ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
July 21, 2015
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much (Aubrey). Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. This is the monthly (NPSG Open Quality) meeting on Tuesday, 21 of July. On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Patrick Anglin, (James Gannon), (Alice Route), (Marsha), (Adam Hick), (unintelligible), (Abby Domiere), Robin Gross, (Ruby Vanbrick), (Judy Johnson), (Stephanic Currin), (unintelligible), (unintelligible), (Daniel Offerman), (Jeremy Mafun), (Mark Tuchier), (Aleviate Quan), (unintelligible), (unintelligible), and David Cake. And of course myself, Maryam Bakoshi.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Over to you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you Maryam, and thanks everyone for joining today's call. Since we have people - newcomers, just to give a background about this kind of call -- we are trying usually to have a monthly call before the GNSO council. It's an opportunity for all members to get the briefing and update about what

happened in terms of policies within the GNSO council. And so, we try to go through the GNSO agenda and to try to discuss and to find out how our council - our elected NCSG council to GNSO council are going to vote. And therefore, also we are trying to get an update about (what's happening) in different working groups and so on. And, we also have kind of any other business we can -- discuss about any relevant events.

For this time, we have also - we have a presentation from the Vice President in Europe for ICANN, Jean-Jacques. We also have (unintelligible) from ICANN staff. We are going to try to (leave) presentation about (hopefully it's about) to engage (unintelligible). I'm not sure if Jean-Jacques is on the call, but I think we have (Adam). If you have any comment about the agenda, please do so. Otherwise, we'll start with the current agenda.

Okay. So, can we hear? Can you hear me or not? I'm not sure.

Woman 1:   Hi Rafik. We can hear you.

Man 1:   We can hear you Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. That's good. Sorry. Next time (unintelligible). So, different connection -- not the same phone number and so on. So, I'm not sure about if this thing is working or not. (Adam), I think you will do the presentation for this time. Did you share your slides with Maryam? Or, I mean we can do it without slides.

Hello Adam? Can you speak up?

And please, as a reminder, if you are not speaking please mute yourself. Otherwise, we have a lot of background noise and it will be really hard to listen to each other.

Okay, I'm not sure what is the problem. We don't have Jean-Jacques (on here). And, I cannot hear (Adam). Hello? Can you hear me well or not? Hello?

Woman 1: Yeah, Rafik. We can hear you clearly.

Woman 2: Yeah, I hear you fine.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. I'm not sure. It sounds like someone (under water and) a lot of noise around. So, I'm just checking. Okay, so let's maybe go with the GNSO Council agenda and see if we can get Jean-Jacques later on.

(I have problem and have to reconnect). So Maryam, please share the agenda.

Maryam Bakoshi: The agenda is up.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So let's start with the agenda. Okay, so I'm (unintelligible) go through the agenda and (go through the first one). (Unintelligible) can you please go through that and maybe brief about the first item?

Man 2: Sure. This is (unintelligible). I can go through GNSO agenda for the meeting on the 23rd. Before I do start, maybe I should just check to see if JJ can talk right now. He's got his hand up in the (unintelligible) room. Is that what you would like to try now?

Jean-Jacques: That's right. Can you hear me at all?

Man 2: I can hear you loud and clear now.

((Crosstalk))

Jean-Jacques: Sorry about the issues. Thanks for having me on the call, and (Adam). This will be - I will keep this very short. There is a document on Google Docs that I will refer you to. Basically, as many of you know, because you have worked with us over the past few months, we have done a few events around basically (unintelligible) engagement over the year -- both in terms of information webinars on topical issues, but also outreach events -- for instance, (unintelligible) recent ICANN meetings we have held sessions where we try to invite local (unintelligible) communities to hear from our own (unintelligible) communities about how they can be involved in ICANN, how it works, and where they should participate going forward.

Basically, we've conducted the past 12 months -- almost on a pilot basis -- both running our own events or supporting your own event as a (unintelligible). And, what we'd like to do going forward is just give a little bit more structure to this so that basically we can be as effective as possible and as supportive of your efforts as possible.

So, we have - it's not rocket science. It's simply that we wanted to put structure to it all. There are three broad elements of how we look at our (unintelligible) society engagement in ICANN. All of them with the long-term goal of basically enhancing (unintelligible) society participation in ICANN -- both in terms of numbers or in terms of diversity generally, to make sure we have proper geographic diversity. That (unintelligible) society is (unintelligible) as it can in ICANN.

Now, so the three key elements are basically around (unintelligible) -- such as those I discussed, whether it's face-to-face workshops or webinars -- it's communication, and then it's around capacity building -- both in terms of

newcomers, but also in terms of how we can help you, the existing (unintelligible) in ICANN in your own outreach efforts or in your own participation in ICANN's processes. (Unintelligible) we just want to do that increasingly better.

So, we have put a short document together which describes this -- what we have in mind -- and a Google Doc link can be circulated for anyone to have a look at and comment and input. The idea is its very much stuff here trying to support you -- our community -- and so we'd very much like to do this jointly. And you know, if you think about it, a lot of you (unintelligible) have participated in activities along those lines before. So, it's more of continuation of what we've done -- thinking about well, where can we reach a wider spectrum of (unintelligible) society people in organizations? Can we do things around (unintelligible) -- for instance -- or NGO specific conferences -- things like (unintelligible) conferences that we've (unintelligible)? Or, can we look at other big conferences -- like (unintelligible) and others -- where it could be helpful to be present and talk about ICANN and how (unintelligible) society can and should participate. That sort of thing.

So, we really need both your feedback on the (unintelligible) we've made and also just going forward we hope (unintelligible) partnership directly with you to serve these objectives. So, I might just stop here and - it was just a general overview. What we hope to do is both collect your input on the Google Doc and then have a longer discussion after the summer -- possibly as a face-to-face around the (unintelligible) meeting. I might stop here and take any questions or comments.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Thank you for this quick presentation. Yes, just - we are beginning the discussion here and sharing the document for people to comment and share feedback. And we - hopefully we will follow-up after the

summer holiday for (unintelligible) in the northern hemisphere. So, we'll try maybe to set up (unintelligible) and continue the discussion (unintelligible). And, I see that (unintelligible), maybe he wants to ask a question here. Yes (unintelligible)?

Man 2: Thanks Rafik and Jean-Jacques. Thank you very much for joining us on this call. I actually have two quick questions. The first one is - I was actually curious about ICANN's participation at (unintelligible). And, if you could maybe share with us whatever material that was presented there -- I think that would be interesting to myself and maybe some others. That would be really great if you could do that. Thank you.

My second question is if you are planning on holding any more outreach sessions during the ICANN meetings -- like in Dublin and beyond -- it would be really helpful -- though I know probably very difficult, but it would be helpful if you could try as much as possible to avoid scheduling those at times that conflict with the GNSO council meetings of any sort because we have some of the people who are really involved in gTLD policy development in those meetings. It's really some of these folks we would want to also participate in the outreach sessions. That's sort of to let people - let whoever we're trying to do the outreach to just to get a really good understanding of why it is important for the civil society to be involved in ICANN and gTLD policy development. I know this is not an easy request to accommodate. But, to the best of your ability, that would be great. Thanks.

Jean-Jacques: Yeah, so let me start with the latter one. I can only fully agree. There's various outreach efforts during the ICANN week. You've got the one with the fellows and the newcomers, which is on the Sunday. And, what they've done for the past two or three ICANN meetings is that the last hour of that session -- which is usually around 4 p.m. on the Sunday -- is an opportunity for the newcomers

from the four or five key stakeholder categories to have about an hour with some of the leaders from each of the committees. So for civil society, you know which is (unintelligible) in a corner of the fellows room, and we have people like (Bill) and Rafik and (unintelligible) and others that (unintelligible) questions, etc. Unfortunately, I realize that timing seems to clash with; I think it's the (unintelligible) council. So, that's unfortunate. We've said that back to the fellows team. We'll see how we can try and work around that for Dublin.

In terms of the other outreach effort, now for instance in Buenos Aires we did - I should say, NCUC for instance we did an outreach event which was late on a Saturday. And yeah, we tried to make it so that we didn't clash too much. That's going to remain our objective. So, I'll be working in particular with the chair to try and make sure we don't conflict too much. I fully agree. We need to get our existing committee leadership properly in tune in meeting the potential newcomers. So, I will - that's high on my (unintelligible) taken.

On (unintelligible) -- that's just an example. Again, it was a pilot. That was led or organized by one of my colleagues in Asia, (Pat Girong). And basically, they organized a panel session around ICANN and multi-stakeholder model and in particular how civil society gets involved in ICANN. I will dig up the details of who was on the panel. I cannot recall exactly if it was - there was a PowerPoint, but I'll check.

Usually, when we - you know we run a few of those workshops in the past year and usually we have three or four. Usually we try to bring in people from the community. We've had (Bill) a couple of times. Rafik has been on a couple of webinars. We've had others, many others -- especially (unintelligible). And the idea is really to share experiences to both extend the relevance of ICANN's work to all of these other NGOs and (unintelligible) groups out there, and how it works in practice -- you know, what does it mean

to be involved in decision making and policy making and then, what impact it has.

So, there's more that we need to do, aspects we need to look at. You'll see in the initial paper. We need to look at the content we have, the material we have and see if it's - if it needs updating. If we can prepare material that would be even more relevant for the (unintelligible). That's where we'll need to work in partnership with you. So our staff, we're committed to supporting you, but we'll also need your input -- your brain power -- to guide us in the right direction really.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Jean-Jacques. I think we have question from (unintelligible).

Jean-Jacques: Rafik, sorry. I just see your note from Rudy. He mentioned an (unintelligible). I didn't mention (unintelligible). But of course they too had their outreach event in Buenos Aires and we've done a couple of things with them in the past. I'll just give a (unintelligible). It's the whole community there. We will also consider working with (unintelligible) in the same perspective. So, it's the broader civil society community in ICANN that we're talking about.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Jean-Jacques. Jim?

Jim Galvin: Hi, Jim Galvin. So, thank you Jean-Jacques for presenting on this. I think it's a (unintelligible) to start with, and I think particularly of interest to a lot of people here. The event we had in Buenos Aires was quite successful. It drove a lot of (unintelligible) Latin American region and we've had a number of new members come out of that. I think it was very successful. Personally, I would like to see something like that move from possibly an ad hock basis to something more structured that we look at as a capacity building exercise going forward in conjunction with your team.

Secondly, I just want to call out for those who may not know -- I noticed that we have Adam Peake both on the call and he (unintelligible) global coordinator as part of this effort. And for those who don't know Adam, he has a long history within (unintelligible) in ICANN. So, it's great to see him moving into a position where he will be supporting civil society.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks again. I see that - if anyone wants to add further comments?

(Stephanie Parin): I just wanted to - (Stephanie Parin) for the record. I just wanted to say that when I joined NCUC and ALAC a couple of years ago now, I found it very confusing as a new person trying to understand the roles and voting procedures and the, you know, who actually represents the kind of civil society that I represent. And so, I don't know what you're using for communication materials when you go out on these outreach sessions, but a brochure that explains the difference between, I guess it's basically the three groups -- NCUC, (unintelligible) NSCG as the umbrella, and ALAC -- would probably be helpful. Because, it took me a while to figure it out and I still don't know what ALAC does. I just thought I'd through that in.

Jean-Jacques: Yeah. (Stephanie) I've mentioned briefly (unintelligible). It's mentioned also in the paper. What we like to do as one of the first steps is just really do a catalogue of the material that we have that's civil society related. And, that includes material that each of the constituencies have. And you know, I've been looking at the brochures myself and it's true. I mean if you look at (unintelligible) and certainly (unintelligible) you see -- depending on which part of the respective brochures you look at -- they look the same. But actually, if you look at some more of the detail it's quite nicely defined. But, I think we need to work on that and make it as clear as we can to the newcomers. That's very, very important.

So, that's again where hopefully we can work together on that part because -- for instance -- currently I probably don't have access or visibility of all the material that you guys have. So, I'll need to get your input on that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Jean-Jacques. I think we maybe just are starting discussion here. And, I see that a lot of input is coming. That's really a good start. Okay. So, I'm not sure if there are other questions, but I see several comments on the chat. So, maybe you should like try to compile them later on and share. And we will make sure the document is released too so we can keep the discussion going on.

Okay. Jean-Jacques, do you want to ask something before or?

Jean-Jacques: I'm just trying to read. There's a lot of comments on the chat. Just to be very clear again, please have a look at the Google Doc. Scoping or defining what is civil societies (unintelligible). We've tried to scope it in there and welcome your feedback on that. The three ICANN communities that we will be focusing on will be NCSG and within it (unintelligible) and NCUC. And then, to an extent (unintelligible), in respect to the non-commercial and individual end user (unintelligible). So, you know this one is to be included. Okay. So, let's be very clear on that. I'd appreciate your feedback on the scope after we sort everything out.

((Background Noise))

Rafik Dammak: Thanks again Jean-Jacques. I think we went over what we expected as the time allocated. Maryam, can you please find out how to stop this - okay. So okay, thanks Jean-Jacques again for this presentation.

((Crosstalk))

Jean-Jacques: Thank you Rafik. Thanks a lot. Go ahead. Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. We'll try to compile all the comments in the chat. We have the (unintelligible). And, we will share the document to try to get more input. After hopefully in September we can organize another, maybe more (unintelligible) just for this topic webinar. And so, we can work again more into documents updated with all the feedback collected.

Thanks again. So, we need to move on to our next agenda item. So, we have - we spent 20 minutes on that. Okay. Let's go to - go back to the GNSO agenda. And, the first item is about the (unintelligible) to approve a GNSO issue of the (unintelligible). And, hopefully if we can have someone from the GNSO council who can explain what (unintelligible) and the content of the motion and so on? Omar, can you please volunteer for this?

Omar Kaminski: Sure. This is Omar. I can give an overview of this. I don't know if Carlos would like to take a stab at it first and then I could maybe follow-up on? Because, if I'm not mistaken, I believe Carlos was involved in the specific GNSO council project. I see he's got his hands up in...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I see that Carlos wants (unintelligible). Carlos? Carolos, can you speak up? Carlos, I'm not sure. Can you try to speak?

Omar Kaminski: Rafik, this is Omar again. Carlos is having some audio difficulty. I can (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I see (unintelligible) you want to speak.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Okay. (Unintelligible) to hear her. Okay, we will check later what is the issue with audio because it's really bad. Yes Omar.

Omar Kaminski: Thanks Rafik. Can you hear me? Can anyone hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. You can hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Omar Kaminski: This is Omar again. I just figured I'd take a stab at doing an overview of this motion until Carlos gets (unintelligible). Okay, this is a relatively new practice that the GNSO council has begun to adopt. It's specifically regarding GAC and advice to the ICANN board. What the GNSO council kind of came up with was a method using a template to sort of address a GAC advise items that are - that have any relevance to the GNSO's work. So, and the purpose of this is not to communicate with the GAC so much as for the GNSO council to inform the ICANN board on where the GNSO stands on any given advice by the GAC on the GNSO (unintelligible).

So, if I'm not mistaken, this is the first actual bit of GNSO council input to the board on the GAC advice. It's mostly stuff relating to gTLD safe guards on some items from the GAC advice (unintelligible) public interest commitment specification (unintelligible). As well, I believe, something regarding the community priority evaluation in the new gTLD round that is going to kick off soon. So basically, the GNSO council has populated this template to tell the ICANN board that these issues are all being addressed.

((Crosstalk))

Omar Kaminski: All right. So, I was saying that this current motion is about - the first template to sort of be filled out in response to GAC advice. And like I said, the items are on community priority evaluation in the next gTLD round as well as...

((Crosstalk))

Omar Kaminski: I'm sorry. Was someone trying to speak? Okay. So yeah, and some advice on the ICANN board implementing some of the public interest commitment specifications of the registry agreement advice from the GAC to the board in prior communicate...

((Crosstalk))

Omar Kaminski: So, basically what the GNSO council has done in responding to this or in trying to inform the ICANN board on maybe on some relevant information they might need to react to the GAC communique is basically telling them that these things are all going to be included as part of the preliminary and final issue reports of the new gTLD around PDP that is about to kick off.

                   If you recall, the last GNSO council meeting in Buenos Aires, there was a motion to make a request for an issues report on this issue -- on the new gTLD program, a new PDP for the new gTLD round. And, I think recently the GNSO council received an email from ICANN staff requesting to postpone the drafting or publication of the preliminary issues reports. This is a common practice if ICANN staff feels they need more time to work on it -- since this is a big sort of issue -- I think it's understandable that they did make this request.

But, that's basically what the motion is. Personally, I've gone over the documents that the GNSO council is suggesting to send to the ICANN board. I think though the answers are quite - well, they're all right as far as I can tell. And, they're in line with what my personal belief is that the GNSO is the place where gTLD policy developments should happen as opposed to GAC giving advice to the ICANN board and the ICANN board acting on it without going through the GNSO.

I hope I gave a clear overview. I know we had a few audio interruptions and it was kind of throwing me off. But, if there are any questions I will be happy to answer. I hope that Carlos is back on audio because he's actually involved in this project of council responding or sending briefings to the ICANN board regarding GAC advice. So, any questions?

None? Okay well, I'm personally planning on voting in favor of this motion unless there are any objections from other councilors. I don't see any reason to - I mean I wouldn't mind having a discussion on this if someone has a reason why we shouldn't vote in favor of it. But personally, I - right now I plan on voting in favor of this motion. Thanks.

Maryam Bakoshi: Rafik is trying to speak. (Unintelligible) line in a minute.

Omar Kaminski: Okay. This is Omar again. Maybe I'll just carry on with the GNSO council agenda until Rafik comes back on the line. Maryam, we have had some serious problems with audio today I think.

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes, I apologize.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Rafik speaking.

((Crosstalk))

Maryam Bakoshi: And we have muted his line. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Hello.

Omar Kaminski: Rafik is back on. So, I'll just hand it back to him. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thank you. I'm not sure why I was muted. Anyway, thanks to Omar for the presentation. And, we will try to figure out about all those issues regarding the call today. We didn't change the technology - I mean the provider or whatever. It's the same. But, we will try to ask the ICANN IT team to do a review and check what is the problem. And maybe we can ask for more improvement or using another provider for next call. For now, we will try to overcome this and move forward.

I don't see really any disagreement with voting yes for this motion. If there is any (unintelligible) question, please do so. Okay...

Omar Kaminski: This is Omar again. I have one more thing.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Omar Kaminski: Okay, I just wanted to say that the audio problems throw me a bit off my game. But, I am very aware that we have a number of new members on today's call. I'm guessing -- I'm personally guessing that my presentation of this topic was very confusing for them. I would just like to reassure them that we really appreciate new members joining these calls and please make it a regular thing. And, please do ask questions either by raising your hand and (unintelligible) or by putting them in the chat. And, we will do everything we

can to answer those. The purpose of these calls is not just to discuss policy issue but also to update our membership on what's going on. And so please, if there is anything - if you have a question on anything or there's anything you don't understand - we try to as much as possible not to use acronyms but use the full length terms of whatever it is we're saying. But, please do not be shy to ask questions. We're here to help. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Omar. And yes, really thanks for all the new members who joined us today. I'm sorry for all the annoyance because of the technical issue we have with the call. But anyway, if you want to ask any questions, please feel free to do so. You can do it in the chat if you don't want to speak up. It can be the most easiest way. But, please do so.

Okay. Let's move to the next agenda item. It's about an update on discussion (unintelligible) purpose of (unintelligible), data policy development process. I think Omar, you (unintelligible) about this in the (unintelligible). And, there was - there is already ongoing discussion. I think you can do kind of maybe give a briefing to explain about, I mean, this issue and also maybe explain more about the policy development process since this is a particular case here. So Omar, can you do so? Hello?

Carlos Souza: I'm afraid the system is down because I have no computer connection anymore Rafik. I am on the bridge, but my computer just lost connection.

Woman 1: Me too. I've lost the Adobe Connect.

((Crosstalk))

Woman 2: Yeah, it went down for me too.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. That's really bad. I thought I have only this problem. (Unintelligible) for me many times. So, but...

Carlos Souza: I just got a breech but the computer system is down. This is Carlos, by the way. Thank you Rafik.

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Souza: I'm trying to reconnect now. Is there any chance to redo it in an hour or two it would be great Rafik. I mean the discussion on the policy - on the GNSO council agenda. This is always very valuable preparation and we should try to program...

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Carlos. I'm not sure we can do so quickly. If people have other calls later after this. So, I mean definitely I would have to follow-up with this. It's really unacceptable. And it's the kind of (unintelligible) support that we are getting from ICANN if we cannot even handle a monthly call. I mean, it's really questionable what kind of support we are getting.

Carlos Souza: I was in that call an hour ago and it was perfect. I was in a call on (Work Stream 2) for accountability and it worked perfectly. Everything worked perfect. I don't know how can they change from one to the other.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I'm not sure right now.

Carlos Souza: Well, let's take it from here and just let's - I think I'm on again. I think we have the platform running again, no?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I'm trying to check now.

Carlos Souza: I have the platform but no audio. Hello? Hello?

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Carlos Souza: Yeah, the platform is coming up again, slowly.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. It seems the issue is with our provider -- Verizon. So, we'll have to check.

Carlos Souza: Rudy is very upset.

Rafik Dammak: You've got access to the (unintelligible)?

Carlos Souza: Yes. It's up again. (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I am trying to connect.

Woman 1:   Yes. I just started the audio bridge. So, it's okay.

Carlos Souza: (Unintelligible).

Woman 1:   Yeah, (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Souza: Okay. We're up and going.

Omar Kaminski: I should already be in a call right now.

Carlos Souza: I can hear you, Omar.

Omar Kaminski: Alright, because I'm on the call. I've got an operator on with me.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Omar, can you please take over from here for going through the agenda since it's about the (unintelligible) presentation (unintelligible) and I will try to (unintelligible), okay?

Omar Kaminski: Yeah. I would be happy to take over the agenda, except I also have an operator in my ear. So, it's a bit disorienting.

Man 2:   Hello?

Omar Kaminski: Oh, that's (Stephanie).

Woman 1:   Okay. It should be okay now.

Omar Kaminski: I can hear (Stephanie) dialing in talking to the operator. I think that's what is going on.

Woman 1:   And now I'm back to playing assistant administrator. So, I'm letting people into the call.

Omar Kaminski: Oh cool. Thanks for that (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think we are back. (Unintelligible). Okay, hello everyone. We are back. And please mute if you are not speaking. So, we are trying to continue as much as (unintelligible) through the agenda. And, Omar will give kind of an explanation about the ICANN (unintelligible) data policy development process. So, Omar please go ahead.

Omar Kaminski: This is Omar. First thing, I'm getting a lot of echo. So, if anyone out there has - hello?

Rafik Dammak: Yes Omar, I can hear you.

Omar Kaminski: Okay. I think the audio I the AC room was activated and everyone is off of mute. Hi...

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Omar. I can hear you.

Omar Kaminski: All right, can anyone else hear an operator speaking or is it just me?

Woman 1:   I don't hear an operator.

Omar Kaminski: That is so weird. Okay. All right. I'm sorry. We're on the agenda item right now for the new GNSO stuff for the new domain registration directory services.

Rafik Dammak: Yes Omar. I asked you if you can make the presentation.

((Crosstalk))

Omar Kaminski: I'm sorry. I'm listening to James dialing in as well as someone else. It's very confusing. Hold on. I'm going to try to get on the audio in the AC room. Just give me a second.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Omar Kaminski: Can you hear me yet? Hello? Can I be heard?

Woman 1:   I can still hear you.

Omar Kaminski: All right. Thanks. I really apologize about this. Okay. This is the discussion
                item on the next council agenda, which is the purpose of new gTLD
                registration data policy development process. Okay, this is what we more
                commonly known as the post-expert working group PDP. And, I' guessing
                that (Aubrey) probably has a lot more to say about this because she was
                involved in a group that consisted of some GNSO councilors and board
                members trying to work out the issues report, which is the first phase in a
                policy development process. So, just scoping what issues need to be addressed
                or considered in any given PDP or policy development process.

                However, the preliminary issues report -- which was drafted by staff and is the
                result of the work of this group between the select few GNSO councilors and
                ICANN board members -- is not open for public comments. It has been open
                for public comment for a few days now. And, I believe the public comment
                period for that closes on September 6. So, we do have some time to work on
                this.

                Personally, I've gone through the issues report. It's quite a good one actually.
                It includes things dating back to a (unintelligible) final report published back
                in 2003 all the way up to ongoing policy development processes like the one
                on privacy and policy service accreditation as well as the implementation - the
                ongoing implementation of the (unintelligible) policy and the translation or
                transliteration of contact information policy which is now being considered by
                the board. So, there's an open public comment for that.

                I'm not sure if you want to submit a comment or not, but the GNSO council
                adopted the final report recommendations of that PDP working group. And,
                that is now on the agenda for the next board meeting following the closure of

the public comments period on that. But yeah, like I said, this is a pretty good roundup of everything who is - that has ever taken place at ICANN -- at least as far as I can tell. If (Stephanie) is on the call, she might be happy to know that this issues report even includes her dissenting comments to the expert working group recommendations. So, even that is in there. It really does include everything.

In terms of sort of the function or purpose of a preliminary issues report, I think this one does the job very well. Remember, right now it is not the time to discuss the substantive issues of this given policy. It is more about just about scoping it and making sure that everything that needs to be considered is in there so that when this does go to a PDP working group that we don't try to bring something up and realize that it is out of scope. So, that is really the purpose of this report right now. It is not to discuss the substantive policy issues.

But, from a substantive policy issues perspective -- I guess the one thing that I am really not happy to see in there and would like some, at least some advice or feedback from other (unintelligible) on the relevance of this to the issues report -- is a GAC communique regarding who is from - I think it was given by the GAC back in 2007. Basically they're saying in this communique that the purpose of (unintelligible) is to assist law enforcement in battling online crime and cyber terrorism and that sort of thing. Yeah, that's no good at all from a policy perspective.

I just do wonder - I guess in all fairness it may be warranted to include that in an issues report. It's just that I am - I guess it's the only thing that comes into this report that is not generated by the GNSO but rather by the Government Advisory Committee. And yeah, I'm not - personally, I'm not too happy

seeing that in there. But like I said, the purpose here is really to scope the issue and make sure that everything is considered.

I guess there's also a list of sort of points or items in a framework that is meant to sort of guide how this PDP should take place. There are several bullets on those. I am looking at them right now. One of them is sort of like the users or the purpose of a new gTLD registration data service. How to handle gain of access, data accuracy issues, data elements, privacy, coexistence, compliance, system model cost, benefits, and risks. And, I think the coexistence issue is sort of like how the current existing (unintelligible) system would sort of coexist with the transition to a next one. So, this is something that the PDP working group will have to consider.

Apart from that, I think it's relatively - it's a really good one. And, one of the things I was very pleased to also see included is a lot of consideration regarding internationalized domain name registration services. So, this is - I'm glad to see that in there. Although there actually is an expert working group that specifically dealt with that -- with internationalized registration data services -- and I see no mention of their final report which was published a couple of months ago in this issues report. So, this is something we might want to point to.

But, I think sort of in other areas of this issues report -- although that expert working group's work was not specifically mentioned, but you could sort of consider that it was included in other random parts of this issue report. I would recommend that those who are interested in (unintelligible) or interested in privacy and - sort of just take a look. It's not a very difficult document to read. It's actually fairly easy. But like I said, I think from an issues report perspective, I think it's a rather good one. I think staff worked really hard to make sure to include everything in this report. I'm guessing

that's probably because we gave them such a hard time over the past couple of years regarding the process and how to sort of integrate the expert working group process -- which was an ad hock process with the traditional GNSO policy development process.

So, I think that's all I got for now. I don't know if (Aubrey) has anything she would like to add. But, I also see (Stephanie's) hand is up. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Omar for the good report and introduction. And, I think we have already someone who wants to ask a question. I see (Stephanie) in the queue. Yes (Stephanie)?

(Stephanie):   Yes hi. Thanks very much. I think that was a great summary. (Stephanie Parin) for the record. The scoping issue is really quite important. I just wanted to raise something that has been coming up in the Whois conflict (unintelligible), which is basically an implementation group implementing a 2005 policy I believe.

One of the things that does not appear to change and evolve as the internet expands and grows is the insistence on Whois as a law enforcement mechanism -- as Omar has pointed out. And the fact of the matter is -- and those who know me know I'm doing my doctorate on this -- when that original policy was crafted, data protection law was hanging in the balance in Europe and the United States was winning in terms of not getting data protection law in. The Charter of Human Rights in Europe had not passed.

So, quite frankly, to allow a policy that now no longer meets constitutional law and is out of (unintelligible) with 15 years of data protection development is in my view wrong. And so, when I look at the scope, I want to make sure that we are not paving the cow path -- as it were -- that we are not old policy

and refusing to look at it again. That, I think, is one of the risks in this otherwise excellent report. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks (Stephanie). Okay so, yes Omar. I think you want to respond here.

Omar Kaminski: Yes, thanks Rafik. And, thanks (Stephanie) for bringing that up. That is actually an important item and I just wanted to also mention that this - the ICANN policy on handling conflicts - Whois conflicts with national laws is also something that is in the issues report here. And so, this is something that we need to keep a close eye on.

Personally, I think starting - since this PDP is starting, I think this is going to be one of the most important PDP's that the GNSO has handled. This is a board initiated policy development process. So, we will be proceeding to a PDP working group. The GNSO council has nothing to say about that. I think it would be helpful if (Stephanie) (unintelligible) and a lot of other sort of gave sequence of webinars on the important issues that (unintelligible) because I think if we don't - this is a process that's going to take a long time if we don't coordinate our work on this early on in the process.

We're going to start getting lost in the work. And, this is something that will ultimately harm us as a stakeholder group representing noncommercial (unintelligible) because on the other side of this we have the intellectual property consistency and the business (unintelligible). I'm sure there's going to be GAC participation in this or input in one form or another. These guys are going to be pretty well coordinated. They're going to be taking this very seriously and it's going to be extremely difficult keeping up with them on a long term project if we don't get it right from the start. So, I think we have an

opportunity now. We should take it and hopefully get a really good team on this. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Omar. (Aubrey)?

(Aubrey):   Thanks, (Aubrey) speaking. Just one quick comment. I haven't had a chance to read this version of it yet. One thing that I don't know whether it's in there -- but perhaps Omar you've already read it. But, if it's not, it's something that we can comment on in any case. It's every PDP has the option of including a rights (unintelligible) analysis -- that that's part of the PDP process. That's something I'm trying to get into the bylaws, with no great success -- but that's beside the point.

So, if this doesn't have it, I think a lot of (Stephanie's) concerns in terms of the rights as they have been constitutionally expressed is something that we can point to and get quite explicit about the requirements for a rights impact analysis that takes all of those things into account. So, that's probably one important thing to look at in terms of getting a comment in. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks (Aubrey). Okay Omar, do you want to respond to this?

Omar Kaminski: Yeah, this is Omar again. Yeah, I just wanted to say I fully agree with (Aubrey) and thank you for bringing that up because - well, now there is going to be - there will possibly be a - actually, will be a (unintelligible) for the PDP working group as part of the final issues report. This will be based on the public comments input you provide now. I guess we really should be looking at this report not just as an issues report but also in terms of what we want to see in the charter. If we do want to spell something out -- like an impact analysis on rights -- then we should make that clear in whatever

comment we submit now. So, I just wanted to really agree with (Aubrey) and thank her for pointing that out. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. I see a lot of agreement here and we should proceed. So, hopefully we can make this maybe action item to follow-up to be sure that we follow their approach. Any further comment on this topic, or questions?

Okay. I think we can move forward to the next agenda item, which is an update and discussion about the (unintelligible) working group and (unintelligible) working group. So, I guess this is more an update in what happened last week's meeting in Paris. So, we got (unintelligible)... ((audio cut out))... attending the meeting in Paris and also several folks attended remotely.

So, who - I mean maybe I can ask here Robin, since she's our representative to the (unintelligible) working group (unintelligible), if she can give us an update of what happened last week and maybe how we should follow-up for this and what can be our next action. Robin, can you hear me?

Robin Gross: Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I can hear you.

Robin Gross: Okay, so yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: So, I just got back yesterday from the Paris meeting and the CCWG. And, (James) and (Ed) and (Aubrey) were also there from NCSG. So, we had a nice team of people. And, so it was a two day meeting. And, some of the issues

that we focused on was when trying to come down to an acceptable reference model for the community mechanism, to try to - the means by which the community will exercise the powers that the community would like to have, with respect to ICANN and some of the board actions.

So, before we were talking about a membership model or a designator model. There were some who were talking about sort of the voluntary model, which is staying where we are today basically. And, then the lawyers have proposed that we sort of evolve the membership model to become a single member model whereby all of the SOs and ACs would be part of the single member of ICANN -- which is the community. So, you could maybe think of it as sort of a community member model. And, there seemed to be some momentum going towards that evolution.

For one thing, my concern with the membership model as we were talking about it before was that we would be empowering the very well healed among us -- basically the contracted parties, in particularly the CSG -- to be able to file derivative lawsuits any time they want to put pressure on ICANN and a policy issue. So, that was my concern with the membership model before. However, I think perhaps this sole member or community member model can address that pretty well by ensuring that there must be unanimity amongst the community in order to be able to bring a derivative lawsuit -- which of course there's never going to be unless ICANN has really screwed up. And then, we would probably want such a thing.

So, that seems to address some of my concerns with respect to the membership model. However, when it comes to exercising all of these powers -- and we're talking about the powers being approving bylaws and approving the budget and approving the - I should say rather, not approving but rejected -- the rights to reject the budget and strategic (unintelligible) and being able to

remove the directors -- both the one - the individual one that a SO appointed and also sort of a spill the total board proposal. So, these are the community powers that we're talking about. And so, in order to exercise one of those -- any of those powers -- really what's going to be important is where do we set the threshold for being able to exercise some of these powers?

So, we have to think about this carefully because on the one hand we don't want it to require unanimity in order to be able to exercise the right to be able to get the bylaws in forced against ICANN. Brining in IRP -- for example. Think about the trademark (unintelligible) example and how (unintelligible) broke the policy in order to appease the CSG on that issue. We would never be able to get relief under a single member model if we have to have unanimity in order to bring a bylaws matter.

There's an awfully loud noise on the line suddenly. I don't know what that is, but I'll try to carryon despite it. So, because the CSG would never agree -- for example -- to bring an IRP against ICANN for violating the bylaws by calling the GNSO policy, which was exact match only -- deciding to interpret that as trademark plus 50. So, that's a violation of the bylaws that an objective (unintelligible) understand. But, the party who benefited from that, who was lobbying for that CSG would never agree that was a bylaws violation. And so, we wouldn't be able to -- I think -- to bring a successful action if we have to be all on the same page -- 100% unanimity -- in order to...

It's really hard to talk with this language blaring in my ear. I don't know what it is. Do other people hear that as well? Is it just me?

Woman 2:   I hear it as well, but I don't see it as being an Adobe Connect person.

Man 2:   Yeah, I hear it.

Woman 2:   So, it's probably somebody on a phone.

(Aubrey):   So, I'll try to carry on.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible).

(Aubrey):   Yes.

Rafik Dammak: One second. Maryam, please mute everyone who is not speaking and just keep Robin unmuted so she can continue. I'm sorry Robin. Go ahead.

Robin Gross: Okay. Thanks. Okay, so on the other hand, we want to be able to - we don't want a single stakeholder group or a single constituency to be able to constantly bring in IRP actions in order to influence the policy development process. So, we have to find a balance somehow on these different powers and how we exercise them -- on what the threshold would be and how we constrain or craft that in some way -- to ensure that a case like trademark plus 50 where there is going to be somebody who is going to agree with what staff did. And so, if we require unanimity of the community in order to ask in that case, we wouldn't have been able to get any relief under a single member model if the threshold is set that high.

However, we don't want it set so low that every time there is a policy issue the Intellectual Property Constituency or the CSG is going to be able to unilaterally bring in IRP and basically threaten ICANN to bend a little bit in order to what it wants to do - what the CSG wants to do on a particular policy issue -- be able to use that as leverage -- threat of bringing an IRP to get what they want through other means.

So, I think that's really what's going to be crucial here. So, for the next basically two weeks - we have until July 31 to get the second iteration of our report out. And then, it's going to be out for a 40 day public comment period. So, it's going to be really hardcore for the next 10 days or so where we have three or four meetings just about every weekday. And, the email is literally hundreds of emails a day and I don't know how anyone can really keep up with it. It is the most excruciating and burdensome ICANN working group I've ever been on.

But, we have until July 31st to hammer out a lot of these details on these thresholds. This is very important. And then our report goes out for a 40 day public comment period. So, that's really what's going on with the community mechanism. Now, there are also issues like we're reforming the reconsideration request. And, the proposals that we've got in there now aren't at all controversial and I think they're just going to fly through.

Reforming the IRP -- and this is very important because everything that we're doing, all of the fixes, all of the powers that we're creating all are pretty much hinging upon the IRP as the means of enforcement. So, we have to be especially sure that we get the IRP right. And, but frankly I'm pretty confident with the way the IRP reform is going right now. We do have a lot more details to work out.

Now, there are some things that I am concerned about with proposal. One is which the extent to which we are empowering GAC and at large - to a much larger extent than they currently are in the existing structure at ICANN. I think that's troubling for a number of reasons. Another concern that I have - oh shoot. Sorry, I just lost my thought on that.

But, so there's this issue of how many votes each of the different SOs and ACs would get. And, it's really hard to get the proposal to be moved away from sort of this equal votes -- even though it's rather arbitrary in terms of who gets included. You get an equal share. So, I think that remains to be a concern. The issue of whether or not some issue of human rights will be included as a fundamental core value of ICANN -- that's something that a number of us in NCSG have been trying to push for. And of course, we get the usual pushback from business and even GAC and contracted parties.

Although, I think we may have made some traction on that in the last couple of days and we may be able to get some sort of reference to human rights in the core values. I really like Ed's proposal about really specifically defining what we're talking about as freedom of expression -- which includes their use -- privacy and due process. Although, due process is arguably in the bylaws already as a fair objective, nondiscriminatory process.

So, these are some of the open issues that we're going to be working on in general for the next two weeks or so as we come to a conclusion with our final report. So maybe - I've gone on quite a lot there. So, let me stop there and see if there are any questions or if any of the other participants who have been very active on this want to disagree with something that I've said or add to something that I said because I'm sure I've forgotten something important. So, let's open up a queue on this. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Robin for this. And, maybe just to say -- at least for now -- I think we should have a webinar about this topic in the coming weeks. So, we should do some planning and prepare for it. So, it will be maybe more detail about what was discussed and what we are getting as a proposal. Am I understanding we have also soon public comment coming in August? So, we should have - yes,

it would be nice for this - for the accountability discussion. Thanks again, Robin, for this.

So, we go now to (Ed). (Ed), if you want to speak now -- (Ed). Can you hear me? Can you speak up?

(Ed):   (unintelligible) about the - about access to the (unintelligible). But, the fact is, we don't know. I'll give a new example. In the (unintelligible), we talked for about 15...

Rafik Dammak: (Ed), sorry.

(Ed):   Can you hear me Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: (Ed) sorry. I think I have the problem to hear you well.

(Ed):   Okay. Is this any better?

Rafik Dammak: Can you speak more louder? Yes, yes. That was very much better. Yeah.

(Ed):   Okay. I'll do this. Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah. That's much better.

((Crosstalk))

(Ed):   The problem (unintelligible). I don't share her concern about access to the IRP. I think there's been a bit of confusion about who would get access. But, as I understand it - and I confirmed this with one of the chairs this afternoon --

we as NCSG would be able to access the IRP ourselves. It all comes down to when we enforce it down the road -- how to enforce and IRP decision.

But beside the point, where Robin is right on is we don't know a lot of the details. We have this broad outline. On the WP2 call -- for example -- today, this is how intricate it is. We had a large argument over whether the word necessary or appropriate should be used in one of the mission statements. That may not seem like its important, but when you start applying language in an IRP things like that are going to determine the outcome for years.

So, we're really right now at the stage of determining what it is we've already determined. And, being able to monitor the language so the corporate folks with their attorneys aren't able to manipulate the process is really very important right now. As Robin said, how we construct the IRP is absolutely key. We are giving up -- working internally -- the right to go to court until we've gone through an IRP.

We're going to be working on that tomorrow on a call - on a WP2 call. So, anybody interested in joining, please look at the schedule and join us for that because I think it's going to be one of the key moments. Thanks (unintelligible). Thanks everybody.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Ed. (Aubrey), do you want to speak?

(Aubrey):   ...briefly. Robin covered it all quite well, except that at today's WP2 call -- I don't know if Robin was on it -- we ended up in a stale right mate on the human rights language and the requirement for always understanding the impact of our policies on human rights. So, it basically got deadlocked in the WP2. And so, it's going to be the item of discussion on later today's full CCWG call.

But, that seems to be one that the intellectual property people are pushing against it quite strongly because they believe that the only reason anybody wants to talk about human rights is because we want to hurt intellectual property. And, (unintelligible) we don't understand it. It's too hard. It's something we need to put off and such. So, unfortunately, I have to be a little bit more pessimistic than Robin was about us getting close to it.

And, I just wanted to bring that up. And also, that I will be missing tomorrow's WP2 call because I have an ITF meeting at the ITF that I have to go to. So, I won't be there to support anything on that tomorrow. That's it. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thank you (Aubrey). And (unintelligible) to your presentation tomorrow about (unintelligible) human rights and ITF. Okay. Anyone want to comment or ask a question here?

Okay, I guess no. So, we will follow-up with having a webinar and we'll try to (unintelligible) question and also to prepare for the coming (unintelligible).

The next agenda item is about discussion update and the proposed (unintelligible) working group and (unintelligible) option proceed. We - the NCAG appointed two representatives to the drafting team who are (unintelligible). And I'm understanding there was already a meeting for the drafting team in Buenos Aires. So, it will be great if we could get some update for what happened there -- about that discussion in the Buenos Aires session. And so, if anyone in the council has any update about what's going on there.

Yes Omar?

Omar Kaminski: Thanks Rafik. This is Omar. Actually, I don't believe the council has been receiving any updates on this in between council meetings. And, even the ones we do get in council meetings seem to lack any real updates. So, I was wondering if there actually was a meeting in Buenos Aires of the drafting team? I was hoping that maybe Klaus or (unintelligible) -- if they are on the call -- to sort of just let us know and let us know what's going on with that. That would be helpful, especially considering we're going to be talking about it in a couple of days.

                 Klaus has his hand up. Thanks Klaus.

Rafik Dammak: I think Klaus maybe wants to give an update here. Klaus can you speak?

Klaus Stoll: Yes sorry. We had problems (unintelligible). Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry.

Klaus Stoll: Hello?

Rafik Dammak: We have little - yeah, can you speak more louder?

Klaus Stoll: That's very difficult.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. That's enough loud now. Yes, go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: I'll keep it very short. I think we are actually still on standby. The drafting team hasn't been properly constituted and has not been put together. I think we are just simply at the moment on standby.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Klaus, I'm not sure - yes, I can hear you now Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Okay, what I just said is I think there has not been any significant movement since Buenos Aires or in Buenos Aires. And, I feel we are all on standby. But, I will have to say that I really found the discussion which is going on in the discussion groups from (unintelligible) very, very helpful. I encourage everybody to give out their opinion where it should go, how it should go. Because, I think the better we are informed and the more we discuss it, the more we can actually give policy input.

It seems to be also one of the topics where all interest lies -- of course it's about money. But, if you're looking for example (unintelligible) last week, I think it was mentioned at least 20 times. So, there seems to be very high interest topic. But, at the moment, I don't hear anything.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Klaus. I think Omar wants to ask something. Yes, Omar?

Omar Kaminski: Yeah, thanks Rafik. This is Omar. And then thank you Klaus. That actually did remind me of something. Some of the discussions on this at the last GNSO council meeting - that there has been a bit of trouble sort of populating this drafting team -- the charger drafting team -- with volunteers from different chartered organizations. And, it's my knowledge right now, I think the only other AS or SO expressed interest in participating is the (unintelligible) or ALAC. If I'm not mistaken, they should have provided through their part dispenser members the drafting team by now. I know that (unintelligible) is the ALAC liaison to the GNSO council volunteer while on the call.

But, if I'm also not mistaken, the CCNSO -- the country code name support organization -- declined to become a chartering organization in this cross community effort. Their view seems to have been since they were not involved in any way in coming up with the funds that they don't feel it is

appropriate for them to participate in the decision on how to use them. I guess (unintelligible) mention now that there has been a bit of discussion about this on the policy committee list, which is of course publically archived.

When this started, I was very much in favor of a cross community effort to sort of answer the question of what to do with auction proceeds. Now, I am a lot less in favor of that and actually -- in retrospect -- wish that I had sort of supported more of a GNSO working group approach as opposed to a cross community working group. I think that ship has sailed. But yeah, I just wanted to add that. And then thanks Klaus for the update -- reminding me of these important points. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Omar. Okay, I'm just checking here if there is any further questions. Okay. So thanks Klaus for the report and thanks to Omar for the council standpoint. The next agenda item -- and the last one -- is about the GNSO chair election time table. So, I think it's just about (unintelligible) process. Maybe - I mean who can give (unintelligible)? Omar, yes. Thanks Omar. (Unintelligible).

Omar Kaminski: Yes, thanks Rafik. This is Omar. I just happen to have the time table in front of me. So, I just thought I could make it quickly. September 25 is the deadline for nominating a GNSO council chair. October 2 is when candidate statements are expected to be submitted. The 17th and 18th of October, there should be some sort of setup of Q & A -- questions and answers -- with the candidates. I'm not sure if that's supposed to be done over a call or over email. We don't really have any sort of - or is that going to be in Dublin? I'm not sure. I don't recall the dates of when the meeting in Dublin will take place. That might actually be there, face-to-face.

And October 21 - yeah, that probably is in Dublin because October 21, the GNSO chair election will take place, which I believe will be at the council meeting then. And then the new chair should -- I guess -- take over in the last council meeting in Dublin, which is the wrap up -- the GNSO wrap up session. So, that's pretty much the schedule -- September 25 (unintelligible) nominations, October 2 candidate statements. The 17th and 18th will be a Q & A. And, October 21 will be the election. I'm guessing the 17th and 18th of October is when the weekend sessions take place. So, that's the schedule. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Omar. I had some problem to hear you correctly. But anyway, thanks again. Is there any question or comment?

Yes (unintelligible)?

M3: (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Okay, (unintelligible) you have a lot around you.

M3: (unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: We can - oh. Yes, you have - really have problem to hear you. Sorry. Okay, yes Omar, you want to add something?

Omar Kaminski: Sorry, old hand.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. If there is no further comment here, I guess we can move to the next - just to move to the update (unintelligible) from working groups. If there is any (unintelligible) that you have (unintelligible).

Hello? Can you hear me?

Omar Kaminski: I can hear you now.

Rafik Dammak: Hello? Okay. (Stephanie), okay. Go ahead.

(Stephanie Parin): Thanks very much Rafik. (Stephanie Parin) for the record. I'm just wondering if we could -- possibly on the next call -- do a little coordination of the different outreach meetings and various special meetings that we are having or planning to have in Dublin? There was talk about having a half day privacy meeting at some point. There - we would need to get an update on what's going on with the human rights group at some point because that's sort of an extra meeting. And, I know there's one planned. We can update you on extra meetings of the PVT. I can tell you right now there will be what looks to be an all-day meeting of the privacy proxy services working group on the Friday before Dublin.

So, it would be good to sort of start thinking about how our time is going to be spent in Dublin. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks (Stephanie). I don't know why have really hard time to hear you. But, I think just to clarify. The scheduling - I mean the planning for the Dublin meeting didn't start yet. So, we still have time to figure out about the session.

For the human rights meeting, I think that's up to the working part to decide whether they want to do it in Dublin exactly. That's a discussion within the working party. I'm not sure what you mean by privacy. Do you think about the (unintelligible) face-to-face meeting? I think we have probably like before some trouble support for those who are participating from NCAG. So yeah.

I think we can have this discussion later anyway. We getting more details about this, but let's hear from Omar. Yes Omar, please go head.

Omar Kaminski: Thanks. This is Omar. I was actually going to switch to another topic because you asked open public comment period. I just wanted to point out that we only have three more days to submit input to the open public comment period on the GNSO review. And although I have started working on it, I'm far from done with it. But yeah, I just wanted to point that out and I hope we can move quickly on sort of getting as much in put into that as possible and having the policy committee endorse whatever we come up with. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so thanks Omar. Yes Ed?

Edmond Chung: ...agenda. So, my fellow council knows something that I'll be doing there. In other topics there is going to be a request for an extension by staff for the preliminary issues report of the new gTLD. James Bladel and I have talked. Although obviously we're going to grant the request, we're getting a big concerned that staff has to keep asking us for extensions. So, we're going to put a question this staff, whether they have enough support or whether basically we need to hire more people for them to be able to do their jobs in time.

So, I just wanted folks to be aware that we're going to actually be doing that at that point.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Ed. Yes, Omar?

Omar Kaminski: Yeah, thanks Rafik. And, thanks Ed for letting us know about that. That's a valid concern. I would also add that the GNSO did - the GNSO council did

submit a comment to the - when ICANN was holding a public comment on its budget and strategic plan. So, the GNSO council did recommend that there be a higher budget for hiring policy support staff. It was - in response, ICANN had confirmed that they will be hiring two more fulltime employees in policy staff. So, I hope that does help. I hope they are put to use in whatever policy work that is needed to support the GNSO.

I guess bringing in new policy support staff is not an easy process. It probably takes a while for them to sort of catch up and sort of figure out how to work with everyone, especially considering the high sort of - the very good performance by current policy staff. So, I'm not sure how effective that may be in the short term. But, in the long run, I hope it does pay off (unintelligible) as well. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks Omar. Okay, we have gone, I think 50 minutes in this call. To be honest, I have myself a lot of problem to hear well. So, I am thinking just we - if we need just to stop the pain and to end the call for now. We will have to follow-up with the ongoing discussion. We will figure out what happened exactly for all the (unintelligible) issue, which is (unintelligible), which made this call really painful for everyone (unintelligible).

We will try to follow-up also for the policy discussion. Regarding the planning (unintelligible), we will try to maybe (unintelligible) all the proposal (unintelligible) and continue maybe a discussion (unintelligible). And also (unintelligible). I'm really sorry for this. It was not (unintelligible) like the previous call. Anyway, so okay. I'm not sure. Ed, you wanted to add something or it's an old hand?

Edmund Chung: Old hand. Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. So, I will try to follow-up after this. It's unfortunate we have such situation, but we still have a lot of work to do. And, so okay. So if there is no objection, we really (unintelligible) the call for today. So, it's unusual, but I think that's much better.

Maryam Bakoshi: (Aubrey), you may stop the recording now. Thanks very much.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks everyone. Thank you. Bye.

END