Transcription ICANN Dublin
Wednesday, 21 October 2015
GNSO Council Part 1

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely
accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It
is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an
authoritative record.

Adobe Connect room recording
MP3 Recording

The transcriptions and recordings of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct

List of attendees: NCA – Non Voting – Carlos Raúl Gutierrez
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Volker Greimann, James Bladel, Yoav Keren absent temporary alternate Jennifer Standiford
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Donna Austin, Bret Fausett
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG):Phil Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi, Osvaldo Novoa, Tony Holmes, Heather Forrest, Brian Winterfeldt
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Amr Elsadr, Marilia Maciel, Edward Morris, Stephanie Perrin, Avri Doria, David Cake
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed – absent apologies proxy to Heather Forrest

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Olivier Crépin-Leblond– ALAC Liaison absent apologies
Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer - present in Adobe Connect

Mason Cole – GNSO liaison to the GAC

ICANN Staff
David Olive - VP Policy Development
Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director
Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director
Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director
Julie Hedlund – Senior Policy Director
Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst
Berry Cobb- Consultant
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Nathalie Peregrine - GNSO Secretariat

Jonathan Robinson: Welcome, everyone, to the GNSO Council meeting, today 21st of October here in Dublin. We have two meetings today. As you know, the first is to conduct the ordinary business of the Council. And the second will be to deal with the election of the chair, which will follow very shortly after the first.

For today's meeting we'll follow the agenda, which you should all have seen previously. And so the first item is to ensure we undertake a roll call. So if I could ask Glen to do that and then we'll proceed with the rest of the business.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Jonathan, I will. Bret Fausett. Bret's not here yet. Donna Austin. Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yoav Keren is absent and the temporary alternate for him is Jennifer Standiford. Jennifer Standiford.

Jennifer Standiford: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: That's me.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Phil Corwin.

Philip Corwin: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Tony Holmes.

Tony Holmes: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Marilia Maciel.

Marilia Maciel: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Amr Elsadr. Amr Elsadr is not here at present. David Cake.

Woman: Just walked in, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Welcome, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr. Sorry I'm late.

David Cake: And yes, I'm present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Edward Morris.

Edward Morris: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: I'm here, thanks.

Glen de Saint Géry: Stephanie Perrin.

Stephanie Perrin: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Daniel Reed is absent and he has given his proxy to Heather
Forrest. Carlos Raul Gutierrez.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Olivier Crépin-LeBlond, the ALAC liaison. I do not see Olivier but
we will take his excuse because he - his apologies because he is at
other meetings. Patrick Myles. Patrick is most probably at other
meetings as well. Oh he's in Adobe. Thank you. Thank you, Jonathan.
Those are the councilors.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. Okay, so if I can just call for any updates to your
Statements of Interest so would anyone like to make any comments
with respect to their Statement of Interest? Seeing none we note the
status of the meetings for the previous Council meeting as highlighted
in your agenda.

And move on to Item 2 which is a brief review of the action list - action
items list and an opportunity for any questions or remarks in respect of
the project list. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. It's Amr. Just from a procedural perspective so I'm not
mistaken, motions that are submitted past the 10-day deadline I
believe the first order of business in a Council meeting should be to
make sure there are no objections to this motion being submitted and
then we move on. So I know this is the first time we've done this for the

GNSO Council so just wanted to make sure we're following procedures properly. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: I read that at it's the first order of business for that agenda item rather than.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, you may be correct, I'm - but if I'm not mistaken I think it may be the first agenda item for the Council meeting. Just not to address the motion...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: ...just to make sure there are no objections.

Jonathan Robinson: We'll -can I get some clarity on that? I mean, I'm sure as long as we deal with it in the appropriate way I understand the point. But let's see if we can't clarify that. And I'll run through the items and then we'll come to that as a point or otherwise deal with it immediately prior to the motion. Mary.

Mary Wong: This is Mary from staff. And for everyone's benefit who's not been following, Amr is referring to Section 3 of the GNSO Operating Procedures and indeed there is a late motion for consideration today. But, Amr, the specific language does call for a vote on the request for consideration as the first order of business for the agenda item that deals with the motion.

Amr Elsadr: Oh. This is Amr again. My apologies and thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem. Thanks, Amr. Okay. All right so you have the project that's in front of you. Is there any - I mean, we've been through the work of the GNSO quite thoroughly over the weekend. Are there any comments or questions or issues arising? And what I would say is that this is our public meeting at the ICANN meeting as usual. And should anyone from within the room who is not a councilor, wish to speak, we will create a specific opportunity for that towards the end of the meeting.

But if you would like to make any relevant or key points with respect to the item under discussion we have a couple of microphones up at the front of the room there so feel free to come and stand at the microphone and if I don't seem to have noticed you or one of the vice chairs hasn't picked you out on my behalf please do make yourself known.

Any comments or questions on the project list? Seeing none we'll switch to the action items and briefly review those. There is not a lot to comment on because we've either completed many items or we'll come to them on the - as the substantial items on the agenda.

I suppose it is worth highlighting that the consultation group with respect to GNSO and GAC has some open items that are still underway. And from my role on that group I understand that that work is underway.

We did get, with respect to global public interest framework, we did get Nora to share with the GNSO Council some of the links and resources that are going on there and we may touch on that in a further item on the main agenda later.

And for the most part the items are completed. I will highlight for you again that the new gTLD auction proceeds comment period is open on the discussion paper so feel free and please do encourage your groups to put in relevant public comments there.

Moving on through Item 3 which is a consent agenda. There are no items on the consent agenda and so therefore we move on to Item 4 which is the motion presented to adopt the final report from the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group. I think probably the first order of business is to present the motion and I'll ask Volker to do that. Volker, I suspect it's sufficient to simply present the resolve clauses but you may want to make any other introductory remarks.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Jonathan. I don't think any further introductory remarks beyond those that we made during the weekend session are required. I think the motion has been - the - is the result of a very well thought out PDP. And we have a lot of proposals in there that will make the review of policy easier for the future and therefore would like to say that this motion as made by me and seconded by Avri Doria should be read into the minutes with the resolve clauses as of - as they stand.

Resolved. The GNSO Council adopts all the consensus recommendations in the Final Report and instructs ICANN staff to begin implementation of the seven recommendations. The GNSO Council thanks the DMPM Working Group for its efforts and recommends that the working group be formally closed as a result of the adoption by the GNSO Council of the working group's recommendations.

The working group nevertheless requests that the working group remain available - I'm sorry, Berry, can you assist me here? And should it be the GNSO council or the working group? We may have a typo in here which I would like to see cleared up before we go.

Berry Cobb: Volker, this is Berry Cobb. It should be the working group just in case staff needs to go back and make any clarifications for the implementation.

Volker Greimann: All right. I'm sorry. I read this clause again. The working group nevertheless requests that the working group remain available to provide input to the GNSO Council and ICANN staff should any questions or issues arise in relation to implementation of its recommendations prior to the formation of an Implementation Review Team. And finally, the GNSO Council requests ICANN staff to prepare an evaluation report for the GNSO Council shortly after the conclusion of implementation of this pilot effort.

I apologize for the confusion.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker. Apologies accepted and it feels somewhat understandable at this stage of the ICANN meeting with everything that's been going on. Any comments or discussion or points anyone would like to raise in respect to this motion? Go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Heather Forrest. Just a quick comment to say that the IPC expresses its gratitude to the working group for all the work that's been done. This is quite a large body of work and we're grateful to them for having done so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Heather. And thanks to the IPC and I'm sure I can express the same on behalf of the GNSO Council. So seeing no other hands in Adobe or no other hands in the room or comments let us proceed to vote on the motion.

I'll just note, for the record, that Bret has just joined us from Registry Stakeholder Group so welcome, Bret, and we'll record you as present from now. And you're just in time to join us for the vote on the motion for approval of the Data and Metrics Working Group recommendations.

So I suggest we do this via a show of hands. Could I see anyone who would like to abstain from voting against - from voting on the motion? You could record, Glen, there are no abstentions.

Is there anyone who would like to vote against the motion raise your hand. There are no hands raised.

Could all those in favor of the motion please raise your hands? Stephanie? And thank you. So if we could record that all those present and could anyone holding proxies - I think that's only Heather - Heather, if you could just confirm that that's on behalf of the proxy as well? Thank you. And Jennifer. Yeah, Jennifer, you're an alternate, right, not - are you holding a proxy for someone? We're good, thank you.

So we'll record that the motion is passed unanimously.

Next item is a motion to deal with the adoption of the Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to Replace the Whois PDP Working Group or RDS. This is something we discussed extensively

on the weekend and indeed came back to at our preparation meeting last evening. So we are all relatively familiar with the topic but I'll just encourage anyone in the room if you would like to come up to the mic and make any points in relation to this work and that which is within the remit of the Council please do so. And I'll defer to Susan to present anything you would like to about the work, Susan, and the resolve clauses of the motion.

Susan Kawaguchi: I thought it was an interesting discussion last night and a fruitful one. I think we came to an understanding and I appreciate everyone on the Council and elsewhere that brought up all the important points. Other than that I think the, you know, the working group was established and this is a board PDP. So we do have a responsibility to the board to move this forward but in a responsible manner.

So other than that we, you know, this - if you've all read the report it is the recommendations by the Expert Working Group to update the process - or to replace the Whois. Other than that I'm not sure I have anything else to say.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Susan. Any other comments or issues? Well you could read the resolve clauses, Susan, please sorry. We'll come to a discussion of them. Yes, please.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you. Resolved, One, The GNSO Council approves the Charter and appoints Susan Kawaguchi as the GNSO Council liaison to the Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace WHOIS (Next-Gen RDS) PDP WG;

The GNSO Council directs ICANN staff to issue a call for volunteers for the PDP WG no later than ten days after the approval of this motion but the call for volunteers should remain open until the working group convenes for the first time. And, until such time as the working group selects a chair for the working group and that chair is confirmed by the GNSO Council, the GNSO Council liaison to the working group shall serve as the interim chair.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Susan. Any comments, questions or discussion in respect to the motion? Volker.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. I think we can all agree that this piece of work will result in one of the most important policy making processes and pieces of policy that ICANN has embarked on for a long time. Whois has always been contentious and this PDP proves - promises to at least solve some of the issues of Whois which would be beneficial to the entire community and in the interest of the entire community to show that ICANN is showing progress in this matter.

That said, being a very important piece of work also bears within it the potential to be very contentious. The Registrars, therefore, feel that it is important to understand the full implications of the charter that is - that would be forwarded by this motion, that would then the basis of the working group. We have for the initial report issued a comment and as the final report was issued and the motion was proposed only briefly before the Council, even though it was well within the submission deadline, there has not been enough time to fully digest the entirety of the final report in as much as how the comments that we've made for the initial report have been incorporated.

We therefore would like to ask for a deferral to be able to take the time until the next Council meeting to fully digest the charter and analyze if there have to be any changes from our view or if the charter is solid enough to go forward on this important piece of work.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker. As you will know, there are two issues with respect to deferral of the motion. One, it is in the discretion of the chair but generally acceded to providing that it is on the basis of outlined by Volker, that there is a requirement for further time to consider the motion. So it seems reasonable to grant the deferral in this case.

But that doesn't preclude further discussion at this stage should anyone want to make any additional points or comments. And so I would welcome that if any of the councilors or indeed anyone in the room would like to raise any related points in respect to the motion and/or the proposed work that is implied by it. Got Phil Corwin and then Avri.

Actually just if I could just make a point for a moment. It's probably easier to manage if you do raise your hands in the Adobe room, just as a single place. So, Council, if I could ask you to raise your hand in the Adobe room. But, Phil, please go ahead.

Philip Corwin: Yeah, thank you. And just after raising my physical hand I realized I should have raised my virtual hand in the chat room. I just - brief remarks. Want to comment the BC councilor, for her hard work on this and her willingness to be the liaison and the short-term chair until a permanent one is picked for this proposed working group.

Personally there's no problem with a deferral to allow councilors to review the charter and make sure that it's appropriate. Just want to make sure that there's an expectation that at the next meeting we would adopt the resolution because, as we know, there are many - quite a large number of complex working groups that are in the pipeline, we wouldn't want to see this continually pushed back because of workload.

Understanding we're going to have to all deal with how to manage that very workload coming up next year on the heels of whatever happens on the transition and accountability, some major issues coming up with new TLDs and RPMs, second round and RPMs and UDRP and all of that. There's a lot of to do down the road. But no objection at all to a one month deferral to let councilors get a better handle on the charter.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Phil. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria speaking. Yeah, I'm glad that it is being deferred even though I was part of the joint group that put together this - was part of the discussions that resulted in this because the charter is indeed complex. I think that the complexity of the charter is even more of an issue than the bandwidth of work that will be required.

It is many interrelated pieces. There are sequences. There are loops. There are such. And I really do recommend that as the Council will be managing this process that people do spend a considerable amount of time looking at diagrams, looking at the pictures of how this thing will have to go forward so that you really understand it as you, you know, decide on how to approve it and what kind of resources may or may

not be needed beyond just the people, you know, just beyond just the volunteers to actually make this thing happen in an effective way.

So I'm glad that, you know, the Council and the various stakeholder groups and constituencies will have the time to do that because I think it's an absolute necessity that you know what you're jumping into when you vote on this thing. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: I do understand the reason for deferral and I appreciate the thought that Council would like to put into this. It is an important PDP. And I look forward to seeing the proposed language to revise the charter so that we can look at this once again at the next meeting. And I forgot to thank Carlos for seconding so thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, there are no further hands in the queue so thank you very much for contributions to the work, considerations and a reminder that the next Council meeting will be upon you before you know it so having heard that those thoughts about making any revisions to the charter and making sure everyone is familiar with the work I'd encourage councilors to make that effort as soon as possible so that that can be done.

All right so the motion is deferred therefore we do not vote on it at this meeting and we move on to the next item in the agenda.

And that next motion is - I think for the first time what we've referred to as a late motion. It's a motion that can be considered - a motion that's come in beyond or inside of the 10-day - the normal 10-day deadline

for motions but outside of the 24-hour meeting prior to this - to this meeting, and therefore is applicable for consideration if and only if when councilors consider this first we consider the vote for - we first take a vote on the request for reconsideration of the motion. And we need to be unanimous in accepting the motion before the Council.

So the first order of business under Item 6 is to vote on the request for consideration of the late motion. Carlos, we'll need you at the table for the vote. Carlos. Carlos. Sorry, Osvaldo, apologies. Osvaldo, we'll need you at the table for the motion for consideration of the motion.

So we here vote to - whether or not to consider this motion before the Council. Can I have any - an indication if there are anyone who would like to abstain from participating in this vote? And I'll remind you before doing so that your abstention will be considered as a no vote in respect to this. So would anyone like to abstain? Would anyone like to vote against consideration of the motion? Could all those in favor of considering the motion please raise your hands? Thank you.

And, Heather, could you confirm that your hand is raised for the proxy you hold as well? Thank you. So, Glen, we are unanimous in wanting - in accepting the request for consideration and therefore we go on to have Avri present the motion.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And thank you very much for considering this first waiver of the 10-day rule. I very much appreciate that you're willing to listen to me talk about it. So should I start with the reading or should I start with the - we had had a conversation the other day where people asked me why. And should I go with the why or the reading first? Do you have a preference.

Jonathan Robinson: I think you can provide the motivation and then the motion, that would be great.

Avri Doria: Okay. So the motivation for why, first of all, why at this time; why without any warning or the short bit of warning. And it basically had to do with the work that is going on with the CCWG Accountability at the moment. We are in active period of the end game or what we hope is the end game of coming up with the plan.

You know, there's a real hope that we'll be able to come up with a plan for accountability in Dublin. And so part of it was just basically encouraging that process, was basically the GNSO being able to come in and sort of say, we recognize the work and we want to encourage those of you that are working on it this week to, you know, good luck in a sense.

But there was more to it than that. There was the part of the reasoning has to do with in something as complicated and as critical as this you're really in a state of nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. There are so many interrelated pieces, there are so many things in motion, people coming up with new problems, new issues, doing as much as possible to take into account the many different comments that have been held.

So it's very much also an encouraging and committing ourselves to sort of keeping an open mind as this is going through to not get ourselves stuck on any position, to sort of say that we ourselves, while we have many different views on how this should end and how it

should work, that we are really all committed to keeping our minds open to this and going through it. So that was a big part.

There was also - felt it was important perhaps because Thomas is leaving the Council but still carrying this burden, to just recognize the work that he and the two co-chairs had done to encourage them, to give them sort of a GNSO atta-boy and (fortza) and, you know, good luck to you kind of sentiment on it.

So those were really - but the real core was to really commit ourselves to the fact that we're waiting to see it, the GNSO Council and the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies will have to consider it and either approve or send it back for further work.

And so basically to say, you know, we think it's important, we're keeping our minds open, we're waiting with baited breathe and we'll consider what you come up with. So that was it. And I don't know if anybody wants to question me on it before I read it.

We normally skip the Whereas's; right?

Jonathan Robinson: Right. So I have a couple of hands up in the chat...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: ...so maybe we should defer to those.

Avri Doria: Sure.

Jonathan Robinson: And Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I'm not sure how you read motions or draft motions when they come in. But I usually go to the resolve clauses first. And I read the resolve clause and I thought, yeah, that's one I should second. Then I saw the acknowledgement part and I said, okay, would not be appropriate for me to second that motion.

And also I thought that I should say this before you come to a vote. I very much appreciate this draft particularly since it mentions my name. But let's be very clear, this is a team effort, it's not only the excellent co-chairs, Mathieu Weill and Leon Sanchez, but also the GNSO appointed members. And I can give the compliment back to Avri, Robin Gross, James Bladel and Steve DelBianco who are really, really working very hard and were constantly providing very high quality contributions towards this process.

So I think that the GNSO is playing an essential role in this challenging task and I think you have excellent representation in this process.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, for the record, my name is Jonathan Robinson since the transcript hasn't been recording me and if the transcript thought I was Chair Schneider so - but I'll join - I will join...

Thomas Rickert: You wish you were.

Jonathan Robinson: I will join Herr Rickert in making those vote of thanks to the GNSO contributors, including Avri, to the work of the CCWG. So let's give them a quick round of applause. And then here from one of them. James.

James Bladel: Hi. Thanks. James speaking for the transcript. And I would not have clapped if I'd known that I was going to be included in that, sorry. But so thank you, Avri, for putting this forward. And as I indicated on the list, the Registrars support this addition to our agenda and will support this motion and of course thank you to you and to Thomas, Thomas in particular. You have the patience of a saint for some of the things that have been going on.

I have just a quick question that I would pose to Avri and to Thomas. And again reiterating our support for this motion but just a question that because things have changed so rapidly during this week hour by hour, day by day, did we miss our window somewhat with this statement? Is it still as relevant now as it was when - okay fantastic. I see heads nodding and that was just something I wanted to confirm that we hadn't - that events hadn't overtaken the sentiment behind the motion.

I mean, it's always good to say we support this but I want to make sure that it's still as timely as it was when it was first raised because, you know, the GNSO Council's calendar is a little more fixed and the developments have been occurring on the CCWG at a little bit faster pace. So if you'd weigh in on that one and then I just say thank you again.

Thomas Rickert: Pressure is on. The motion is very timely. I think we're going to have a lot of work before us. We will discuss a revised timeline and work plan with the group this afternoon so I'm not able to talk to any specifics. But let's not forget this not only about the CCWG writing up recommendations. We need the chartering organizations to approve those.

And I think it is worth reminding all the constituent parts of the GNSO that we need them to be ready, stand by, work through that very, very quickly and very, very diligently. Raise red flags as early as possible so that we're going to have the approval process as easy going as possible.

Everybody is very much focusing on the CCWG at the moment so we're seen as being the last piece of the puzzle. But that is only a partial piece of the last piece of the puzzle. We need the chartering organizations to approve and then we can only pass it onto the board. So pressure is one. And we need all of you to buy into this process. And it's going to be hectic. It's going to be cumbersome. But I think that judging from the CCWG deliberations over the last couple of days we're making huge progress and I'm confident that we can deliver.

Avri Doria: And this is Avri speaking again. To answer the question, there was a moment yesterday when the world looked so rosy that I had the same view you did. Oh my, this may be too late. Should I withdraw it? Should I - people put them through that. And then I started talking to people more and more and heard of other questions coming up and other issues.

And then all of a sudden I felt really quite glad that it was still on the table and I hadn't been sort of misguided by my own rosy glasses I constantly put on that we were just at the end. We've got a ways to go. And we've got a lot of conversations going up so yeah. Okay so I read now? So - because I see no other hands.

Resolved, The GNSO reiterates its support for the process that is ongoing in CCWG-Accountability. Its commitment to participating in continuing discussions with the goal of finding solutions with broad agreement for ICANN accountability in preparation for IANA transition, and to working through the process as agreed upon in the charter before declaring support or opposition to possible outcomes.

Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Avri. Since we've had discussion and comments I think we can put that straight to the vote at this stage. So I'd like to call for a show of hands as to anyone who would like to abstain from voting on the motion. Anyone who would like - Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I'd like to abstain from it because I'm mentioned.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so for the record could we record that Thomas abstains from voting on the motion. Thomas, it's customary to give a reason for why you abstain from voting, could you give that reason?

Thomas Rickert: Let me express my support for the resolve part of it but I think it wouldn't be appropriate for me to vote in favor of the acknowledgement.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Thomas. Is there anyone who would like to vote against the motion? All right, could all those in favor raise your hands? And, Heather, could you retain your hand raised for the proxy. Thank you. So, Glen, if you could record that the motion was supported by all

councilors save for Thomas Rickert who understandably and with a rationale, abstained.

For the record I did not direct the proxy how to vote, I did assume, for a moment that the proxy would vote in the same direction as Heather had voted but just to be clear Heather voted independently for the proxy.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather Forrest. To be absolutely clear, that is the case.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Heather. Good, thank you for bringing that motion. It's useful to have both clearly the content was substantial and appreciated and also it's useful to have in the context being able to apply the relevant procedures for a late motion.

Good. Our next item of business is to deal with Item 7 which relates to the letters from the Standing Committee on the GNSO Improvements. So here we have two letters that we've received dealing with two references to the standing committee. And this is a committee on which I think, Avri, you're the liaison, is that correct?

Avri Doria: Yes I am. I'm NCSG's primary representative and I'm the Council liaison to the group, a job that needs to be filled by someone else starting later today.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you and we'll duly note that for the wrap up session on Thursday, tomorrow. And, Avri, if you - I mean, we did have an opportunity to discuss this and I think we're in a pretty clear position here but you may want to remind everyone what the two points are

briefly and see if there's any other discussion or indeed input from anyone else in the room.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Yes so basically - and I think it was the first time we did this there was actually a formal template developed with questions sent directly to the SCI basically asking questions. And it was sent by Jonathan as chair and myself as liaison.

And basically asking questions in relation to submission and resubmission of motions and actually did we have the other one? Was there also a letter for that one?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, there were letters from...

Avri Doria: There were letters from both but the request was only from one. I think. But anyway so we basically got two letters back from the SCI after they did a fairly extensive number of - amount of work on them.

In the first one, which had to do with resubmission of motions and the - let me bring up the letter so I'm not talking totally from memory. Right it was the 10-day waiver, the one that we just used for the first time, and whether the 10-day waiver was applicable to the resubmission of motions.

Now the resubmission of motions, for anyone that doesn't recall, is basically if a motion has failed and there is a procedure for someone to bring it back up at a later meeting and there are, you know, processes for that. And the question came up is if I'm doing a resubmission of motion do I have the same 10-day requirement? Yes.

Can I apply for a 10-day - a waiver from the 10-day? And after looking through and an extensive discussion the answer was no. Basically one is when you look at the motivation for the 10-day waiver that it's something that's timely, that it's something that - this is something that's been in the works, we've seen it, we've talked about it and it shouldn't be a surprise to anyone when it comes up. So there was clarification that basically no, those two are not related. And the waiver is not applicable.

On the other one was a request on the issue of seconding. And where seconding fits into our motions. It's not a formal part of the operating procedures, the Council Operating Procedures, you know, but it is a tradition and it's a tradition - a practice that we've gotten used - and it develops. And at one point there were - there has always been seconds, as I remember from the 10 years that I've been involved with the Council. But for a long time, for example, seconders weren't part of the so-called friendly amendment process.

Then seconders became part of the - so basically there was a request to sort of document what the current practice is. And then after the practice was documented perhaps it'll be time to change it, perhaps not. So the SCI has basically delivered their documentation on practice as those in the SCI believe it is current.

The request now that comes to the Council members and perhaps to people in your constituencies who have been around for a while is to read that, review that, make sure it's accurate and then should the Council want to do something about it then you get to fill out one of the templates again to make a request based upon that. In other words, does it need to be changed? Is it incorrect? What have you. So that's

basically the hand-waving gist of these three documents, two letters, and one, the template request that was sent to the SCI. And I see one of the - I see the vice chair of the SCI nodding at me so I think I got it right.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. So, you know, the SCI is a very useful tool for the Council or service to the Council to be able to deal with what might seem arcane and tedious elements of process but are vital, as Avri reminded me when I came into the chair position - that sort of we are all about the process in some ways in that that's - that is what we trust in. So it's pretty important that we know and can value and trust that the processes work, have integrity and are comprehensive.

So any other comments or questions on this item or any other points that anyone would like to make? I think it's pretty clear where we go with this. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yeah, just on a related matter, we will need to find new people for the SCI. I was the NomComm appointee alternate. I neglected my duties over the last couple of months but I think we need to find replacements for some positions on the SCI. And let me say the SCI is a great committee. It is a testimony of how consensus works - is conducted in ICANN. It's really interesting because we only pass things on once we have full consensus on something so that's very thorough work, important work. And with that I should conclude my advertisement slot and encourage you to - yes. Jump on it.

Jonathan Robinson: (Avri

Avri: Yes I'll take advantage of that. I've been on the SCI since it was
                  formed and at times we've had fairly good participation at times we've
                  had awful participation. And it really is important that each one of the
                  constituencies and stakeholder groups have people. It is important also
                  therefore that's why there is a primary and an alternate because it's
                  hard to get yourself to this meeting all the time. It is dry, it is detailed, it
                  is sometimes painful.

                  But really want to ask people to make sure that you will point people -
                  don't make them do it more than a year. I mean, as I say I've done it
                  for seven now. Don't make them - or six. Don't make them do it
                  necessarily for more than a year but get people to actually - it's a good
                  training ground for people that want to be on the council because then
                  you know - come to the council actually knowing how it works.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Aubrey) and that's also - okay. So a couple of points on
                  that. One it's a reminder that those roles that you talk about do need to
                  be dealt with. They will be picked up at the wrap up session tomorrow
                  or at the next forthcoming council meeting. It's a reminder to all council
                  members who are either remaining on council or coming in to join the
                  council as of today, please do come to the wrap up session. Can
                  someone from staff remind me exactly what time it is tomorrow? Or
                  any of the council? Could anyone remind me what time it is tomorrow?
                  I'm thinking around midday.

Glen: 12:30 to 1330 Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. And will lunch be provided?

Glen: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: So not only do you have an exciting meeting to attend tomorrow you have the incentive of food being provided. So good news. So please do all come along to that. It's an important mechanism by which the sort of work of the past few days is brought together and set on its future course.

All right. I think we'll draw a line under that item 7 and move on to item 8. Item 8 deals with a request from the ICANN board concerning possibly policy work on replacement insurance requirements for ICANN accredited registrars. Here the board sent us a letter highlighting their recent change whereby the board had resolved to waive the insurance requirement in the 2009 and 2013 registrar accreditation agreement for motivations that will become clear if you look at the board resolution.

But in addition the board asked the GNSO to consider whether policy work on replacement insurance requirements should be undertaken. And so I think we do need to respond to that letter and so here is an opportunity to discuss the board request. I know the registries did touch on this at our meeting yesterday. I don't know if anyone else would like to make any comments on this. Clearly there is the - this - there are - well let me just open up for that. I - see I have a handout from Bret and a handout from James Bladel. So let's go to Bret first of all and then James and Volker. Bret.

Bret Fausett: I just wanted to relay the sense of the registry constituency which was that this wasn't policy to begin with, that we didn't think a policy process should've gotten it in there or got it out of there and we don't think that there's any policy to be done about whether we put it back.

So we would take the view that the answer to the board's question is no.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Bret. I have James, Volker and then Tony Harris up at the mine. So James.

James Bladel: Thanks Jonathan. Thanks Bret for that characterization. I think we had a slightly different perspective in the registrar discussions on this. Nothing formal of course but something along the lines of that the group taking a look at this issue was not able to find clear benefits. So the benefits of maintaining this insurance requirement were unclear but it was definitely causing measureable or discernable harm to some registrar applicants who were unable to obtain this particular type of insurance.

So I would say that if we were to undertake any further work in this area that we would first clearly articulate the harm that we are seeking to solve, the problem that we're seeking to address because I don't think that was ever captures. So but I - but given the registry's position I think that where we are currently is very much in accordance with that statement which is that we respond to the board that we do not see any pressing need or urgent cause to develop policy work in this area. And indeed it looks more and more like a commercial term of an existing contract and not consensus policy.

Jonathan Robinson: Got Volker and then Tony and then Philip.

Volker Greimann: I agree with everything James said. Would like to add something for context though. Even while ICANN has waived the insurance policy requirement for 90% of all registrar nothing will change, and they will

still be required to have that insurance policy in place simply because registries have similar matching or comparable requirements in their accreditation agreements therefore requiring registrars to get this accredited - the very same policy that they would also have to (unintelligible) to ICANN before. Therefore in many cases the insurance requirement is still in play as most registries have this requirement.

Maybe the registries would also like to remove that from their contracts. That would be a consideration that we would appreciate but so far nothing has changed for most registrars.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for the clarification, Volker. Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes good afternoon. Tony Harris, Income Main Counselor. I was part of the life strategy group which - I think we made a lot of noise on this which has probably contributed to this board resolution.

On a personal basis as Executive Director of the Argentina Internet Association, for two years we struggled to present an application to become an ICANN-accredited registrar but unfortunately the conditions in our country, in Argentina specifically made it impossible for us to contract a policy of this nature due to the incredible cost that it implied.

So I would strongly recommend or let's say ask that we do not open this up to having this replaced by another obstacles to a developing country registrars who might want to become accredited. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Tony. Phil.

Philip Corwin: Thank you. Phil Corwin. In regard to this particular letter and - there's no need to maintain - it appears there's no need to maintain a (unintelligible) insurance. It really doesn't cover the type of act that there's a concern about and when it forms a barrier to entry that reduces competition and the availability of registrars in certain localities.

Having said that the letter does identify that the types of harms that the insurance didn't cover but which are real and potential harms are accidental deletion or failure to renew a registration or allowing a domain name to be hijacked.

There's been - within the BC we had to have discussion of the domain theft or hijacking issue. There's been attorneys involved in the domain space. Have noted a significant increase in the number of hijacking reports and cases they've had to bring on behalf of clients to attend to. Recovered domains: there seem to be a small number of registrars in certain locales who have become the repository of hijacked domains.

So we have had a preliminary discussion of this issue within the BC. We haven't taken it to the next step of requesting an issues report or anything like that but we may well. So I just wanted to bring to the attention of councilors that in particular the - for a business whether it's an active commercial business or a domain investor these acts of negligence or perhaps worse that result in the loss of a domain or its theft can be extremely serious.

There have been press reports of businesses, particularly small businesses of being put out of business by hijackings and it's an issue that we may bring back from the BC at some point with a request for

some type of consideration of action. So I just wanted to bring that to everyone's attention now. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Philip or Phil. James? Did you want to comment?

James Bladel: Yes just briefly. I acknowledge that this is a problem and something Phil and I have discussed offline as well as a possible area for future policy development. I just would note that this insurance policy while as the board's letter indicates wouldn't help in those situations many registrars either can view a requirement through the registry or through other requirements. As a - for example a credit card payment processor or just because of the state or country where they do business or maintain, you know, other business licenses may be required to carry other policies. It could be applicable in those cases.

So in addition to not been having clear benefits and perhaps even being a barrier to entry it also seems to be fairly redundant. So I agree that if we were to work on something like that it would be separate from this issue.

Jonathan Robinson: So it seems to me then that we don't have a black and white answer to the board's letter at this stage. My suggestion to you would be therefore that we respond to the board - and this will become a job of the incoming chair I suspect. But to respond to the board as follows. We thank them for the correspondence and we indicate that we appreciate them referring the matter to us and we may consider it for future policy development, which leaves it open to be considered but neither commits us to do so nor reject it out of hand.

Woman: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: Responses to that suggestion. James and then anyone else?

Bret Fausett: Yes I'll raise my hand.

Jonathan Robinson: Bret.

James Bladel: Yes so I - just going back to your first statement which is that we didn't have a clear response to the board. I believe we do have a clear response to the precise question of, you know, do we accept this change and would we pursue further policy work around the insurance question. I think the answer to that is no.

However as you indicated we would leave the door open to policy development work on the specific harms that were cited in the letter that are not covered by the insurance requirements that's been thrown out. So I think that that is maybe the clearest path forward and it's clear as mud I'm sure, but.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me just be clear on what the question is. The question said, "Some community members said that a different type of insurance requirement for registrars might better protect registrants. As a result the board is referring this matter to the GNSO in the event that the GNSO wishes to consider additional policy work on this topic."

So we have three options: say nothing; reply and thank the board for their letter; or reply and thank the board with some substance which says we won't undertake policy work, we will undertake policy work, or we may undertake policy work. That feels to me like the scope.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Can I just respond with a point of clarification which is that we would not pursue policy relating to other types of insurance but could pursue policy relating to addressing the harm that this was intended to ensure again. So I think there's a - it's a nuance difference.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) get it now. I misunderstood that and I - and Bret, does that cover it okay?

Bret Fausett: That's great and yes very similar. I - and maybe it's a distinction between British English and American English. I think we'd - I'd be a little more blunt. I don't - I think "may", people might believe that we were actually going to do something. I think it sends the wrong message. I think we should say that we have no present intention of starting a policy process right now. We reserve the right to do so in the future but that is not our present intention.

Jonathan Robinson: Philip?

Philip Corwin: Yes and again I think it's just nuances here. I think on the insurance question there's no present intention evident in this room to pursue work on identifying a different type of insurance to respond to these harms. We might wish to inform the board and the - whether that the issue of harm to registrants particularly with a rising reporting of domain hijacking that it may be something that - that it's something that the council - has been brought to our attention. We may act in the future. We have no plan at the moment for how to pursue it but it is something that's on our radar screen.

When we ever get into that it may be that insurance is part of that response but clearly the best response is prevention rather than trying to pay someone for the harm of having a valued domain hijacked or a business destroyed because of a domain hijacking.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well if I was remaining as chair I would feel I had sufficient information to put together a draft of that letter on the basis of what's been discussed here. I hope that I am leaving the incoming chair similarly equipped. But it feels like we've covered this sufficiently. So thanks very much for a substantial discussion on that item.

And so the action therefore is on the chair, the incoming chair to draft a letter which covers this and I suggest circulating that prior to sending it in response to the board for sign off. Okay?

So item 9 then is - deals with another discussion of possible action. And this is the request from the ICANN board concerning possible policy work on exclusive registry access to generic strings. Now we did have some discussion of this previously and the letter is - has been available to all of you to see.

And in particular there was an exchange of letters I think on this one in and around the global public interest and we understood from our exchange with that that there is work going on under the direction of Nora Abusitta within ICANN's Executive Management team and that we will have access to information as to what work is going on there. The question is, is this - what if anything do we require further from staff and two, is this part of our overall work on future rounds of new gTLDs or is this a specific piece of work that needs to be undertaken here?

But it - is that an old hand or is that an - any other comments on this at this stage?

Okay. (Marilia)?

(Marilia):   Thank you Jonathan. This is Marilia speaking. Well we have been discussing this public interest topic for a lot of time in spite of the constituencies and as GNSO. And I've been thinking that maybe the only way for us to better understand what is being demanded from us, try to identify and define public interest topic by topic. Not trying to maybe tackle the issue from a very broad and comprehensive and maybe a (unintelligible) perspective because I think that we will not reach an agreement on that. But tackle it little by little.

In this context here with regards to discussion on public sensitive strings what - (unintelligible) what they mean when they talk about public interest? I mean, what are they considering here in this specific topic? And if we do it there's - for every issue that is put in our place maybe we will reach from an inductive method in a broad understanding or a better understanding about what public interest is.

So I would think that right now the best approach maybe would be to give them time to respond on that and what are they understanding with regard to public interest in this context. And I would feel like this would be something that we should let go and we need to discuss the new subsequent round.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin. So just to (Marilia)'s point I think in this context the public interest was a reference from the Governmental Advisory Committee. So this is - if my memory serves correctly this was part of GAC advice that came through the new (unintelligible) program.

So I think if we're looking to the context that it sort of comes from then we should go back there to understand what the GAC was talking about and perhaps, you know, and the NTPC has considered this and they've, you know, had some discussion around that as well. So I think for the context of this that's where we need to start. May not be where we end up but that's certainly where we need to start.

And just from discussions in the Registry Stakeholder Group around these two said yes, you know, this is something all we'll pick up in next round discussions. But the discussion around, you know, the generic term shouldn't be constrained by the public interest requirement that was raised through the GAC or the GAC advice. So it's not - it should be, you know, much broader and not just be confined to the public interest element of it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna. Any other comments or points on this subject?

So, I mean, it - I mean, it's easy to get distracted by the public, I mean, the primary question here was a question of dealing with exclusive registry access for gTLD strings representing generic terms. And the motivation for considering that was one of public interest. So I think - the public interest is a framing point and I think we should certainly undertake to keep close to any development that goes on from a staff perspective. Feels to me like this work will be - in any way be absorbed

within - maybe someone could confirm to me whether exclusive registry access for generic terms is covered in - as a - well is it covered part of the discussion group work and the issue report for it?

Man: You know, I was going to raise my hand to ask we're at disadvantage and I don't think that Steve Chan is at this meeting but maybe (Rico) or Lars knows the answer to that question.

And if the question is no then I think it's very easy for us just to - or the draft issue report is out for public comment now we can just make sure that this goes into that public comment and that it's adopted for the revision, right?

Jonathan Robinson: That's right.

Man: Lars is giving me a thumbs up. So and that's the way to handle it.

Jonathan Robinson: Exactly. For the record staff concern that this issue is encompassed within the issue report on future rounds of new gTLDs so that extent it is covered. It's really the reference then that the missing piece is one of global public interest and it's something we're just going to have to keep an eye on and work collaboratively.

But nevertheless it's clear that this is at the highest level of ICANN. The directors have a duty to consider the public interest. So I would think this is something but I would suggest that the council perhaps takes up with the board at future meetings and just keeps clear on where the board's headed with respect to this because it fits - it weaves into accountability and it's a really overarching point as Mariliahas suggested. And it has specific applications and specific

context but it's nevertheless an overarching point that you probably need to keep an ongoing dialog with the board on.

All right that's probably enough on that section then, on that item unless - Donna, is that - have you re-raised your hand for that? That's the previous one, right? Thank you.

And so next we go on to item 10 which deals with the final report of the independent examine on the GNSO review and the working party is clearly going to be looking at the implementation of that. I believe Larisa is here should we - should anyone need to ask her specific questions or comments. And so she'll be in a position to help. That's Larisa from ICANN staff.

(Aubrey), I think this was yet another area where you were either a participant in the working party and/or our council liaison. I don't know if you - if there's anything else today that you'd like to provide from work that's gone on in the meeting at all, (Avri)? Just checking if there's anything you'd like to provide to the group.

Avri: No.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay no problem. I didn't mean to put you on the spot there. But Larisa, is there anything you would like to specifically add as to what's gone on during the course of the meeting that we should be aware of and as the work moves its way towards implementation?

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you Jonathan. I'd like to brief everybody that the working party had a very productive meeting on Monday. It was - the purpose of the meeting was to review the 36 recommendations and they went through

about 27 of the 36 recommendations following a very structured approach to looking at each one in terms of priority, feasibility, cost, alignment with other work, alignment with a strategic direction of the GNSO and ICANN, and they will continue to do this work within the next several months as they prepare to finalize their conclusions and report them to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, which will meet on this in February. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Larisa for that distinct and clear update. Are there any, I mean, it's clear that the work progresses towards implementation. Are there any other questions or comments for Larisa or in and around the work?

And again to remind anyone in the room if you'd like to make - if you have any questions or comments feel free to come up to the public microphone towards the front of the room.

So seeing no hands (unintelligible) - oh I see one from Volker. Go ahead Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes just a question for clarification. At the last council meeting we had a brief debate about one of the recommendations which was the last recommendations in the final report which was added to the final report which was not found in the initial report. And there was a thinking that we would either send a letter or wait and see what is going to happen. So is there any update on the last recommendation? Any additional requirements for the council to send a letter with regards to that final recommendation?

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. So I think you're referring to our recommendation 23. As (Jen) Wolfe I believe reported over the weekend that recommendation had a lot of discussion and debate within the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. So there was continuous questions about whether that's a useful and implementable recommendation.

And I'm going through the process on Monday. It was clear that that recommended - most people thought that that recommendation should not be implemented so it's been categorized as such.

And there was some discussion about still sending the letter. That has been drafted by the GNSO review working party but there was not a conclusion as to when that would be sent. But that's still on the table.

Volker Greimann: Thank you for that update. Very helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. Yes as Larisa said, yes during the exercise of reviewing the recommendations the working party members agreed that this is - the recommendation would be on this to - it should not be implemented. And - yes. Just making assurances that the working - there's ongoing work on sort of refining the language in the letter prior to deciding whether or not it should be sent on behalf of the working party to the OAC or not. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay good. Thank you Amr. Thank you Larisa for your updates and all you work in that area.

Right so the next item is item 11 where we'll touch on the new ICANN meeting strategy and Volker will give you a brief update.

Volker Greimann: All right. I already provided this small update. Volker Greimann speaking for the record. Apologies. On the new meeting structures. As you all know we have in the upcoming year quite drastic change to the structure of how ICANN meetings will be held. And while the upcoming meeting in Marrakech will not be as severely affective as other meetings there will be - there will have to be some rethinking of how the ICANN meetings are structured and how the GNSO meets and deliberates during the ICANN meetings.

There has been a small working group set up that met at the last meeting and presented the thinking of the GNSO of how to structure its sessions in the new meeting structures, i.e., for Meeting A, Meeting B and Meeting C. However we are still waiting for input from the other constituencies, SGs, the boards, and really looking forward to seeing their thinking of how they will engage with the community, how they will fill their allotted times within the schedule and avoid conflicts in the upcoming meeting structure.

So there's a lot of work that still has to be done. I had hoped that we would be able to present a more concise picture of the upcoming meeting by this meeting but that sadly was not to be. So I just reiterate my request that all parties that are planning to schedule any events at the upcoming ICANN meetings do so with a consideration that they present their plans to the other groups and us as soon as possible so we may integrate change to revise our thinking and present a meeting structure that will contain as little conflict as possible and as much ability to work efficiently during those meetings. Thank you.

Are there any questions for the new meeting structures? Any comments or input? Phil?

Philip Corwin: Yes Volker thank you. Just for clarification just two quick questions. My understanding and correct me if I'm wrong is that for Marrakech it should - the structure of the meeting is very much like this one and council will still come in the weekend prior to conduct its usual weekend meetings. Is that correct?

Volker Greimann: Like I said there will have to be some change as the Marrakech meeting is only scheduled I think - if I'm not very much mistaken it is a five-day meeting which we have been told would be the final length of the meeting and no...

Philip Corwin: Okay.

Volker Greimann: Marika, do you want to - six-day meeting. So - yes. So yes there will be pretty much the structure that we're used to but we will still have to see if that structure that we're used to is the same structure that the other groups have in mind when they look at this new meeting structure.

So we might have - may have to shift a bit our planning and even though we expect currently that we will be able to hold the Marrakech meeting pretty much as we are able to do now, there may have to be some movement of the schedule either way.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Well thank you. So basically contingent on other groups' plans it wouldn't be - we don't expect a radical departure from what we're used

to in Marrakech and turning to the B meeting which is the four-day meeting, and I know we've been told by staff that absolutely no groups will be funded to come in earlier to do work.

We're going to have a great challenge and we still don't know how to resolve it because if we kept to the two days of meetings we usually have on the weekend plus this meeting plus the wrap up with other things it would consume, we'd be consuming almost all of our time on the meeting of the four days with just GNSO activities which clearly wouldn't work in that context.

Volker Greimann: That is correct. We are currently estimating that the weekend session that we are currently holding will not have a life presence equivalent in this shape or form that we are currently seeing during the four-day meeting. There is some thinking of having a conference call, a quasi-preparatory meeting for the council in advance of the meeting by phone and Adobe. But how that will shape out is still to be seen.

Philip Corwin: Okay. I guess we'll just wait and see how it gets work out for the mid-year meeting next year. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: And if you have any input, any ideas, any suggestions to the meeting structure please do not hesitate to forward them to us.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thank you Volker. Thank you Phil. Right so before we move on to item 12 we have open mics here and I'd like to make sure that if anyone has any other business that they'd like to raise they're given the opportunity to come forward to the pubic microphones and raise any points or issues of concern that pertain to the work of the council or policy work within the GNSO. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin. So my hand was actually up in response to what Volker just said in relation to the middle meeting, meeting B for 2016. So just a comment.

We had some discussion last night understanding that we had two significant payday piece that will likely - working groups will start to get together in January of next year and that's for the WHOIS and also for the subsequent round. So it's going to be a significant piece of work and we understand that.

Now when the Meeting Strategy Working Group, you know, started to think about how we can redesign the way that we do business at these meetings, the idea of the middle meeting was it was to be focused around the working groups and the actual policy work that could be done. And if we go back to Bret's suggestion that was made I think earlier this week that was laughed out of the court but we have two weeks that we can actually dedicate to significant policy work.

This middle meeting is supposed to be an option to provide us the opportunity to do that in some significant way so that when we have discussions about the subsequent rounds and also the WHOIS payday period that's coming down the pipe as well, if we had the opportunity to have a dedicated session on both those issues at the middle meeting where you had everybody in the room -- and when I say everybody that's (ALAC), that's the GAC, that's registries, registrars, and all the other constituencies that make up the GNSO -- then you could have a reasonably robust discussion around a number of the issues that go to make up those PDPs.

You know, we rarely have the opportunity to do that when we come together at ICANN meetings. So what happens if you, you know, you have your working groups but you don't have the opportunity to interact outside of those working groups necessarily at these meetings because of the conflicts that we have in the schedule as it currently stands.

So if we just think of it from that perspective and you think of this is supposed to be about, you know, the policy work that is happening then these middle meetings are supposed to provide that opportunity to everybody to get in a room together and have substantive discussion around an issue at least once a year. Now it's not terrific but it's progress in terms of how we do it these days.

So just in terms of when we think about what that meeting is really supposed to be that's what the thinking was when the Meeting Strategy Working Group came up with, you know, how we can possibly do things differently. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna and thanks for that more substantive context and based on your knowledge of the work of the group that led to the new meeting strategy. So really appreciate you providing that insight into the council and I hope people will take that on board.

All right. I think we're in a position then to move on to item 12 where we undertake a vote of thanks to our outgoing councilors. And for that I will hand over to ICANN's Head of Policy - I'm never quite sure of how to say these job titles but I think that's captured it. Part of the - well I won't even go there in trying to describe various job titles. But David Olive, welcome to our meeting.

David Olive: Jonathan, thank you very much and Volker and (David). I appreciate this opportunity to be here for some recognition of our councilors. It's always great to welcome new councilors to the GNSO and to the ICANN work. I do get a bit sad about saying farewell to the outgoing councilors but we do hope that you'll remain with us in the corridors and in the various meetings to continue your service and work with us at ICANN.

Of course in trying to get a little memento or gift for you we had a multi-staff holder process to determine this and we thought we would give everyone a lifelong membership in whatever working group you so desired. But we thought that might be a little too much. And so with that we decided on something more practical.

And so I would like to present this to the outgoing councilors: Bret Fausett from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

We also would like to recognize though we know he's not here Yoav Keren from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Thomas Rickert, Nominating Committee Appointee.

((Crosstalk))

David Olive: I'll rearm with the gifts. Obviously the next one from the Intellectual Property Group, Brian Winterfeldt. Thank you so much for your service.

((Crosstalk))

David Olive: We next move to the other side of the house and we have Tony
                 Holmes from the ISP Group.

                 Thank you Tony for your service. And your colleague (Osvaldo).

((Crosstalk))

David Olive: Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

David Olive: We also have not quite last but least (Avri Doria). Thank you very
                 much. Lifelong membership.

                 And finally someone who is not here, we'd like to recognize (Daniel
                 Reed), Nominating Committee Appointee. And we'll make sure he gets
                 his gift.

                 I don't want to forget our last person who is departing. And with that
                 we'd like to show a little video in tribute to Jonathan Robinson. Could
                 you cue that up please?

                 And with that video and the multi-staff holder gift idea we're going to
                 give you this gift Jonathan and you might want to open it because it
                 may be very useful to you in your next life outside of ICANN and also
                 within ICANN. Congratulations and thank you so much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much David. I'll take your cue and I will open it. But
                 thank you so much for - all of you for all of the warm remarks and
                 throughout the week and today. And, I mean, I think the most - really

the most exciting thing is to feel that the council is in a very good place. There's a great team councilors, both those of you who are - I have to think of the right word. I'm not allowed to say "departing". The outgoing councilors, the remaining councilors and the incoming councilors.

But it truly feels like we have a functioning and effective organ within the GNSO. And I know you're bored with me saying that but actually it's tremendous to see that the value and standing of the council is appreciated, understood and known.

And if you cast your mind back to a few years ago we were - we had a community that was very critical of the GNSO policy development process. It's not perfect. We've always got work to do. There are always challenges. But there's a greater recognition and generally positive attitude to the work of the council and the policy development work within the GNSO. So for me that's the true, you know, proof in the pudding as it were.

And so thank you very much because it doesn't happen without all of the hard work of the councilors, the staff that support the work of the council who've been tremendous and who - with whom I've also enjoyed working very, very much. So thanks to all of you and let's have a look at what's in this...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...in this bag. I'm a little nervous.

Oh I have a feeling I can guess what this is. Is this a parachute?

((Crosstalk))

David Olive: Not quite.

Jonathan Robinson: Is it a - I feel like it might be a hammock?

David Olive: Correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh wonderful. There you go.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Fantastic. There you go. Well I hope I find some time to use this fully. Thank you again everyone.

                   And I think that concludes...

David Olive: I think we have to turn it over to Volker and (David) possibly?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. There is a public mic up at the front (unintelligible). Open mic.

(Lisa Furr):   Sorry Jonathan. I know you're not finishing the CWT Chair yet but Marika and (Greg) and I did a little photo so you wouldn't miss us too much going on a holiday. And - well thank you. You're as they say a really good chair and I loved learning a lot from you. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much. And for those of you who don't know this is (Lisa Furr), my Co-Chair in the cross community working group on (unintelligible) stewardships. So we have worked together through long

hours and some people think we are even a couple at this stage, but anyway. Thank you very much (Lisa).

All right so as you know our next item is another meeting of the council which is scheduled to begin a little over half an hour. Now I need to know whether we can bring that forward or not. Can I get some help from anyone as to whether it's possible or whether the schedule will constrain us from doing so? Because it strikes me that we could do a five-minute break and bring the meeting together with the new councilors and conduct the business that's required.

Okay so then just to be clear with you the business of that next meeting is seating the incoming councilors and it will be dealing with the election of the chair. And we have an interesting situation where we haven't had nominations for vice-chairs. So we don't have vice chairs for the newly formed council.

So I will be proposing to you and you can think about this in the interim that I chair that meeting in the absence of the different houses proposing a new council. I will no longer be on the council but I'll make my services available as chair of the meeting. And so we could go ahead and do that providing there are no objections from the councilors.

So when you come back we'll do that and if there are objections we'll have to find ourselves another chair of the meeting. Thank you very much. I'll see you all together in five minutes. So just a five-minute break and we'll reseat at 2:45.

END