ICANN Dakar, Senegal

GNSO Public Forum

26 October 2011

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Hello, everyone. We will start the council meeting now. Operator, please start the recording. Can we have confirmation that the recording has started, please. Great. Thank you very much.

Welcome, everybody, to the Dakar GNSO Council meeting on the 26th of October. Before we go into the meeting agenda, let me just explain, for the benefit of everybody in the room and the people participating online, the way that this meeting is going to go today.

We will have our normal open council meeting with the current council members up until 6:00 p.m. local time. At that time we will break. We will say a fond farewell to the outgoing councillors, and we will then reconvene with the new council. And those councillors that are new to the council will be invited to come up here and take their place on the council. This half an hour council meeting from 6:00 until 6:30 will only have one agenda item. And that is the election of the new council chair.

So this is a two-part meeting. The regular council meeting up until 6:00, and then just the new council sitting everyone and electing the chair.

Having said that, our first agenda item before we go into our regular business is an agenda item that is something new that we are trying for the first time here in Dakar. Those of you who are regular followers of the open council meetings and our council meetings in general know that we have begun to, as a council, to work on improving the open council meetings, both in terms of how to improve the participation from the community, be it remotely or from the people in the room, and to make the council meetings themselves flow more smoothly and be more entertaining, for wont of a better word.

So we're trying something new in Dakar, which is we've asked the stakeholder and constituency group leaders to make presentations to the council, should they want to. We have invited all the stakeholder group and constituency leaders to do so.

And at this point I would like to highlight the fact that this initiative has been brought by Jeff Neuman who worked with Glen de Saint Gery, our secretariat, on preparing the agenda for this whole Dakar week for the GNSO Council. For that I think they certainly deserve a big thank you. It's a big job. And it's especially appreciated -- I mean, we really appreciate seeing new initiatives like this. Some might work; some might not. We'll stop take after the meeting. And, if you have suggestions on how you feel the open council meetings should be changed or run differently, please do not hesitate to participate in that debate, either through the open microphone sessions we'll have sprinkled throughout our agenda today, or by participating in our weekend sessions that we have before every ICANN meeting. And there's actually a group, a council group working on this issue as

well. So there's plenty of opportunity to say -- have your say. And, if you feel that there are things that we can improve, please do not hesitate to let us know.

 I should also remind everyone that our council meetings are open. In fact, most -- I can't think of any GNSO Council session that is not open. So participation, once again, is encouraged. And you can do so, if you're doing so remotely, by using the Adobe Connect room that there's a link on the Dakar meeting schedule. Simply login as guest, type in your name, and you can participate.

 So, with that, I will pass it over to Jeff for the first item on today's agenda. Thank you.

  >>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Stephane. This is just one of those ideas that came out of that group that Stephane was talking about about trying to make the meetings more interactive. And one of the reasons was we get together on the weekends and we talk about some of the policy items, but there's always a gap because it's always on Tuesday that the constituencies and stakeholder groups meet and discuss the issues. So this is really to try to get an idea of what the constituency and stakeholder groups talked about, any changes or different thinking than some of the issues that are on the agenda.

 So, without further ado, the first group I'm going to ask are the registries stakeholder group. And so, if David Maher could come up and give a couple minutes.

 Again, this is interactive so, if there are any questions, feel free to come up to the mic behind David and ask some questions as well.

  >>DAVID MAHER: Thank you, Jeff.

 We had our regular Tuesday stakeholder group meeting here in this tent. Not exactly the best venue for discussion, but we still got through the agenda.

 We started out with GNSO updates. We went through the council motions, the motions pending today before the council, including the PDP process, RAA, relationships with law enforcement, the UDRP. We moved to brief review of the Affirmation of Commitments review team in all of the three items -- accountability, transparency; the WHOIS; security, stability and resiliency.

 We talked briefly about the WHOIS studies that are going on in the council. At 11:00 -- pardon me -- at 10:00 Kurt Pritz, John Jeffrey came to our meeting.

 And we had a -- about an hour-long discussion of the new gTLD process developments, including the continuing operations instrument, the EBERO, and a extensive discussion of the IDN proceedings. One of our particular interests is the single letter IDN possibility. And we had an exchange with the ICANN staff about that status.

 We brought up a question of the applicant guidebook, the fact that there have been suggestions for revisions and what is labeled the final version. There was a -- there have been comments about that. And we asked a status of those provisions. The answer seemed to be that we'll find out at some point.

 We discussed -- we asked questions of ICANN staff about the cross-ownership inquiries that have been made to competition authorities. And then, finally, one of the things we learned is that Karla

Valente, who is one of our interim registry group representatives, will continue in that role until possibly new staff is hired.

We then moved to the stakeholder group business. We had a treasurer's report from Ken Stubbs. There were no proceedings to vote on. And, at that point, we broke for lunch and at 1:00 moved on to the new form of our meeting with the ICANN board.

I thought that that meeting from 1:00 to 2:00 was one of the best we've had. A good deal of interchange -- not a lot of questions from the board, but we had an opportunity to make the points that we thought were important, including cross-ownership, continuing operations, the JAS proposals, ethics issues, the question of amending ICANN's ethics roles, the revolving door issue.

There was a brief discussion of takedown issues, the relationships between registries, registrars, law enforcement. We made the point that we regard our relationships with law enforcement as very successful, very positive. To our knowledge, there's no friction. We're looking for better ways to cooperate.

At that point in our meeting with the board, Rod Beckstrom left the room. And we had a very candid discussion with the board about our thoughts on the selection of a new CEO. Following that board meeting, we came back here and discovered, to our -- not to our surprise, that the temperature had risen considerably. Notwithstanding, we had a very good presentation from Maguy Serad about ICANN contractual compliance issues, followed by a very thorough presentation from Adam Peake, Vanda Scartezini regarding the NomCom. And we urged NomCom to take into consideration a very interesting technical point that the NomCom representative, in effect, can become a tie breaker. So it's a very key appointment. And we had a lot of discussion of that.

Finally, Kathy Kleiman appeared and gave us a brief presentation about the status of the WHOIS review team, the Affirmation of Commitments review team. And we emphasized that -- we urged that team not to take on the role of developing policy, but rather to raise questions about policy.

And we concluded at about 4:30. Moved on to a joint meeting with the registrars stakeholder group. Fortunately, in an air-conditioned room. And had quite a number of topics for discussion with the registrars, the RRA, the new gTLDs, and the amending the bylaws of our -- or the charters of our respective groups so that we can make sure that we don't have people voting in two separate stakeholder groups or constituencies. Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, David. Does anyone have any questions for David?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Jeff, if I can just -- there's a question online, which I think we should answer. It's asking what's the difference between a stakeholder group and a constituency. We forget that our structure is not clear to everybody. Far from it.

So I just wanted to explain that, in the building blocks that make up the GNSO, the constituencies are -- and the stakeholder groups are groups that are of common interest. The difference being that a stakeholder group can have constituencies in it. So a stakeholder group can either be made up, as is the case with the registries, that -- the stakeholder group that David chairs, of one group, one common group of interest. Or they can be made up of several constituencies. For example, the commercial stakeholder group is made up of several constituencies.

All these groups are out of the GNSO restructure that has been going on for a few years and that has transitioned the GNSO from a structure where there was only constituencies in it before to one where there are now constituencies and stakeholder groups. Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Stephane. Anyone with questions for David?

Okay. The next one is the registrars stakeholder group, and Mason Cole will be giving a presentation.

>>MASON COLE: Thank you, Jeff.

I should point out for the council's benefit which I know everyone is aware, but this morning I formally stepped down as the chair of the registrars stakeholder group so as to assume my seat on the council later on.

We had a very productive day with the registrars yesterday. We began at 9:00 a.m., went all the way to 5:30 as David said.

We almost always have a very crowded agenda. Yesterday was no exception.

As you have seen by the note that I posted to the list, we have been in discussions for some time now with ICANN staff about a process related to our accreditation agreement.

We very rarely meet in closed session but we did have a closed session yesterday to discuss that. Yesterday morning. We moved on to a discussion with the compliance team. Maguy Serad and her team came in and gave a discussion about ICANN's compliance program. And with a survey that she is starting where registrars can self-assess and provide information with the Compliance Team as a way to enhance the compliance function.

We had several other pieces of stakeholder group business, things like our banking system and the need to change our bylaws, particularly in light of vertical integration as that approaches.

We broke briefly for lunch. We went then into a discussion with ICANN's policy team. David Olive and his very good team came in and gave a general update on policy activity.

We had an extensive discussion about the policy team's current capacity, which was brought up to the council in its sessions over the weekend. And I think we had a mutually productive discussion about how to assist with the GNSO's current overload of policy work.

We left that meeting. We went to talk with the board. We had several items on that agenda. We discussed the meeting the GNSO had with the GAC on Sunday. We talked about domain name takedown procedures. The board was interested in that. We talked a bit about ethics guidelines that ICANN is examining now. So we had a good session with the board.

We went then back into session with the registrar liaison staff. And I won't bore you with all those details but it was administrative issues about our interaction with ICANN.

We were then joined by the NomCom, the chair of the NomCom, Adam and Vanda joined us. And we talked about the NomCom and the need for greater outreach to help the NomCom fulfill its duties to ICANN.

We broke from that session. We said happy birthday one day in advance to our friend Jeff Eckhouse and to Tim Cole whose birthday is tomorrow. So be sure to wish Tim a happy birthday tomorrow.

And then as my friend David went into detail, we had a joint meeting with registries and there is no need for me to repeat what we discussed since he gave you an accurate read of that.

And that was our meeting.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Any questions for the registrars? For councillors, if you can use Adobe, too, because it's hard to see all the way down there. I know someone had their hand raised.

Ah, Kristina.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Thanks, Mason. I can tell you on behalf of the IPC we are very much appreciative of the registrars' action with regard to the future RAA amendments.

I was hoping perhaps you could add a point of clarification, though in that yesterday during the GAC/Board meeting Kurt Pritz reported to the GAC that the negotiations would cover the high priority topics, but the statement that the registrars released doesn't identify the scope of the topics.

Can you clarify or confirm for me?

>>MASON COLE: We haven't confirmed that with staff just yet.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Okay. Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kristina. Thanks, Mason.

Any other questions?

Okay. The next group --

>>MASON COLE: Jeff, Mary has a question.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: It's hard to see.

Mary.

>>MARY WONG: Thanks, Jeff. It's not so much a question, Mason, but to follow on Kristina's comment that my stakeholder group and specifically the NCUC within that stakeholder group would be very interested in the outcome of that clarification as well.

Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Mary. Any other questions?

>>MASON COLE: Adrian.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Jeff, Adrian has a question.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: It's not a question. On behalf of the registrars, I just also would like to say my appreciation for the work the registrars have done.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Adrian is also going to be introducing his own thank-you motion to himself later on.

[Laughter]

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Mason.

The next we are going to have from the noncommercial Stakeholder Group. We are going to have first Konstantinos to talk about what happened at the NCUC meeting.

>>KONSTANTINOS KOMAITIS: Thank you, Jeff.

We had a very productive meeting with new and existing members. NCUC represents approximately 100 organizations, noncommercial organizations, and more than 100 individuals, who, many of them, were able to join in remotely.

The Noncommercial Users Constituency discussed the issue of the UDRP review, both from a substantive and a procedural point of view. At the meeting we recognized that there are significant issues with the UDRP that need to be addressed. And for NCUC, the UDRP review is one of its priorities.

Part of these discussions was focused on the kind of time frame that needs to be regarding the review of the UDRP.

We also discussed the issue of domain name takedowns and many of the NCUC members raised significant concerns about the balance between due process and free speech and the need to take down domain names.

NCUC considers that domain name takedowns is an issue that relates to access; therefore, it is very important. And we also discussed in this regard what is or should be the role of ICANN.

We also discussed issues of global outreach and how NCUC can help ICANN -- the ICANN community to expand and become more inclusive of members, especially from the developing world. And we also discussed as part of this process also what is -- how the fellowship program exists.

Then we had the NomCom that came to give us an update on the processes, and we also have a visit from the PIR group, in particular Brian Cute and Paul Diaz, that made an introduction and we exchanged some very interesting ideas.

And finally, last but not least, we also discussed some procedural issues that concerned the constituency, especially the forthcoming elections that the noncommercial users will be holding soon, as well as issues concerning the NCUC charter.

Our meeting was only half a day because afterwards, we met as a stakeholder group.

Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Konstantinos.

Any questions? Comments?

Great. Next we are going to hear from the newest constituency, also been the noncommercial Stakeholder Group, the not-for-profit operational concerns constituency, the NPOC. Debbie Hughes.

>>DEBRA HUGHES: Thanks, Jeff. It's my pleasure to bring the first update from this brand-new constituency on behalf of the more than 34 international nonprofit operations representing all five ICANN regions. I am delighted to say we were joined at our meeting by School Net Africa. Some of you may be aware of that organization. School Net Africa is an organization that unites more than 33 African affiliates providing ICT and Internet-related education throughout Africa, and they are very interested in our constituency as well.

So we were excited to see them.

We have also done a lot of outreach around the world, which I will talk about in a second. But I just wanted to first say that our meeting that we had on Tuesday focused a lot on our organizational requirements.

As you can imagine, a brand-new constituency, there's a lot to do organizationally. And so we have a set of interim leadership members, and they are currently Amber Sterling from the Association of American Medical Colleges. Our interim vice chair is Alan B. from (saying name). Our interim policy chair is Judy Branzel (phonetic) from Goodwill Industries. And we have two representatives to the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group executive committee. They are Klaus Stahl (phonetic) from (saying name) and Michael Carson from YMCA of the U.S.A. Klaus Stahl is also serving in the role of our interim communications and membership chair. And I am serving as the outgoing board-appointed councillor.

So we spent a lot of our meeting talking about the pending -- and actually, throughout the week, via e-mail, about the pending policy issues that are going on, in particular trying to review the proposed JAS statement that was being offered by the NCSG and we were glad to be able to join with them in supporting that, in JAS efforts. As a matter of fact, one of our very new members was an active participant in that work group and we were leased he was able to jump in and start working.

We also talked about the amendments to the RAA, and also the potential upcoming review of the UDRP.

Several of our organizations are very concerned, too, about security and stability because of the important fund-raising activities and other activities that we perform. So we are planning to really focus a lot on DNSSEC and other security and stability related concerns. And as a matter of fact, at our last NPOC meeting that we had last month, we had a visitor, Dr. Crocker visited us and spoke to us about DNSSEC.

So DNSSEC is really important to our organizations, and we're looking forward to being engaged there.

We wanted to just highlight for you some of the exciting things that are going on with our new constituency and invite you to reach out to them, as you see them walking around in the next ICANN meeting. Although we won't have a councillor that's actually sitting on the GNSO Council, we are

excited to be a vibrant member of the ICANN community and are going to do the best that we can to try to get representatives there so that we can participate in events like this, talking about our constituency.

I just wanted to highlight that some of the organizations that are involved. There's an organization called the Global Knowledge Partnerships, which is a wonderful multistakeholder network of organizations that are devoted to providing Internet and ICT knowledge throughout the world. They were founded in 1997. They have a presence in more than 50 countries. So we are excited about their participation and their membership.

Another such organization is the YMCA of U.S.A. We were able to get a member here for his very first ICANN meeting. He is a member of our Executive Committee, and Michael Carson is here, and so we were glad to see their organization's participation.

From the organizational perspective, we are still continuing our outreach, as I've mentioned. We have currently 34 members. We have another 19 or so with applications that are ready to be reviewed. And we collected ten applications, actually, at the IGF, which was really exciting. And we are really trying to encourage nonprofit organizations to make ICANN the place where they can talk about Internet governance, which we think is really important.

We're planning a presence at e-Asia why early in Bangladesh. We are also trying to plan a workshop in Costa Rica which will be a challenge since we are going to have to try to figure out how to get ourselves there but we are excited about being in Costa Rica, we are committed to being there and we are going to have a wonderful workshop at ICANN 43.

We are also planning a Webinar on December the 6th. You know, part of being a new constituency, in addition to explaining the policy issues and how to navigate work groups, and we all know outreach is important but you have to figure out how to teach them about ICANN. And so this Webinar on December the 6th will be not only about the important initiatives like the new gTLD program and what that means for nonprofits, but also ICANN 101. What is ICANN? How do you get involved? What's a work group? We didn't want to dump these organizations into the ICANN mix without helping them navigate. So we are really excited we are going to have this Webinar on December 6 and we will be sure to share that information so you can pass it on to those who might be interested.

So we are really excited, ready to be engaged, ready to be involved. Looking forward to all of our members being active members of the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group. Looking forward to continued outreach. One thing I always said is outreach is not a destination; it's a process. I am committed to that, and I am committed to being involved in this multistakeholder process as long as our organizations have a voice and have the ability to be involved.

So thank you very much.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Debbie, and welcome as a constituency and it's a great report, and lots of interesting things going on. So that's great.

Now we're going to turn to the Commercial Stakeholder Group, and the first constituency from the Commercial Stakeholders Group is the commercial and business users constituency and they are represented right now by Marilyn Cade. So Marilyn.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you.

My name is Marilyn Cade. I am the chair of the Business constituency, which is the short name of the Commercial and Business Users Constituency, and I brought cue cards and gifts. And I see that you are passing them out to the councillors.

I will speak very briefly but let me open my remarks by saying the following.

I want to tell you how much that my constituency appreciates the work that the council does. There are former councillors in our constituency as there are in yours, and we are very aware of the workload. Continually it slops over into our days as well. It is a tremendous workload and we have really appreciated the work you do. So I would like to open my remarks with that and how important we do think the work of the council is.

My comments will be focused not on what we do on constituency day or on gTLD policy. We will leave that to our very able councillors. And if you are interested in our agenda or you are interested in what we do, we transcribe our calls and our meetings. We also do minutes of our meetings, and they are posted on the public archive on our Web site www.biz.const.org. And yes, I know, I have to change the name.

The second thing I want to say is I want to share with all of you something I hope you had all find useful. The business constituency launched its quarterly newsletter in time for Dakar. It is something we developed ourselves. It cost us roughly a thousand euros, and that includes printing 500 glossy copies.

Sometimes people think that developing collateral is very expensive. We did this ourselves. We wrote it ourselves. We're highlighting our members. The contributions of the photos and the intellectual capital we hope makes it look good, and we would welcome sharing with you the process we used should you be interested in undertaking something like that.

But I will ask you to take a look at the sheet, the single sheet that I handed out, and I want to acknowledge the vice chair of finance and operations, Chris Chaplow, and our part-time Secretariat, Benedetta Rossi. And after I tell you what a great job they did, do not try to poach them.

The inside of the brochure and the sheet I gave you is a code sheet to understand who the current -- the new leadership is of the GNSO Council, the SGs and the constituencies, and hopefully this will support Stephane's verbal explanation of the building block approach. We were inspired to do this because of the challenge of explaining, on the back of cocktail napkins, how the council, the SG, and the constituencies fit together. So we hope you will find this helpful. It will be available on our Web site in a single-page PDF that you will be able to download and use freely, and we will keep it updated. We will also have the full brochure posted as well.

The second thing that I would like to just mention is that in Cartagena, a few of the chairs of the SGs and the constituencies gathered for breakfast informally. We had four participants and two regrets,

and at this meeting, the chairs of the stakeholder groups and the constituencies joined by the chair of the council and the two vice chairs had an informal ad hoc no-host breakfast, that means we all bought our own, and did not talk about gTLD policy, because my view is that's really not what we should be doing. And we talked about the larger ecosystem challenges. I think everyone enjoyed it, found it a worthwhile thing to do and as time permits, I think we are going to do it again.

I want to make a comment about what our understanding in the B.C., led by John Berard, one of our councillors, was that perhaps this segment would turn to more interaction with the participants, both remotely and also in the room around gTLD policy topics.

I might suggest that next time, if you all agree that if you would move forward with that and maybe have a sort of a list of topics that you want people to comment on ahead of time, they could prepare for that, but you might want to also factor into that talking to Glen and the staff about slightly changing your room setup. I'm not going to go into how to organize it. You have expert staff to do that. But of course if you are going to be able to facilitate remote participation, it does take some preplanning. And so I just mention that so you could address it in time for the Costa Rica meeting planning.

Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Marilyn.

Anyone have any questions for Marilyn? Comments?

Okay. Let's move on to the next constituency in the Commercial Stakeholder Group, the Intellectual Property Constituency, and that will be given by Mr. Paul McGrady.

>>PAUL McGRADY: Good afternoon, everyone. Just a brief update on our meeting. We had a very concise agenda because of our pre-Dakar calls. We try to take as many decisions as we can before we get here, especially in situations like this where the venue perhaps was a little challenging for the majority of our membership to make it.

I think without a doubt the highlight of our meeting yesterday was the visit from various members of other constituencies who came and engaged in dialogue with us about various topics that weren't necessarily on the agenda, but still was a very interesting time and certainly kept everybody engaged in the conversation.

The primary take-aways from the meeting, substantively, were concerns about new gTLD issues. As you can appreciate, I'm sure, the IPC is very keen on not complicating or weakening the RPMs for new gTLDs through the implementation process. We would like to see ICANN do a better job promoting the importance of trademark protections on the fact sheets and on the Web sites.

We would like to see, of course, drafts of the URS before an RFP is issues. We would also like to see a draft of the trademark clearinghouse product for public comment as well.

And lastly, on the topic of new gTLDs, we think that a Webinar perhaps can be put together for parties who will be newly contracted and others in terms of what their obligations are to comply with the RPMs. The IPC would be happy to be involved in that.

One of the consistent comments we have heard over the year is about the UDRP in terms of registrar compliance is that the registrars simply didn't understand it and that's why there was so much noncompliance before the compliance department appeared on the scene.

We would hate to go through another five or ten-year period where we have contracted parties who have signed contracts but don't seem to understand what those contracts mean.

And so we would be happy to help on the education front for the RPMs.

The next major topic were the RAA revisions. As a constituency, we're happy to welcome reports that the RAA revisions will be published before the Costa Rica meeting. We look forward to seeing those. We also look forward to a transparent negotiating process where everybody will have an opportunity to look at those and comment and be involved.

And then lastly on the substantive topics, the issue of UDRP review came up. I think that one of the common themes that we hear generally is how much work not only this council has to do but the community generally. And right now, in the middle of implementation of new gTLDs, we certainly are all quite busy. I do think that the IPC believes that there is not much appetite for yet another major project right now in the middle of all that and would hope to see this issue deferred to an appropriate time. However, I think the consensus around the table of the IPC members that were there is that if it's going to happen we will be putting together a robust wish list of things that we intend to insist on, because obviously that has to be part of the process.

But in any event, that was the substantive topics, primarily, that were covered in our meeting.

We ended the meeting by thanking our wonderful councillor, Kristina Rosette, who has done an amazing job over these years for the IPC, and we're going to keep her from having to bring her own motion to thank herself today. Kristine has done a fantastic job and we ended our meeting telling her how much we appreciated her hard work and dedication to intellectual property interests.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you, Paul.

Anyone have any questions for Paul?

I hear a little echo.

Okay.

Great. Thanks, Paul.

And then the last but certainly not the least, the Internet Service Providers and connectivity providers. Tony Holmes is a former councillor as well, will make the presentation.

>>TONY HOLMES: Thanks, Jeff.

The ISPCP met yesterday and discussed the following issues. The implementation of the GNSO tool kit for which we were joined by Rob Hoggarth from the ICANN staff. We discussed issues that were to form some of our later discussions with the ICANN board, including ethics and integrity and the gTLD program.

The ISPCP also discussed recommendations from the JAS Working Group and in particular the proposal to reduce the fee.

The ISPCP support the intention to reduce fees for needy applicants, but our concern that the support application review panel will struggle to effectively inhibit gaming of the system.

We continue to support the JAS work, but will be looking to ensure an effective implementation follows once a decision is made to move forward.

However, we are also concerned that failure to effectively implement the JAS recommendations has the potential to delay the gTLD program.

Members of the ISPCP were also brought up-to-date with progress made by the Commercial Stakeholders Group working on the budget, and we discussed the recent announcements by NTIA on the renewal of the IANA contract. Of course, IP addressing is particularly important to ISPs.

We met with representatives from the NomCom to discuss their ongoing activities, and we also discussed motions on the table for the GNSO meeting to ensure our councillors are fully conversant with the views held within the constituency.

We discussed this session today, and the invitation given to us to present to the GNSO Council the results of our meeting. Many of us who have been around a long time remember this process was used in the very early years of ICANN. In fact, in the days of the DNSO. It was a practice that was discontinued, and despite being here today I am reporting the ISPCP are not supportive of resurrecting this practice.

Many of the issues discussed within constituency meetings do not fall under the purview of the GNSO Council and its responsibility for developing gTLD policy. And meetings are open, and anyone can attend.

There's clearly a need for council to fully engage with the broader community during its public meetings but that should be focused on the topics that are currently being discussed by council, and this will provide a much more effective use of the valuable time we will spend together at ICANN meetings.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Tony.

Anyone have questions?

I would just like to add that, you know, we all appreciate that the meetings are open. I think unfortunately they schedule them all at the same time, so there's no way for those of us that are interested in what other constituencies are doing to actually get to them and participate in our own. And having the session was in no way meant to kind of exert any kind of authority over the council, but was just trying to facilitate an information exchange.

Appreciate the statement made by Marilyn earlier, and perhaps if we do something like this again, we can actually provide a list of topics that are within our purview for comment.

So I appreciate -- Yeah, absolutely.

>>TONY HOLMES: Just to respond to that, Jeff. I appreciate council will discuss this after, and there is nothing wrong in trying something new. So we are not against that.

But the only comment I will make is that we are now nearly an hour into the meeting and we haven't discussed GNSO policy. So I think that is proof in itself.

Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Anyone have any comments to that? Carlos?

>>CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you Jeff. Just a quick comment.

We are here. We are the NomCom appointee also. This comment is especially for the fellowship here in the room, because we are into the GNSO, discuss with the constituencies and the stakeholders the resolution we take.

Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks Carlos, I saw a hand. Adrian.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Thanks, Jeff. Adrian Kinderis.

I just wanted to follow up on that. It really depends on what the purpose of these meetings are, and I just want to come back to, I think I said at the last couple of meetings where we met publicly, it would be great to get a better understanding. And I think it's something that is evolving over time, and thankfully you won't have to hear me talk about it any more going forward.

But to the point of I think it makes sense for us to get a bit of a snapshot of where constituencies are at and get the ability to talk directly to the heads of those stakeholder groups and constituencies in case there are any issues. It's up to them to bring up what they want to bring up. They don't have to bring up all the detail, but I do like the ability to interact with the heads of those constituencies and stakeholder groups in order to discuss any topics that we have missed over the day.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. I have Marilyn who is up at the mic, and then I will look around to see if anyone else wanted to.

>>MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Adrian.

All of the constituencies and stakeholder groups have charters. In the case of the constituency in the stakeholder group I am in, we have fairly clearly -- I picked up a new term yesterday from Maguy about swim lanes that I am going to use here.

We have fairly clearly defined swim lanes, and when you are swimming in a lane, that doesn't mean you might not get your arm under or you might not get your arm over the rope, but you are not going to get your whole body over the rope.

So we have fairly well defined swim lanes, and our councillors own the responsibility of representing the points of view of the constituency on gTLD policy issues.

They are members of our Executive Committee which means that they also are full participants in the decisions made about our operation of our constituency itself.

Perhaps for a different discussion, we might park the topic of what we began talking about, I think, over the past few days, and that is that the GNSO is going to be profoundly affected by the new gTLD program. And maybe the thing to kind of do is to note the interest that some people may have in interacting with the chairs.

I have a (garbled audio) Executive Committee, and I am not responsible for everything. I have a distributed team, which if we could park the topic of what it is that the council as a whole needs from communication from the constituencies and should the councillors -- should it not be gTLD policy, perhaps my councillors and the other councillors could think about formulating what that is, and then we could talk about it if that would be possible, rather than -- because I have other people who are in charge.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. We are going to call on Tony but I am going to pass the baton over to our chair.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Tony. We've got four minutes left on this segment.

>>TONY HOLMES: Just a quick remark, Stephane. I don't think I'm that far away from Adrian's view. It's just how you come at this. I would like to think I come at it from both the constituency point and also from sitting on that side of the table you guys are on now.

What would be really helpful for us would be, in advance of these meetings, recognizing that you hold many meetings where we can't participate as publicly. It just isn't possible to do.

We want to give you the input that you seek. And what would help us would be if, prior to these sessions, you actually posted to the constituencies a list of topics that you really want to seek input on. Then we could discuss them within our constituencies, come back into this forum, and deliver, hopefully, what you want. I think that's the way to go about it. It would really focus that discussion from our standpoint.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Tony.

Adrian.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: That's really helpful, Tony. Thank you for bringing it up.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, everyone. Any more questions or comments on this item? Seeing no hands, I just want to say that this was, once again, something new that we were trying here. I think the conversation and the discussion that we've just had is very constructive. Thanks for that. I think it should continue. The GNSO has a wrapup session that is open as well. So feel free to come to that and contribute. I'm sure the council will want to address that tomorrow. And this conversation should certainly continue with the other chairs of the groups that did not comment. We have heard from the IPC and the BC, how they feel about this process. I think it's also interesting, perhaps. to hear from the council, as Tony suggested, to hear from the council and other constituencies, perhaps, on how they feel so the next open council meeting that we have, we have a clearer roadmap of whether we want to continue doing this. And, if we do, how do we want to do it.

So thanks, everyone. We'll now break for 20 minutes. Back here at 20 past 3:00, please. So that's probably quarter past, so that we have time to seat everybody and begin on time. And we will begin then with the standard GNSO Council meeting agenda at that point. Thanks, everyone.

>>Stephane, could you shorten the break of 20 minutes to 15?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I know that there's a desire to get through this agenda quicker and not end at 6:00. The problem with that is that we have a two-part meeting today and we have remote participation. We have councillors dialing in remotely. So whatever happens, whether we finish at 6:00 p.m., we have to start the new meeting at 6:00, and the new councillors will have to be back at 6:00, so I suggest that we follow the agenda.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Stephane, if I could comment, being a councillor that won't be sitting on that meeting, I'm happy to get through as quickly as possible and meet the old councillors by the pool.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Your constructive comments will be missed, Adrian.

(Break)