

MINUTES	TUESDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2017	22:00 – 23:00 UTC	CONFERENCE CALL
MEETING	IPC Policy Coordination		
CHAIR FOR MEETING	Greg Shatan, IPC President		
MINUTES TAKEN BY	Andrea Glandon, IPC Secretariat / Approved by Kiran Malancharuvil, IPC Secretary		

Agenda Items

1. Introduction

2. Guidance to Councilors (Heather & Paul)

- a. Heather stated there are four votes for the upcoming council meeting. Item 6 is the confirmation of the GNSO council chair as representative of the GNSO council to the empowered community administration.
- b. GAC Communique-Paul carried the pen for this item. Heather read through it carefully, made a few editorial corrections. Kiran noted that Aslam made a comment and wanted it to be discussed. Aslam’s concern is that the IPC should not be weighing in on this until the GAC has its full opportunity to determine the public policy issue. Heather stated that to not respond to an item in the communique would be odd and wouldn’t make sense in the context of the document. Greg noted that he did not see anyone joining Aslam in his conclusion.
- c. Motion to refer IRTP Part C Privacy/Proxy Registrations Implementation Issues to PPSAI IRT-Steve stated that we have worked out an understanding with the registrars who are pushing this and stated they seem to be pushing this at the instigation of the staff. He states what we ended up with is okay because it refers you to the PPSAI, but only to be taken up after the comment period is over on the PPSAI accreditation standards and other documents that we are now working on with the IRT. Steve thinks that what is in the motion now is acceptable.
- d. Whois Conflicts with Local Law – Alternate Triggers-Heather stated the problem now is the alternate trigger number 1 and number 2. In a recent post Darcy thought that alternate trigger number 1 came from the IAG. Steve stated that the alternative trigger Darcy is speaking of was not approved by the IAG. It was brought up in the IAG, included in an appendix, but the consensus of the IAG was not to support that. Coming out of Abu Dhabi Steve understood there were 2 options and the IPC could get behind one of the options which said that if a registrar gets an exception because of conflict with that country’s law, then other registrars in a similar situation could get the same exception. It has since been stated that they wanted both options. Heather does have the option to defer this vote, Vicky, Steve and Greg agreed with deferring is Heather is able.
- e. Other policy issues before Council-None others dicussed.

3. Reports from the Working Groups (noting hot policy topics)

- a. RPM WG-Lori gave an update, the RPM group is meeting to determine data points for the survey that will be developed regarding the claims and sunrise periods. In terms of the main group they have moved onto URS review. Phil Corwin called Lori to let her know where he stands, that the questions that are going to be reviewed regarding the URS and the UDRP are simply about whether or not they are working effectively, that the providers are providing services fairly and according to the contract. Phil Corwin is working on a statement with J. Scott and Kathy to share with the group that will re-enforce that it is not the tact of this group to consider whether or not URS or UDRP should exist, but how well they are functioning.

MINUTES	TUESDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2017	22:00 – 23:00 UTC	CONFERENCE CALL
MEETING	IPC Policy Coordination		
<p>b. Next Gen RDS WG-Greg stated that the group continues to work through the drafting teams and their purpose statements and the last meeting was spent discussing the technical purpose aspect of use of RDS.</p> <p>c. Subsequent Procedures WG-Susan Payne stated that all worktracks are working to have draft recommendations put out after the Puerto Rico meeting, around April. Anne stated that she is concerned about the approach that tends to say that economically based community applications are bad and non-profit public interest community applications are good. Anne also brought up the predictability framework and asked for Greg’s perspective. Greg suggested that there should be a working group and IPC working group caucus email list. Anne said that she feels it would be helpful for IPC members who are participating in the plenary on Sub Pro to chime in that consultation with standing IRTs should be in the next round that it should be mandatory and not optional. Greg asked that Anne send that to the IPC caucus list.</p> <p>d. IGO/INGO Curative Rights-Petter stated that the IGO INGO plan to have a final report ready for the GNSO council meeting in January. They have reached out to active and inactive working group members after the online seminar updates with a vote on the three possible options to solve the dispute resolution. There is a clear majority for option C which is the possibility to have a specific arbitration for the project.</p> <p>e. Auction Proceeds-Not discussed</p> <p>f. Others-None</p> <p>4. Open Public Comments and Other Requests for Input/Volunteers (Brian S.)</p> <p>a. Open Public Comments-Brian S stated there are some comments the IPC won’t be commenting on, Cyrillic Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules being one of them.</p> <p>b. Lori Schulman drafted a comment on the reserve fund, Brian asked everyone to take a look at it because it is due in a couple of days.</p> <p>c. Other Requests for input</p> <p>i. Advice to Board on Geo Names-Kiran sent an email about this with more information.</p> <p>j. Nominations for the Community Onboarding Pilot Program. Nominations due by Dec 15</p> <p>k. Lori notes that Staff accountability and ICANN’s jurisdiction comments are due on Jan 5. CCTRT comments are due on Jan 8. Lori is sending a letter on behalf of INTA regarding the Jan 5 deadline for two important topics, due to the holiday.</p> <p>5. ICANN 61 (San Juan) Planning</p> <p>a. Cross Community Topic Suggestions</p> <p>6. Other Policy Issues</p> <p>7. AOB</p> <p>8. Adjourn</p>			

