

ICANN Dakar, Senegal

GNSO Council

26 October 2011

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Everyone, this is your two-minute warning. Councillors, please come back to the table, the stage, whatever it is.

Okay, we will begin again. And we will start with the administrative item that we have at the start of every agenda.

Glen, could you please do a roll call of council members, please.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Certainly, Stephane.

Jeff Neuman?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Ching Chiao?

>>CHING CHIAO: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Jonathan Robinson? >>JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes, present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Tim Ruiz?

Tim was on line earlier. Thank you, Tim.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Adrian Kinderis?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Stephane van Gelder?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Here.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Andrei Kolesnikov?

>>ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Still here.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Zahid Jamil?

>>ZAHID JAMIL: Here.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: John Berard?

>>JOHN BERARD: Here.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: David Taylor has a temporary alternate, and that is Brian Winterfeldt. Brian?

>>BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Jaime Wagner?

>>JAIME WAGNER: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen.

>>WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Here.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Bill Drake has a temporary alternate in Konstantinos Komaitis.

>>KONSTANTINOS KOMAITIS: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Wendy Seltzer?

>>WENDY SELTZER: Here.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Mary Wong.

>>MARY WONG: Here.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: The temporary alternative for Rafik Dammak is Robin Gross. Robin is here, yes.

Debbie Hughes?

>>DEBRA HUGHES: Here.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Rosemary Sinclair? She's absent.

>>WENDY SELTZER: Wendy Seltzer is serving as Rosemary's proxy.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Wendy.

Olga Cavalli?

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Carlos Aguirre?

>>CARLOS AGUIRRE: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Alan Greenberg.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Han Chuan Lee?

>>HAN CHUAN LEE: Present.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Stephane.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much, Glen.

Now, there are two, I think, updated statements of interest.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Stephane, I'd like to raise a point of order, if I could.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yes, Kristina. Please, go ahead.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: I would just like to note, for the record, that one of our voting council members has, in fact, been serving and was serving yesterday as a GAC representative. And, although there is nothing in our bylaws that would prohibit that, I think it leads to possible conflicts of interest and would suggest that the new council consider whether or not that is a scenario that they are comfortable with and, if not, to perhaps prepare and pass or request the passage of the appropriate bylaws amendment.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Kristina, for raising that point. In that case, I will, first of all, ask the council if there is any opposition to the council member in question continuing to vote in this session.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: I would prefer not to, but I don't think I'll actively oppose. Sorry, too much medicine. I'm not actively opposing that person voting. I would prefer that they not, but I'm not going to actively oppose it.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. So, in that case, any other opposition to this? Jeff?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: No, no opposition. But just a question as to -- can you just -- Kristina, I'm not familiar enough with the bylaws. Is there a violation here, or is it just a concern?

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: No. That's what I pointed out. There's no provision in our bylaws that prohibits that. But I think, especially since we have taken a view as to conflicts of interest at the board level, that perhaps it would be appropriate if we were to consider -- or the new council were to consider whether or not that scenario could lead to or could potentially lead to conflicts of interest. And, if the conclusion to it that discussion or consideration was yes, then perhaps a bylaws amendment would be in order.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Can I ask the council member in question if that person wants to make a statement.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Stephane. Just for clarification, I was a GAC member representing my country, Argentina, before joining the GNSO. I have been advisor to the government of Argentina for more than 10 years. I'm not a government official. I don't belong as an employee of the government. But I do advise the government of Argentina in issues related with technology, Internet, policy about telecommunications and the Internet. I was the Argentina representative in Tunis in WSIS some people which were diplomats. And I also teach in the diplomate career in Argentina technology and also university teacher. And, as an academic and as a investigator of technology and policy related with technology, I joined the GNSO. And I served the GNSO as a NomCom appointee for four years.

And, as I am finishing as NomCom appointee today, I will rejoin the GAC. I haven't been participating actively. I didn't talk. I didn't vote. I didn't anything in the GAC, but I just wanted to be aware of the documents they were talking about. This is why I joined them yesterday. I talked to Heather Dryden. I already sent a new letter of appointment from my government, which is in her hands. So this is what I have to say. If I cannot vote, that's not a problem. If that is a problem for the council, that's not a problem for me. So, if you feel, Kristina, conflict that I don't vote, that's okay.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Olga. Any further comments? Let the records show that I see no opposition to Olga voting in this meeting.

We will now continue with the updated statements of interests. And I have two, one from Kristina and one from Rafik. Please refer to the GNSO Council Web site to see those statements of interests or to the council e-mail list. I believe Glen has sent those in.

So we'll move on to item 1.3. Does anyone want to review, amend or comment the agenda at this time?

Hearing none, no amendments to the agenda. Let's move to item 4. And, just to point out that the minutes from the October 6 meeting were approved on October the 24th.

We will now move to item 2, our pending projects list. The list has just been finished. We were reviewing it. The latest edition of the list was reviewed up until yesterday. So this item is not up to date. And I will not read through it at this time. We will post the new list either today or tomorrow. We will try and do that very quickly.

And, just to note that, as we do at every open council meeting, we have an open microphone slot after every item, agenda item. So at this time, if anyone wishes to make any comments either online or in the room, please do so. Jaime?

>>JAIME WAGNER: I would just like to know if the drafting team is considered private or not. And I would note that the cross constituency workgroup drafting team is not marked in this list of the pending projects.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Jaime. Anyone from staff want to comment on that? We'll just take note of it and review the list. I'm sorry.

>>MARGIE MILAM: I'm sorry. What's your question? This is Margie.

>>JAIME WAGNER: The question is if the drafting team is considered a project or not and if the cross constituency work group drafting team should not be in the list of the pending projects.

>>MARGIE MILAM: I believe it's in the project list, actually.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Okay. We'll make a note of the question and review that list and make sure that it is. Any further -- any further comments? Marika?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I think I understand your question now, Jaime. Because you're talking about why it's not listed as an added working group. It was already there as a drafting team, but now it's transformed into a working group. So that's why it's not specifically listed as a new added project.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Any further comments?

We will move to item 3, an item on our open council meeting drafting team. I alluded to this earlier on today when we were going through the constituency and stakeholder group presentations and to the work that the council has been doing on revisiting the way we structure our open council meetings in an attempt to improve the way that we work. This -- I said at the time that there's a council group working on this. I believe Adrian Kinderis has been leading that group. And he is going to give us an update on the work of the group. Adrian, please.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Thank you, Stephane. First of all, it's a surprise to me that I'm the leader of the group. And I have this nothing prepared, but I have an update.

So let me tell you a story. So -- who is on that -- John Berard is the leader of that group, isn't he? And John is not here. So I'll continue to tell a story. So thank you for throwing it to me.

So, as far as I know, with respect to this meeting, John and I got together. We tossed around a couple of ideas about trying to mix up the meeting a little bit to try to increase public participation and ensure that this wasn't the snore fest that it had become over the last three or four meetings.

We stalled a little bit in our progress just due to the workload. John did some good work. I sent to him through an e-mail. I think he, then, added to my e-mail and forwarded that through to the list. Jeff Neuman, did you get that eventually?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Eventually, yes.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: So that's kind of all it was was just a few inputs from me. I notice none of them have been implemented in this meeting, probably because they were rubbish ideas. But I'm okay with that, as I am now leaving.

However, being an interested party in future meetings and coming in and starting tomorrow as other such rotten fruit at the council, it would be good that I knew the format that that was to go in.

So I think there is still some growth that can happen over the journey. And it would be good that the council continued with its work in my absence. So I hope that you can assign a leader and make sure that that leader knows that they have been assigned that role.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Adrian. Sorry for taking you by surprise. I would remind the council that the agenda is published on the list for comment a few days before each council meeting. And sometimes it may be worth reading it. I believe John has a question.

(Speaker off microphone.)

>>NANCY LUPIANO: If the speaker has his computer on, he must mute it or be on a headset, please. Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: John, John? I have to interrupt you. We cannot hear you. I'm told, if you have your computer on while you're speaking, you must mute your computer. Can you try again, please?

>>JOHN BERARD: I don't have it on.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Okay. We can hear you better now. But I'm sorry that the point you're making earlier on got lost.

>>Or if he's using a speaker phone, that won't work. You have to use a real handset. Otherwise, it creates the echo. It may not be you, but someone on the phone somewhere has a speaker phone on that's causing that loop.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: John, we can hear you, so perhaps try to make that point. We can read it off the transcript as well.

(Speaker off microphone).

>>JAIME WAGNER: Maybe it would be useful to give an advice to all those that are participating remotely how to use the speakers.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Okay. The instructions are not to have your computer noise up and not to use a speaker phone, I believe, although I'm not a telecommunications technician. But that's what I heard.

John, do you still want to try -- I think we may have lost John. But we'll try to get him back. Any further comments on this? Any suggestions on any improvements that we may consider to these meetings?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: So these were draft in my ideas at the time. So we got bogged down in -- I believe in -- once again, this is just Adrian's ideas, so I'm a little shy about bringing them up. But -- not shy. I've never been shy in my life.

But, with respect to, potentially -- I felt that we were being dogged down with respect to the motions. And we, as a group, I think, have spoken a number of times that we often are changing and editing motions on the fly. And there can be nothing more boring to an audience participant than to watch that process. It's painful enough to be involved in it. To watch it unfold in front of you is not very helpful. I came up with the idea that this should be an ability for the community, because we don't normally have the community being able to interact with us, trying to find a way for -- to deal with the motions and whether we dealt with them in a separate session or something and then allowed the community to really pick through the current issues of the council and ensure that they were able to discuss and debate them.

So I wanted to create an environment and a forum where this was possible and, you know, make it more a workshop than an actual meeting where we sit up here and everybody's down there and try to get everybody to engage.

One of the ideas I had was to separate the motion stuff. Maybe we could have dealt with that on Saturdays and Sundays, although I understand there are some logistical issues with that. But, once again, these are embryonic ideas John and I tossed around. John had more. He's very good at this sort of thing and really trying to ensure that our stakeholder engagement was paramount and that we were ensuring that that was facilitated. Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much, Adrian. Jonathan.

>>JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Stephane. I'll throw my hat in the ring. It's perhaps controversial. I don't understand in this particular context why we need "whereas," in front of every preamble clause. Frankly, from my point of view, it is intimidating language that needn't be there. And, if necessary, one can put a single "whereas," in front of all of them. But there's no reason I can see why one simply doesn't describe this as a preamble or an introduction, strip out all the "whereas's," and get on with describing the background to the motion. So that would be a very simple change that could make us slightly more accessible and clearer in our way of working.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Jonathan. We've also had discussion whether we should read the motions at all before we take a vote, which has always been a subject of some disagreement on the council. The reason we do it is because some people listen in to the calls remotely but don't have the text in front of them. So, if we don't read the motions out, they don't know what we're voting on. As technology advances, it may be the case that fewer and fewer people join the council meetings just listening in and more and more people actually have access to the text. So that's may be something we have to look at. But these are good points, and I hope the people on the open council meeting drafting team will be able to take these on and see what they can do with them.

Any further comments? Any comments from the room or the remote -- the people participating remotely. Margie?

>>MARGIE MILAM: Michele Neylon says, "Drop 'whereas,' is a good move." He's commenting on that suggestion.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Michele. Any further comments. Adrian.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: I think this is a good forum for those that are sitting out there. This can be one of the more painful meetings. Any way that they're sitting there now or any way you want to get more information or anything, now is a good time to come and speak at the microphone to let us know. How can we improve this forum? How can we make it from just a you sit and we speak and you listen for a little while and then fall asleep for a majority? How do we change that and get a little bit more of a dynamic environment happening? That's the point of the working group that we had. And so any feedback you've got right now about how we can change that, maybe it's just to get Adrian to shut up for five minutes. That may be some positive feedback we can take back to the council.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I echo that. I don't know -- not the shut up bit, Adrian, of course. But I'm just slightly worried. Now I see Steve standing up, so I'm less worried. There's no input from the room on this. It either means that you're already asleep and we've just started, or it means that you feel the meetings at the moment are the way they should be. And I know the council feels that that's not the case. So there's a disconnect there, maybe. But Steve?

>>STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you, Stephane. Steve del Bianco with NetChoice. I would only make an observation that any legislative body has to work with motions. Whether the "whereas," is in there once or many times is neither here nor there. So figure that out. But, when a motion is put forth -- and maybe it's deferred a few times, it's modified or amendments provided, that whole process is something you've lived through for the past three or four months sometimes. But those of us here in the meeting don't always know what's gone into it. And often a lot goes into it in the very

last hours before the meeting. So I would say that, when we get to the meat of what council does at these meetings, it's legislative. It's motions. That the mover of a motion may simply explain it. But somehow we have to convey what's happened. What's the history behind a motion. It was born and raised in an issues report. It turned into a motion that was modified and who seconded and why. And then, at the last minute, if something has happened, if something has been withdrawn, what we crave is an explanation of what really went into it and what we really expect to happen next. And that would be something to keep us all awake at the very least. Thanks, Stephane.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Steve. Looks like Adrian's call to arms has worked. We could hire you as an emcee for the council. Philip.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Thank you. Philip Sheppard. Whereas, I recall some time ago, not that many years ago, there were no whereas clauses in motions; whereas, this caused enormous confusion in terms of where it came from; whereas, it also meant that nobody was really certain that council had done a good job in terms of due diligence and history; whereas, a certain chairman of the names council who shall go nameless might have been guilty for introducing this in the first place, I would suggest, indeed, there was a good use for that. I think Jonathan's suggestion that one "whereas," is enough in the text is a jolly good one. And, I also think, actually, to be a bit more serious, I think the point is simply to show historical context and thoroughness and there is a sense of history and continuity in the decision making. But, when it comes to weeding out a motion, I think probably, certainly, you know, because there is -- that text is available in so many other ways, it is largely unnecessary as part of the motion on the discussion. And a good practice to consider, certainly, would be to look at a static motion and get on with that and have that discussion rather than wasting time over the fact that council has, actually, done quite a good job of understanding history.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Philip. Former chair of the names council, of course. Michele.

>>MICHELE NEYLON: I generally agree with what the other speakers have been saying. The entire GNSO structure and everything seems very impenetrable. Oh, we lost power or air conditioning. I'm Irish. I break things. Plain language, which would make it easier for the translators to convert into plain French, plain Spanish, and plain whatever other languages, just explaining in really, really simple terms what on earth a motion or a PDP or some other thing is about. Sometimes I look at open common periods. And, as most of you know, I'm slightly more engaged than others on some things. And I look at the list of these topics. And I have absolutely no idea what on earth they relate to. I might be able to ping a member of ICANN staff or a councillor or whatever to find out exactly what they're talking about and realize oh, yes, that's what that's about. Why on earth couldn't they say it?

But it's this kind of thing where you have loads of acronyms used out of context. And, if you're coming to your first ICANN meeting, it's acronym soup. There's all these little groups and stakeholders and constituencies and councils of this and boards of that and advisory committees of that and advisory committees for that. And it's very, very hard for somebody to understand what on earth is going on. It ends up where the entire system is kind of -- it's kind of self-selective. Only if you have the patience, the time, or just really love arguing with people do you actually get involved. Whereas, a lot of people in the hallways are they're kind of going what on earth are they talking about. And you have to kind of take them aside and go right, this is what it refers to. You know, forget the acronyms.

So, for example, I'm currently the chair of the IRTPB working group. What the hell is the IRTPB? You have to sit down and explain it's the inter-registrar transfer policy. And they go, "What the hell is a registrar?" You have to explain that. What is an inter-registrar transfer? You have to spend a lot of time taking something that is fundamental that happens every single day between registrars, domains moving around, and try to explain that in simple terms that somebody can understand. I think that's something that you on the council need to do a little bit of work towards. And I know some of you have. But I think it will be good to see more of that.

And, just by way of final comment, must thank Adrian, because he does bring a certain levity to the entire proceedings that will be sorely missed. Thanks.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much, Michele. Those are very important points. I think from the feedback that I get, there's a steep learning curve which almost acts as a barrier to participating, and I know it's difficult for people to come in and actually even raise their hands to ask a question, which is why I was very happy to get that stakeholder group constituency question earlier on. And I'd welcome -- I'm sure we all would -- any more questions of that sort.

These council -- the open council meetings are also structured to maximize engagement and for people to be able to ask questions, which they may feel are questions that newcomers shouldn't ask, but I think quite the contrary.

Margie.

>>MARGIE MILAM: A remote question from Kieren McCarthy. His question is, or statements the inclusion of "whereas" puts a legal barrier in front of participants and isn't needed, legally or otherwise. It should be a no-brainer to get rid of it in front of every clause. If you want, you can stick it at the front of a motion and then list all the points.

And he also says a further point, historical information included in the whereas should be put at the bottom rather than at the front. It's a way of clear understanding of the GNSO Council work.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Marika.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, this is Marika. Something to note and I am actually looking on the council and see it's not posted there. What we have done for the previous GNSO Council meetings is to provide a background briefing on those items the councillors are voting on. And everybody has as the objective to explain what is the issue in front of the council, why are they looking at this now, what has been done about this issue and what are the main recommendations.

So I think at least from a staff perspective this was intended to provide some background to the motion that's under discussion, because I agree going through whereases might be confusing or, indeed, with acronyms or links.

So that is a tool that we have been trying to use, and we probably should do a better job of distributing those to council members so they can distribute those to their constituencies and get them posted on the agenda. But from our part, we are trying to do our best to make it more understandable for those not daily involved in GNSO Council activities.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Marika.

Jamie.

>>JAIME WAGNER: I would like to endorse two motions, one from Steve that the presenter of the motion explained it in terms not as formal whereases, and the other from Michele that this presenter should avoid acronyms. And I would advance a motion that these two suggestions should be used today in this very meeting for the presenters of the motions.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Jamie. Any other comments?

Move to agenda item 4. It's an agenda item on the amendments to the RAA, and this item is linked to a motion that was made by Kristina Rosette at the October the 6th meeting and deferred from that meeting. So we are considering it today.

I would ask Kristina to read the motion and possibly leave out the whereas motions.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Actually, in lieu of reading the motion and providing the historical background I would like to read a slightly different statement instead, if I may.

As I mentioned previously the IPC is delighted that the Registrar Stakeholder Group has opened negotiations to amend and update the current RAA. Kurt Pritz informed the GAC yesterday that those negotiations would cover the high priority topics included in the final report on proposals for improvements to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement.

The IPC requests that all of those high-priority topics and the medium-priority topics be the subject of those negotiations.

If, however, the negotiations will not cover all of the high-priority topics as the GAC has been advised, we do expect that the GAC would be informed accordingly.

We look forward to a negotiating process with maximum feasible transparency into which those vitally affected by RAA rules will have an adequate input. And as we wish to give these negotiations an opportunity to proceed unfettered by a parallel process, I hereby withdraw my motion.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much, Kristina.

In that case, any comments before we move on to -- Jeff.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I actually appreciate the withdrawal of the motion.

I'm a little concerned in the IPC statement as if there's some obligation for the registrars to report to the GAC. To me, that just seems a little bit bizarre. So perhaps I can get clarification from the IPC as to what they intended.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Sure.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: And of course -- just to finish on -- we also have to realize that what Kurt may have told the GAC is not necessarily what the registrars would have told the GAC had the GAC invited the registrars to talk about the statement. So perhaps it may be despite the fact that Kurt had said the high priority items, it's possible that he had something else in mind when he said high priority as

opposed to the high priority items in the RAP report. In fact, I would guess that Kurt probably couldn't name, as most people couldn't name, all of the high priority items in the RAP report.

So I want to make sure that it's not necessarily understood; that that may not have been what was meant.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Okay. Let me be perfectly clear. My withdrawal of the motion is based on the premise that those negotiations will, in fact, cover those topics. And should that prove not to be the case, I can assure you that my successor or one of my colleagues will reintroduce this motion.

As to your point about the GAC, I think the Registrar Stakeholder Group saw and experienced, unfortunately, quite clearly what happens when the GAC does not have complete and accurate information.

I think it would be highly undesirable for all of us who want this model to continue for the GAC to later be told Kurt Pritz was mistaken and he was wrong and he wasn't speaking for us. And to learn that for the first time when the agreement is published.

I don't care who tells them. But I think they must be told, and I think the consequences of not telling them, if those negotiations will not, in fact, cover those topics, are probably going to be a repetition of what we saw on Saturday -- or Sunday, rather.

And frankly, I don't have the appetite for that and I don't think anyone else in the community does.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Zahid.

>>ZAHID JAMIL: I just wanted to second that. I think that we are all hoping that the high priority items will be actually covered in the negotiations. And if there's any confusion about that, it should be made absolutely clear by the registrars at this stage one.

Second, it's unfortunate that this motion hasn't been gone through the GNSO process and we have seen the stonewalling that has led to this situation. And unfortunately this whole thing had to go outside the GNSO someplace else in a different forum for the process to continue.

I think this speaks to transparency issues, and it also speaks to the structural problems we're having within the GNSO.

And I hope we will be able to fix those. But again, most importantly, I think that whatever negotiations the RAA agreement goes through, I think it must include the high priority items.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. I have Tim remotely.

Tim, can you hear me?

>> (Off microphone).

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yes, we can.

>>TIM RUIZ: (off microphone for the scribes).

(scribes have no audio for telephone line).

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Tim.

Jeff.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, I guess in lieu or as a response to the threat from the IPC, perhaps one of the first action items, then, would be to clarify, because obviously the registrars couldn't control what Kurt did or did not say to the GAC but perhaps there could be a clarification of which items are going to be addressed as part of the contract negotiations, the bilateral contract negotiations between the registrars and ICANN staff so that we don't wait until the next meeting to be told that there is a different understanding from the high priority items.

And frankly, I'm not sure how the GAC knows what is the high priority items in the RAP report as opposed to general things that may be considered high priority.

So let's all get that clarified. Let's make sure we're clarified in the not-too-distant future so we can all be on the same page and have the same expectations.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Jeff.

Wendy.

>>WENDY SELTZER: Thank you. In light of the motions being dropped, the amendment that I proposed will obviously not be considered. But I wanted to ensure that no one listening in the room or to the transcripts gets the impression that there is unanimous support for the items identified as high priority in the RAA report.

The NCUC explicitly does not support various items that would reduce the privacy of registrants or their options for preserving privacy through the use of privacy and proxy services, or items that would reduce the security of their ability to communicate through a domain name by putting that in jeopardy through domain takedowns. We hope that the process that will be adopted for RAA amendments will take into account public comment, and will give us further opportunities to help in developing processes that are both effective against criminal abuse of the DNS and also respectful of the free speech interests of registrants, the privacy interests of registrants, and the free expression interests of all of those who use the Internet for communications, which are not all in freedom-respecting countries.

Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you.

Just we have a comment from -- in the chat room explaining that we are not actually talking about the RAP, which is regulation abuse policy but the RAA, these high priority topics discussions. That's a comment you made, Michele; right? I just wanted to point that out.

>>MICHELE NEYLON: Just by way of clarification if you will allow me, Stephane.

There were two working groups that dealt with proposed amendment changes, call them what you will, to the RAA, which worked through a list of suggestions that came from ICANN staff, law enforcement and other members of the community, and that's what we're dealing with.

The RAP is a completely different topic. So I'm not too sure where Jeff got that impression with respect to the --

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks Michele.

Please stay up there. We will continue the discussion at council level, then open it up for discussion with the room.

I have Margie, Kristina, Mary and Wolf.

Margie.

>>MARGIE MILAM: Just to clarify that that report had high priority and medium priority items and as staff -- I will go back to Kurt. I can't make any, obviously, commitments, but we will go back to Kurt and make sure we clarify it.

The RAA final report had high priority and medium priority topics. And I will make it an action item to consult Kurt and find out what he has in mind.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much.

Kristina.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Just following up a little bit on what Michele was saying for those who have not followed this whole process for the last several years, and just to make clear that, as Michele noted, the topics that were ultimately identified as high and medium priority topics in that report were collected based on, as he noted, comments from ICANN staff, from participants within the community and a public comment period, not only during the RAA negotiations but then a separate public comment period conducted solely for the drafting group.

The drafting team then made their efforts to categorize and prioritize those topics, hence high and medium priority topics. And then those topic categories and groupings as well as the report itself were put out for two rounds of public comment.

So I would hate for anyone out there listening or following who may not, again, be as familiar with this process to think that these topics were really just kind of spraying fully formed out of someone's forehead as opposed to being the subject and originating from multiple rounds of public comment.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Kristina.

Mary next.

>>MARY WONG: Thanks, Stephane. I have a question and a comment and the question is for the registrars stakeholder group but I will start with the comment. The comment is to echo one of the things Zahid said that it is very unfortunate and I think potentially alarming in the current context of ICANN that there could be run arounds the GNSO and GNSO Council in order to get things done and direct approaches to groups.

It may be justified in some situations. In others, perhaps there might be policy topics that needs to come back to the GNSO, in which case it ought to be done directly.

And in a third instance, it may not be apparent on the face of a particular request that something might impact certain other groups and constituencies, which, therefore, might not have an opportunity to even know about it or study the requests and proposals till much later on in the process.

Given the multistakeholder model of ICANN, like I said, I think this is quite alarming if this trend continues.

As a suggestion -- sorry, as a question, though, and this is a question for the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and I understand it may be early days yet, but to the extent there's some information you can provide to us in this forum, I think we'd all appreciate it. And this is based -- this is in respect of the process going forward, given the announcement of the imminent negotiations.

There was a staff discussion paper that was put out on the 13th of October, I believe it was, that outlined some possible approaches that could be taken going forward and listing certain topics and themes for discussion.

If you are able to provide us with some sense of whether, going forward, that is going to be the basis, whether that is going to be something that the community can provide input on and so forth, I would be grateful.

Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Mary.

I have Wolf, Zahid, Kristina and Jeff.

Wolf.

>>WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Let me just comment on behalf of the ISPCP constituency.

We, from the beginning, we were in support of approving the amended version of the process specified as Process B in the final report to develop a new form of RAA with respect to the high priority and medium priority topics, including the law enforcement-related RAA proposals. And we will follow-up the discussion very diligently, what's going on. And whether -- whether -- what we understood was that the direction which was taken by the registrars and received right now is the one in this direction.

We have really big concerns following the GAC/GNSO discussion and the GAC/Board discussion yesterday that the entire multistakeholder model may be endangered if we don't come to compromise solutions in the future, and that the GNSO might, more and more, be bypassed and (indiscernible) in this respect.

So this is our concern.

Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Wolf.

Zahid.

>>ZAHID JAMIL: First of all, I just wanted to clarify it wasn't us that went to the GAC, in case there is any misinterpretation of this. It is sad to see this is happening outside the GNSO. That's what I was trying to say earlier.

Secondly, I wanted to also sort of ask, Marika just mentioned about the RAA report and I wanted to get an idea from her about the status of that report. Does it include the high priority items? And if it does, are they considered GNSO approved?

I'd just like to get a sense of that, because does it mean that the staff is negotiating these as if all the high and medium priority items have been approved by the GNSO? So if I can get a clarification, that will be helpful.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. I think Margie said that, but do you want to address that now?

>>MARGIE MILAM: Just to clarify, the report didn't say that those amendment topics should be adopted. So no one went through the analysis of saying whether it was a good topic or -- all it was was a list of things to consider. And at this point, the report has not been approved by the GNSO Council.

The only thing that was approved was the registrar -- registrants' charter, rights and responsibilities charter, which was approved, I think, in February. And the motion that Kristina had brought and the other motions that preceded were an attempt to take that work forward.

But nowhere in the report was there a statement from the working group that those topics should be in the RAA. It was more they should be explored.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks. Can I add you? Kristina is next.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Zahid said most of what I was going to say.

I would just strongly encourage those of you who don't think that the GAC is following all of these issues very closely, to be quite candid, I think you all need a better set of political radar.

The GAC has made it very clear that they intend to take a more active role and I think we need to be very mindful of that. And that to the extent that there are issues of importance to them, that we are not able to progress through our practices, I think they sent us a very clear signal that they will take it out of our hands. And that is not a desirable outcome.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you.

Jeff.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So I guess now is a good time for, if that motion were on the table, the registries would have voted no. We don't believe, unlike what has been said by certain members of the GNSO Council, that a Registrar Accreditation Agreement or any agreement between any of the contracted parties is something that needs to be approved by the GNSO Council.

There seems to be this view amongst the council that we are the be all, end all and everything must go through us as a council to approve or not approve. And we do not read the Registrar Accreditation Agreements that way.

What is the role of the GNSO community is the ability to comment on those -- on the results of those negotiations. So I just want to be clear that although there are statements to the contrary on the council, we do not believe there is any role of the GNSO Council in approving or not approving any amendments.

And as far as the threats regarding the GAC, we all need to do a better job in educating them. We certainly -- That's certainly made clear.

And so to the extent we can do that and hold consultation sessions, the public, as opposed to private sessions with council members, that would help for the true understanding of what the facts are.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Jeff.

Zahid.

>>ZAHID JAMIL: I want to respond to what Jeff said. That means our fear is actually sort of confirmed that we have to go outside the GNSO. That all this will be happening in a nontransparent manner. And what that means to me, effectively, is that we had a registry agreement that went to the new gTLD process. We have a new registry comment that ran into public comments and transparency, but we don't have an RAA in that respect. I think we really have to look at this. If the GNSO can't do anything about this, then what other process are we going to have to adopt to have the community to have transparency and confidence in what's happening with the new registrar agreement.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Zahid. I have Jonathan next.

>>JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Stephane. I think mine is in many ways a follow-on from what Jeff said.

I think to suggest, Kristina, that any one of us could not have heard or observed or absorbed the newly -- the new role and perspective of the GAC and their awakening to the role they might play in the ICANN community is almost disingenuous. We hear them. We can see, hear, and feel very loud and clear the role they expect to play in having a voice.

That said, there are certain fundamentals about the way in which the contracts work and what is and isn't the subject of consensus policy, and we need to be very careful about retaining that, because that is fundamental to the model in which we all work.

And to suggest that we break with that, it would be substantially problematic.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Jonathan.

Jamie.

>>JAIME WAGNER: First, I would like to say that I came here to ICANN and the GNSO community at the very time when the new structure of the GNSO was being put in place. So I don't have a vivid experience of the previous structure.

I think the GNSO and the GNSO Council in particular is the epitome of multistakeholders. It is here that multistakeholderism will prove to function or not.

And it seems to me that there is a strong -- since the work was very hard in building this new structure, there is a fear among all to face the problems that it may still -- that may still remain.

Yesterday at the Commercial Stakeholders Group, I made a -- it's a point that it seems to me that the previous structure was not agreeable to anybody. It dissatisfied everybody.

So we moved to a structure that seems to be satisfies one part. The contracted parties seems to be very -- or if not satisfied, they seem to be good with this structure.

And I would just like to say that, in a sense, if one party is satisfied and the others are not, this is more unjust situation than the situation where everybody is dissatisfied. It's just a remark of an outgoing councillor.

I made this not in -- in my private capacity. I didn't discuss this with my constituency.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you.

Jeff.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I think I have to just clarify my remarks here, because it seems like it's been misconstrued, and sometimes things leave this meeting and get to other people and it just kind of spirals out of control.

When I said there's no role for the GNSO Council, I didn't say there was no role for the GNSO community, which, Zahid, your chair, continually points out. There are certain things which are appropriate for the policy process that are with the GNSO Council and there are certain things that are appropriate with the stakeholder groups. And one of those is the ability to comment on the agreements once they come out.

And that should be maintained.

The GNSO Council also has a role in the policy development process for amending whatever agreements they apply to with consensus policies. And if we leave that model, that leaves -- that diverts or, I should say, is a departure from the 1999 agreements that were between the U.S. Department of Commerce and -- I'm not sure if they were VeriSign yet or Network Solutions, that developed this whole consensus policy process.

That is what we, as contracted parties, signed on to when we agreed to amend our agreements through the consensus policy process.

And it seems like this whole concept of being able to amend the agreements has just kind of gone out of control.

We still have the consensus policy process. We could still go through that for any items of policy that we want to address.

So again, I did not say the GNSO has no role. It has a role.

So I just want to be clear on that.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Jeff.

Any further comments from the council?

In which case I will invite comments from the floor.

Steve.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. Steve DelBianco with Net Choice. And if a Process A or B had been undertaken, I would make this suggestion somewhere in the middle of that road that you are on, so that I could make a constructive suggestion to work out roadblocks that might occur on trying to renegotiate -- sorry, to negotiate a new RAA.

But it looks as if, with the withdrawal of this motion, it's not going to occur on an open road. It's going to go into a tunnel, which would be bilateral between the staff and the registrars, and we will get to see what comes out at the end of that tunnel. I understand that.

So my suggestion is this. Somewhere in the middle of that tunnel, it will be clear that the registrars don't want it amend the RAA for existing registrars to incorporate some of the high and medium priority items. And that's a real impasse. That's a roadblock that will be encountered somewhere in there because to do so, we ought to follow the process of consensus policies within the picket fence, go through a PDP at council. Because you are changing the terms of a contract for existing registrars. So I get that.

So when you come to that fork in the tunnel, my advice is to pick that fork up and stick a fork in the RAA for existing TLDs and just leave it alone, and then proceed down the tunnel to design the RAA-plus. RAA 2.0. Design it for the new TLDs. To design an RAA that incorporates all the best thinking that we need for the new era of ICANN and the new TLDs. And you will move that through the end of the tunnel and very quickly it will be surfaced for public comment and modification just exactly the same way we modified the new gTLD registry agreement and code of conduct. Those weren't done in a consensus-policy, picket-fence PDP. They were done in a communitywide process with lots of input from GNSO.

Now, they weren't imposed on registries; right? No registry has to follow the new gTLD process. Only the registries that want to run TLDs in the new round voluntarily agree to take that on.

We missed the opportunity to do the same thing with the RAA. We could have, the registrar and the new names, especially under VI and CO, you have to follow the RAA prime, RAA-plus. Well, that opportunity is going to come right back to us, because right in the middle of that tunnel when we hit the things that affect existing contracts, just put a fork in it and move ahead and let's come up with an ideal registry agreement. And no registrar has to take it unless they want to do business in the names in the new gTLD program.

Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Steve.

Mason.

>>MASON COLE: I wanted to address a couple of points that were made during this discussion.

The first is, it's very, very clear to registrars. I don't know how it couldn't be clear to registrars the amount of anger that was expressed from the GAC about considerations in the process as it relates to the RAA. I believe that stemmed from a couple of things. One is not a clear enough understanding of what our obligations, the registrars' obligations, are to the community through the structure of this contract and through its obligations to work through the GNSO to develop policy.

I believe the registrars will and must do a better job of educating the GAC about the realities of the operational situation that we have to live in.

The other, frankly, was not a good enough job on the registrars' part of communicating to the GAC exactly what was happening during this process.

We, in truth -- My understanding is the GAC's main interest in the RAA is to help put into place policies that were advanced by the law enforcement community. I'd like to point out that we have been in discussion with the law enforcement community, a discussion that was initiated by registrars and initiated after law enforcement went to the GAC and got their proposed amendments endorsed without understanding whether or not those were technically feasible. Many of them, candidly, are not, nor could they be without the actual help of the GAC and law enforcement providing us data that I believe they are going to be very reluctant to provide.

So all of that aside, I just want to reassure the GNSO how seriously we take the situation with the GAC. We have no quarrel with many of the amendments or the policies that have been proposed under the guise of changing the RAA.

We may have quarrel, and do, with the process route to get from point A to point B, but I hope that the community will do a better job of characterizing registrars' intentions to help the community satisfy the agendas of parties other than registrars because we have no intention of roadblocking anything.

We do have the intention of protecting our rights and responsibilities under the agreement, and that's what we will continue to do.

I know there is an open question about which proposals will be taken care of first. I don't have the answer to that. I'm unaware of what Kurt promised to the GAC. But whatever it is, I'll find out.

Thank you, Stephane.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Mason.

Chuck.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Stephane.

I would encourage everyone on the council to take a look at the bylaws for the GNSO Council. You won't find anywhere in there that there's any approval rights or responsibilities for contracts.

I'd also encourage you to look at the register agreements with ICANN or the RAA between registrars and ICANN. Again, you won't find that there.

I don't know where that idea came from.

That being said, though, that doesn't have to preclude working together to amicable solutions. And what I'm hearing is the registrars are regrouping and ready to do that. I haven't seen the details like you haven't either.

But again, look at the GNSO's responsibilities, the council's responsibilities. You will not find any approval rights for contracts. But we have a precedent, longstanding, going back to the very first renewal agreements for registries that we were probably the ones, and it was probably the Network Solutions agreement, of input from the community. And that can include input from the council.

So again, look at the defining documents for the council and the GNSO. I personally think it's very clear.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you.

>>ELLIOTT NOSS: Hi, Elliott Noss. There are two points I would like to make today. The first is extending a little bit on Chuck's previous point. I think what we have seen really over the last two years since the last RAA is an attempt to mutate the RAA into something that it is not. I can tell you, if I would have known that some in the community were going to treat the RAA in the way that they have in the two years since we signed it early, I would have let my term expire, signed it on the last day that I could, and ensured that I had the protections there for a full further five years. We gave our previous contract up and took on new obligations in good faith, and I feel that good faith was not honored. Getting enforcement type provisions, be they law enforcement or intellectual property protections inside of the RAA accomplishes only one thing. It turns the ICANN compliance department into a police department. Because the only enforcement you get through the RAA is the ability to include ICANN compliance. And I think that people who are looking for protections in the DNS would be well served to try and look for a lot of what they want to accomplish outside of the RAA. I believe that that would not only be a faster road to getting what they want, but would also be significantly more effective in its actual enforcement.

The second point I want to make is something that, through the new gTLD process, I shared with the board in the public forum. And I'd now like to address GNSO Council with this point.

We are really seeing the birth of the relationship of the nation state to the multistakeholder process. For better or worse, good or bad, I think what we saw on both Sunday and yesterday was an attempt to bring politics as usual to multistakeholder. Here governance is done in a much different way with a different flavor.

I would describe much of what I saw yesterday as kabuki theater and not really something that was intended to accomplish a goal, unless that goal was to blow up multistakeholder.

There are two places in the ICANN community where multistakeholder can be protected in their relationship with the GAC. One is in the board, and the second is right here, I really encourage you, all of you who have a sworn oath on some level to protect and foster multistakeholder, to keep that in mind when you're listening to the inbound. Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Jonathan.

>>JONATHAN ZUCK: Jonathan Zuck from the Association of Competitive Technology. Just having spent the last two hours with the compliance team, just one issue I would contradict some on is that I think there are terms of the contract that -- for which there aren't teeth to enforce. What we're finding is that they don't even have the tools necessary to do the job that they've already been given to do. So, rather than putting new rights into the RAA or new considerations, I really want to make sure -- and this is more to the staff than anyone else, now that this is a staff issue, is make sure the recommendations the compliance team itself made for new provisions to the RAA be considered. Because right now, really, the only thing they're able to do is revoke people's agreement if they don't pay their bills. That's the one hammer they have. If you're late paying your bills, they're on top of that. For everything else, it was frustrating being a programmer in a room a bunch of lawyers. It doesn't say here I can do that, so we can't do it. So they have nothing but a nuclear option in terms of the enforcement of the provisions that already exist in the RAA. So I think something that really has to be addressed in the new agreement are mechanisms of enforcement that can be brought to bear by the compliance staff here to begin to address what everyone recognizes as an endemic problem.

The fact that they get thousands of complaints a month means that there's something wrong. And I think that's something about which we have consensus. So we need to at least give them some of the tools that they need to enforce the provisions that already exist and the responsibilities the registrars have already agreed to. Thanks.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Any further comments?

We'll bring this item to a close and move to item 5, which is something on the policy development process work team. This is, once again, an item that we are carrying over from October the 6th meeting and a motion that we were looking at during that meeting, which was deferred in that meeting and which we will consider now.

The motion was made by Jeff Neuman. And I will ask Jeff to read the motion. And we will then open this up for discussion. Jeff?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Can someone -- there it is. So, to avoid reading all the whereas clauses, maybe I'll just give a brief overview of the resolution. This is a -- the last of the restructuring policy development work that's been going on. I'm happy to say after two years and nine months we finished it. It was very complex. It covered everything from raising an issue in a PDP to evaluation of or review of a PDP and the outcomes of the PDP as well as the PDP process.

One of the things I want to emphasize, too, and something I heard, there's a lot of frustration raised at the GAC over the last week or so about the -- how long a PDP takes.

And I just want to clarify, for the record, that a PDP does not have to take two years or three years or even a year. There are ways in which PDPs can be shorter. We don't need a whole new expedited PDP process. The reason PDPs take a long time is because lack of interest, lack of participation, tough to get people together on calls, all sorts of reasons it takes a long time for staff to write an issue report, legitimately, because there's so much work going on. There's a whole host of activities.

So it would be great, once we actually get this approved, since the board did approve it and there's a PDP manual that goes along with it, perhaps we can start an education campaign with the other stakeholders to let them know that the PDP is not or does not have to be as daunting as it's been in the past.

So with that said, Stephane, can I skip all the whereas clauses and just read the resolveds.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yes.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: "Now be it resolved the GNSO Council recommends that the ICANN Board of Directors adopt the revised GNSO Policy Development Process as reflected in the proposed Annex A and PDP Manual as outlined in the PDP updated final report. (See)" -- and there's a link there.

"Resolved, the GNSO Council recommends that the procedures" -- sorry. Just lost my place here.

-- "that the procedures of the new Annex A shall be applicable to all requests for issue reports and PDPs initiated following adoption by the ICANN board. For all ongoing PDPs initiated prior to the adoption by the Board, the Council shall determine the feasibility of transitioning to the procedures set forth in this Annex A for all remaining steps within the PDP. If the Council determines that any ongoing PDP cannot be feasibly transitioned to these updated procedures, the PDP shall be concluded according to the procedures set forth in Annex A in force on" -- it should say "on of before the adoption of the new Annex A by the Board."

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Jeff. Can I open this up for discussion, please, before we vote on this motion?

Mary?

>>MARY WONG: So this has been said many times before in different fora, but I think it's worth saying for the record here today that certainly many of us, including my constituency, is very grateful to Jeff for leading the team and the team itself for doing very good work on the processes that they're recommending and also for taking on board and into account the various public comments that were submitted. So we're really grateful.

The other comment I would make is to second what Jeff said. And this may be something the council and the community wants to take up at a future time. But in the very near future, perhaps starting with our wrapup meeting tomorrow, with respect to figuring out how to inform not just the GAC but others in the community about how we work and about the fact that we don't always take two years to get something done. At least we shouldn't.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Mary. Any further comments? Any further -- any comments from the floor? Any opposition to a voice vote on this motion? Glen, please do a voice vote on this motion.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Stephane. All those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand.

>>On the phone: I'm raising my hand.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: On the phone we have John Berard and Tim. Tim, you also -- both of you in favor?

>>TIM RUIZ: Tim is in favor, yes.

>>JOHN GERARD: John is in favor.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you. Is anybody opposed to the motion, please raise your hand.

Is anybody abstaining from the motion, please raise your hand?

Stephane, seeing no abstentions, nobody is opposed to the motion, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Glen. May I suggest for the next votes, as we do have councillors dialing in remotely, that we consider their silence as approval. And we ask them to speak up only if they abstain or if they are in -- against voting against the motion that may be simpler for them. I see or hope that's not a reaction to my suggestion. Adrian?

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Yes, it is a reaction. Because, if their phone drops out, it's assumed a yes vote. And I think you need to get a verification in some way from them.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: We have -- we can follow if they are connected or not. So, if they are not connected, we know. Mary.

>>JAIME WAGNER: There is always the possibility for them to raise their hands in Adobe Connect. Indeed they both --

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I don't expect this to be a full-blown debate, but why don't we ask them. I'm only trying to make it easier for them to participate. Mary?

>>MARY WONG: I was going to suggest what Jaime did, and I think asking them is a good idea. But I think, more generally, I'm uncomfortable with you don't say anything, that you're deemed to have agreed.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Agreed.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Opposition to that idea. We will not implement it. And we will ask the councillors online to continue voting actively if they are in favor of a motion.

And we will now consider the next motion on our agenda today, which is a motion that stems from the work done by the outreach task force. It is a motion on the outreach task force charter. And, Olga, you have moved this motion. Can I ask you to please read the motion?

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Stephane. Before reading the motion, allow me one moment to thank you the council allowing me to be a member for four years. This is my last meeting. And also for allowing me to be the vice chair and two times chair candidate. I have enjoyed very much working with you. I have learned a lot from my three chairs -- Avri Doria, Chuck Gomes, and Stephane Van Gelder.

I also want to thank the team that worked with us doing this draft -- what it is? It's a charter. Sorry. I would like to thank especially Julie Hedlund and Debbie Hughes. I was chairing this group, and I had problems with my mother's health two times and I couldn't attend. And they were so kind to cover my role.

And also I would like to thank the members of this drafting team, Carlos, Tony -- Tony, where are you? Debbie and from the registries constituency and also Chuck Gomes were very good for enhancing our work. Should I read the whole motion or just the whereas?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Just the resolveds, please.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: It's quite long.

"Resolved, that the GNSO Council approve the Draft Charter," -- there's a link -- "thanks to the OTF drafting team for its efforts on this important initiative and dissolves the OTF drafting team. Resolved further that the GNSO Council requests staff to seek volunteers for chair and vice chair of the OTF."

Thank you, Stephane.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much, Olga. I will now open this up for discussion. Jeff and Zahid.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'd like to thank Olga for all the work she's done for the last four years and also on the outreach task force. I hope that, even though she's no longer on the council, that she continues to serve on the task force. Because it's open, obviously, to community members. I also do want to bring up a comment on -- you know, we're going to, obviously, vote in favor of this.

But in the last resolved clause on seeking volunteers for chair and vice chair, we actually had some comments over the week on -- that sometimes with working groups we kind of rush to select a chair and vice chair and that often times the group wants to be constituted before and then having them kind of nominate their chair and vice chair. So, although we're going to approve this motion, perhaps we can have the group form, let them talk amongst themselves, and then not put so much pressure on them to have a permanent chair and vice chair.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Jeff. Zahid.

>>ZAHID JAMIL: Hi. I make this with great restraint. I want to first acknowledge the great work Olga has done. I think it's fantastic that we have this kind of work about outreach. I've always been a proponent, and so is the BC that we want to get underserved communities involved. We want to acknowledge especially the role that Olga has played and the hard work she's put into this. I think that is going to stay here. I have an apology. We in the BC discussed this on constituency day. And there was a request that we should defer this not because we're against it. This is just to be clear.

We're not against this. But just because we want to discuss it. There's a CSU working group and budget, and they wanted to provide some sort of consideration and probably input at some stage. So we -- the BC would be asking for deferral.

While we do that, we wanted to say that we do understand that the next motion you won't be on the council. But, Olga, I wanted you to know that we will be making the point on the council call that it was you who did this. It was Olga that really helped us get this through.

So I hope that's not taken in any sort of negative light. We just wanted to say thank you so much for all the hard work that you have done. It means so much to us, especially those from the developing countries, that you really took the lead on this. Thank you so much. Really appreciate it. Thanks.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Zahid. We do have a practice of allowing any group to ask for deferral of a motion. So we will honor that. However, there are still people in the queue, so I suggest we continue discussion on this. I have Wolf, Debbie, Julie standing up. So Wolf.

>>WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Thank you, Stephane. Thank you, as well, Olga, for the amount of work which has been done. And I was following that -- the development of this work.

However, by reading the motion and the charter itself, we -- in our constituency also we raised some question with regard specifics it means.

If you look at the -- at the overall targets of this group, we understand, are targeted to reach out to the GNSO, outreach for the GNSO. But, if you're going to the details and look to what is laid down in the charter, it sometimes seems to be that the borderline to an outreach to the entire ICANN community is very weak here. So it's not very clear.

So where is this borderline between what ICANN outreach means and GNSO outreach means. And this is -- I'm of support of what Zahid was saying to defer that so that we can discuss it in detail and come up with a more clear view on that. Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Wolf. Debbie?

>>DEBRA HUGHES: Thanks, Stephane. I just wanted to say, again, thanks to Olga. The OSC work group that I was on was actually the first work group that I joined as a GNSO Councillor and really appreciated her mentorship in helping me learn this very confusing process.

What I will say is, although I won't be on the council, I look forward to participating in the eventual activities of this group and would hope that the council will remember that, although this motion is being deferred, that the not-for-profit operational concerns constituency does fully support this motion and if you could please keep that in mind as further discussions continue. Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Debbie. Julie?

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you, Stephane. Very quickly just to address Jeff's point. Currently, as the charter is written, the chair and the vice chair are selected first because they are actually tasked with staff in the charter to do the recruitment process for the outreach task force. The drafting team envisioned that there would be a significant amount of outreach involved in getting the volunteers for the task force. So there isn't -- so we will have to, I think, consider that, you know, as we look at

the charter, since there is a deferral to the next meeting, as to whether or not we want to change that order. But the way it stands right now, it is -- and this is why the resolution was written this way, it is that the chair and the vice chair are selected first. Then they work to recruit the members. So I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

Thanks, Julie. That's useful. Any further comments? Yes, Olga.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Stephane. Just for clarification, the idea of the whole team was taken from the IGF, from the Internet Governance Forum, from the multistakeholder advisory committee to the United Nations General Secretary that I'm a member of and also Zahid is a member of.

And what we are, like ICANN, people all over the world. And we do participate on the line and sometimes in meetings but not necessarily. And we have remote participation. And the experience has been really very good. I've been a member of that group for more than five years.

So that's the idea. Maybe you can tell this to your stakeholder groups and explain the model. In the case that you want to review the document, it has been for revision for a while.

So thank you very much. And as I'm not -- will not be a member of the GNSO Council, I would like to be involved in this -- in this task force and help for the outreach efforts in Latin America. Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Olga. Jeff?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks, Julie, for the explanation. It could be solved by making an interim chair, interim vice chair and have the outreach. And, once the group is formed -- I'm just bringing it up, because others in the community have commented on how it seems like a daunting task to join workgroups and everything seems predetermined and, you know, it seems like a harsh environment for people to join working groups. So, in kind of recognition of that, perhaps we can make that one change.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Any further comments on this from the council? Any comments from the floor? Do we have -- Michele.

>>MICHELE NEYLON: I'm kind of echoing what was said earlier, I suppose, in some respects. A lot of people don't realize how easy it is to get involved in working groups, to get involved in policy process. You don't need to be a registrar. You don't need to be a registry. Don't need to be a member of a stakeholder group. You can get involved if you're a private individual. I think that's one thing where ICANN probably does fall down is to make that message clear that a normal human being who doesn't have any skin in the game, to use that expression, can get involved, can make their voice heard.

And for a lot of people, I think it's somebody introduces them to this or maybe they get dragged in somehow kicking and screaming. But, you know, there are millions and millions of Internet users. And, you know, there's only a tiny number of people who actually get involved in policy decisions that affect them all. I think that's a terrible disjoint. Especially when you see people saying that they represent thousands and thousands of users, and yet they probably really don't. They're so far away from the end user that they can't say that they're actually representing them. They might be trying

to. They might be doing their best job. But I don't honestly feel that they are representing them. Thanks.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Michele. Any further comments? Okay. We'll move on to the next agenda item. And this is an update from the cross community working group drafting team. The council has been looking at how we should go about interfacing or getting involved in, shall I say, cross community working groups. And this group has been looking at that question.

And we have Jonathan Robinson, the leader of the group, who is going to give us an update on the work being done in this group. Jonathan?

>>JONATHAN ROBINSON: Sorry, Stephane, just coordinating which button to press in which order.

There's one thing I want to make sure at the outset, in the interest of being clear, I'm not sure I know the difference between what a drafting team and a working group is. Can anyone clarify that? So we'll live with the mystery.

This is a GNSO group. And the background to this is that there has been an increased use of so-called cross community working groups, that is to say that have been chartered by more than one organization or advisory committee. And these are perceived to be or are actually of increasing importance. And their existence and perceived importance raises questions as to whether some form of special rules or guidelines with how to operate are needed.

I wouldn't want this to be overemphasized, but there is potential at least for -- some reluctance to form new CWGs until the council thought it would participate or in what framework they would function in the future.

So, in order to deal with this, the council established this drafting team. And, primarily, the focus was on developing a proposed function -- proposed framework that could form the basis on which, ultimately, the GNSO could participate with other SOs and ACs in developing policies and procedures in dealing with these groups in the future.

So that's just a summary of the members. One of the issues I'd like to raise is, like all of these things, we've heard a lot about volunteer fatigue, participation. There's plenty going on. So I'd love to encourage anyone who might volunteer to join this group to help. I'd like to make some real progress between now and the end of the year. And, to the extent that you are able to participate, either if you're on the list already or -- and can participate or if you'd like to join, please do.

There's a series of community working groups, cross community working groups going on or at least coming to the end of their function at the moment. So, for those of you that aren't familiar with the range of activities going on under this type of umbrella, that's a summary of it.

The -- we set about forming a charter by which this group would work. And that was approved by the GNSO on our last meeting on 6 of October. And, really, the key points were to develop a framework under which these jointly chartered working groups can both function effectively and produce meaningful and timely reports.

The primary goal being to develop a GNSO perspective as a departure point, really, for developing, perhaps, a more broader community -- common community understanding of the role, function, and method of these groups.

And, really, I guess one of the key concerns of one of the key principles was to ensure that, while I'm taking this kind of work, we respect and preserve the existing and recognized roles and responsibilities already assigned to each SO and AC.

So the drafting team, which has made not as much progress as I would like -- and I'd really like to push it forward between now and the end of the year, is really -- will endeavor to define for the GNSO at least a way forward for effective chartering as a minimum as well as functioning and utilization of these groups so that they operate effectively but within the existing ICANN structures and consistent with ICANN bylaws. But I've highlighted one key point in red. The GNSO drafting team simply operating in isolation would not be constructive. It's really, really important to emphasize that this is open to all who are interested in participating.

So, essentially, I'm going to run a workshop which will go through the draft principles of this group tomorrow morning. I believe it's on at around 8:30 a.m. tomorrow. So I'd really, really encourage anyone who's interested or has a view on the way in which these groups should or might function from the chartering functioning and utilization point of view, given their perceived importance in ICANN, I'd love to see you at that meeting tomorrow rolling up your sleeves, giving us your input and then, ideally, continuing to participate between now and the end of the year when we hope to produce a final report for the GNSO.

So, really, those are the next steps. It's -- we've sent the letters of outreach to the various SOs and ACs and asked for volunteers to participate in contributing to the drafting team.

Hopefully, we'll be available tomorrow morning, and, indeed, our intention is to produce a final report for the GNSO consideration by the end of the calendar year.

And that's it, Stephane. Thanks very much.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Any questions or comments, please, from the council.

I see no questions. It must have been a very clear presentation.

Are there any comments from the floor? Chuck.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I don't know if you caught the comment that Lesley, the chair of the ccNSO, made in the joint meeting on Monday. But she -- and I am not quoting her precisely, but she basically asks, "Are you doing this without the ccNSO?"

And so my caution -- And it was a valid question.

Obviously, the GNSO isn't the only player in communitywide working groups.

So my caution is, and Jonathan and I have had this discussion more than once, and he understands it, but I think it's good that the whole council understand it, be very careful how you describe what you are doing to avoid making it appear like the GNSO is going to create these guidelines and then

will ask the other SOs and ACs to bless it. I think if we're tactful there, it can be handled okay. But please avoid making it look like the GNSO is going to do this thing and we expect everybody else to follow.

And by the way, I don't think it's enough to just say that this group is open to everybody. At some point in time, there needs to be a group that involves the others that finalizes this.

Now, I think it's good. I have looked at the work that they have done, and I think it's really good work. So I'm not criticizing that at all.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Chuck, thanks.

I think not only did we catch the comment but we responded to it at the time, the comment having been made at the joint ccNSO/GNSO session that we had on Monday.

This group really is the GNSO asking itself the question before -- and getting a clear path forward before reaching out to others, and I think it's probably useful for the GNSO Council to get a clear vision of how it wants to move forward on this issue before taking it to the wider community.

So I just want to make it clear that this is no way an attempt to not outreach with others.

I saw -- well, Michele, you are standing up.

>>MICHELE NEYLON: I have been involved in a couple of working groups which had more than one chartering organization. I know Alan was on a couple of them with me and other people were as well. And to be perfectly honest, it was very, very, very confusing, because I would be bound or meant to be following what the GNSO was saying, and then somebody else from maybe ALAC or something, they had a completely different set of guidelines laid out to them.

So you are sitting there and the topic is the same, but it's groups of people talking about -- obviously coming from different angles but with a different charter, almost.

So you are there, and you are like, okay, this, for me, is out of scope. It's in scope for you. Why? What?

It's hard enough dealing with some of these topics under relatively clear circumstances. But when you have that level of confusion -- and I don't do policy for my day job. I am trying to run a company. My poor little head is going to almost explode.

So if there's something you can do to clarify that, it would be really, really helpful.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Michele. We will try to avoid that.

I have Alan, Olga, is your hand still up? Okay. Alan and then Jamie.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Responding first to Chuck. As the one foreigner on this group, when the drafting team was chartered or charged with a task, it was clear that it was to try to get the GNSO's ideas together before going and talking.

The GNSO has enough different opinions in it that there was some feeling that they should be working from one script before going and talking to other groups. Otherwise, it would be even more confusing.

So I didn't have a real problem with not being explicitly invited.

As of yesterday, the invitation was widened, and I will be there tomorrow, in any case.

With respect to Michele's comment, I think we have to treat (garbled audio) as a special case. The two charters we ended up with were not the chartering of a new group but the rechartering of an existing group. And as it turned out, the group itself said we have no problem working to two different charters as long as it was clear what the overlap or different parts were, and it proceeded on those grounds.

I would find it a lot harder to do that with a brand-new group which didn't exist ahead of time.

So I wouldn't let that particular case be considered the rule. Whether we ever have another Joint Working Group with multiple charters, I am not going to try to guess. But that one was really a certainly case. It was a rechartering issue. The group was comfortable with the situation. In the end, it worked out just fine.

So I wouldn't try to change the rules going forward forever based on that one rather unusual case.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Alan.

Jamie.

>>JAIME WAGNER: Well, Alan made a point, I think, trying to respond to Chuck. We must have a very clear approach to this inside the GNSO. And I think inside GNSO, there are many points of discussion on how to face the -- I will say in quotes -- "problem" of multi-chartered groups. So I suggest that this group focus on the chartering, because the problem arises when there are different charters for a group like that.

If the charter is the same and it is subscribed by all those, there is no problem.

And we should discuss this inside the GNSO, the multi-chartering of these cross-community working groups. And once this is discussed -- But obviously, this discussion would benefit from points of view of other SOs and ACs. That's why this group is open to all, as any other group in the GNSO, to anyone that would like to participate and give his input.

But we should fix our point of view on how to face this multi-chartering inside GNSO.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Jamie.

Jonathan.

>>JONATHAN ROBINSON: First, Stephane, just a couple of comments. I will be very brief.

Mindful of the prospect of being thought of working in a vacuum or however one might want to express it, I think that was very clear in our minds in making the outreach, notwithstanding the fact that there is, at the same time, an attempt to straighten out the GNSO perspective on this.

And so in that context and hearing Chuck's point, it's very clear that the next step beyond the work of this drafting team is a broader community-based effort in order to resolve the effective use and functioning of community (garbled audio) working groups more broadly than simply the GNSO's perspective. And that is what was very important in setting off on this route, that we didn't go off on a tangent without having any reference to other groups.

So hopefully we will get that input. And I should say that the draft, with reference to Michele's point, the draft principles which we are outlining work through tomorrow do include the concept of a single charter for any CWG.

Thank you very much.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Jonathan.

Any other comments from the council or from the floor?

So let's move on to the next agenda item which is the geo regions working group. That group is currently drafting its final report. The final report is expected sometime early next year, and this is an item that's designed to update the council on the work of the group and to ensure that the council is fully aware of it.

To give us that update we have Rob Hoggarth who is ready, I think, to give us the update.

Rob.

>>ROB HOGGARTH: Yes, thank you, Stephane. We have slides up on the screen for those of how want to follow along.

My presentation is going to be a little bit briefer than we made to the council on Saturday.

Just a quick overview of why this effort is under way and as a prelude to note that, following up on Jonathan's mark, this is the result of a Joint Working Group established by the board.

There is an effort being undertaken by this working group because it's required by the bylaws of ICANN. The ccNSO council requested the working group be formed and that the board undertake its bylaw obligation back in 2007. The board agreed. It reached out to the community, established this Cross-Community Working Group work team which then developed a charter which was passed by the board in 2009.

The working group has followed through a three-step process. It's been through the first two steps. An initial report, which was fundamental research, and a second report, which was essentially an overview of the potential recommendations that the working group called its interim report.

The group has now drafted a final report that's been posted for public comment. And I will touch on that in a moment.

The role that the GNSO Council has played in this effort was to very early on respond to the board's request for input. And the council essentially produced a set of principles, talking in general about the relevance of regions and the potential for changes in the number of the regions. And additionally, the working group supplied two representatives to participate in the working group.

Zahid and Olga are your current representatives, and I will be looking for them to correct or clarify any of the remarks that I am making today.

The findings of the report are fairly simple. I am not going to go through the whole report for you. There is going to be a workshop tomorrow at 12:30 in room B5 and 6 where you can get some more details on this. But fundamentally, what the working group found is the general principle of geographic diversity continues to be valuable to ICANN and needs to be preserved. They also determined, however, that functional types of diversity, languages and cultures, are commonalities that are also important, and there may be additional areas of commonality that the board should consider. They basically decided that changing the number of regions would cause some significant financial and organizational issues, and they looked at a wide variety of potential other options, finding essentially that there was no common single independent authoritative way that any international community or more than one international community followed.

The approach that they have suggested is a twofold one. A combination of top-down and bottom-up.

Essentially they have said that ICANN should continue to maintain a formal top-down arrangement where there is a regional structure that's applied to the board and that is available for all the supporting organizations, advisory committees and other structures to use. But at the same time, harkening back to that concept of potentially additional components like cultural diversity, language diversity or other economic factors, they recognize it's important to provide for the flexibility for individual communities to develop their own approaches.

And as long as there's some form of board oversight, that that's something that should not only be identified but encouraged.

The specific recommendations that the group made are essentially to look to the Regional Internet Registry structure and look at that as a starting point for a foundation of the geographic regions. The advantage of that is that it doesn't change the number of regions, and so the geographic regions within ICANN would remain at five.

Very important because there would be a number of potential country allocations to regions would change. The group is also recommending a process by which countries could say, "I don't want to move. Wasn't to stay in the same place."

And again, as I noted earlier, a top-down structure could be applied, but that individual structures could have their own opportunities to be flexible as well.

So the next steps essentially are that the public comment forum is open. Individual members of the community have the opportunity to comment, share their points of view through the middle of December. December 19th is when the comment period closes. I have the 14th up there. It's been a little bit longer than that.

The working group is going to look at what community input they get and potentially modify or change their recommendations. The chair of the working group, Dave Archbold has been active, responding to a lot of invitations from various community groups and speaking this week. As I

indicated, he has an hour and a half, along with other members of the working group, to talk with community members tomorrow, early afternoon, in the convention area.

After that time, once the working group finishes its final report, that's the point at which the GNSO Council members or other who choose to participate before the middle of December can submit formal comments as SOs and ACs. According to the charter of the working group, the group is making its recommendations, and then because the working group is made up of representatives of most of the SOs and ACs, there will be an opportunity for comment. That is something you all should consider factoring into your workload and looking at probably in the mid -- early to mid-2012 time frame where you will have this potentially on your agenda. Which then puts board review and potential final action probably this time next year.

So I will stop there. There is plenty of additional information from the working group on the Wiki. They have all their documents setting out there. There is the public comment forum and of course the workshop tomorrow.

I am happy to answer any questions but I encourage Zahid to correct any of my remarks.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Any clarification of Rob's remarks?

Zahid and Olga.

>>ZAHID JAMIL: This is Zahid just saying that we do need to, on council side, who after Olga is going to be the representative of the council. This is just an action point we wanted to discuss.

And I wanted to say I haven't been doing as much work on this as Olga has, and again, appreciating her role here.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Zahid.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Stephane. I would like to thank especially Robert and all the working team and also the chair of the working team. They have actually -- Really, they did most of the work that we have been following.

And I think that the document will be quite explanatory and good. So I encourage those of you who want to have more information to go to the workshop tomorrow or review the document that has been for public comments and reviewed several times for all of us.

Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks to you both. We do have the action point after the discussion part of the agenda on this item. So we will have to look, as Zahid has said, at the question of who can act as GNSO rep to this group, as Olga will be stepping down from the council at the end of this meeting.

Before we open this up, any further discussion on this from the council or the floor?

Seeing no hands raised, I would like to open up discussion on choosing or having a volunteer for service on this group. The current council representatives are Olga and Zahid.

Zahid, are you comfortable with continuing in that role?

>>ZAHID JAMIL: Yes, I am. I mean, if there were other people who were interested, I am happy to also not be there. But either way. I'm fine.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Do we have volunteers now? If not, we will take it off-line.

Ching.

>>CHING CHAO: Actually, I would like to also thank to Zahid and Olga. If there's an opportunity for me to contribute on this particular group, I will be happy to join.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much.

So we have Ching volunteering to take Olga's place, I guess.

Any opposition to that?

Good. Well done.

We have a new rep. Thank you very much. Let's move on to an update from the ASO chair, Louie on -- Louie Lee, sorry, on -- the -- The idea for this item came out of the discussion that Louie and I had in Singapore, I believe, where we realized that there was probably not enough, both, interaction between the GNSO and the ASO and knowledge and understanding at -- certainly at GNSO Council level, of the work the ASO was doing.

We had planned to have a session during our weekend sessions with Louie, and there was a problem withholding that session at that time. We asked Louie to, if possible, come and address the council during this open meeting, and Louis was very kind and set aside a few minutes to come and address us.

So I will pass the mic over to him. Louis. Thank you.

>>LOUIE LEE: Thank you, Stephane.

Hi. I am Louie Lee, and sorry about the delay here.

We have been on a road show, basically, going around to the different groups.

We have a workshop, a two-hour workshop, on Wednesday afternoons. But depending on schedule conflicts, like you guys had today, it's hard for you all to come to a two-hour meeting.

So we have been going around to the different groups, and there have been very different formats: closed meetings, open meetings, U-shaped tables, speaking from the floor right now, speaking from the table.

So we're working out how to get my presentation up here right now.

And I'm comfortable walking around if that's needed.

Okay. I'm the chair of the ASO address council. And the presentation will come up in a moment. But to go through the agenda, we'll go through what we're about, how we're formed, our global policies, and what the address council is made up of.

And we will cover a little bit of the policy development process, our PDP; our principles, roles, basic setup; and the global PDP. We may also have a couple of minutes to go over our current global policy that's in process now and expect to be sending to the board in a couple months' time, several months' time.

And we will open it up for some questions, and you have in front of you some information, details about the ASO, the ISOC. Thank you for holding that up. And information on how to participate.

Not yet? No?

And go!

All right.

About the ASO. We are formed with an MOU signed between the NRO and ICANN back in October '04.

This -- It says that the NRO fulfills a role of the ASO. And the NRO number council fulfills a role of the ASO address council.

Now, it also defines the global policy development process as a 15-step process, and it's based on the regional policy development process. Basically, that the regions each have to pass the same text, the same policy, before it's passed on to the ASO address council, which will qualify it, review it, qualify, and send it on to the ICANN board.

About the ASO global number policy.

That's defined within this agreement. It's Internet number resource policies that have the agreement of all the RIRs according to their own policy development process.

Sorry about that. I think I might have yanked that.

And they require specific actions or outcomes on the part of IANA, or another ICANN-related body.

So for the most part, the global proposals, global policies determine the number allocation point of impact for requests from the IANA -- from the RIRs to the IANA. So it guides how IANA assigns addresses to the RIRs. Who, in turn, will pass on to their customers, which could be NIRs. And it's still not coming on.

And we're back.

All right. The address council comprised of the 15 elected and appoints individuals from all five regions, three from each region. I am surmising it's similar to the makeup of your council where you have a representative from each of your constituencies.

Now, this is an independent body separate from the RIR management and from the board. So we oversee the global policy development, appoint two ICANN Board of Directors, serve on ICANN

bodies: NomCom, AoC review teams. And we also advise the ICANN board on number resource matters.

Now, our development process principles include open forum with an open policy mailing list and policy meetings. It's transparent in that the policy development process is documented. The PDP itself, the policies and the meetings are all documented. It's bottom-up in that it's consensus based. And the RIRs do not dictate policy. They simply implement it.

Sorry about that.

Al turn your head. Okay. We're still on. Great.

The roles of this policy development process. We have the community. They are the ones who submit policy proposals. They also discuss the policy proposals amongst themselves. And amongst themselves meaning on a mail list, at the meetings, in the hallways, what have you, to work out what people want, why they want it, and where the (indiscernible) and craft a good policy.

Then we have a consensus evaluator. So after all the discussion has been going on, take votes to determine whether the major objections are considered, things like that.

And beyond that, after that, we have the board who provide fiduciary and process oversight, ratify policy. Some of this can be done by the working groups within the RIRs.

And then we have RIR staff. They conduct assessments of proposal impacts and implement ratified policy.

Actually, we have various members from the ASO sprinkled amongst you in the audience. They make up the board of the RIRs, CEOs, staff, and I believe there are also just people who would consider themselves community members. If you would just kind of raise your hand a bit, wave, people know you're here. Do you hear me?

John?

Suzanne?

Hi, Suzanne. Thank you.

Great.

The basic steps in our PDP, community individuals and groups submit a proposal. And then the community discusses, like I have said.

Whoa. Okay. I will stop doing that.

Okay. With the 15 minutes and all these problems, you can read this extensively in the guides that you have received.

These basic steps are important in that they are the ones that are the same across all regions. There are minor differences in, say, timeline, requirements to have a full meeting, things of that nature. But essentially they are all the same.

For global process, it is, after it's gone through all five, they can get passed up to the ASO as a common text.

The ASO AC will process by reviewing it to make sure there is common agreement in the common text, and there is adequate consideration for all of the viewpoints.

If the review is successful, the AC forwards that proposal to the ICANN board for other option. If not successful, the board -- or the ASO can send it back to the NRO which will, in turn, pass it down to the RIRs for more consideration, more work.

This implies the ICANN board automatically adopts. Of course they need to have their review, also. Put it out for community input because of their own bylaws. But the implementers are IANA.

Since 2001, we have had nine global policy proposals, of which six are adopted. One is under discussion, and two are abandoned. And you can see these in the URL posted.

So since it was so fast, I don't think I need to review that. But I will jump real quick to the current global policy proposal.

Okay.

Designated GPP-IPv4 2011. This is the global policy for post-exhaustion IPv4 allocation mechanisms by the IANA. Simply stated, it allows IANA to receive address space from the RIR, should address space reclaimed, brought back, sent back by somebody who doesn't need it and cannot sell it for their own reasons. And it allows IANA, more importantly, to allocate this address space back to the RIRs so that these addresses, these IPv4 addresses that people really want is not stranded at IANA. Because, without this policy, there is no policy now for IANA to send these addresses back to the RIRs to distribute back to the community.

As you see the status here, AfricNIC is in last call. APNIC has abandoned it. I'm sorry. Adopted. Big difference. Adopted. ARIN is in last call. It says here LACNIC is in last call. There's an update today. It's been adopted. And so has RIPE.

And, just a brief summary of the regional policies activities. Across all five regions there are 40 IPv4 policies that were worked on. They cover allocation, reclamation, and transfer. Transfer being between individuals, between organizations, companies, within an RIR, also across RIRs. This way it will allow cross regional transfers to places where they need it the most.

Six IPv6 address policies. Five WHOIS changes. Yes, there is a WHOIS in the reverse. And one other one.

So in all there are 52 in the later half of 2011 that they can work on.

So, in closing, you can watch the ASO AC web for news, ASO.icann.org. You can also participate in the policy discussions in your region. You can also participate outside your region. There are no membership requirements. You do not need to reside in any of the regions. You do not need to be a paying member or free member. You can submit proposals across regions. If you see a need, that will get discussed. And, if it's a good proposal, it will get accepted. If it's not, well, perhaps it will get worked on a bit to be made into a good proposal.

Subscription to the policy memos. No membership requirements. You may attend in person or via remote participation for free.

So that concludes my presentation. And I hope I'm within your 15 minutes.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Louie. Thanks very much. Let that be a lesson to us all. We don't want to do presentations with an iPad.

>>LOUIE LEE: Agreed.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Are there any questions for Louie at this time? Yes, behind you.

>>NAOMASA MARUYAMA: About the open policy meeting, you said it's free. But it's not free. They all five RIRs are collecting the registry fee for the policy meeting attendees. So that is something not -- saying open policy meeting. And this is -- I have -- actually, I have attended the APNIC meeting more than 10 years ago, I think. And at that time I think it was free. But, currently, all five RIRs collected money from the attendees as a registration fee. I strongly urge you to abolish that.

>>LOUIE LEE: So I think John would like to address that. This is John Curran, CEO of ARIN.

>>JOHN CURRAN: Yes, I'm CEO of ARIN. I'm also here. Raul Echebarria, who is the chairman of the MRO, Member Resource Organization, which coordinates some of the RIR work could not be here. So I'm here as secretary of that organization on his behalf.

All of us have meeting expenses, obviously, to recover. And, because not all of our members who benefit from registration services decide to go to the meetings, we separate those. But the costs -- administrative costs of a meeting is generally on par with any other professional conference. And anyone can participate in the policy process. Remote attendance is something we all excel at with the RIRs. You can participate online; you can ask questions; you can participate, in some cases, in remote polls. So, even if you don't want to pay the conference fee to attend the meeting, you can still participate without any charge as a remote participant. I know it's not the same and some people want those bundled. It's up to each RIR to make the decision whether or not it wants to bundle the cost of conference attendance into its registration fees or not. It's up to each RIR to make that decision.

>>NAOMASA MARUYAMA: That is -- I strongly disagree. That is the -- the policy development process is the real important part of the IP policy. And all five RIRs are collecting the fee from the -- their end -- what it is, regional ISPs, that is the recipient of the addresses. And that is the source of money. The open policy meeting should be funded. That is my strong belief. And to look at the -- for the example, last meeting last August in person to look at the revenue and expenses of the 2011 APNIC, it's enough -- they have enough money to support that.

So I strongly urge you to abolish the registration fee for the participants. And, also, it's very important to say that the participant for the policy meetings are people who are contributing to the RIRs. That should be free.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Gentleman, sorry. I don't want to cut into an argument here. If you just let me finish. Thank you very much. And this is -- we were here to discuss how the GNSO and the SO could work together, understand each other better. This is slightly off topic, and we do still

have agenda items. So I'd like to cut it short here. And, please, by all means, we can have this discussion off line, I'm sure, just as productively.

>>JOHN CURRAN: May I ask something of the chair? He made a point, which is incorrect, regarding attendance at the meetings, caused people not to participate that I feel an obligation to correct.

The participation in the meetings is not just to the ISPs. All of the RIRs have an open meeting process. So anyone, specifically anyone -- ISPs, civil society, governments -- can all participate. And the request to change that runs contrary to ICANN's actual formation. So point taken. I wanted to correct that so people don't think they cannot participate. Our meetings are open to absolutely everyone who wishes to attend, whether remote or on-site.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, both. Any further questions for Louie?

>>LOUIE LEE: May I ask one?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yes.

>>LOUIE LEE: What would you like to hear from us? What topics would you like us to develop? Or is that something we'd like to take that offline and work on?

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I don't know. If any council members would like to answer that now, by all means. Perhaps we will take it offline.

Louie, thank you very much for your presentation. And we'll definitely keep this going.

>>LOUIE LEE: Great. Thank you, sir. And everyone.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. We'll now move to the last of our regular agenda items, which is a discussion of the final issue report on a possible PDP on the UDRP. This item will be introduced by Margie with a short presentation. And then we'll open it up for discussion. Margie?

>>MARGIE MILAM: Thank you, Stephane, I went through an extensive description of the final issue report on Saturday, so I'm not going to do that today. I just want to give you an overview of what happened.

There was a preliminary issue report published prior to the Singapore meeting. We published it for public comment on the current state of the UDRP. And then, prior to Dakar, we published the final issue report. So, for the council's perspective, the next step is to decide whether or not to initiate a PDP on the UDRP.

And in the report we did have a recommendation against initiating a PDP at this time. And I went through extensive discussion on that on the Saturday session. But I just leave it up there in case it has -- if it's something you want to talk about.

So, really, it's up to the council now to decide whether or not to pursue a PDP on the UDRP.

And there's just links to information on this slide, if people in the audience would like to get more information. Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Margie. So, as you just said, the reason we had this agenda item on today was that we could try and get an idea of where the council wanted to take this. Can I open up for discussion? Does anyone -- Jeff?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So the registry stakeholder group had a long discussion on this action item. And the registries made comments in the preliminary issue report. We were in favor of initiating a PDP. However, due to a number of the comments that were received by the IPC and especially the GAC, we're going to be introducing a motion at the next meeting for a delay but with concrete deliverables. In other words, we've heard loud and clear that the IPC and the GAC do not want a PDP done until 18 months after the launch of the first TLD, or sorry, the first new gTLD.

So the motion that the registries are going to put forward will, basically -- I'm sorry. There was one other thing asked for by the IPC, which was that it related to all rights protection mechanisms, not just the UDRP. So the motion that we're going to introduce at the next meeting -- so it doesn't come as a surprise, and so you all can talk about it -- will be to ask for the delivery of an issue report on all rights protection mechanisms to be delivered to the council by no later than 18 months after the launch of the first gTLD. "Launch," I guess, we'll define as delegation into the root, which is as clear and concrete as we can get it. This way it doesn't look to the community that we're just delaying for delay's sake and that we are making progress, although, granted, it's going to be a little while before that happens. You know, we don't want to just delay and then -- like we did in 2003 where there was a delay and now it's eight years later and there's still been no review. So, hopefully, that will meet the -- that will be accepted by the IPC and the GAC who specifically made these comments. So I want to throw that out for discussion, if anyone wants to talk about that. And, you know, we have a lot of time between now and the next meeting. So it would be great if we can get that voted on.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Jeff. I have Konstantinos, Kristina, Alan.

>>KONSTANTINOS KOMAITIS: Thanks. You said you discussed extensively yesterday at the constituency meeting. And the position is we'd much rather see that the UDRP is open for PDP at this stage.

So I would like to get that on the record, because we really feel that the UDRP is the oldest ICANN policy. And it should be reviewed. And out of fear is that we will end up with the same scenario like in 2002 and 2003 when these discussions started taking place, and the UDRP was never reviewed.

Now, having said that, we would be willing to discuss and having the council to commit when the UDRP is -- when the council considers that the UDRP should open up for a review. And thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Konstantinos.

Kristina?

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Actually, if you could come back to me.

>>ZAHID JAMIL: Hi. Just want to say there's a difference between the review and, actually, the PDP. Just wanted to make that point.

Secondly, with respect to the UDRP, I think if we're going to focus on various rights protection mechanism, the review, I think we should do it holistically. Together. I made this point before -- I'm

going to make it again -- that, if we're going to have review or we're going to look into the RPMs, we should do them all together. The UDRP forms the basis and foundation. Any change in that will automatically naturally consequently impact the rest of the RPMs that we worked on together. So there's going to be review or any other change that has to be done in the context and while we're reviewing all the RPMs. And I guess that can only take place once we had the new gTLD launch.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks. Zahid. Alan.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I don't object to any of the logic in what Jeff was proposing. In fact, I think I was the one who suggested what the ultimate proposed resolution is. I'll just point out that, if we don't start -- don't do an issue report for 18 months at the 18 months after the launch, that's roughly three years from now, it's likely to be a complex PDP, which means we will not see any changes in -- or actually in place on the UDRP for about six years from now. Wondering if the parties who are really involved in this consider that acceptable.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Alan. Jonathan?

>>JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Stephane. I think two points. One, Zahid, just in response to what you said, as far as I heard what Jeff said and what I understand the registries position to be is this would be to include all rights protection mechanisms and issues report covering all. So you've got that.

The second point is, I think, just as a sort of softer context point, one of the issues we discussed was an awareness of the strength of feeling that exists. So we could -- on the one hand, there's the point of principle we all discussed should be reviewed. It's a time for review. It's the oldest policy and so on.

But we're also mindful of the strength of feelings and of strongly-held views across the council. And one of the things that the council has got to come to terms with is -- and effective functioning and, as much as possible, working together. So that was a softer context point in our way of thinking in terms of that as well, so I'll just make that remark.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Jonathan. Debbie?

>>DEBRA HUGHES: Thank you, Stephane. Jeff, I wanted to say thank you for providing this information. I haven't, obviously, had a chance to talk about this with our new constituency. But I can say that our constituency did talk about potential review of the UDRP, as I mentioned in our earlier report. And I think that our members would certainly support the approach that you're taking. Obviously, we haven't seen the motion. But I did want to get on the record, since I won't be here, that our constituency looks forward to seeing what you propose.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Kristina, back to you.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Thank you. Jeff, just on behalf of IPC, I'd like to thank the registry stakeholder group for taking our concerns into consideration on this point. This is something that our members feel extraordinarily strongly about. And with the caveats that I -- you know, we haven't seen a motion and that I lose my right to vote in about 20 minutes, I would expect that we would certainly support that motion.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Jeff.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: And perhaps maybe I can request some assistance with the motion with an IPC member, so I'm sure to get it right. It's the concept I talked about. And, you know, the wording I want to make sure is acceptable. So, if anyone wants to help me with that motion, I'd gladly take some assistance with that. I want to make it acceptable to everyone.

And same thing with the non-commercial side. Want to make sure to address your concerns as well.

I just want to address something that Alan said and just kind of set something straight in the record. I heard a lot of discussion at the registries over the weekend, and certainly for the past several months, that the registries have an interest in changing. The only reason they're pushing it so hard is that they want to change the UDRP.

And that's never been true. There's never been a set of changes that the registries have advocated. We've just been on the principle of reviewing it. So, when Alan says that may not result in change for six years, the only thing I have to say is we're not entering into this review to change it. And so that's acceptable to us. Whatever timeline it takes, we need to do a review. And we need to make sure that it is doing what it's intended to do.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Jeff.

I have Mary, Brian, Alan, Konstantinos. Mary?

>>MARY WONG: Thanks, Stephane. As Konstantinos said, the NCUC's preference, as expressed in the public comments recently, is to launch the PDP. That's not a secret to anybody. I'd like to follow up on that and on Alan's comment about the breadth and the size of the task of this. And, if we then bundle in everything that happens in 18 months or three years time, it's going to make it more large, complex, and long. At the same time, as seen in the reports as well as in some of the public comments, there are some very specific issues and some very specific concerns about the UDRP now that could well be addressed. I'm not saying that it's a foregone conclusion by launching the UDRP they will be addressed. First stage is to get a charter, former working group, scope out the issues. It may well be that the scope of issues would be, well, we thought these are things that could be done in 18 months but they're not. Or it could be these are the six things that people actually think could be done without having to wait for the other stuff coming down the pike.

As such, we would urge at least further serious consideration of doing a PDP now with those kinds of things in mind, not precluding folding in the additional things that will probably concern us after the launch and the new RPMs.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Mary. Brian?

>>BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Thank you, again, with the caveat that Kristina had that we haven't gone back to our constituency. But we definitely are excited to see what Jeff puts together. And I want to also volunteer to work with him to make sure that the IPC has input. And we appreciate the opportunity to do that.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Brian. Alan?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Just in response to Jeff, to be clear, I wasn't implying the registrar -- the registry stakeholder group had any changes in mind. I was just pointing out that, should any changes result from a -- an eventual PDP, it would be six years plus or so, before they actually were implemented. Not implying anyone's intent.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Alan, thanks. Konstantinos.

>>KONSTANTINOS KOMAITIS: Thanks, Stephane, I would just like to add that we really think that there are some issues that we can start discussing right now and possibly review the UDRP without waiting to see how the new RPMs will play out. And, to be more specific, I think that these issues can concern the relationship between ICANN and the accredited centers, concerns issues of conflict of interest, and also concerns issues of forum shopping.

Having said that, I would also like to put myself forward to work with Jeff, if he wants to, for the motion. Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much. Any further comments? Any comments from the floor? Michele.

>>MICHELE NEYLON: Just in relation to any kind of review or whatever the word you want to use with respect to the UDRP. As a registrar, I personally have issues from an operational level with the policy as it is currently written. There are gray areas. There are areas where it's not clear. If you are not a large registrar with in-house legal counsel, it's problematic. It's not clear what time you are meant to act in certain ways. It's not clear what time you should do certain things to a domain name that is subject to dispute. That, for me, is a problem. I do not want to end up in a situation where I'm going to have to wait six years to see a change and for the next six years I'm going to have to deal with arbitration decisions that could leave me in all sorts of pain and suffering.

And I would wish -- I would wish the council would actually move forward with some kind of -- even a tweak at an operational level would make life easier for registrars such as ourselves. Thanks.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks a lot, Michele.

Any further comments? Marika.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: This is Marika. If I could just remind those that will be working on the motion that there's still the outstanding recommendation of the IRT Part B working group that is linked to this issue. So maybe take note of that and address that as well in your motion.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Any further comments?

In which case we'll bring this part of the agenda to a close. And now move on to something which requires me to grab

In which case, we will bring this part of the agenda to a close and now move on to something which requires me to grab my mic, if I can turn it on, which I can't.

Okay.

So as you know, we have a number of councillors who will be leaving us after this meeting, and as you also know, I'm sure, working the council requires a lot of work, a lot of dedication, a lot of patience, sometimes a sense of humor. So we just wanted to, as a council, say a proper goodbye to those councillors, a proper thank you for the years of effort, dedication, work, and, well, courage, I guess at helping the GNSO and the community at large work through some important policy issues and.

And to do that, we have a few presents to give out.

So I am now going to stand up and walk around the room with my little list, and my little bag of presents, and try to honor all the councillors as best I can.

I will start with, ladies first, Olga Cavalli, of course.

Olga, thank you very much for your time on the council.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: And from all of us, thanks very much.

Olga, serving as an NCA, will be leaving us at the end of this council meeting.

Next I would like to honor Rosemary Sinclair; however, she is not here at this meeting. So we will -- Rosemary --

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: We will send your present in the post. You will probably get it next year because you are far away. That's what Adrian told me to say, anyway.

So next we have Debbie Hughes. Debbie has been with us for a relatively short amount of time compared to some of the people that we're saying goodbye to, but we have all enjoyed your company, Debbie. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: And please stay involved.

Sorry. I have to run back to my list.

I'm trying to -- Kristina has conveniently slipped out of the room. She had warned me she might do that, but I will track her down. Kristina Rosette, IPC councillor, has been a long-time on the council, a long-time serving council member.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you for the applause.

And then Jamie who has represented the ISPs on the council will also be leaving us.

So, Jamie, from the council, with appreciation. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: I'm not going to kiss you but I will shake your hand.

I have got something special for you.

So next we have Andrei who is also an NCA who served in the --

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: -- contracted parties house this last term. Andrei, I am going to walk all the way over there and give you your present.

I should tell a story while I'm walking, but -- thank you very much, Andrei. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Next we have Tim Ruiz, who is a registrar rep and also a long-time and very experienced councillor, just like Kristina is.

Ah, there she is. Kristina, you are not going to escape this.

And Tim is not here. He is participating remotely. So, Tim, a round of applause, and your present will be in the mail.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Kristina has come back so we can now honor her.

Tim, did you want to say something?

>> (Off microphone).

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: So Kristina, I wasn't able to give you your present earlier on, so I can give it to you now. Here you are.

[Applause].

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: And a round of applause for Kristina.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Thank you.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Who is left? Who is left? Let me -- I think we have done it -- Have we not done everybody? Is there someone left?

Oh, okay. So Adrian Kinderis, thank you very much for your entertaining time on the council, and here is a present from all of us.

Adrian has a farewell speech he wants to give, and I am going to allow that. But he has told me the speech is 25 minutes long, so if you can all bear with us. And obviously, because we also have an

issue with the gala tickets tonight. We are unable to get some for the people on the council at the moment, so Adrian is going to provide the entertainment instead.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: Get comfortable, folks. This was supposed to be a smoke machine and a band, but they must have been waylaid.

I was going to say, I think I will take the opportunity on behalf of the council, because I do that. This is in my personal capacity, and I have not spoken to my Registrar Stakeholder Group. Thank Christ I don't have to say that anymore.

But I just wanted to say thank you to all the support we get from the staff. They are amazing. Glen is a very dear friend of mine. I have built up a very good relationship with her over the journey. She has looked after all of us. She is a very sweet lady and I don't think I have ever met anyone quite as nice.

So thank you, Glen.

[Applause]

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: I knew when I got on the council very early that it was going to be an experience when Marilyn Cade cornered me. She hadn't spoken a word to me before that, and told me that I needed to listen to everything she said, and hasn't said a word to me since.

So I knew I was going to be in for a bit of a good time. But I have been ably supported, as I assume all of our stakeholder groups do. But I got on the council early when Bruce got up to the board. I had Ross Raider and Tom Keller with me and they were fantastic. I would like to thank Tim Ruiz and Stephane Van Gelder.

What are you doing? You want to be able to retort, don't you? I want to thank Tim Ruiz and Stephane Van Gelder very much for their assistance in bringing me up to speed. And I think I'm probably a good example for those out there that think they know nothing sitting in the audience, and that this whole experience is too much and there's too many acronyms to learn and everything else. And I think that you will find the people are very, very accommodating when you do take that first step. And I didn't know all that much. I just know I had something to say. I have always got something to say, but whether it makes any sense or not is a different point.

But I --

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Only 20 more minutes to go.

>>ADRIAN KINDERIS: I am nearly finished if you will let me go.

So I just wanted to say some parting remarks, if you like.

I think that we tend to beat ourselves up because we argue so much on the council, and I think we are much maligned externally because of that.

However, I have always believed, and if you know me, you will understand why, that arguments are a good thing. We all have different perspectives. All we need to do is make sure that we respect

them. But you are quite entitled to argue. And we are never ever going to have, like in ccNSO, a unified position. What we strive to do is get consensus.

And I think that the GNSO Council very, very much externally gets bad reviews.

These guys put a hell of a lot of work in, a lot more than I have been able to contribute over the time, and you ought to give them a break. Because no one here is in an easy position. They have all got axes to grind from their stakeholder groups, and they have all got positions that they need to play.

So I think you ought to cut them some slack. And I'll certainly be working from outside trying to promote that having had this experience.

I have been able -- And I think also you should give -- cut ICANN some slack. I have been able to see the process from the inside now. And I think from the outside, you can moan and get upset about things moving slow and why is this like it is, but it's not until you actually look behind the curtain that you realize that there are a lot of moving parts and there are a lot of perspectives, and they all need to be respected in some way, shape or form.

And with that in mind, I think we should also cut ICANN and ICANN staff some break because they are the ones trying to accommodate all this.

So I wanted to part with those words and I apologize taking up time. I know it is late in the day.

I want to thank everybody for giving me this opportunity. I have learned a hell of a lot. My business has benefited from me being here, and I think that's fair. I have dedicated a lot of time. My business will continue to dedicate time to this industry and volunteer our time.

So thank you very, very much to my councillors. Thanks for the good times. I will miss our Saturday night meetings and singing '80s tunes to the wee hours of the morning. Stephane you are doing a fantastic job, mate, and you are a good mate, too. So I appreciate it.

Thanks everybody.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much, Adrian.

Olga, I know you want to speak.

Before you do, can I just also have a thought for one councillor that isn't here for a very good reason, that's David Taylor. I know his wife Sarah has just given birth to baby Grace, so congratulations to the Taylors.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Olga.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Stephane.

I came here to learn, four years ago. And why did I choose GNSO? Because I thought it was the Supporting Organization that did the most complicated documents and things.

And, guys, you have challenged me so much. From the very first day until today.

So I'm really honored for that, because I just am an investigator, university teacher, technical advisor. I don't have a company, I don't belong to a big corporation. And for me, you challenging me and putting me in that position of understanding and talking and going through all of these documents has been such a learning experience.

So I'm really honored for that.

And I thank all of you, all the council members, the chairs, the vice chairs, and especially also the staff for being so kind for me, having such patience. And believe me, my English is much better now after four years.

Thank you.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Olga, thank you very much. And I know, Tim, you want to say a few words.

>> (Off microphone).

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Tim.

Guys, you know I like to run a tight ship. We are nearly at the end of the meeting. But Jamie and Andrei.

>>JAIME WAGNER: I would just like to thank everybody. Chair and Glen, single out from. But all the staff, everybody.

Thank you very much for this very profound learning experience, and for your companionship. And also my English isn't getting better, but -- okay. What can I do?

But many thanks to all of you, and to the support of my constituency also.

Thank you.

[Applause]

>>ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yeah, I will be really short. This kind of experience, you basically can't get in many places on this planet. I mean, GNSO is setting up something new, which I believe will come to the change of this world, including the political (garbled audio). I think all the weird word multistakeholder is, and it has been repeated many times. But I am very proud. Thank you. Thank you councillors, thank you staff, and I love you all. You are great.

[Applause]

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Andrei. I think most people will probably think that's a good thing that you can't get this experience anywhere else. But thanks to you all. We will miss you guys a great deal.

I know it's certainly been a pleasure for me to -- I obviously want to thank ICANN staff as well because they are doing a great job. I obviously can't say enough of Glen, Marika, Margie, Liz, Rob and the others.

I also want to give a special thanks to the co-chairs and especially Mary, whom I believe will be leaving that position. Mary, thank you very much for the work that you have done with us, and it's been great working with both you and Jeff this year.

[Applause]

>>MARY WONG: Thank you, Stephane. Thank you all. I am not going to make this a long speech, not just because it's late but because you are stuck with me for another year. I will still be on the council.

So I just wanted to thank Stephane and Jeff and all the ICANN staff for their support, for the camaraderie and for teaching me a whole lot. I would like to thank all the councillors for their support and their friendship this last year. And I look forward to staying on the council for one year, and I would very much welcome the opportunity to work with the leadership team that will be coming up, including the new vice chair, hopefully, of the noncontracted parties house, Wolf-Ulrich, whose candidacy I fully support. Thank you so much for stepping up for us.

>>STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Congratulations to Wolf.

And with that, it's one minute past 6:00. We will now end this meeting.

Thanks to you all. We will reconvene in just two minutes. Just give time for the new councillors to please take their positions on the stage and say one last goodbye to the outgoing councillors.

Thank you very much, and we will reconvene in a few minutes.

Thank you.

Live Scribing by Brewer & Darrenougue - www.quicktext.com