
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the NCSG Policy Call on Tuesday, 3rd of July, 2018. On the call today we have Ayden Ferdeline, Elsa Saade, Gustavo Paiva, Ioana Stupariu, Rafik Dammak, Razoana Moslam, Shah Rahman, Tatiana Tropina, Tomslin Samme-nlar. We have apologies from Arsene Tungali. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Maryam. Thank to anyone who made it and joined this call today. We have this call in our usual time, our work recall, usually it precedes the council meeting but for this time we are organizing it in order to prepare for the drafting team call, scheduled this Thursday and it's about the EPDP team charter. On the last day we spent time during the Panama meeting and this day is to work on the charter. There are still several areas that need to be agreed and [inaudible] with the other groups and the language in the charter.

We will try today to at least cover some of those areas to get a clear understanding what should be NCSG's position and see how we can negotiate with the other groups. We will go through several PDFs. For now, the charter was split between different Google Docs by sections.

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.

We will start first with the scope or the EPDP team as the composition is maybe one of the most contentious parts that we need to fix.

Maryam, you prepared the PDF for all the documents? That's what you are sharing now, that's the charter, that's the first document that was used but I'm not sure if it's still up to date. So, if you can share the EPDP Team PDF. This is the section about the composition.

MILTON MUELLER: Can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you.

MILTON MUELLER: This is a new meeting format and I don't see any documents, I just see a little square with the names of people.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I really have hard time to hear you. Can you speak up? We have the document in the Adobe Connect.

MILTON MUELLER: You're in Adobe Connect?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes.

MILTON MUELLER: Because the link took me into some Go Conferencing Hub Global Meet Software.

RAFIK DAMMAK: There is the Adobe Connect and there is also the -- to join the [inaudible] only.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay, I'll go into Adobe Connect also.

RAFIK DAMMAK: In meantime, I see Ayden is in the cue. Yes, Ayden?

AYDEN FERDELIN: Thanks, Rafik. I just wanted to quickly comment for Milton's benefit that the Adobe link only changed a few minutes ago, so perhaps he has an earlier link. We have a new Adobe Room now, where we can see the document and Farzaneh's indicated that she will send the link to you now. While I have the mic, I might just note that Stephanie is attempting to log in as well, so she should be joining us shortly.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Just to clarify and understand, there is a confusion. There was a problem with the NCSG usual Adobe Connect, so we are using this one

temporarily. I understand that people missed that. You can find the details on the last email and my Maryam to the NCSG.

We have this section, the EPDP Team, which is about the composition. The current text is concern for us because it's sitting unbalanced between the different stakeholder groups in the GNSO, giving more seats to the CSG by giving for each of the CSG constituency three seats. They have around nine, while the other stakeholder groups have only three each.

By historical terms, it says we need a balance in the composition and I think that was shared already in drafting this and we already saw push back from other groups. We're here to think what should be our proposal and also what we can make as other changes in the text around this, it's not just about the numbers but if you have any other suggestions to tweak the language for this part of the charter. I see that Tatiana is in the cue. Yes Tatiana, please go ahead.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Rafik. Just to update our members. Ayden and I yesterday, raised this issue on the Drafting Team Mailing List and we were accused of being disruptive because some council fellows from BC and IPC and some other others, it looked like we agreed on these compositions in Panama and we didn't. What happened in Panama was that this composition was balanced, at least by the rules of weighted votes. The votes went in proportion, so even if IPC and BC and whatever had three members in the group, during the voting didn't have this weight.

The problem was that in Panama the mass for the weighted votes was completely wrong. The lead for the group composition admitted that there was a mass mistake, however, we moved away from the concept of would because it was said that voting is discouraged in this group and we had to come to consensus. What we got now is very weak consensus language, saying that the Chair should take into account that the group is disproportionate to whatever.

While I believe that we have to continue fighting for the even composition, I also think that the problem is when an idea of decreasing the number of IPC representative will not be supported. We will not be able to find nine people and nine alternates for these EPDP. What I suggest doing in addition to fighting for proportionate representation and decreasing the number of commercial stakeholder group representative, I suggest that we will change this language is on the bottom of the screen for the purpose of reaching consensus and in order to reflect and respect current balance and so on in this paragraph, we have to have a very clear and bidding rules for the Chair of the group there, as to how the Chair is going to assess consensus.

I created the Google Doc yesterday, I'm going to share on the chat here in the AC Room, any proposals are welcome. We pushed yesterday on the Drafting Team List, at least IPC said that, okay, they would agree probably to change this consensus language, so maybe we're better to, as we say in Russia, to sniff the iron while it's still hot. If we're going to finalize this consensus language, at least in our favor, so we can at least ensure that if we end up with uneven numbers, at least the Chair will be bound by the rules. It would be at least be something in our favor because otherwise we are completely in shambles here.

I'm going to share the link to this Google Doc here on the chat and please, anyone who can contribute who as thought how to make the proper rules for the Chair in terms of facing consensus in this unbalance and uneven environment of representation, you're welcome. Please use the suggestion mode. Thank you very much, that's all from me, thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Tatiana. I think the expression is not just in Russia. About the consensus, I think the definition of consensus on this and also describing what the Chair can do, the usual language terms from the working groups. I think the working groups guidelines were part of GNSO operating procedures, so it would make sense just to double check, but since here we are clearly discussing about the consensus, I think we'll override what is there in the procedure. This is just something we need to check but I think should not write any problem.

We still have a queue, we have Ayden, Farzaneh and then Tatiana. Yes, Ayden, please go ahead.

AYDEN FERDELIN:

Thanks, Rafik. I just wanted to respond quickly to a few comments that Tatiana made a few minutes ago. I was chuckling at her initial characterization of the IPC's concern -- somehow reached an agreement in Panama City and backed out of it. To pretend that we had reached any agreement like they are doing, it's simply untrue, we never have. I also think it was charitable to say that it was a mass mistake.

Maybe it was but it's increasingly looking like it was the intention of, which is the composition remains unbalanced. I think Keith Brasick is responsible for drafting the text that we see composition. I raise this in three emails in the Drafting Team List in the past five days, until roughly 12 hours ago, we had not received a single response. Others in our stakeholder group have also raised these concerns as well. They've not been addressed. It's unbalanced, I do not believe it is a mistake, I think this is by design and that's very problematic.

Thirdly, Tatiana has put forward, I think it's great but I still think we need insist on an equal number members relative to the other stakeholder groups because I'm worried that even with the great language that Tatiana has proposed and this language essentially says that the Chair must give appropriated weight to all perspectives regardless of how many members that stakeholder group has put forward, especially when we're not voting. I think that's very difficult for anyone to be able to manage. We need to be careful there and I think we must insist on having an equal number of participants relative to the other GNSO stakeholder groups.

In terms of the other bullet point in the structure, it's listed as two ICANN Board liaisons and I wonder if we can cut that down to one? I know it does include the Board itself as communicated that they we're happy with only liaison, so I'm not sure why we would send two? I strongly oppose to any other supporting organization or advisory committee sending three participants, I think they should send one participant and one alternate, with the acceptance of the GAC, who I appreciate for political reasons, I think there is a fair compromise.

They were insisting on five a few days ago, three from the GAC I could accept. If we balance this out, three from the GAC, one from each SO/AC, one Board Liaison rather than two and equal number of participants, we should be able to get down from 36 members to 25 or so, which would make this group smaller and more manageable and contracted parties happy, still concerned about the cost of transcript to ensure they would love to see some cost reductions and travel as well. That would be a suggestion that I think we should put forward. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Ayden. Razoana, go ahead.

RAZOANA MOSLAM:

I appreciate the effort to make the language change, however this stage I do believe that we should not strategically come to any compromise whatsoever on the number of the representatives. I have checked the transcript of the meeting that happened on 27th of June and I can see that [inaudible] even said that we might want to consider that the Chair gives way to the discussions and decides on consensus based on the council's structure.

I do suggest that you go and read what she said because it gets some support but it's not in the document. I think whatever language we come up with, that says that the Chair should be neutral and should consider NCSG does not have as many members. Unfortunately, will not really -- first of all, we cannot assess whether the Chair is doing this and I think in this environment we are not going to be able to actually challenge the Chair later on.

Second of all, if we come to any compromise at the moment, I think we are going to lose the bigger picture which is having at least equal number of representatives. [Inaudible] is insisting on having more representation because they want more participation and they know that there are short comings if there is less of them. I think we should not, at any point, say that we are going to compromise on the number and I do not recommend strategically suggesting something now because they would think that this is it and that they can just give us this language and have their nine members appointed to EPDP, while we have only three. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMIK:

We will go Tatiana and then with Milton.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much. I think that anyone who read Drafting Team Mailing List yesterday would never think that I'm going to compromise on the numbers, I was fighting as much as I could. My question is here, what we going to do? Where is our scope? How far are we going to go? Are we going to not approve the Charter? I'm going to ask Rafik, do we need super majority for this Charter? If we vote against it are you going to stop it from being adopted? Because if it is going to happen, I believe that they will insist on the three or two representatives till the very end.

My question is, how far we are going to go and are you ready to be accused in being destructive and whatever? Personally, I'm ready too. I'm ready to go that far. I'm ready to insist that far. I'm ready in being accused of being destructive, I was already yesterday, so it's not a

problem for me but I want our group to decide how far we going with this. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Tatiana. If you check the bylaws for the EPDP, we have to get super majority vote and so we stop this. We have to think carefully about it. We can stop the EPDP for sure, that's possible. We need to think how we will proceed anyway. I think that Milton was trying to speak.

MILTON MUELLER: I just wanted to note, I'm on Adobe Connect now, so I want to know if you can hear me okay?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. I agree that you should not only be trying to -- threatening to stop the Charter, you should be essentially pulling out anyway you can think of to inflict pain on the process because they need to move fast and what you have to make them understand is that by initiating a fight over process and representation, they are wasting tons of time. You need to even look beyond on the EPDP process itself and look at the IRP challenges or any other process challenges that you can threaten them with, to say that this is fundamentally unfair.

I think that they won't react to anything else. I don't know exactly what's up with Keith, I'm going to try to contact him privately but you should also be talking to registrars and trying to get them to take a few votes away from this. When you take about a super majority, my question is, a super majority of what, the council? Is that all you need? That's a question.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, I think it's the super majority house.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay, so it's a council vote, is what you're telling me?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes.

MILTON MUELLER: I think that council has to approve the Charter and you're saying that if everybody on NCSG votes against it, then you can stop it, is that correct? Or do you need to pick up some NONCOM members or what?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Good question. Even if they -- it's better if I double check. I think it's 60% each house, even if they get the NomCom that won't be enough, it will be less than 60%.

UNKNOWN: If I could just in for a moment. It's two thirds from both houses that we need.

MILTON MUELLER: A super majority is two thirds of both houses?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, that's what I said.

MILTON MUELLER: That sounds like you have a very clear ability to stop it.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we have. That's why I said, it's nuclear option we have.

MILTON DAMMAK: It's not a nuclear option, Rafik, it's just an unacceptable Charter. Why are you calling it a nuclear option? This is an unacceptable Charter and we won't pass it and if we can stop it, we stop it. That I think we resonate with them, if they're not listening to the justice arguments then they will listen to the procedural argument.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I'm not arguing about what important by nuclear option, mean that it's really about deterrence here, so we can use that to be clear that we can stop the process. You can discuss about the wording, I'm not going to

spend that much time. Again, it's about deterrence and that it's a way to say that we have the ability to stop the process.

TATIANA TROPINA: Rafik, can I jump for a minute? We actually have to discuss this option and we have to agree that we are going to stop the Charter.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I'm starting to see a cue. I couldn't hear you. Just to be clear, please avoid if we want to jump like this, I will have very hard time to hear you and understand what you are saying. Please Tatiana, you can go now.

TATIANA TROPINA: I'm really sorry for the jump because to me it looked like you were going to call the issue. My point is that we really have to agree as a group that we're going to use this option, that's it. I believe that this discussion is important because I totally agree that if we cannot use fairness, justice and there are still arguments, I'm for stopping this Charter because this is a completely unacceptable document. A document that we really should not compromise because we will be ripped of dignity additionally and whatever you can imagine. We will lose the war or game even before it started.

I also believe that this is the line we have to take, we agree on this as a final stop. We consolors are going to vote against the Charter for whatever reason, in whatever circumstances, even if we will be accused of being disruptive and having no EPDP and whatever circumstances, whatever accusations they will have, we're going to vote against it. I

believe this immense pressure, this is immense pressure, so once we say yes, we are going to do it, yes, we are going to it, otherwise we will have thought about not being political enough, not being diplomatic enough, not being whatever enough. We have to agree we have a final stop. I'm certainly voting yes, we agree to have this final stop but I don't know about others. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Tatiana. I see that everyone is for, that is what I understand, the direction, for those who on Adobe Connect, that everyone understands that we mean to have a sense regarding the representation. That it is not open for negotiation. That we are asking for the balance in terms of representation. If we don't get that, it's clear then we can say that we will vote against the Charter. It's important to make that clear.

I'll ask everyone to understand that; other groups will react to that, but it's not the first time and I don't think that's something that should dictate our decision. I think if they were in the same situation, they would do the same. They are not going to think twice about that and they will use the voting threshold for their own interests.

Now go really into the whole thing, what does it mean? Just to be sure that we are all on the same page about that. But maybe for clarity, in terms of process. The vote will be electronic vote and so if during the Drafting Team call or by email discussion, making clear that we are going to vote against the Chair by the procedure of electronic vote and

decide that we are not ready for vote and so that will be deferred and that will mean slightly that will be deferred to the next counting.

I think that will be on the 19th of July and so more work to be done. This is just in terms of procedure. If we clearly say that we are going to vote against, the impact reserved for the voting, it's likely that we are not going to have electronic voting, for now this is kind of my reading but it depends what will be decided or interpreted this week after the Drafting Team call. That's it for the composition, for the other points...

RECORDED VOICE:

The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

That's just let me forget what I was going to say. I was talking about the AC and the SO representation. I think what we can leave with is just GAC can have up to three representatives but the rest, they should have only one and I don't think even the ccNSO should participate but that's my personal point of view, I don't see anything that led them to participate. We should avoid the situation that's cross community working group forum here.

Anyone want to comment or have any questions on this? I don't see any. Do you have any other concerns with this Charter other than the composition, the balance between CSG and NCSG? Yes, Milton, please go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER:

This is part of a much bigger problem, it's not just the representation of commercial verses noncommercial, it's this whole idea that whenever there's an important decision to make ICANN completely rearranges it's representation structures. This is very, very, very GNSO issue. This is about the WHOIS requirements for gTLD's and so why do we have ALAC and other advisory committees on there? I know they might be allies but what the heck are the CC's doing on this thing? They are not affected by this policy, they don't have to follow it, they are not contracted parties? What are they thinking?

That's my thing. I don't know how far you're going to get with that, I doubt you're going to get anywhere with GAC and ALAC and SSAC, but I think you might at least propose that they be advisory and there to be listened to but not counted as part of the consensus. This is just crazy. This is a straight up the line contracting issue in the gTLD space, it makes no sense for AC's and another SO to be in there. Why don't they invite the address people if they're going to do it this way?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Milton. About the ccNSO already raises that point and I have no idea they were added, there was no reason to add the ccNSO, it's really political. They used all the means they have during the meetings that week to push, that's why there is this idea to have the compromise to get them involved. I guess the idea, the participation, the consensus, something maybe we can use, so they can participate in the process but when it comes to decided about the consensus should be only the GNSO groups. Yes, Tatiana, please go ahead.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you, Rafik. I want to reply to Milton and in general. Milton, I actually raised this issue at the meeting of 27th on Wednesday. I said that we have to go with three tier group structure, like members, participants and observers and ALAC and GAC and others should not be participants of consensus. What I got in response, I clearly remember I got eye rolls from [inaudible] and from some others, saying, "Oh my god, but we decided to abandoned this structure."

Then I raised this issue in more general. The GNSO is literally allowing to test its borders by addressing the unwritten demands from SO and ACs because never GAC is going to allow us to participate in their processes. Why are we adjusting and violating our board of policy making, we are getting demands from them? I suggest that we go [inaudible] this is the kind of reaction I got because I think that people don't see the problems. Contracted parties doesn't see the problem inviting GAC and ALAC.

At least several people came to me later and told me, "No, the group have a wondering work track five, I don't believe it was wonderful in work track five, I believe that work track five has been in shambles since the very beginning. I believe that the solution we can get here, we might still push for structured member participant observer, where only GNSO structured member are going to be seated in any consensus call and participants like GAC, ALAC and whatever, they can contribute in terms of input into discussion because I believe this stage we are never going to exclude them but they are never going to be called in any

consensus call. I believe this is the only structure we can propose and support. This would be my idea. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Tatiana, for this. At the end of this is coming kind of [inaudible] table that's raising all the kind of issue for us. We can come back to this idea. That is really for the GNSO to be center here for making the consensus. Other AC can participate of course, it can give input but they should not be in the driving seat in any manner.

I hope I'm not mistaking, get some clear position NCSG, what should be our stance on this composition matter? It's important to be clear when we communicate, addressing teams, to other groups in the GNSO and council. Let's see what they can propose. I understand there will be pushback but that doesn't matter at the end. They would do the same if they were in our position. Tatiana, is it an old or new hand?

TATIANA TROPINA:

It is a new hand. I want to address these concerns on the Charter about them being able to speak and whatever. The point about inviting them and I talked to several Board members who told me these, that the final balancing act will be done by the Board and the Board will expect GNSO or this group, at least to hear the concerns that GAC or ALAC will raise and address them.

This is why it is important to allow them to speak because if they raise any concerns that we will not at least properly analyzed in the work of this EPDP even if they will not be addressed but there would be an

explanation that GAC raised this and that issue and we decided not to go with that. The Board would be happy to adopt this policy but not inviting might end up in some very last moment screams and changes and whatever. Just to avoid the risk, it would be better to invite them but again, as I said, I think the structure should be three-fold. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Tatiana. At the end, advisory committee, they have their own process, they don't like the outcome, even after participating, they can give an advice to the Board regarding the recommendation. It's not a problem at the end, they have the channels to express their opinion about the policy recommendation that will be the outcome from the EPDP. Again, also depending on the outcome of the EPDP, we still have to vote on that, there will be there for us to decide if we are happy with the outcome or not.

I guess we spent quite a time here on this issue and we got clarity. Unless there is any other point that needs to be raised, I think we kind of went through the kinds of issues we expect to talk about, I would like that we move to other points of the Charter. If you have any other issue, please say so, otherwise we move to another section. I don't see any objections here.

In terms of quite important section of the Charter that we need to confirm is the scope. Maryam, can you please upload the PDF for the scope section? Maryam, did you hear me or not? I'm not sure if we lost her as a host.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Sorry, can you repeat that? I couldn't hear that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: There is the scope Google Doc, if you can share the PDF. It was the first thing. With regards to the scope, we also spent some time last week about what should be here because there was kind of a push that we get to cover the temporary spec and also ANEX. Including the ANEX, covering the [inaudible] and accreditation model. We kind of could get - that ANEX should not be favorite or included in this call of the EPDP.

As you can see here it's more like trying to outline from the different sections in the temporary spec what should be covered by the EPDP Team, which means either confirm or reject the different part. I'd really ask here that for those who had the time, if they have a specific concern what is in the scope or if they would like to request some changes there. I know that Farzaneh sent to me some language and if she wants to share with us, maybe just more what are the reasons behind those changes.

FARZANEH BADII: Sorry Rafik, I was not paying attention to what you were saying. I will dig up the language. I think what I saw in this document, for me it was too bad for -- one thing that caught my eye was the thick data registry but I have to go back the document, I can't remember my comments. Please continue without me until get my notes.

RAFIK DAMMAK: It's nice to note that you didn't pay attention to me. The language, most of the language is coming from the analysis that was done by the contract party, most of it. I think what may be of interest for us is that what we discovered in terms of access, is just what is in the temporary space. I think that's something we can live. Any comments or questions on this while we're waiting for Farzaneh? I see none.

FARZANEH BADII: I'm jumping in. I can ask Stephanie to -- because Stephanie made extensive comments and shared with our list, if she could briefly tell us a little about these changes and I find my comments too, then that would be great. Stephanie, I'm putting you on the spot.

RAFIK DAMMAK: That's a good tactic, Farzaneh. I think one of the comments made by Stephanie is about RDAP. Maybe it's something you can clarify here Stephanie? I'm not sure if it's coming from outline document or not but this is what was added to the scope section as a comment. If you can clarify or elaborate a little more about that comment.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Did the put my comment on distribution in whole? I haven't checked yet because I put things like the comments and certainly Ruben's responded to this because the problem with RDAC is these guys are ready to do RDAC, you can see that Elliot was already rolled it out. The small guys are not and this is an issue that has come up more than once and you might remember Ruben going to the microphone talking about

it. There are several big players around table, notably Verisign among others, who are ready to implement RDAC. It's a cost benefit for them, it is a added competitive measure for them and they're going to further squeeze out the smaller players, that's just me speculating but it sure seems likely.

That's why I commented, I wanted to see what the response and Ruben indeed made several comments back and forth. This brings up of course the whole business of thick to thin as well because some of the players are going, "We don't want to continue with thick WHOIS change." That's still up in the air, in terms of what's happening with new WHOIS because it doesn't make any sense anymore, if you don't have a uniform thick WHOIS, that you want the big players, i.e. Verisign to shift, then why would you go ahead with this? It's just a cost on smaller registrars. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Stephanie. Yes, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI:

I found my notes. Basically, I had this mind as well about RDAC because when I looked at the document, there is only one question about RDAC that they wanted to discuss at this point that I looked at it. That was about after migration to RDAC, when can we requirement in contacts, when can they be required to use WHOIS be eliminated? Really, just one question about a new protocol that is going to talk about gated access and its implementation and I am no RDAC expert, I don't if it is

being discussed in other groups but this is something I think at least they should talk about.

The other point that I had to make it is about the fixed registry. I believe before going into question about whether which registry is GDPR compliant and stuff like that, we have to attack the question that which registries are needed? We should not talk about first all, so whether we see that registries are GDPR compliant, we should talk about whether they are needed and then if they are needed then okay, we can talk about GDPR compliance and stuff like that.

But maybe I'm being too -- maybe this is not something that they want to reopen, this is not an issue that they want to reopen but sincerely I think also SSAC, I saw that they liked the concept of fixed registries. I think if we can prove in this group that fixed registries are not needed and that this transfer should not even happen, for various reasons one could be that it's not GDPR compliant and there is no legitimate purpose then I think we should reformulate question slightly but it's a very contentious issue, I'm not sure.

The other thing that I wanted to discuss about the access. So I think the section about access is good, access to nonpublic WHOIS or as I always say, personal information of domain registrant. I wanted to know if it is good to discuss whether have this uniform access model that ICANN is coming up with and is saying that is not a model, how that is going to come into play? Because we don't want ICANN to adopt it and impose it on GNSO discussion. Should we clarify what will happen if ICANN takes unilateral action about access to personal information WHOIS? Whether it comes with a model?

Whether it imposes things on the contracted parties but contracted parties told me that they are not worried because they have ICANN, whatever happens they have to discuss it with them and they have to negotiate the contract but to be honest, I think there is a risk because the test says contacted parties have to provide reasonable access to WHOIS data and ICANN could say, in compliance with that, you need to adopt this. These are the three issues that I have. There is a fixed registry, there is access and there is RDAC. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Farzaneh. Respond about the access, as you can see it's a question here, the existing requirement, temporary [INAUDIBLE -- 0:56:23.4] enough or not? THE EPDP Team can review and decide if it's enough and work to amend that, maybe to elaborate more. I don't think we can add specific language how uniform access model should be handled, I think that's really the scope of the Review Team, it's more for the GNSO Council to decide.

It depends, for example there is more pressure on the Board to make it as temporary spec and if it happens so it will come back to counsel can, so we can initiate PDP. There was discussion that we know, we should handle it, so we can initiate a PDP at some time after we start work on EPDP process. Yeah, the whole ICANN Org can try to impose some model.

That reminds me, I think it will be strategic regardless what we think about the process to respond to the consultation. If the ICANN Org tries at the end registry and registrar, they can refuse as contract and either

they can say it's a matter of consensus policy, so it will have to go through GNSO, otherwise they are not -- there are other ways temporary spec or just ICANN Org can try to negotiate but I think they have the higher hand here on this side, whatever the pressure is on the Board or the ICANN Org. Just to summarize, I don't think really, we need to put such language about the uniform access model here, it's more an issue for the counsel to handle, likely in the near future. Does this respond to your concern Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII:

Yes, it has alleviated all my concerns now, I am at ease, thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

For the thick WHOIS, can you share the language so we can have sent that? For the RDAC, I think it's more a question for the -- suggested by Stephanie, so we can clarify on that matter. All these items are important for us if we start this EPDP, something our representatives should cover. Any comments or questions on this section? I don't see none.

We have other sections, some of them I don't think they are... Please, if you are not speaking, just please mute yourself, otherwise it creates some noise and echo.

MILTON MUELLER:

Rafik, I'm trying to get into the cue. Hello, Rafik. I just raised my hand when you were asking for questions, I didn't raise it fast enough. Can I ask a question before you go on to a different topic?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, you can ask a question.

MILTON MUELLER: Apparently this Drafting Team Meeting on the 5th of July, Tatiana can not make it, is it possible to appoint an alternate, somebody who would be able to speak up and articulate our view? That's my question.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Rafik, I have an answer to that. Unfortunately, I filled in the form for Tatiana, I have gotten an email from Natalie, I checked it very early in the morning, I don't know if I'm right but, I received an email that it is not possible to do the usual proxy for this. I'm going to check again.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I think she responded to you because it's addressing team call, so there is no vote and there is no need then for a proxy vote. That's why she responded to you, however I think it's possible to -- for a period of time to have a temporary alternate, like for a few days because it's not just for the meetings but temporary alternate will also be added to the counsel list, to participate. I think it's possible to have that but just the response from Natalie was, as it is not a counsel meeting as per say, there was no need for a proxy vote, that's just the clarification.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Then I have to get an alternate for Tatiana right, that's possible?
There's no vote but an alternate?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, I think it's possible, yeah.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Who wants to volunteer? It seems like no one wants to volunteer. I can't do it, I'm Chair. Anyway, I will go and discuss and see if we can find an alternate. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Again, it's not a proxy, it's more if want to make a replacement. No further comments on this part? I think that was just a procedural question in fact, not related to the scope.

I said there are other sections but I'm not sure, I don't they are contentious or rising any specific issues. Other counsel, if they want to discuss any section of the Charter. They think they need to get feedback here or they need to get some clarification. Any section from the Charter that you want to discuss, now good time to do so? I see that there is question and trying to respond to Stephanie.

Stephanie, the voting proxy is for counsel meeting, as we have a vote and so we can use that purpose, we give as you know to another counselor. This is a Drafting Team call, it's not really a counsel call per say. Even if we give a proxy vote, that has no effect since there is no vote to be made during the call. It would make sense, I'm not sure

considerably okay or not, it would make sense to have an alternate so they can participate in the process. They are not a proxy vote, that's a different thing. Is there any other point that you want to discuss?

Okay, responding to Stephanie in terms of procedure, the motion was already made that the placeholder that was submitted for the council meeting in Panama, so likely it needs to be amended but we have that motion already, that was what we use for the electronic vote. I'm trying to respond to most of the questions in the Adobe Connect, one of them about the date. Two dates that we available for the meeting, either Tuesday, which means today, which is quite early, so not providing any time for any group to discuss like we are doing now or Thursday and in fact, for both of them the GNSO Chair won't be available and it will be Vice Chair to manage the call.

That clarifies why the dates were chosen and now that they are not good and not convenient for everyone and some people cannot make it, that's why we picked one of those two dates. Having call on Thursday allows us in fact, the NCSG to discuss this matter. Ayden, I don't think it's true because Heather won't make it for the call, it won't be 100% to APC anyway. I don't see any comments or questions related to the Charter or other sections. I would suggest that we adjourn the call, otherwise really, I'm trying to provide you guys an opportunity to make questions or comment. Tatiana, please go ahead.

TATIAN TROPINA:

Sorry, I changed my mind. You can adjourn the call. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Tatiana, that was helpful. If there are no other comments, we'll end the call for today. Just to respond to Ayden, it will be the Vice Chair to chair the call. That's it, and thanks everyone for joining. I know it was not easy since many of us are just coming back from the Panama meeting but we needed to make it for extraordinary reasons. See you soon and have a nice day. Bye-bye.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thanks everyone for joining the call. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]