participating in the actual working group, which is something that we unfortunately did not have during the original work that was done during the previous PDP.

And I think through that conversation we were able to have a good, constructive dialogue, got some indication that they would be willing to engage in this with us, but I have to note that one of the things that they wanted to talk about was to ensure that they would be able to consider the issue holistically. So in other words, they wanted to look at the issue, you know, in its entirety rather than just the specific language that was identified in recommendation number 5.

And in response, we acknowledged that there is the possibility for an existing consensus policy to be replaced by a new consensus policy. In other words, if the Board does accept recommendations 1 through 4 and they become consensus policy, there will still be opportunity for this subgroup to come up with a new recommendation. And that would actually -- obviously have to go through the normal GNSO Operating Procedures and follow the rules around establishing consensus policies, then.

So we have some more work to do there, and I'm going to say one last thing and see if Pam has anything that she'd like to add, and then we can open it up for questions. But the way that we teed this up in the conversation, trying to focus this on the chartering and scoping effort ahead rather than looking backwards is to say we as the GNSO Council are going to have to charter a group; right? We're going to have to

charter some PDP effort, whether it's a subgroup of an existing PDP or something new.

If the Board accepts recommendations 1 through 4, then it would be comprised the RPM PDP umbrella, the effort. If they return 1 through 4 to us, we'll probably be in a position of having to establish a new PDP on the issue.

So either way that goes, we still have to go through this chartering and scoping effort. And that was the message that we gave to them, is however this plays out, whatever action the Board takes, we need and want your input, so we can try to structure this appropriately for maximum success.

So I hope that wasn't too much but that's the context of the discussions we had, you know, over the last several months, this week, and looking ahead.

So, Pam, is there anything you would like to add?

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Keith. Pam Little speaking for the -- from the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

I maybe just want to provide a sort of more layman term about these recommendations 1 through 4 for our councillors as a refresher, maybe for those are participating.

Basically, this working group was chartered to see whether the UDRP or URS can be amended or a new dispute resolution mechanism model on

UDRP or URS be developed to enable IGOs and INGOs to use because at the moment they feel the current UDRP and URS rules do not suit them and because of the unique position as not really a trademark holder.

So if you recall the recommendation 1 through 4 the Council approved back in April, basically one of those recommendations says there will not be a new dispute resolution mechanism to be developed for IGOs and INGOs. But to me the primary goal of that working group really is to find a way of amending the UDRP and URS or developing a new dispute resolution mechanism for the IGOs and INGOs.

So now I guess the challenge for all of us is having approved the recommendation 1 to 4, including the one that says there is no need for a new dispute resolution mechanism, but referring 5, recommendation 5 to phase 2 of the RPM working group. The phase -- recommendation 5 actually only deals with the jurisdictional immunity issue. And I guess the GAC's concern is really that wasn't the main purpose of the original working group that worked for four years on this topic.

So the reference to holistic approach I guess is to say how -- how this recommendation 5 referral would be probably constrained for this new group. And so that's their concern.

And then the challenges for us as a group at the Council is we already approved that recommendation, that consensus policy recommendation from the community, from the working group. Now it's sitting with the Board. So -- and so it's kind of in a bit of a holding pattern there. And pending the outcome from the Board action or nonaction, how do we then deal with this and also charter and scope

this new body. Whether it's a discrete work stream of phase 2 RPM or EPDP, it's unknown at the moment.

I hope that makes sense.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Pam. That was really helpful additional context and clarity.

Paul, over to you.

Thank you.

PAUL McGRADY: Thanks. Paul McGrady here.

So setting -- sort of setting aside that -- right? -- for a moment and looking at the future, I think that we -- whatever we do from here ultimately is going to affect 1 through 4 because either the Board will send along 1 through 4, it will become policy. And then if we're talking about chartering a new sub-team or something in phase 2 of the PDP, they may come up with recommendations that then modify, undo, enhance, reaffirm, whatever, 1 through 4; right?

So from my point of view what the Board does or doesn't do with 1 through 4 doesn't really have much effect on where we go from here because whatever team we charter doesn't have to hold 1 through 4 as sacred. Does that make sense?

Now, the question that we're talking about putting before a new team is recommendation 5. And I think more specifically, is recommendation 5 the way to go? I think we've already sort of determined that it's not or else we would have said, you know, yay for recommendation 5. And if not, what then? And that "what then" could be a fairly big question for this team to answer, but if we give it one question, that will also limit the time frame in which it needs to move.

So in terms of 1 through 4, okay. In terms of 5, we've already sort of rejected it, so 5 gives us a segue to ask a different question perhaps. So I don't want us to be too bogged down on what's happened in the past.

I would like to speak a bit at the right time about what the future might look like, just from notes coming out of that discussion yesterday. But I just wanted to react to Pam's note.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Paul.

So maybe what I could do is, since we've been talking quite a bit, is just to open it up right now to see if there are any initial questions or feedback or, you know, any requests for clarification. If not, then I'll hand it back over to Paul for this conversation.

But I think what we're looking to do now, and as we engaged and entered that conversation with the GAC and the IGOs yesterday, is to look ahead and try to figure out how best to scope the effort ahead, wherever it lands and wherever it lives and however it's structured, as how to scope that effort for maximum success.

And so what I think we will eventually do coming out of this discussion today and over the next weeks and months is to come up with a charter, drafting team or a scoping team that will engage with the IGOs to ensure that we're receiving their input. It's ultimately our responsibility to charter; right? It's our job, but I think we can do our job best through being informed of the views of the impacted parties.

So with that, Martin and then Robin, and then we'll go to Paul. I think that's an old hand from Flip.

So Martin.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT:

Thank you, Keith. This is Martin Silva for the record.

It's my understanding that if we are giving a new part of the charter to the RPM with this issue, we are sort of giving a blank card for that new subgroup, or whatever its form eventually, a blank card in the sense of a blank page to work on this. And we are not just handing them the obligation to implement something that came from other work. Is this correct? Or we are giving the RPMs (indiscernible) to say find a way to implement this that has already been discussed into the UDRP as you can, but implement this.

I understand that if we delegate this to the RPMs, they have they past, they have an idea, they have a suggestion, that they have a blank page to say -- to redo the mandate of how we solve the IGO/INGO access. Is this correct or am I wrong? I might be wrong. It's a genuine question.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Martin. It's a great clarifying question, and I'll try to address it, and if Pam or others, or Paul, would like to jump in. So this was actually discussed during the meeting yesterday and it was a question of, you know, are we considering previous work? Are we starting completely from scratch? And does it have to be something specific to the UDRP; right? And I think the answer to that is we don't want to discard or ignore previous work. We don't want to necessarily say this has to be a function of the UDRP, and that it's really now up to us to figure out, you know, how much of a blank slate and how -- you know, how targeted and how we scope and how we sort of frame the issue in the charter going into it.

And so I know that middle -- that third answer is a little bit wishy-washy. It's a little bit, you know, unclear because I don't think we have a real solid answer. I think that's the work ahead of us in the coming weeks and months.

So, Pam, do you have anything you'd like to add to that?

PAM LITTLE:

Not -- not just on that particular point but yesterday, I think during the small team meeting with the GAC representatives, one of our Council representatives actually brought up the point that to make sure that whatever work has been done in the previous working group is not wasted, and so to leverage what has already been done. And that's very important.

And then when we talk about maybe making new policy that would replace the, now, recommendation 1 through 4 that is to become -- potentially become consensus policy, I guess that working group or that team, small team really needs to look at the work that the previous working group has done, and also come up with compelling reason why they are now rejecting that recommendation, and to -- to show that there is a need and with sound reasoning, we need a new mechanism, for example.

So I think in that context, it is to really look at what has been done, perhaps with the flawed reasoning or incorrect facts that the team actually looked at. So now with the new information or new analysis, there is a good, sound reason to have this new dispute resolution mechanism developed.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Pam.

Martin, did you want to follow-up? And then I'm going to hand it over to Paul, and then probably we need to -- oh, Robin, I'm sorry. Martin follow-up, Robin, Paul, then we need to move on in the agenda.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT:

Thank you, Keith. Very briefly. My intuition is that we need to give sort of a blank slate to RPMs eventually because the equation that balances the decisions there just have different variables than the ones decided

eventually the work track 5 -- the recommendation 5 and other recommendations. But I understand the need of not throwing it away. But at the end, I see that always as a background suggestion and everything and just they need to redo the equation for this working group.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Martin. It sounds like we may have our first volunteer for the drafting team.

Robin, over to you.

ROBIN GROSS: Thanks. Well, you were about to get your first volunteer for the drafting team anyway because I just wanted to let you know that the councillor that I'm here to represent this week, Elsa Saade, would like to join this drafting team. So you've got two members now.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Robin and Elsa.

Paul, over to you, and then we'll take one last round ever any, you know, quick questions, but we do need to move on.

PAUL McGRADY:

Thanks, Keith. As team member number three, I agree with Martin; right? Sorry, but I don't think that a lot of time, months, years ginning up the prior discussions that led us to outcomes that were not great, one of which we've essentially rejected, is going to move this forward at the speed with which the GAC members and the IGO participants that were there yesterday have in mind. I'm not saying that history isn't important, and we can spend a little bit of time doing that, but if I'm right, I think there was -- the staff report originally on this was in 2007? Something like that. I mean, it's been a long, long time. So I do think it may be time to set aside some of those things.

The advantages that a fresh slate would bring us is we can do away with a lot of really philosophical questions. For example, what does 6ter of the Paris Convention give you in terms of standing for a UDRP. I mean, I've been practicing law for about 20 years and I could probably spend three months and then write a paper on 6ter and nobody would read it; right?

If we have a blank slate, we can write our own rules about standing means and where you set that issue. We don't have to spend six months studying 6ter. It's nonstarter. So there are things like that that we can do to move things along quickly.

I haven't had a chance to run this past my constituency, so if I'm speaking out of school, I apologize to any IPC members that are listening and I'll take the heat. But there are some things to -- just some things to think about.

One, recognizing the concerns of, you know, the issues out of the last working group. We've done that. We went in very conciliatory yesterday. We get it. It wasn't -- you know, the outcomes weren't great. We'd like to start again. I think we can now put that behind us, you know, and say, okay, we're done. We -- apologize is the wrong word, but we acknowledged everyone's concerns and now the Council wants to move on.

I think we need speed on this one, and we've talked about April 2020 as when phase 1 is winding down. Here is what I might get in trouble for. I think we need phase 2A. If we're going to stuff this into phase 2, I don't see why phase 2A would need to wait for phase 1 to be over. If we wait for phase 2 to begin and then charter a sub-team, it's going to be the same overworked participants anyway, so we might as well overwork the participants in phase 1 instead of phase 2. What's the difference; right? So I don't think we have to wait until April TOR March next year to get started.

I think something like this with a single issue, which is if not rec 5, and obviously it's not rec 5 because we voted no, then what, is a fairly narrow question. And that might take the work of rec 5 and find some way to fix that or it may be a new dispute mechanism. That's what was being discussed around the table yesterday. As a Council, we can't pre-assume any outcome, but if we ask the working group one or two questions instead of 50 questions we can move quickly.

I would personally love to see this issue wrapped up before phase 2 proper, phase 2B begins, because I think with one or two questions, we

can move that quickly if we have the right size team, the right number of participants, the right expertise on that team.

And so I've got a list of other things to talk about, but the bottom line is I think that if we go into this with a sense of urgency and a sense of narrowness and a sense -- and we have to make a decision about whether or not we're going to put this off until next summer, which is when phase 2 will get under way, or if we're going to start now, get this done before April 2020. I think that's an important question, which means, you know, if we're going to do phase 2A, then leadership team, membership criteria, all that stuff, we have to move forward.

It would be great if we could say that we're going to do this under PDP 3.0. PDP 3.0 isn't done yet; right? So we have to do this under PDP 3.0 principles; right? Right size team, you know, issues about leadership, those kinds of things. So in some respects, we're kind of jumping ahead on PDP 3.0 by doing this.

Anyway, that's just my suggestion that we think about how narrow and sleek we can make this.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, Paul. This is Keith again.

So I think that's all very well said. And again, I think the next step for us, as Council, is to pull together volunteers who would like to participate

in that drafting team effort who will then, in turn, work with IGOs and GAC members to secure input so we can go through this process.

I just want to say one last word on this before we move on, and that is, you know, as Council and as Council leadership, you know, we obviously have a job, and that is to manage policy processes. We did that with the output of the IGO/INGO CRP PDP. We have forwarded those recommendations 1 through 4 to the Board and referred number 5. I know I'm recapping here, but those are our GNSO and GNSO Council approved recommendations at this time. They may be accepted by the Board and become consensus policy. If something, as I said earlier, is going to replace that, it needs to follow GNSO policy and operating procedures; right?

And so I'm just putting a marker down to say, you know, that this -- whatever comes out of this will follow our operating procedures, and that we are very sensitive to, you know, how this plays out moving forward.

So what I'm going to do is let's take an action item to send a call for volunteers to the list. And if people would respond and will come together. And then because of the positive response I think that we got from the GAC and the IGOs yesterday, I would like to see this, as Paul said, try to move a little bit more expeditiously in terms of next steps and action.

Okay. Thank you very much, everybody, for that.

We're a little bit over time but not too much. So next item.

Okay. This is the discussion about the IDN policy work. As I mentioned at the outset in Kobe, the ICANN Board approved a resolution to discuss basically to talk about IDN variants and IDN variants at the top level, identifying the potential need for policy work both for gTLDs and ccTLDs and acknowledging the need for the GNSO and ccNSO communities to work together to ensure a consistent policy to the extent possible. And so we have that as one component.

And the other component of our discussions over the last several months now is about the potential need to look at the IDN issue holistically; to consider the implication of the IDN guidelines 4.0 which have over time become not best practices and guidelines and now become contractual obligations; and do we need a policy process to essentially create a framework for those guidelines, now contractual obligations, to exist.

So we as council need to take this on, and we need to move this forward. We have, I think, several volunteers on this from council. I think it's Rubens, Maxim, and Philippe, I believe, have volunteered to participate in this.

It would be great if we could get some additional folks to participate. I know IDNs is a very technical and nuanced issue that not everybody has bandwidth for or has strong feelings about.

But this is an important topic, and the Board did take action giving us the obligation to, you know, consider policy implications on this.

So I have Rubens in queue, Michele in queue. If anybody else would like to get in, please do.

Rubens.

RUBENS KUHL:

Rubens Kuhl, Registry Stakeholder Group.

Just a side note that happened while I was following the IDN team, that during the GGG Summit in Thailand -- the summit is the contracted party house intersessional -- ICANN org made a very bold statement that the IDN guidelines, which is the second-level IDN rules, were made as a request from the GNSO Council.

And that surprised me. And I started looking at the transcripts. And that was actually one thing that was discussed during a GNSO working -- council working session that happened during weekends at that time.

So besides the substance of the IDN topic, which I will speak to later, there is -- probably something to be made clear to ICANN org is that discussions during GNSO working sessions are not GNSO Council requests and when we request something, to be described as such as a request. So there is an opportunity to make things clear from that point.

I have some more substantive comment, but I will let the discussion go around and be back later.

KEITH DRAZEK: Great, thanks very much, Rubens.

Michele, you're next.

If anybody else would like to get in the queue, please put up your flag.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Keith. Michele for the record.

I suppose from my perspective with the IDNs, the way you introduced this, it sounds to me that this isn't one single discrete topic, that you're actually talking about probably three or four separate tracks all related to Is. Some of them are purely policy, policy, wonkery, legalese, crafting of document-type stuff. Other aspects of it, however, are operational. And then you also have issues of coordination between the ccNSO and GNSO.

So I think it might be helpful -- obviously not at this moment, but to try and break that out into those separate, independent tracks because trying to take it on as an entire topic as one probably won't really work because the skill set required to address it is going to be diverse.

I mean, on the policy language-type stuff, you need a Paul McGrady-type person.

Sorry. Okay. We're are halfway through the meeting and I haven't had a go with you yet. Come on.

On the more technical, operational side of things, you need a very different style of input.

One of the areas I know is causing concern, for example, in the security community is the inconsistency of some of the rule sets around where IDNs can be used, the character sets, the mixing of character sets right and left of the dot, and various other things here which do cause issues and have caused issues and will continue to do so until there's greater clarity and consistency within that space.

So I'm also -- rather than just beating up on you, Mr. Chair, if we do break that up into discrete sections, I'd be interested in following the more kind of operational security aspect of it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks very much, Michele.

And I will just make a couple of quick comments and then get to Maxim and then Rubens.

Yeah, as you've noted, there are a number of different components to this question, right? There is the question of policy development for new gTLDs as it relates to the IDN variant issue, right?

There is -- and there is also the question of policy work around existing gTLDs. And all of that has to be considered in the context of the IDN variant policies and issues around the ccTLDs, right? So there is a bit of a mix in terms of where these things come in.

And, of course, from a GNSO Council perspective, we have to figure out where the policy issues are and where they intersect. And that's one of the reasons why we've said, Boy, we might need to take a look at this

holistically to make sure we're getting it right and not doing it piecemeal and ending up with problems down the road.

And I think there are -- Michele, as you notice, the guidelines, particularly guidelines 4.0 at this point, are operational in nature. But I believe, as I understand -- and I'm not an expert in this field -- that there is some interrelation between the guidelines and the variant question that needs to be sort of fleshed out.

So I agree that this is a fairly complex topic that is nuanced and specialized, if you will, in terms of IDNs.

Again, Michele, quick response. And then I'm going to Maxim.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks.

Just one small follow-up. I think also from some of the conversations I've had at both ICANN meetings and elsewhere, I think there is a certain degree of urgency around moving this forward, because our lack of movement on this is having an impact on other work tracks elsewhere.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Michele.

I will just take a note, there is an ICANN policy staff paper on this that has been produced and distributed. So I would encourage everybody who is tracking this, cares about this, to make sure we've reviewed that because I think it does help us understand and set the scene and the

framework. And thanks to Steve and team for all the work that they've put into that.

So, Maxim, then Rubens.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Maxim Alzoba for the record.

Speaking about guidelines, those are contractual obligations for registries. And the fact that you have a group of technically oriented people, some of them with linguistic background, were discussing something going into contracts is not very assuring.

And the situation is that the (indiscernible) has four parts. It's linguistic which was covered; technical, which was covered; legal, which is highly questionable; and operational. Because if you don't look into legal part of side, you don't know how to operate, what to do. And that's why we have something, which is legally binding but also having almost level of influence of a proper policy, but which wasn't fully developed. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Maxim.

Rubens.

RUBENS KUHL:

Rubens Kuhl again.

On the variant TLD topic, one issue I would like to flag to the council is that one possible avenue to handle the IDN variant TLD issue is to refer that to subsequent procedures.

This is in my personal opinion probably the best way to handle it. But it doesn't come free. It comes with an impact to a PDP that is already a big plate and is already under pressure from the community to produce results.

So even though it might be the better option, it has consequences. So we need to be aware of that.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Rubens. That's a great point, particularly for the council as the policy managers, is to understand the implications of any decision that we make on this.

And just to recap Rubens' point, as we look at IDN variant policy making for new gTLDs, anything that's not currently existing, that is being discussed in the subsequent procedures PDP already.

There is the separate question of how you, you know, develop policy work for existing TLDs because that's clearly not -- or no longer subsequent procedures.

And then how do you encourage the ccNSO -- or the ccTLDs to contribute to this discussion? Would they be willing to participate in subsequent procedures on this topic? Do we need something else? Would they be willing to participate in a PDP with us on the topic?

And, Rubens, I saw your reaction. Go right ahead.

RUBENS KUHL:

Just to inform that even though we don't know yet whether they're willing to participate in the GNSO PDP, me and Maxim have been attending the ccNSO PDP on this. And we have been flagging, oh, this is somewhat different from the GNSO policy. You might want to consider that and either harmonize that or keep it as it is knowing it will be different.

So this is already ongoing as we speak. So even if they don't later join GNSO PDP, whether they do it or not, we are already trying to harmonize that to the best extent possible.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Rubens. Thanks for all your work and efforts on that and sort of the informal engagement with the ccNSO. It's really -- really helpful at this stage as we try to figure out our next steps.

Okay. I think we need to move on in terms of timing and the agenda. Any final comments or questions?

Edmon, yes. On this particular topic, absolutely.

And again, for everybody's benefit, we will have an open mic Q&A session at the end of the meeting today. We're on schedule.

But on this particular topic, Edmon, please go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Edmon Chung here.

On the issue about coordination with ccNSO, I would suggest that we not only just do informal ones, and potentially have it harmonized more formally, maybe we can broach this subject -- I think there is a ccNSO-GNSO meeting later today, to add that to -- at least identify that as an item.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Edmon. This is Keith for the transcript.

Yes, thank you very much. I think it's a great suggestion. And, again, I think on this particular topic, because of the technical and complex nature of the issue, as we have, you know, a few folks from council, sort of who have agreed to help us, help shepherd us through this process, I think it would make sense in this particular case especially to invite other members of our community to contribute to the effort. So I don't see this as just a GNSO Councillor responsibility, that we need the expertise of our colleagues to contribute to this effort, as we develop our small team or working group or whatever we're going to call it.

Okay. Thanks, everybody. Let's move on to the next agenda item, which is an update on the Board consultation or discussion on the EPDP phase 1 next steps.

As I mentioned at the outset, we had a discussion during the council working session over the weekend. We discussed this topic with the ICANN Board during our working session lunch. And, essentially, I'll give just a quick summary and then talk about next steps, as I understand them.

The ICANN Board in its consideration of the EPDP phase 1 recommendations that were approved in full and as a package by the council, the Board elected to not accept two of those recommendations in full. It accepted the recommendations in part but not in full.

The first was Recommendation 1, Purpose 2. And that was -- that appears to be at this stage non-contentious because in that language, in the phase 1 report, it acknowledged that it was placeholder language and that further work and consideration would need to be done in phase 2.

And so I think in the view of many, that language -- that purpose could have stood and acknowledging that it was a placeholder, but the Board chose in this case to say that it was not accepting that portion of the recommendation. But that appears to be non-contentious. We didn't hear any objection from the EPDP team when we asked for their input. So I think on this particular case, there's not much action required at the council level.

However, on Recommendation 12, there was a subset, or a component of that recommendation related to the deletion of data associated with the organization field if after a request, the registrant did not certify or did not confirm the validity of that data.

And the Board, as we understood it had a question about that and a concern that the deletion of that data, if deletion were allowed, that it could have some negative impacts and that basically deleting something might make -- you know, reverting to a former state impossible.

And essentially the Board communicated to us in our working session that they had a question and, therefore, didn't feel like they could act and approve that at the time.

We did have some discussion during our lunch. So it would have been good if there had been, you know, a dialogue or an engagement from the Board with the council and potentially, you know, engaging the EPDP team to clarify that before the Board essentially did not accept -- didn't overtly or affirmatively reject, but it did not accept the recommendation.

And there was an acknowledgment from Board members that, yes, that would have been helpful, it would have been positive. But under the time constraints and the imminent deadline, the expiration of the temporary specification, it just didn't happen. They didn't have time. It was an acknowledgment that we can do better in the future, but in this particular case, that was the situation. And the reason for the nonacceptance of that subset of Recommendation 12.

Having said that, I think the dialogue that we had over the weekend during that Board lunch with the council provided the clarity that the Board needed and that there was at least a preliminary indication that if we, you know, followed up with something in writing that sort of explained that and clarified it, that the Board would be prepared to accept that explanation and then support Recommendation 12 in full. I think we still have a little bit of work to do just to confirm that and to make sure that we're all clearly on the same page.

But I think at that point, the council will be able to send a follow-up communication in consultation with the EPDP team to clarify that formally in writing with the Board and hopefully be able to move this on.

And as I've said, since we started this and since the Board initially did not accept those portions of the recommendations, we are setting some precedent here in how the GNSO Council engages with the Board and vice versa when a recommendation is not accepted or whether a component of a recommendation is not accepted.

So I think we have gone through, you know, our due diligence and established some process and procedure that we can refer to back in the future in the event that this kind of thing happens against. And I'm very cognizant that it's important to make sure that we're diligent and, you know, follow, you know, a clear process here that establishes that the council is taking action appropriately when the Board does not accept a recommendation that has been generated through a consensus policy process.

So I know I went on quite a bit there. That's the scene setting. Would anybody like to get in on this?

I don't see any hands. So at this stage, we have an action item then to engage with the EPDP team, primarily in this case registrars, to ensure that we can explain appropriately to the Board sort of the rationale behind this language. And we will be sure to circulate that to council before anything is submitted.

Okay. Michele, go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Keith. I'm going to give you just some input, so you can give your voice a rest.

I think part of the issue here is -- as things stand at the moment, the Board's only options are to accept a proposal or to not accept it.

Beg your pardon.

There's no third option query, query it or ask for clarification.

But as you rightly pointed out, the timing this time was far from optimal. But I would also remind people that there were Board liaisons, so this shouldn't have been a surprise.

In terms of the substance of the recommendations themselves, I think people do seem to be conflating and confusing different things. I mean, what is publicly published and made available to the world in most people's systems, unless as I said the other day you've got really, really terrible brokers working for you.

You will often have way more information, and you will have versions, and you will have the ability to roll back to previous states. At least we do, and I assume most of my registrar colleagues do.

So the deletion, I think, in this context we were talking primarily of deletion from that which is published, which does not necessarily

equate with deletion from the planet; that there would be records available somewhere.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Michele. This is Keith.

Very much appreciate that additional clarification.

Yeah, I think your point about there were Board liaisons associated with the EPDP team, I think certainly looking ahead, we'd like to think and hope that the liaisons would identify issues ahead of time.

But at the same time, I think we do need to acknowledge this was a pretty big report, lots of nuance. This was a very, very sort of like small bit of an overall report. And, obviously, the Board got some input and feedback from others as they were considering this that flagged this as a concern or at least a question.

So I hear what you're saying. But I think in this particular case, this was such a -- sort of a small bit of a very, very large document.

Thanks, Michele.

Okay. Would anybody else like to get in the queue on this before we move on? Any other comments or questions? So, again, the action item here is for the council to in consultation with the EPDP team draft a written communication to the Board explaining this particular topic and hopefully securing Board support for Recommendation 12 in full.

Thank you. Let's move on.

Okay. Next item on the agenda, Agenda Item Number 8 is consideration of updates from PDPs and a determination if any follow-up or council action item is needed.

As I noted, prior to Marrakech we had a GNSO policy Webinar that included presentations and updates from the leadership of the three active PDPs that we currently have under way. And that is the subsequent procedures PDP, the RPM PDP, and the EPDP phase 2.

So this is an opportunity for council and councillors to raise any questions, raise any concerns that we as council, as the policy managers, policy process managers, should be aware of. Do we need to follow-up with the leadership of the three PDPs?

Questions? Comments? I'll open the floor.

Michele. Thank you.

MICHELE NEYLON:

I put that up preemptively. Paul McGrady and I will be having a standoff shortly.

Just in terms of -- I'm not particularly interested in the specific PDPs but more to do with how this was handled, because I think that's, in many respects, a more pertinent discussion, because previously we used to have the situation where the various PDP leaders -- sorry, various PDP groups would come to us with these massive PowerPoint decks which, more often than not, included a crazy amount of information that most

of us didn't really need, including the history of stuff that we actually had done and that if we had actually been tracking what was going on would know about anyway. And I don't particularly enjoy flying around the globe to look at a PowerPoint presentation that I would do on the flight there.

So I think changing how we get those updates as we did prior to this meeting, I thought that was a very welcome addition. I'm not saying with how that panned out was absolutely perfect or anything like that, but I'm very happy that something different was tried so that rather than us having the death by PowerPoint when we're here physically, that we were able to actually review that material in advance.

Now, maybe what we might end up with in the future is some kind of combination where we get that kind of big stack of PowerPoint slides that we all want to see, and then when we're here at a meeting in person, that we're actually able to have proper, substantive, "what the hell were you thinking when you came up with this idea" type of conversations.

But just I find the tradition of 50 bazillion slides with that entire history just not particularly helpful.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Michele. This is Keith. And I agree, and I think that we're, you know, experimenting here in terms of the efficacy of, you know, the webinars, the pre-ICANN webinars much this is something that the organization has moved towards in other areas as well, and I think sort

of that prep work really does help us all as a community sort of get ourselves in the -- sort of in the right mind-set and with the right information to be more effective when we're here in person.

So I agree. Michele, I think there is also still a good opportunity for us to have a face-to-face interaction with the leadership of the PDPs. Like, for example, here we're talking about consideration of updates and determine, you know, do we need to have any follow-up. It would still probably be good for us, looking ahead, to schedule time with them here at a face to face meeting, which we did not do this particular meeting. But I think this is an evolution and we'll try to figure out how to get it right. So thanks for your comments.

Paul, you're next.

PAUL McGRADY:

Thanks, Paul McGrady here. And I'm so pleased to say I agree with Michele; that I think this approach has been great. I think our attention to particular PDPs and their time frames and working more directly with their chairs or co-chairs has yielded fruit. I think, for example, the RPM PDP is moving in a much better pace than it was when last we met.

So I do think that -- as Council liaison, I'm the weak link in all that in terms of being in the weeds more -- even more with them than I could be or should be. But I do think that our turning our attention to getting in -- into time frames and deliverables and dates is working and so that means we need fewer giant slides about what's happened since the

beginning of time and maybe the update is what happened specifically since our last time with them.

So I think it's not perfect, but we are definitely improved from where we were.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Excellent. Thanks very much, Paul. And I should just take this moment to thank all of our liaisons to the various groups and PDPs for the work that they do. And of course we always have the opportunity to seek updates from the liaisons to any of our groups.

Rafik, you're next.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks. Rafik speaking.

My first comment is that I think the format was different from the webinar, and in term of what we get and also on the content was quite different because we heard more from the working group, PDP leadership about the issues, the concerns, and they were kind of escalating to us and asking the Council for action. And that's, I think, why we have this agenda item, is to follow up.

With regard to what Michele rose also, slow death by PowerPoint or slides, I guess in term of the update, and I guess we discussed this several times before, is we need to see kind of what we are doing before the meetings. So we are asking our liaison to report if there is the

update, and also we want leadership to share any -- any change in the timeline, and so on.

So I guess taking into account all those kinds of updates and that they should be kind of, say, done in coordination, synchronization. So in the way, what we get just before an ICANN meeting is really to list this kind of maybe the issue of the concerns and all of the questions, so we have more engaged discussion during Council working session, or maybe we can figure out another way for engaging with the working group leadership.

So I guess I like -- maybe it's the word of the day -- holistic approach for the update. I know that we did discuss that before, like, in the SPS meeting. So if we just maybe start to kind of apply and also, you know, about the PDP 3.0, maybe in term of the format and so on.

So we will have different way to get information. Just we need to be sure that we maybe have different perspective. And to not kind of duplicate.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Rafik. I think that's all great comments, and completely agree. And to the extent that we can ensure that we're more prepared with, you know, a framework for engagement with our liaisons and the leadership, I think that's absolutely right.

Okay. So I've got Darcy and then Cheryl and then Maxim, and then we probably need to move on. Thanks.

DARCY SOUTHWELL:

Thanks, Keith. Darcy Southwell.

Rafik said a lot of what I was going to say, but I think if we could find a way -- and I know it's hard for liaisons. I've been one; it's hard -- to sort of have their viewpoint in advance of the meeting and decide what we should be really asking. Because I think as individual councillors, or I shouldn't lump everybody in there, but for myself, I am not close enough to some PDPs and I'm really close to others. So sometimes there's a nuance going on in one that I just am not familiar enough with where other times I am.

So if we had that sort of where do we really need to poke at and ask questions to make sure we understand that they really are on track. And if they are having issues, how do we help them. So if we could have maybe a more pointed conversation. Because the update I think we got in the webinar was far better than we had in the past. So I think we're on a great path, but how do we make sure we're really looking at the right issues when we get here in person.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Darcy. Completely agree. And we should take an action item. So if I could ask staff to capture an action item that as we look ahead to ICANN66 in Montreal that we basically put that as an action item to secure some early sort of input, either before, following the webinar, and then before we arrive to the face-to-face meeting.

Cheryl and then Maxim and then we'll move on.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Thank you, Keith. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And a perfect segue, actually, to what I wanted to speak about so thank you so much.

I'm one of your co-chairs of one of your PDPs, and I'm certainly only speaking on my own behalf here. But I -- I definitely value this preloading in a webinar rather than time in a face-to-face meeting with Council for reporting. And we also don't enjoy putting 47 slides together either.

With the effective use of -- All right. I do. He knows me too well. That was Michele, for the record.

If we are making as effective use as a Council of the liaisons, and I believe we are, or if not, we will be soon, and that follows what Darcy was suggesting, then that's going to help enormously with what we used to try and capture with these briefings face to face. But I would plead that the week before or even ten days before the meeting is probably not the dial time to be having a webinar-style briefing. I would back it further away from a face-to-face meeting.

And so if we can have our discourse with PDP chairs and the Council and have a frank, free-flow conversation, briefing, identify any issues, and then narrow down to anything specific that may or may not need to be dealt with in the upcoming meeting, that would be a blessing. And I think it would probably be a blessing for our staff because they're working really busy doing lots of other things up to meetings as well.

But I think it's definitely heading in the right direction, but I'd actually pull it back a little bit more. Maybe four, five weeks in advance.

Thanks. Three. Yes.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Cheryl.

Okay. Maxim, over to you and then we'll move on.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, it's a managerial thing, I mean operations. And the reporting I think should be limited to one page per item. First is a timeline with the change from the previous timeline, so it's easily visible what's going on with the speed and pace; second, its issues; third, it's progress; and fourth page is just comments. It should be enough.

If there is no way to explain what's going on in one page, it's definitely something we should look into.

Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Maxim. I think that sounds right. I think that's a good suggestion. We should take that on board.

All right. Thanks, everybody, for the discussion on that. We will now move on to the next agenda item, and we are still currently on time to ensure that we have our open mic at the end of the meeting.

Next item is a Council discussion on the consideration of the CCT-RT recommendations that were passed to the GNSO Council by the Board.

I think just to recap, as most people recall, the ICANN Board during its Kobe -- ICANN64 Kobe workshop made decisions around the recommendations that came from the Competition, Consumer Choice, and Consumer Trust Review Team. And in many of those cases, the Board did not accept the recommendations outright. They referred many of those recommendations to different parts of the community, including some to the GNSO, GNSO community.

So the Council needs to take this as an action item moving forward to identify those that impact the Council as the managers of the GNSO policy process and our PDPs. And so that's the setup.

I'll also want to refer to our weekend working session where we had -- we were joined briefly at the end of our day by Jonathan Zuck who is one of the chairs of the CCT-RT.

And just to put a point on this, the review teams are obviously an important accountability mechanism for ICANN. And I know that there has been quite a bit of discussion and debate after the Board's decision to not accept all of those recommendations, to refer some out to various parts of the community, including ICANN org. And I think we should all acknowledge that we, as a community, the GNSO and the Council included, need to be aware of the cost implications of recommendations that are submitted. I think this is one of the clear messages we've received this year, and I think it's something that we need to take on board and to consider seriously. Whether it's

recommendations that come from consensus policy, recommendations that come from review teams or other parts of the community and different work streams, everything has a cost; right? Everything has a cost in terms of dollars or, you know, currency, whatever currency you want to choose. Every recommendation and every additional bit of work has a cost in terms of just resources in general. That's volunteer resources, it's ICANN org staff resources, and across the board.

And so while I understand and recognize there are some concerns about the Board not accepting quite a few of these recommendations, I think it is a signal to us that we, as a community, looking ahead, need to make sure that we're considering the cost implications of recommendations that are submitted.

So I will get off my soapbox there for a moment, but in this particular instance we have some concrete recommendations that have been referred back to us, and we have an obligation to review those and to come up with some feedback.

So let me pause there. So, Carlos, I see your flag, and if anybody else would like to get in queue on this, please do.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ:

Thank you. Thank you very much. This is Carlos for the record.

I fully support your comments, Keith, but in the case of competition, we have been -- we started speaking even before the competition review team about the need to have data, time series about how the market is

developing. We walked into this review team without data, without quantitative data. The only thing we got was qualitative survey. And I think it's a big issue because it's five years that we have been hearing that we need to be a number-oriented organization in terms of the market, the size of the market, the players of the market. There is no other way to measure competition but with data.

We are already talking about the next round, and we have dates for the next round. We have numbers for the number of applications we expect. And I think it's very hard for -- for any organization to fly without data. And many of the issues that we have here on the table in terms of recommendations is about collecting and keeping time series of the market. The size of the market, the prices, the numbers, et cetera.

Thank you very much.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right. Thank you very much, Carlos.

Michele, is that a new flag? Go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yes. Yes, it is. Michele for the record.

Just a simple question for those of us who kind of get distracted and confused. What is our timeline on this? And I also wanted to follow-up on some of the comments Carlos was making but if you could answer that first, that would be helpful.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Michele. I don't know the answer about the timeline question. So we'll pose that maybe to staff to come back to us in a minute or we can take that as an action item to follow up. But back to you.

MICHELE NEYLON: On the data issue, I think this is one of this kind of catch 22 circular problems. There is data out there about certain things. I mean, you can see how many domain names exist, you can see how many are registered per reporting period, you can see growth, decline, transfers, all of that kind of stuff. But when it comes to data like, for example, pricing of a domain name in 2000-and-whatever year, that becomes a lot harder because to begin with, we don't sell them that way, and, secondly, we have no reason to keep records of those data points in the same way that somebody might ask us about it 10 or 15 years later. And I don't see an easy fix for that, to be perfectly honest.

So this is kind of part of the problem I see when people start talking about data. The question becomes which data are you talking about, and making sure people understand that while there is data out there and it's not a question of us not want to go share data, the questions you might be asking us could prove to be difficult because we simply never stored the information in that way, or it makes an assumption that we were packaging the product or service up in such a fashion that you could map it to that. So that was just kind of more to Carlos's point.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Michele.

Would anybody else like to get in queue on this topic? My understanding, and thanks to Marika, it doesn't appear that there's any deadline imposed upon us on this. So it's essentially, I think up to us as Council to figure out how we'd would like to respond and on which timeline.

I think in this particular case, you know, some of the CCT recommendations that have been referred back to us, as I understand it, and I'm sure I'll be corrected if I'm wrong, have implications for ongoing PDP work. And I think subsequent procedures is one in particular. And I'm not sure about URS and UDRP, but I suspect that there's implications that we need to review.

So I think we need to -- again, I'm going to call on volunteers and having a small team to focus on this issue and to try to identify areas where the Council needs to engage.

I'll just take a moment to say -- and thank you for your patience on this one -- but we have a tremendous amount of work to be done in the remainder of this calendar year. And we have one more ICANN meeting after this face to face, and we are going to need all councillors to step up and to volunteer and to contribute and to get work done if we're going to accomplish the things that we set out to do this year.

Our next slide is actually going to refer to PDP 3.0. That's another example of where, in order to deliver on the good work that's been done over the last 18 months, you know, we really need to focus, and we really need to engage and pull together and deliver.

So that's a bit of an aside. Thank you for your patience on that.

Pam, you're next.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Keith. I have two points to make. One is about data collection, and the other is about how we approach the recommendations that were passed on to the GNSO.

Regarding data collection, I believe there was a -- not I believe. I know there was a DMPM, data and metric for policy making something. It's a nonPDP working group. And I was in that working group, and that was kind of many years ago.

And some of the recommendations were actually adopted, implemented, and incorporated into the council documents or templates including our charter template, which actually deals with data collection of metrics that is a recommended step maybe for each given working group to actually define in their final report what sort of data will be suitable to measure success of a particular PDP.

I think in terms of practice, we haven't really, really stocked to that. I haven't seen -- maybe because that recommendation or the working group final report was new haven't seen any working group final report actually come up with suggested data to be collected.

And this is the problem. The data collection should start many years ago before the review. And we have the CCT RT review saying where is the data. At that point, you then scramble for data.

But there are many types of data, as Michele alluded to. You can have market data which you may not be available within the ICANN construct. You have to go out to the market and maybe engage a firm to go and collect that kind of data.

But there is also another type where ICANN does collect and is available. But then, I guess, it's up to us, the GNSO Council or GNSO working group to be mindful about the data or metrics that they can recommend in the final report to be collected from the data -- when the policies become effective, so they can start to have the data collected. And, say, five years down the track when there's a review of that particular policy, then we have the data available to measure the success or nonsuccess of that particular policy.

My second point is about how we deal with this. I'm mindful to what Keith just said, so much work ahead of us. I had a look at the five recommendations.

It appears two of them would be sort of more related to contracted parties and two about the rights protection mechanism and one is about a definition for "global south." That one I think is kind of a bit funny one.

But I'm just thinking whether it would make sense if we have a small council team -- and I'll be happy to lead that. Then we can have the input from contracted parties as well as maybe our IPC colleagues to brainstorm about how we actually react to those five recommendations. Then present to the council. So then we can kind of get this one off our plate.

I'm happy to hear other suggestions. I feel like this is something we can really deal with in a more expedient or efficient way. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Pam. Thank you for volunteering to shepherd that effort. I agree, getting a small group together again, getting people to volunteer and contribute in a timely fashion, is critical.

So we'll take an action item, if staff can capture the action item, that we will send a note to the list asking for interested parties to contribute to that discussion under Pam's leadership.

And, you know, anybody who wants to participate is certainly welcome. But as Pam has noted it, some of the recommendations are sort of unique to particular parts of our community. And we will certainly have an opportunity to -- everybody to consider whatever we put forward. But anybody is welcome to participate in that.

Rafik, you're next and last and we'll move on.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. It will be a short comment.

I support this idea to have the small team, so we can move forward. But what I want to comment is really -- it's not about substance here. But we know that we have this recommendation to deal with. So the question for us is how we do the planning in terms of time line because we always have the discussion at the beginning of the year at SPS that

we need to plan the activities or the work we have to do, so how we will factor that.

We know that it was coming but when, not when. We have to think how we will address that and creating some time line, take into account what we have already now on our plate.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah, thanks, Rafik. I completely agree.

Okay. With that, let's move on to the next and final item on our agenda, which is an update on the PDP 3.0 implementation work.

I will note here that we discussed this during our weekend working session. Unless Rafik disagrees, I think we can actually move on and recognize that this work is very important. The volunteer group that put their hands up back at the SPS in January and said that they were willing to contribute to this, we need you to do so. And if there are others who would like to volunteer, please do so. Good work has been done, but there's a lot left to do before the end of the year.

So I don't think we need to go over any of the details, Rafik, unless you would like to add anything. If not, that's fine.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

I'm not sure. Was it a question or not?

What I can add is just the team members had small -- I mean, an informal meeting, taking into account what we discussed and noticing

what we have to do within the four months. And we agreed also on additional action on how we will handle the work and also do the planning in terms of dividing the work and ensuring that we will finish what we already started and planning for the next items.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik. And also to Pam for both of your leadership on the PDP 3.0 work.

So with that, we are now at the open mic period. We have ten minutes left in our scheduled meeting. So I would like to invite anybody in the room to come to open mic.

And we can also use this as an opportunity for any other business from council.

But I'd like to give first priority to anyone in the room who would like to come forward and engage with the council on issues of interest.

I understand, Jeff -- I think it was from Jeff Neuman -- may have had a comment previously on the discussion about the PDPs and the reviews. And I apologize to Jeff that I missed that.

So if there's a question either from Jeff, if he's here in the room -- and if not, if somebody could read that -- that would be helpful.

Ariel, thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel Liang. So Jeff in the comment, he had asked for the council on their slides for the PDP working group updates but had no follow-up. That's his comment.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, thanks, Ariel.

So if I understand correctly, Jeff had posed some questions to the council about the slides that were prepared for the Webinar. Is that correct? Okay.

If that was something that the council missed, Jeff, I apologize. We will circle back and see if we can track down that communication. If you have something you submitted in writing, feel free to reforward it to us or we will go back to the transcripts and identify what the questions were. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may. Cheryl.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, sure. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Woo-hoo. Thank you. Jeff is Skyping at me. Sorry, Jeff is Skyping at me, so I am going to read at verbatim.

I should have phrased it better. But the point is that our slides have a certain format and part of that format are the "asks" of council. Our decks have had that in there, as we know, for months and that is a thing that there is no follow-up on.

So just to make sure the record is clear, I think I've done justice.

Sorry.

No, not the slides -- despite the fact I was reading verbatim, ladies and gentlemen.

The slides had questions. Uggg.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Got it.

[Laughter]

Thanks, Cheryl. And thanks, Jeff. We will take an action item as council leadership to go back and review those questions and to get you an answer to those questions. So apologies for not getting that done and apologies it has taken us that long.

Okay. Anybody else want to come to the mic? Please come on up. You're welcome.

We'd love to hear from you. As I said, at the outset, we have unfortunately not had a lot of open mic time recently because we've run out of time. But we've managed to reserve ten minutes.

Edmon, thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Edmon Chung here.

Since I see nobody here, I will bring up the topic about IDN again.

I think the -- what Rubens mentioned in terms of the GNSO asking for the update of the implementation guidelines, I think that is certainly -- in my view, that is incorrect. And I think Rubens brought up quite nicely. And we should really take this opportunity to think through that particular process as well.

But on the substance of it, I know that there are two distinct items: The implementation guidelines and the IDN variant TLDs. I think we may be able to manage it within one working group of some sort moving forward, though, especially in the initial time, the initial process.

If it then splits into two or three committees, that might -- or working groups or teams, that might work better than initially trying to split it up. Just that's in response to Michele's point.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Edmon.

Just to clarify or to ensure I got the idea of looking at the IDN issue, which has different components of essentially forming one working group with people with interest and expertise but then considering the establishment of various work tracks or committees would probably be

the most efficient way forward, in this particular case, I agree with you. Because -- because of the nature of the issue and because of the need for some specialized understanding and expertise, I think that makes a lot of sense. There's only so many of you to go around, right?

[Laughter]

EDMON CHUNG: There are more. But just one -- do we have a sense of the time -- time frame? Are we talking about getting this up and running next month or by the time of Montreal, or do we have an idea of that?

KEITH DRAZEK: That's a great question, Edmon. And I would like to see us move quickly on this one. I think it's going to be up to the group of volunteers of council and noncouncil members coming together and working to advance this.

My interest, as I noted at the outset of the discussion on this, the Board passed its resolution in Kobe. And we had the interaction with the Board requesting a deferral of the IDN guidelines 4.0. I think it was at the beginning of May, if I'm not mistaken. I may have the date wrong, but it's May or June.

And so this is a timely issue, and I think we should move forward on it. So I'm calling on anybody and all who have volunteered to -- let's get together. Let's come up with some recommendations for council to consider about next steps.

EDMON CHUNG: I'll put my hand up obviously. But if a mailing list is formed, just feel free to just add me.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks very much, Edmon. Much appreciated. Okay.
Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel.

Jeff Neuman has some more comments remotely. I think the PDP 3.0 review team should have noncouncil members as well, which would include working group chairs, former councillors, et cetera.

Part of the rationale of PDP 2.0 was to not have all work done by councillors, which is how it was done prior to 2.0.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Ariel. And thanks, Jeff, for the comment. And certainly I think I could probably speak for all of us on council that we would all value and welcome input from our members of the community. There's a lot of work going on, and it's probably not clear we can accomplish everything ourselves. But others may have different views.

I saw Marie, Michele, Maxim.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Keith. This is Marie Pattullo from the B.C. Thanks, Jeff, who I can't see but we know you are with us in spirit.

We discussed this morning, actually a small group who are dealing with 3.0. We did talk about this. Very much value anyone who's actually got experience, there's no question about that.

However, there has to be a level of time management and we don't have that much time to get something done correctly.

So what we debated and discussed amongst us this morning was that when we get to the point that we are going to reach out to anyone with expertise, at that point, we will do so on almost a case-by-case basis. So at this point, we will need to speak to Cheryl. We will need to speak to Jeff, to any of the other current and past co-chairs.

We've discussed beta testing some of it. Actually having a dry run, does this document that makes sense to us actually make any sense to you? And at that point, we give it to somebody who has actually chaired a PDP who knows that.

Obviously, we value all the input we can get. There's no question about that. But we are meeting every week going forward. Even though Darcy has agreed to this at 6:00 a.m. on a Monday morning -- huge shout-out to Darcy for being daft enough to do that.

But thank you to Jeff for the question. It's not that we don't want the input. We're just trying to manage it in the best way forward.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Marie. I looked over here, Darcy. Okay?

Michele, you had your card up, but you put it down.

MICHELE NEYLON: Unless you recognize me. I will go very briefly.

KEITH DRAZEK: Good.

MICHELE NEYLON: Again, I agree fully with what Marie was saying.

I think the -- there are many avenues to provide feedback and input into various processes. And I've said this before in other contexts, the council is the council. It exists for a reason. We can't keep kind of pushing things off elsewhere.

So councillors are working on this. We've had multiple public sessions around this. We've also had requests for input to the various SGs and Cs. And if people aren't happy with how that input was channeled or something, that's something they need to raise there. But I would say no to the specific question that was asked.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, thanks, Michele.

Maxim and then Martin.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba for the record.

It's another item. Why it is from my point of view not very bright idea, because currently the number of people composed in the group is of manageable size. I mean, when you have too many people, the speed and the way interaction is done in the group is getting out of control. It's one of the issues we're going to resolve in PDP 3.0. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Maxim.

Martin, you are next and last. We are at the end of our meeting agenda.

I see Ariel putting her hand up.

Martin, go right ahead.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Just press my support to the councillors and their previous comments.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much.

I will just to note, on this particular case, I am going to defer to the people who are actively managing this group on behalf of council.

I think in this particular case what Marie described in terms of reaching out to those who have experience and expertise, I think, is a critical component of this. But I also take on board the comments that have been made about, you know, managing this process from a council

perspective and making sure that as we consider PDP 3.0, it is about making the council more efficient and effective, not necessarily establishing new operating procedures for, you know, outside of the existing PDP manual.

So, anyway, Ariel, back to you. And then we need to wrap up.

ARIEL LIANG:

This is Ariel. Jeff just had a follow-up comment.

Marie's and Michele's comments are exactly what the councillors stated in PDP 1.0. People need to research why we went from PDP 1.0 to PDP 2.0. We are deemed to repeat the problems of the past.

KEITH DRAZEK:

All right. Thanks, Ariel and thanks, Jeff.

Clearly, Jeff, completely recognize your long history and efforts around PDP evolution and your input in this is welcomed and critical. And I know that the group will reach out to you at the appropriate time. And, of course, you're always welcome to contribute even if it's not as a direct member of the council coordinating group.

So with that, I don't see any other hands up. We are out of time. So I will bring this meeting to a close.

Thanks to everybody for your contributions. Thanks to everybody who joined us today in the meeting to observe and to those who brought their comments forward.

So with that, let's end the recording and conclude the meeting. Thanks so much.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]