ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
GNSO Wrap Up Meeting
Thursday, 10 March 2016 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

Also found on page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

James Bladel: I think we've got most everyone. This is fairly informal, right? We don't have a
                  - to have a transcript recording, remote access, all that? Okay. Okay, so
                  we're going to start the recording. We'll get going with the meeting, all right.
                  And we don't do a roll call, do we, (Glen)? No, okay. So, okay, so the - yes,
                  Marika.

Marika Konings: Just a note that we have apologies from Paul - Paul McGrady.

James Bladel: Oh, yes, sure. Okay, that makes sense. Okay, thank you. Okay, welcome
                  everybody. I hope you had a great week and I'm sure after yesterday, folks
                  are - you know, this is the last group of people you want to see but we've got
                  some wrap up things we have to put to bed before we scatter to the four
                  corners of the world again and OT each other for a number of months, at
                  least in person.

So Marika sent around an agenda and we've got a part of it on the screen. We've got quite a number of things to cover. So the first up is, we have to kind of get our arms around what we're going to do in preparation for meeting structure B.

As you can tell, there's a lot of back-and-forth going on in the community about what's necessary, what can be sacrificed, what can be given up. I think that what I'm hearing from staff is that, if we want an extra day, that we need to ask for it and quickly.

So that's item number one. And then the second thing is that there is a group forming that's going to incorporate representatives from all the SOs and ACs to talk about their schedule and given their work in the past on this, I'd like to nominate, slash, recruit (Donna) and Volker, if you wouldn't mind.

I can put your names forward for that group and then when that group convenes, you can take the GNSO's concerns to that. So I just wanted to know if anyone wanted to discuss this topic or - Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. On the PDP face-to-face working group meetings, I think, as you all know, we have a pilot project that still running until the end of this fiscal year which basically provides funding for additional hotel nights for working group participants to participate in these types of meetings.

We didn't have one at this meeting because we didn't really have a working group that was in a position to really take advantage of that as the working group does need to be at a certain stage of their deliberations to take full advantage of a full day.

And as such, you know, from a staff perspective and, indeed, if there is an ability to add that to the meeting, which there seems to be some indications, if there are requests, it will be considered.

You may want to consider offering this option two, I think, two - potentially two of the PDP working groups that are currently underway, and that's the RDS PDP working group as well as the new gTLD subsequent procedures working group.

So as part of a sequence, probably the first step would be for the council to ask whether that's even possible. If that is an option, then go back to the two working groups and say, well, there is the option there for you to take advantage of that. Are you interested in doing so?

And of course, we would spell out the rules because we do have specific rules for how, you know, people get funded and selected for that. And then basically, you know, move forward from that onward.

James Bladel: So I just want to point out, by that time we should have three.

Marika Konings: Right, but the expectation is that that group may not be at a stage yet and as well, you know, another point is, we did look at the overlap between the two groups. There is a 25% overlap between the RDS and new gTLDs, but we looked at...

James Bladel: Between the membership?

Marika Konings: Yes but we looked at - and it's our (identification) that it's not the most, you know, the most active one on the one side and not the most active ones on the other side.

But we do anticipate that, for example, on the RPMs there is likely going to be more overlap possibly with the new gTLD ones and it may be harder to plan for that one.

So - but again, it's for the council to consider. We can also ask for three but it may be more complex to organize and manage both from, you know, logistics

perspective, as well as maybe the volunteers that are involved in those three initiatives.

James Bladel: Thanks, Marika. (Donna), and then Wolf-Ulrich.

(Donna):   Thanks, Marika. I have a principal knee-jerk reaction to say no to this because Meeting B is supposed to be a policy meeting, so to the extent that we can maintain that principle and have the - you know, the working group meet during those days, that would be my preference.

                  So - but I understand where you're coming from. If there's a need for a full day and we can do it, then we should. But my initial reaction as no, because we should try to get as much done during the four days as we can.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you, (Donna). This is Marika. I completely appreciate that, but - I don't know if Volker wants to weigh in as well, but having been on the drafting that looked at the schedule, I think the max we have been able to squeeze out for PDP working groups, is, at the moment, I think, two or three hours.

                  So I think the idea would be - and again, this is, you know, approved as a pilot. And that will be just for the working group to really get their work done which doesn't take away.

                  And I think all those groups within also subsequently meet in a more kind of community engagement town hall format session to really bring the others together and then up to speed where things are, noting as well, that I think all the other communities have representation and participation in these PDP working groups and would also be eligible for those additional hotel nights.

                  So it's not that the GNSO would go in a silo and no one else is allowed in there. It also foresees that other communities that are members of those working groups are able to participate.

James Bladel: I don't think (Donna)'s buying it over here. Okay, Wolf-Ulrich then Chuck then (David).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes, (unintelligible) question, we had a meeting - in our (ISPC) meeting, we had (Tatiana King), so just to fully understand, it's not about a B Plus meeting right now we're talking. It means that - that would mean that full day of the ICANN meeting (extended).

We're just talking about specific meetings for PDP working groups in advance to the B Meeting. So - and this is - I understood (Tatiana) in that way, that they told us, well, the B Meeting is fixed. There is no way to go for a B Plus Meeting.

But - and I understood at that meeting, even she told me, additional working groups might also not be possible. That was what she was telling to us but that's different than what you're saying so there may be the chance to do so.

So what I would like to see, then, is if there are PDP working groups meetings possible, then please, as soon as possible, share this information. So - because people who are interested or more members, because it's not clear who was a member, really, to me. And who is (available) to go for that meeting know about that and could adapt their schedules as well. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes speaking as chair of the RDS PDP working group. I wasn't going to comment on Wolf's comment, but absolutely, we would need to let her working group members now in the next month at the latest. But, (Donna), I don't understand your rationale. You said it's because this is about policy. That day would be about policies. So I'm missing something.

(Donna): Excuse me while I talk with my mouth full. I'm objecting to the extra day. When the meeting strategy working group made the recommendations, they took all of these discussions into account.

This was supposed to be four days that specifically had a strong focus on policy. So we're going kind of beyond that recommendation to add an additional day to do policy.

So to me, you know, we've gone through bottom-up process here to get to a four day meeting to policy. And now we're saying we want to add on an extra day to do policy.

So I can - I understand where Marika is coming from. I get that. But my reaction here is to the fact that we are acting - that we're adding an additional day.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, can I respond?

James Bladel: Yes, well, just so I'm clear, (Donna), is the your objection - is it because this is supposed to be a policy focused meeting, that there should be time in the four days to put the PDPs, and if these PDPs are now being asked to move to a second - to a fifth day, then what the heck went wrong with the four days - with - okay, thanks. I was trying to understand it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Chuck again. So you're objecting to adding a day, not objecting to having more policy work, because that's what I didn't understand. You said because this is supposed to be about policy, we shouldn't to do this. What you're really objecting to is adding a day.

(Donna): Right. Let's do the policy discussions during the four days that are identified for this meeting, is what I'm saying.

Chuck Gomes: So what I've seen on, in terms of the policy, and I think Marika hit on this, there may be a three-hour meeting for it during four days, so.

(Donna):   So, in my mind at least, the agenda has not been analyzed for the Meeting B and is going to be a smaller working group to try to work that out. And so...

Chuck Gomes: And by the time they do that, it will be too late to add on a day.

James Bladel: Okay, we'll - Marika with a response, and then (David) and Volker.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Actually, to make a suggestion because, indeed, I think to track so go in parallel, so maybe we can at least go ahead with the request because, as well, the answer may be no.

But maybe go ahead with the request, see what response comes back and see, as well, in parallel what progress has been made in this other conversation and then on the basis of that, decide, you know, whether to go forward with it or not. There may be a way of putting our money on two horses.

James Bladel: Easier to ask for it now and cancel later than to try and get it and we're not guaranteed anyway so let's ask for it. Okay, that makes sense. (David), Volker and then Greg.

(David):   Okay, so I think the meeting is really kind of - this isn't trying to change what a B Meeting is or trying to change anything. It's - with respect to that, this is what the face-to-face programs - well, you know, the pilot program has been so far, which is, you know, it is out - deliberate really outside the times set aside for meetings.

I find that the face-to-face PDP working group meeting program is not, and has never been, (remotely) considered as an extension or a placement of the work that is done within the meeting.

Essentially, it's intercessional - it's a normal - it's intercessional working group meetings the same way we normally have just - we want to do a whole day face-to-face and for pragmatic reasons, we do that close to a meeting.

It's never been considered part of a meeting and it's - I mean, it is essentially intercessional work. And the meeting strategy has very little to do with it. It is essentially just done adjacent to the meeting for pragmatic reasons.

And I think the - having been into several of them, I think these face-to-face meetings are an extremely valuable way of getting some work done on complicated PDPs. And I really think we should continue that program and continue it regardless of, you know, meeting strategies (unintelligible) essentially.

James Bladel: Thanks, (David). Volker and then Greg and that we probably need to come to a landing on this topic.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you, James. Yes, I bet you're all going to be surprised if I'm saying that I'm absolutely with (David) here. This is an extra day that nobody has to attend. This is not an extra day of the meeting. This is an extra day where the participants of the working group can come together voluntarily.

And if they wanted to do that outside of the meeting structure, they would be able to. And the only request that we would be making at the GNSO is that the GNSO what - that ICANN would continue to fund this as they have in the past.

This is not part of the structure of the normal meeting. This is just those participants of the PDP and their supporting working staff, of course, would be there and attending get some work done.

On a second note, we might want to consider looking at the first day again which is currently outreach. And while that is important for all constituencies and the GNSO, having that time available for more policy work might be beneficial as well.

So - more beneficial for the GNSO than the outreach that we have planned at the current stage. So when we're standing right now with three PDP working group sessions of an hour in the entire (meeting) structure (or more) that's not actually what we had envisioned when we said this is a (policy)-focused meeting, so you might want to realign our priorities as well.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Volker. I think that goes to (Donna)'s point, is what happened to the four days that were supposed to be set aside to focus on policy that we have to move policy to an optional date by?

So I take your point on that and I think, you know, it's a little bit of extra funded travel for participants, for staff or probably going to be there anyway. So yes, I take your point. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. Volker made, you know, some of the points I want to make, but in any case, I think the idea of a pure policy meeting was a great idea and somehow the idea that that was insufficient and that outreach needed to be added to that was the dilution of the plan.

And I would encourage removal of it so if there could be a four-day policy meeting, I think that reducing and, you know, taking it down by 25%, you know, is not creating the problem that we're seeing.

I disagree to some extent with Volker in the sense that if -- and maybe (David) as well -- that if the full day face-to-face meetings are seen as an exceptionally good way to do policy, that that should be something that should be integrated into the policy meeting.

I think the intent of the meeting strategy working group that I can be if - I get it right, was to kind of free think the whole meeting system and to think outside of the box and that if there's going to be a policy meeting, what we should start with is a list of one of the best ways that GNSO does policy and what are the best ways that ICANN (unintelligible) does policy? And that should be on the top of the menu list. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Greg. Good point. Okay, so here's where I think we should go with this and just based on what I'm hearing and throw some of your lunch at me if I've missed something, okay, is that, you know, according to staff, there's no guarantee there's going to be an extra day.

But we should ask for it because we should - we can ask for it and we can, you know, cancel it later if we don't need it. There's a lot of dissatisfaction, I think, I share that somehow in our four-day policy focused event, we ran out of space to actually conduct policy.

And that's what's driving this request for another day. And I think that that probably goes to (Donna) and Volker participating in the small group that's going to help hash out this issue with some of the other is SOs and ACs they communicate that to them and say, "Look, we want to cancel outreach. We're just running up against too many constraints and having actual policy development occur over three days over a four-day meeting is not really enticing enough to get people to get on airplanes."

And so if you want this to be a success, we should really take a hard look at how much outreach we're doing and what we're sacrificing to do that outreach. So I'm hearing that message loud and clear, that this is the policy management body for the GNSO and that we want a meeting to be refocused on policy and that we'll get - Volker and (Donna) will be our leads to that.

Marika is working - she's got just some rough ideas together and we'll throw that in there. And then I guess if other counselors are ex-comms or anybody

feels like they've got some strong feelings on Meeting B, if you could channel those to Volker and (Donna) in the next couple of coming days, we'll get that going.

But meanwhile, we'll ask Marika to ask us for that extra day because we can throw it back in the water if we don't need it later. Does it sound like a path forward? And this Meeting B is a tough one. Jen.

Jennifer Standiford: Jennifer Standiford. I was just going to say I agree and I'll pass my thoughts on to Volker and (Donna).

James Bladel: And, Greg, if I miss a new ones or something in your comments about that policy focus and how we've already given up 25%, please, you know, contact (Donna) and Volker and get those thoughts, too, because that's good stuff. Okay. All right, let's move on to the - oh, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes, thanks, James. Olivier Capon-LeBlond speaking and the ALAC is having exactly the same discussions as the GNSO on this issue. And, again, we're not quite sure whether we want to have an additional day or not.

As you know, we also have policy work that we have to do reviewing things and we've got plenty of working groups as well. If we had one day for outreach, that makes it three days, then - and then one day where we have cross community interactions, so then that makes it two days, and then how many days do you have left? So if you want, we can liaise and see we can do maybe something together and decide on whether we need that additional they are not. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay, and you know now who is on our side, who has the lead on that? Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to confirm as well the first bullet so that (Donna) and Volker are also the leads for the actual schedule developments. Like, we usually have, I think, the vice chairs that develop a schedule. This time I think we had a small sub-team, but I think usually it's the vice chairs that have taken on that responsibility in this context as well. It might be helpful to have Volker in that, so just to confirm that it...

James Bladel: Volker just can't shake this responsibility since he was the vice-chair when these meeting structures changed. (Donna) is - because of her role on the meeting strategy working group, and (Heather)'s off the hook.

And she noted in the chat, by the way, that if they keep this four days, that she might actually spend more time in airports then she does at Helsinki, so keep that in mind, because it's going to be a someday if that's in - if Meeting B and seven Singapore or Sydney or Tasmania - Tasmania, maybe.

Okay, let's move on - and then the other part is that staff will ask for that but if we don't need it, we don't need it. Okay, so let's move on to - thanks everybody, good discussion. It's about as clean as it gets will me talk about meeting strategy B at this stage of the game.

And then we can just get some reports back from (Donna) and (Heath)- sorry, (Donna) and Volker as this goes forward. So one of the things that has come up in the last few meetings is the GNSO review of the GAC communiqué and identification of any policy impactful items in there and then crafting a GNSO response.

And we did this beginning in the second meeting of last year, the first meeting of last year? I've lost track - twice, okay. So presuming that there is an interest in continuing this and I believe we do as part of our new relationship with the GAC leadership, is that we need to convene a small group to take a look at the GAC communiqué, analyze it for policy issues and then start to

put together some thoughts that might be representative of the GNSO's position as a whole.

This particular communiqué - I don't know if you've seen it yet or had a chance to read it, coming out of Marrakech, contains some specific notes on a recently concluded PDP that we've adopted - PPSAI, and I think that is significant fodder for a GNSO comment or response or whatever we want to call it to the communiqué.

So I'm just wondering if we want to - if we can maybe get some volunteers for that effort, and also because it probably will include something on PPSAI, Steve Metalitz and Graeme Bunton were the co-chairs of that PDP and they have been having some dialogue with GAC members.

And so they would also - could also be a resource to helping to draft that if there is a desire to go that route. So Marika had a question and then we'll call for volunteers.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just a comment to note that there is template available. Staff will put the communiqué in that template that was developed by the group. So, indeed, the task at hand is basically filling in a draft, GNSO response, which is then reviewed by the council and eventually adopted.

As a side note, I think, at some point it would be good if the council actually reviews and maybe discusses, as well, with the board to whom it is sent, whether it's helpful or not.

I don't believe we actually got a response to our last one. Maybe a confirmation that they received it but I don't think we got any kind of thank you very much, this is what we've done with your input. I don't know if that is something we can or should expect, but just to maybe put it on the radar screen.

James Bladel: Thanks. I don't know that they're obligated to respond but it would be nice. Yes, okay, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record and I'd like to make it crystal clear that after having done what I consider to be a very bad job the last time, I'm not volunteering for this job.

However, I do think this is really important because it underlines a lot of the concerns that some of us had about the tool role of the GAC. And here we have a very lengthy, laborious, difficult PDP that went on for a year and a half and advice coming in afterwards saying you didn't listen to us.

And so I think it warrants more than just the template in terms of a response. I'm not sure what that response with look like and, again, I'm not volunteering to pen it. But let's take our time and do this well and discuss it because I think there are implications for the future. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Stephanie. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. I'll speak with my CCWG accountability had on primarily. And one of the things that the GAC Wondering in the CCWG accountability is why we were so, you know, ticked off at them and wanted to kind of control their advice and the like - or control how the board dealt with their advice, to be more accurate.

And this is kind of the poster child for that. You take a working group that worked for - through the entire process for an incredibly long time and came up with a very, you know, fine-tuned balance as good a multi-stakeholder consensuses are.

And you finish up - if you've got your key in the lock of the house to begin to open it and all of a sudden, the GAC puts their hand on the door and says, "No, you can go in there and maybe not for a couple of years."

And that creates a huge tension. And I think that there needs to be a recognition of that. I mean, this is, hopefully being solved in a - I think PPSI maybe the last working group that had no kind of GAC early intervention or coordination.

And so, you know, we and they are doing a better job but this is perhaps, whether it's the last of the old regime or a sign that the old regime still exists, either way, this needs to be, you know, dealt with that very different - at multiple levels diplomatically but in every sense of the word, diplomatically because this is - goes to the heart of who does policy and what the role of advice is. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Greg. So, you know, look - okay, just a second. This - on this, (Mary), or...

Woman: Yes, just let the record show that I agree with Greg. That doesn't happen every day.

James Bladel: (Mary).

(Mary):   Thanks, James, and just on this point but more generally for everyone's information, and this is not to say that it was a good thing or a bad thing, but that, as part of the process following a concluded GNSO PDP, we do the notification to the board and then there's a period of time before the board acts on those recommendations.

During that period of time, as you know, the public is supposed to have an opportunity to comment on the recommendations has adopted, and also during that time, and all of this is in accordance with the bylaws, the GAC is invited to submit any concerns that might - it doesn't say concerns, but to - if there's any issues of public policy, that they are invited to provide that input to the board also during this period.

So this is just an FYI that that maybe one thing to look at in terms of what the GAC is doing. Not necessarily just for this PDP, but in terms of other efforts, too.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Mary). So yes, (Phil), go ahead.

(Phil):   Yes, just to add briefly to this - to give a bit of my experience, vis-a-vis, GAC - previous GAC communiqués in my role as co-chair of the working group on curative rights protection for international intergovernmental organizations, there's nothing in the current GAC communiqué on that.

But in past GAC communiqués, at one point they said we should just - we're looking at whether there is a sovereign immunity issue that requires us to create a new curative rights process for some - for all or some IGOs because these - when you bring in an action, you submit the mutual - an appeal (at court) on mutual jurisdiction.

The GAC in a prior communiqué, just told us we should create one without even looking at the legal issues. They also said it should be in very low-cost or free, which kind of understood the - misunderstood the scope of that working group as we have no ability to create a monetary subsidy mechanism.

And finally, we have just received the draft legal memo from an expert on the field of seven immunity and law professor at George Washington University in Washington, and based on that memo, it appears that many GAC members don't even understand how their own national laws and courts treat their sovereign immunity of IGOs.

So there are significant problems when the GAC puts things in communiqués that have no - that both misunderstand the scope of a particular PDP and have no basis in the laws of their own nations.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Phil). (Susan), were you in the queue on this?

(Susan):   I just wanted to volunteer.

James Bladel: You wanted to volunteer? Okay - and volunteer. Just hold that volu- and Jen, okay, so we have three volunteers - (Susan), (Rubins) and Jen, okay. And I just want to note that I 100% agree with Greg, if they are not going to say no to this one, I don't know what they'll say no to because this is about as clear-cut as it gets, at least my opinion personally.

You know, there's a lot of good stuff in PPSAI. Registrars want it. BC wants it. IP wants it. Registries - you know, everybody - that's why it was unanimously passed by the GNSO and we worked so hard on it.

To have it kind of interrupted here at the 11th hour, I think it's frustrating. So we'll make sure that we get that wrapped up and we'll get something communicated. Can we move the item about the Red Cross since that also is mentioned in the GAC communiqué further down in our agenda?

Maybe on the second page - yes, so it's the second to the last one. That was also found its way into the communiqué. And so in addition to the PPSAI issue, the communiqué mentions the GAC's desire for the board and the GNSO to basically just go off and implement something that is counter to the PDP recommendations that were adopted for the Red Cross name protections.

And (Heather) and I were cornered a little bit - well, we had some discussions with the Red Cross folks and some GAC members in the earlier part of the week to kind of go through this as well.

Know, this is really complicated and I understand they've got some - I don't fault the folks who are held in limbo here. They probably want to know what

the next steps are and what the path forward is, but it is something that probably we can tied to that effort of responding to the communiqué as well.

So I just want to know is that changes any of you who have volunteered are any of you who may be left your hand down now, want to raise your hand because I think that is also something important that's in the communiqué. Do you want to - no, okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Oh, right. That's right. I'm sorry. We also invited one of the members of the Red Cross to comment - just we've had so much turnover on the council and 100% turnover on the leadership team.

We've asked them to sort of reset what it is that they - the Red Cross specifically was looking for. This is just going to be an informative update on our next telephone call or a report.

I think it's useful because I think this was approved in 2013 or something like that. So it is kind of an older issue and it probably deserves a little bit of a refresh, so we get asked them to come and present some of those concerns.

Not to presume the outcome of this particular issue, but that is happening for our April call. So that's something that will (fill) into the response of the communiqué as well.

Okay, can we go back to the first page? Volunteers are (Susan), (Rubins) and Jen. Awesome. Thank you, by the way. Okay, next up is, I think something else that was mentioned in the communiqué which is the request that is coming, I believe, from the GAC and from ALAC to get together a small group and discuss the possibility of a cross community working group on new gTLD safeguards.

And if you recall, this is the highly regulated string that would require extra safeguards in terms of requirement to registries and registrars. I was going to, you know, recommend that - or I've actually confirmed with (Donna) and (Heather) that the three of us will go ahead and attend this particular meeting but I wanted to get your thoughts on whether or not you think that we should entertain the idea of a CCWG on this issue.

And I would say bear in mind that there is currently a PDP underway that could address this issue, as well as a competition, consumer trust and consumer choice PD- review team that's also underway, CCT.

And both of those work efforts may be able to take on this issue more appropriately than creating a parallel cross community working group. I just wanted to know what your thoughts were as a council and if you could provide some direction to the three of us so that we know what to say on your behalf when we go into these talks. Okay, first of is Amr.

Amr: Thanks, James. This is Amr. No, I think that would be a terrible idea actually. I think this is clearly within the GNSO's mandate and I think setting up the cross community working group to develop policy recommendations on gTLD policies would be setting a very bad precedent that I would recommend not occur. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Amr. I don't know what the outcome of the CCWG would be. It may be just to feed into those other efforts but there may be other ways to feed into that effort, is I think what you're saying. And given that this is specifically a GNSO PDP, the subject of a CCWG shouldn't be a GNSO PDP. Am I getting that right?

Amr: Yes I think gTLD policy should be developed in GNSO working groups. And the GAC is perfectly welcome to provide input into the GNSO working group as are any other ACs.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks. And Chuck and then (Rubins).

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes. In the new gTLD policy development that led us to where we are today, we had several sub-groups. There was one for reserved names. There were others on IDNs.

It seems to me that - and I think consistent with what Amr just said, the subsequent procedures PDP could have a sub-group, and our groups are always open to everybody.

And we could strongly, in - I mean, very explicitly invite the members of this group, and you guys can talk to them about that when you have your meeting. But that could be cross community.

There's no problem with that but - and all of our groups, really, are cross community if they want to participate, so I - and then, you know, we're all recognizing the difficulty of coordinating all the activities going on by making it a subset of the (unintelligible) and procedures PDP.

Then you - you know, and I think it simplifies the coordination at least a little bit. At another point that I think is important, the CCT review team, they're not a policy development body.

What we're talking about here is policy development because if it's not, we're going to have to go back and develop policy later. So, you know, I think making it a part of whether it's the subsequent procedures are one of the others, I think that's the natural one in my opinion. But - and they would need you to look at something like this anyway, so that would be my recommendation.

James Bladel: Thanks, Chuck. (Rubins)

(Rubins Que):   (Rubins Que), registry stakeholder group. Well, just the subset of (what)
                  Chuck already mentioned, that are working groups are not restricted to
                  GNSO member constituencies.

                  And actually we welcome others to engage early in the workgroups, in the -
                  (then) subsequent procedures, you already (being) at least three, not - let's
                  not say GAC members, but people that represent GAC members are also in
                  the workgroup. So we should encourage them to come to our groups but
                  gTLD (parts development) is managed by GNSO and GNSO council groups,
                  not CCWGs.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Rubins). (Heather).

(Heather):   Apologies. I agree with what Chuck has said and I think we can actually wrap
                  up several other things we've talked about this morning and say that these
                  things have their proper home in subsequent procedures PDP and not
                  (unintelligible). So to the extent that we can try and leave that from council, I
                  think that's helpful.

James Bladel: Any other questions? Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, James. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond on behalf of
                  the ALAC. So I actually have just discovered the GAC comment on this. I
                  think it mentions gTLD's safeguards in the current round, not in the future
                  rounds.

                  So one of the things - one of the concerns that we do have is that if you're
                  putting it into the PDP for the next round of new gTLDs, that would obviously
                  not qualified because we're looking at the current round.

                  So that's the first thing. I don't think it mentions a cross community working
                  group in the sense of a CCWG as we have - as has been defined in the cross
                  community working group on cross community working groups.

It is a case of looking at several options including a dedicated group, if possible. Just to look at the current list that we have here on the table, the one which was identified by the GAC, that's the first thing.

The second question is whether, in the future, this would fall within the picket fence or not. And one thing that we wish to avoid is for it to be said, well, let's put it into the PDP and then the PDP participants decide that actually, no, it's outside the picket fence and then it falls between the cracks. So we have to make sure that we can address this in one way that would (be addressed) rather than just putting it there only to drop it later. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Olivier. Anyone else want to weigh in on this topic? I'm sorry, can I get a point of clarification, Olivier. Did you say that this was not necessarily just for second rounds? You said something about the current rounds, as well.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes, that's correct. Thank you, James. The GAC communiqué says gTLD safeguards current round, and the communiqué mentions that it's a group looking at the current round's (tentative) strings.

So that's why I do question putting it into the next round or putting it into the PDP that would look at the next round. And that's where there's this complexity. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay, but it's not necessarily limited to the current round. It could be the subsequent round as well. That's why they're referring to these other...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I gather it could. It doesn't mention into there and I'd have to come back to you to make sure to see whether that's the case as well. It does say in there that it also wants to make sure that the (picks) are not going to be - are going to be maintained and improved.

So that part, I guess, maintaining the picks and improving them would - I would say definitely fit in the CCWG on the next round. But there is a part in there, if you read the paragraph carefully, which says it also wants to look at things in the current round. And certainly the title of this section says gTLD safeguards current round.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks, Olivier. Important clarification...

Oliver Crepin-LeBlond: And just with the caveat that I've not been involved with drafting this part of the communiqué, so please do check with the GAC if it is unclear. Thank you.

James Bladel: No, thank you. Thank you. (Susan) and then (Marilia).

(Susan): So if it's pertaining to the current round, wouldn't it be in the CCT review? Couldn't we feed it into that?

James Bladel: Potentially.

(Susan): Yes. So that seems like the likely place for it to go.

James Bladel: Steve.

Steven Chan: Thanks. Steve Chan from staff, and I'm by no means an expert on the CC (tier) review team, but from just being in a few other conversations and reading the transcripts, I believe the GAC safeguards are certainly intended to be part of the scope of their review.

So I think it would be good to see if it is within the scope of the review and hopefully not (duplicate) efforts, perhaps. So just wanted to introduce that. Thanks.

James Bladel: So they've already identified this. Okay, that's good to know. (Marilia).

(Marilia):   Thank you, James. Just a quick point to say that, to me, regardless of the fact if we're talking about the new round or the (legacy) TLDs, it still GNSO (remit) so what I would suggest that we do is maybe send a letter to the GAC chair to try to understand what exactly they're looking for and if they are proposing a working group or which structure they would like to collaborate.

               And I think this is a very good suggestion to encompass this in the review so maybe we can consult with them on that and instead of having perceptions about what they meant, actually asked him directly what they meant with it.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Marilia), and just as a suggestion, I don't know that we need a letter because we've been asked to attend that meeting, so we can communicate that directly if that's - okay, and we - I think we're just looking for a sense of the group on what sort of message we should take and I think we're hearing it.

               Anyone else want to speak to this topic? Okay, let's move on to the review schedule and a potential letter to the board. I'll just keep this short. You know, I think we got an update over the weekend session that there is a WHOIS review upcoming.

               There's also an accountability and transparency review and we questioned the wisdom of conducting a WHOIS review when we have an RDS ongoing. We question the wisdom of kicking off an ATRT when we're - just completed a CCWG on accountability.

               And we're actually going to be implementing that and kicking off work stream two, so I think the potential here is for the council to request or recommend that we do what? That we get some kind of relief from that automated calendar of reviews.

And I guess - you know, or ask the board what the process would be to get these reviews postponed or even just folded into these other efforts. So open to thoughts on this.

I mean, I think that staff probably feels like, until the community tells them that they don't want these reviews, they have to proceed. They're obligated to under the AOC. So I'd be interested in getting some thoughts on this. Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks James, it's Amr. What I would suggest we do is we communicated to the board our concern on a possible overlap of work between the upcoming Whois review and the work of the nexgen RDS PDP and maybe try to work with them to make sure that this does not occur and maybe possibly tighten the scope of the Whois review to potential issues they may view as not being covered in that PDP if that is a possibility. I think it's something we should consider. So instead of just a flat out objecting just try to see if there's - there's something that a peer review could with a tighter scope and a shorter timeframe cover something that is not being covered in the PDP. If that is the case then it might be worth looking into, yes.

James Bladel: Thanks Amr. I don't know. It might be a possibility. I know that (Susan) and I and anybody else here on that was on RT4 with us?

Woman: Unintelligible).

James Bladel: You were on RT4 the - yes. The actual scope of the review is in the AOC. It's just a couple of sentences but it actually spells out what you're supposed to be doing. So I don't know that we could ask them to, you know, I feel like if we want it it's going to go forward according to the way that they have to conduct the review. And I think it's a question - and I'm looking to staff to tell me if that's correct or not. But I think the first step would be as a community and we're part of that to say we're concerned about kicking this off right now given that it collides with so many things that are currently going on and then

see what they come back with whether that can be postponed, delayed, modified as you suggest or something like that.

This could - this doesn't have to be really lengthy letter. We can just essentially say that. You know, we're concerned about these reviews. We understand that staff is obligated to proceed unless it hears something from the community and we want to know what your thoughts are in postponing, delaying or modifying reviews and just we - give it that. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks James. Another thing to keep in mind is that the AOC reviews are going to be incorporated into the bylaws in the next couple months. And so assuming this wasn't really that unfriendly a consideration it wouldn't be bad to consider in that effort to draft a new - to make the changes to the bylaws to have some clause in there to provide some flexibility to deal with situations like this.

James Bladel: Thanks Chuck. That's a good point. We should maybe flag that for the CCWG co-chairs as they move into implementation, you know, put an escape hatch in the bylaws if you need it. (Susan)?

(Susan): So happy again on the Whois Review Team so that seems like such a distant memory. And with all the Whois activities going on or registration data activities I still think the Whois review is important because what it will do is go back and one of the things that we do if I'm understanding it correctly is go back and look at the Whois Review Team's report and said, "Okay, we since these recommendations they were approved have they been implemented." And - and if they were implemented did they, you know, what kind of results did we get out of that? I think that is important.

Because if we don't look back to and sort of review what we're doing how do we learn, you know, what we should do going forward though there is a problem with burnout in the community. But there's also the FRR review right?

And I just do not think that we are at a point in this - in ICANN's life and in the Internet in general to not review security and stability.

I think we have more security and stability problems than we had maybe five years ago. And so I would hate to see reviews in general just pushed off. So maybe we do some prioritization. But I think that this is something we need to make a decision on and then move forward.

James Bladel: Thanks (Susan). That was six years ago. I know, it's crazy. (Carlos) and then Avri.

(Carlos): (Carlos) for the record just to comment to Chuck. Having been in two review teams and noticing they are going to be in the bylaws I think it - and before I die of volunteer exhaustion I think it's very important to consider some step or measure of taking the charters of the reviews. Beats me that there is no not consultation or at least comments or a wider review of the charters of those teams. At ATRT2 to my taste was very narrowly - too narrowly limited. And I have a - I worry a little bit about this one although we have not closed the charter. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thanks (Carlos). Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes Avri speaking. I'm on the ATRT first of all we will now have pushed it back one more year because it was already pushed back for this year. It was already scheduled for this year. So it's been pushed back another year. If we count on it getting into the bylaws it could be another year or more. And I think one of the things that's important is one, it serves as a force and function to actually get things done on the accountability.

And two, I actually think it's a good idea to let that one go forward next year because it's a level setting in terms of figuring out where we are actually now after talking about what we ought to be doing about accountability. So and I'd be - and I guess the third thing is I'd be really worried if they say, "Oh, we

have to do them every five years." And then it would go another many years before it might actually happen." So, I think that's part of the consideration on that one so I'd be cautious about pushing it back too far. Thanks.

James Bladel: Ed?

Ed Morris: Thanks James, Ed Morris. Yes I agree with Avir. I think the last thing we want to do with the ATRT is start our new ICANN with our new accountability measures and the first thing we do is post-pone an accountability review. There's just that objects.

James Bladel: Thanks Ed. So what I'm hearing just around the table because I don't see anyone else wanting to speak to this is that - Olivier, you just raised your card just in time.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Sorry, I'm a little slow. Thanks James, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I just wanted to let you know the ALAC is also discussing this. There were two concerns that were expressed. The first one is that there are so many reviews that looked as though they will take place in parallel. We're already suffering from volunteer exhaustion. It's going to be even more difficult.

And the second one is that there appears to be a scheduling of a Whois review. And there were question as to why that would need to happen as well since we're now working in the next registration data, the other RGS procedures so we're a little - we don't 'really quite know. I don't know whether there's something that's been raised here. Thank you.

James Bladel: Yes, that's what we're talking about as well. We're talking about ATRT and Whois for the same reason. So okay so it sounds like I mean if we zero in on a couple of comments there's a good reason why we should keep every one of these reviews on target and on schedule. I want to be clear we don't have to send a letter okay? But I just want to be clear when we talk about volunteer

exhaustion and collision of work and managing the policy that we are now with our silence as a GNSO we will basically be allowing these reviews to go forward.

So they're going to set up. They're going to constitute review teams. We're going to have to do the, you know, the exercise. I'm not trying to discourage. I'm just like this is what we're seeing is that we're going to allow this process to kind of roll on down the road. And I just want to make sure that we're not - so I'm going to say here I want to be sure that we are eyes wide open and clear an that's what we are agreeing to as opposed to standing in the road and holding up our hand and saying wait a second we're going to allow these things to proceed so that when they come, you know, we're not caught off-guard. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, great discussion and I - my comment's going to come back to what (Susan) brought up with regard to Whois. But it - I think there might be a way of tying all of these, even the competing concerns together that the reviews could go ahead but have much more limited charters coming back to the charter issue.

Like for example with Whois their charter could be as a follow-up to on the recommendations. I'm not saying that's what it should be but even on some of these others like the ATRT some of the reduction in workload and so forth could be controlled by their charters while at the same time letting all the other work that's happening on the sidelines go on. So...

James Bladel: Thanks Chuck. And I think one of the points I made earlier and I don't think it's carved in stone but each of the review teams at least the scope is somewhat laid out in the AOC more or less and, you know, there's definitely some room for interpretation. And also because those - the ones that I participated on were the first of those reviews. The second reviews usually go back and review the implementation of the first review as part of their charter as well.

So I'm just saying I don't know that they're going to have the ability to say let's do a lightweight ATRT or a expedited Whois. I don't think that they have that kind of discretion to scale that back. I mean if they go they go. So I think it sounds like I'll get Stephanie go here but it sounds like we're trending towards the council here is that we don't want to send a letter to the board on this. I've got Stephanie, Amr and (David).

Stephanie Perrin: Yes Stephanie Perrin. I may sound like a tired retired bureaucrat which I am. But I'm really concerned that the more we kind of denature these reviews the more meaningless they become. And then it was one of my principle objections to the GNSO review. There were a whole pile of metrics and what I call busy work.

And eventually at the end of the day you don't have real meaningful policy review and real meaningful implementation review. You have tick, we did it again, we did it again. And you have so many of them going on but nobody has even time to read them.

I take Chuck's point and if we could structure it meaningfully, if we could manage scope creep. But as NCSG I think we've got a serious burnout issue and not enough people to cover these things so it implies trust as well that the things aren't going to expand and that things aren't going to creep in that we're worried about. So I just want to put that on the table.

James Bladel: Thanks (Susan). Thanks. Stephanie. And then we have Amr and (David).

Amr Elsadr: Yes thanks James. This is Amr again. Just in case I was misunderstood earlier to be suggesting that we do not send a letter to the board that that is not what I was suggesting. I think it is a good idea to get into dialogue with them about this and maybe look to see if we could work out a constructive way forward in the event that the Whois does indeed need to go forward as mandated by the AOCs.

I think (Susan) made a pretty good point on looking into the implementation of the past Whois Review Team and maybe see what lessons can be learned from that. But I certainly do endorse the idea of doing what we can to prevent a duplication of work between an upcoming review and any work that is ongoing in a GNSO PDP. Thanks.

James Bladel: (David)?

(David):   Yes and I have actually heard today I heard a board member talking about, you know, maybe they can make a very minimalist Whois review scope it just as Chuck suggested. So I think the board are already considering it. We don't sort of need to push that option on them. Some of the review - it is a very difficult area. Some of the reviews I think, you know, there's no reason for them not to go ahead. And I would - I really think they're timely and should be, SSR in particular.

And some of the other, yes Whois is incredibly difficult time for - a problematic time for it to go ahead for a bunch of reasons including workload but also try to do a review on a rapid, you know, on shifting sand so to speak. So I think the board is certainly aware of all these issues already.

If we feel we can sort of come up with a like a single sort of get - (unintelligible) to hear in comments then great. But I don't know that we have to. The board are already thinking about it.

And what we - let's, you know, those are certainly comments we might usefully make. I don't see that there is a - I don't see there are any comments that would apply to all reviews as a group though.

James Bladel: Thanks (David). Okay so now it sounds like we do want to send a letter but I'm less clear on what we want it to say. And I hate to just punt that over to

staff and go put a draft together base it - yes, they're not taking it. They've thrown it right back to us so we need to think this through a little bit more.

What do we want to see with reviews? Let's start with that okay. And let's focus on - and remember these reviews are - for those of you who may be new to the community these reviews are about on part with the Cross Community Working Team. They take about a year. They usually involve not only meetings at ICANN meetings but also off calendar face to face meetings for anywhere from, I don't know, a dozen to 30 people. And usually they're hand selected experts as well from the board. And sometimes they hire outside experts as well.

So I just want to be clear, you know, that to give you - these are pretty big workstreams, not that that should discourage you in any way but they are not like PDPs let's say. Okay I had some hands go up. (Susan)?

(Susan):   So and unfortunately I don't remember who said this so somebody got in here that maybe it's we need a discussion before a letter.

Woman: Yes.

(Susan):   So maybe we need to talk to staff maybe get who - whatever board members are involved with reviews and have a discussion and then come back to the council with some recommendations or just more information. We don't want to crush the staff either.

James Bladel: (Heather), Stephanie?

(Heather):   Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: I think one of the fundamental problems -- Stephanie Perrin for the record -- is the horizontal nature of this stuff and the fact that our agendas are packed. So for instance the consumer trust group was meeting this week. I haven't

been able to make any of their meetings. That will involve listening to all the transcripts in order to make sure that nothing's going on there that has some reference to the PDP on Whois which it will.

So the workload here various potential new members have been asking in public sessions just how much time does it take to be a member of this, that or the other? Well nobody's actually answered that question. But I'm going to put the clock on so that I have an answer for the next meeting.

It's an astounding amount if you have to cover the horizontal stuff. And I would suggest that all these reviews that are going to come up that's a lot of work. Because as you say it's a very thick workstream. We won't be on it. There'll be like one or two reps. And we haven't got the bandwidth, period end of statement well unless my colleagues want to contradict me.

James Bladel: Thanks Stephanie. (Heather) and then (Carlos) and then we'll - go ahead.

(Heather): Cheers (unintelligible). And my thought on this is look, we at least have a toe in the water on this line item in that there is the reference in the GAC communique to the GAC's concern about our PDPs going ahead in light of all of these other reviews. So we can at least express some general awareness that we understand that there are all of these other reviews and that we're considering ourselves how best to progress within this environment. I'm wordsmithing on the fly so that's (unintelligible) but you get the point.

James Bladel: (Carlos)?

(Carlos): Yes (Carlos) for the record. Just to Stephanie's comment the six members of the CCT review, the six GNSO endorsed members got a nice letter from the GNSO reminding them too that they were endorsed by the GNSO and reminding them to keep - to be - to keep in contact. And my other recommendations for the GNSO council is to take a close look at the charter

of the CCT review. So it won't take very long and it will raise some interesting questions. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. So I have a thought here and just want to throw this out so we can move on on this topic. It sounds like we want to say something maybe a little fuzzy on what that on what, you know, that message is. Can I ask that we put a pause on this until our next telephone call on April 14? I believe I'm looking at staff. Do we have time between now and April? Are they going to put out a call for candidates before our next council call for these reviews?

Okay so I think we've got a little bit of breathing room. Maybe we don't have to fire off a letter right away. It gives us some time to go back to our stakeholder groups and constituencies and let them know that council's thinking about this and sending a letter what would they like to say. Do they have specific concerns? Do they have specific asks?

And if we can get that sometime and then bring that to the table in our call on - in - on April then maybe we can have a clearer message that we can capture in a letter and transmit that to the board. Does that sound like the way to fumble forward? Okay, I don't see any objections. Unintelligible) okay.

So okay, so if you have an opportunity between now and our next call please raise this issue either on your G mailing lists or in your next membership calls or ExCom calls. Okay, great. I'm just getting some nods from staff to go look at my watch. So can we - oh, the next item here is statement and public forum regarding the adoption of CCWG.

Wolf-Ulrich you mentioned, you know, whether or not we had any plans or the possibility of making a statement at the public forum. Do I have you wrong? Did I call you (unintelligible)?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: My question was - well on behalf of the GNSO so you as a chair are going to have - to do a statement on that topic so during a public for a

meeting. I know it's open to any constituency well to make statements those - if you say - would like to do so. But the question is is there something well that we should have as an entire GNSO (unintelligible). That you (meant)?

James Bladel: Yes thanks. And that's what I understood your request to be.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

James Bladel: So sorry for misstating that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And support that. And I would - I would just say well I trust you fully that it shall be a positive statement and reflect interest from how we did it, yes. So my question is then shouldn't it also touch on the entire project including the transition, not just the accountability? Because now this is - you know, this cycle has been done around that.

Maybe if you like also to point out how the GNSO is in a position or is committed to further ongoing work with regards to the implementation and the Workstream 2. And that is that would be my question because the question is is it just an ongoing work to see on the existing structure we have with the Cross Community Working Groups or is it to be reshuffled from those groups that they would come back to us to the SO ACs asking for participation? And that tends - that it's not clear to me. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. I did understand that you would - were proposing that I go up and just kind of make a statement. And if that is something that the council would like done I would presume or propose to essentially just read the letter that we drafted together as a cover letter. Remember that letter was drafted to the co-chairs of the CCWG so directing that or making the board aware of that and getting that into the transcript that their meeting might be worthwhile.

I also reached out to the other SO and AC chairs to ask them if they intended on making a statement. So far I'm getting a maybe, we're talking about it so not a firm commitment that any of the others will do so, not that they have to. But I just wanted to coordinate if they were. So just putting that out to the council thoughts on just reading that letter into the public forum with this additional sentence to Wolf-Ulrich that this is an important component of the IANA transition as a whole and that we are excited to see that process move forward. Any objections to doing that? Olivier? Objections, okay just let's just#

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Not objections. You asked for objections. It is not an objection.

James Bladel: It's not an objection. Okay. You were - go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you James. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And just to let you know that the ALAC will be submitting a short statement to the public forum. And it will just be saying that it's very pleased that the work has been undertaken and delivered over to or ratified by the different SOs and ACs and is looking forward to just engaging further work later on. So something to just feel good about, thank you.

James Bladel: Okay so there we have one other at least one other SO and AC doing the same. So okay any objections? I'll just go ahead and do that. And I'll take the letter that we transmitted yesterday as well as just that one sentence note that this is an important step to the IANA transition as a whole, okay.

Next page and we are - we got a few more minutes. As far as ideas onboarding new CEO as inviting to the upcoming council meeting we were talking about - we were discussing with (Yurin) a number of ideas that might help him get up to speed and integrate a little bit faster into the community. I think we were proposing the idea of an explicit invite to our next council call. Of course our calls are public. Anyone can listen to the stream. But having him actually receive a formal invitation might be worthwhile particularly in this interim time before he gets onboard formally with ICANN.

And then of course throwing out other ideas to council and the communities to, you know, how we could perhaps shorten that learning curve a little bit. If you recall when for those of you who were around when Fadi joined, you know, there was a little bit of a bumpy learning process, not just learning how all the pieces fit together but just the issues and, you know, who's on which position.

So if you have thoughts, I mean maybe we can put together a road show of some sorts where we have a designated speaker. It doesn't have to be a councilor but just someone from each of the SGs and Cs to kind of say here's who we are, here's what we do, here's what's important to us, here's what we're working on, you know, little dog and pony show.

So I don't know if anyone has any thoughts on that or maybe we can say essentially let's invite him to the next council meeting and let's pick this up after that as a council and see if we can put something together between now and Helsinki where we can have a university, a GNSO university with a student of one so or enrollment of one. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks James, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And just to add actually regardless the previous topic on the public forum comment the ALAC will also comment that it's pleased to see that the ICG has transmitted the (RNS) stewardship transition proposal to NTIA. So it's actually gone through. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Olivier. So we have a path forward with (Yurin) and the CEO. We'll invite him and I'm just looking down at staff. So we'll invite him to the next call and then we'll put together some ideas for an intercessional teleconference or a Webinar where we can put together some slides. And doesn't - again doesn't have to be a councilor. Doesn't have to be an ExCom. If you have someone who's just really, really good at giving PowerPoints that you'd rather put out front for your community that's good too.

Okay, next items is statements made during meeting with board and CEO. Over our weekend sessions I think it just we need to make clear that if we're making statements whether we're speaking individually making statements on behalf of our SG or C or making statements on behalf of the GNSO Council. I don't think we need to belabor this point. I just think that that sometimes is lost.

You know if the topic of conversation drifts particularly to anything that's controversial within the GNSO, I think it's important not to have those debates, you know, out in front of the board, just in my opinion. And I don't know if anyone else wants to speak to this, but I think that's maybe just a professional convention that we can all adopt. (Heather)? (Marilia)?

(Heather): Thanks James. My thought is on this I guess it would be helpful to have an understanding of, I always understood our Saturday prep session as broadly outlining the scope of our discussion, and if something isn't brought up in the prep session I guess can it be brought up in the actual meeting with the board or the CEO? Thanks.

James Bladel: Yeah. That's a good point. I think the same happened I'll just mention as part of our contracted party house, we had some topics laid out but the conversation drifted into other areas. You know, organically if that's where the conversation goes, you know, we don't want to be robots. But on the other hand I think to your point, if we're going to go off script like that we also need to be aware of, you know, where we're coming from.

So, you know, we're trying to split the difference here. (Marilia) and then (Phil).

(Marilia): Thank you James. I think it's good advice. I just think that the questions that we just sent to the board on the behalf of the GNSO are artificial questions and any questions that may arise from the conversation, at least it would be

my understanding that these are individual counselors asking all of those questions or bringing new topics because of the conversation flow, you know, the direction.

So maybe it's to speak with the board and let them know that these are the common questions and the other thing that arises is just give them a note.

James Bladel: Okay so that we would include that in our list of topics when we send it to the board that these are the, you know, GNSO topics, but other counselors or individuals may have other topics they want to discuss. I think that's fair. (Phil)?

(Phil):   Yeah just to clarify, when I raised a question with the board when I met with them on Sunday relating to a decision by the board governance committee and that was affirmed later by the board that it had occurred since the last ICANN meeting regard to the request for the reconsideration on URS. Is it sufficient? I clearly referenced that in the beginning. Is that sufficient to identify that I'm speaking on behalf of the BC who was a participant in that request, or do you have to formally say I'm raising this question on behalf of the BC?

James Bladel: I think the second part would be clear.

(Phil):   Yeah. Okay. I can do that. I said I was implicit when I referenced the request for reconsideration who I was speaking for. But I'm happy to make it more explicit in the future.

James Bladel: Yeah. And again, thanks (Phil). And I think just, you know, I know that's not the first time it's come up either within this group or within my stakeholder group. It's just maybe a point of clarification just generally that when we're addressing the board we just tell them who we're speaking for. Yeah. I don't mean to single anybody out so.

(Phil): I didn't feel singled out.

James Bladel: Okay.

(Phil): I just wanted to clarify for future discussions if something like that should come up where I'm asking a question on behalf of my constituency because it was on the topic listed for the CSG meeting with the board because it wasn't a uniform concern across the CSG.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks. I wasn't, personally, I wasn't aware of who was on the request for consideration or who (unintelligible) are so thanks. Any other thoughts on this or just more of just expectations, synchronization exercise or a level set there? Okay. Next topic is the GNSO liaison to the GAC. As you are aware we have Mason Cole who is coming up on his second anniversary in this role.

The GAC GNSO consultation group. We just coming up with new names for people getting in the room and talking, but this consultation group has made the recommendation that we make this a permanent position. As you may not be aware, or I wasn't really that Mason's role has been a pilot position that was renewed after the first year.

So the question on the table is, and if anyone believes that we need to move this to our agenda on Wednesday, or I mean the 24th so that we can have an actual vote, that's also appropriate. But the question on the table is whether or not we believe that this should be a permanent role as recommended by the consultation group?

I think that's a good idea, proposal and, you know, I don't have any objections to confirming that now, but I just wanted to see if there's any thoughts around the table on that? Yeah Mason?

Mason Cole: Yeah thanks James. Mason speaking. I agree. I was part of a review process that reviewed the role in the past several months and part of that review; part

of the output of that review was a recommendation that the position be made permanent. I do think in my experience in this role that it would be advisable to make it permanent because the interaction between the GNSO and the GAC I think is only going to increase over time.

And I would recommend to the council that it should be made permanent. That's my perspective.

James Bladel: Thanks Mason. (Carlos)?

(Carlos): (Carlos). For the record I have question to Mason. We didn't make the quick-look mechanism permanent. We said we were going to look together, you know, at PDPs, only for the next PDPs. What would be your position on that? Is it related or is it totally independent? Thank you.

Mason Cole: This is Mason again. If I understand your question (Carlos), you're not linking the quick-look mechanism to the function of the liaison are you? Okay. I mean yeah it is separate. I mean it's related only the liaison would help carry out the quick-look mechanism part of the role, so I think Marika has input on this as well. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, just to know that prior to this meeting I did circulate I think three different documents that were output from the consultation group on both the liaison, the quick-look mechanism, as well as possible additional mechanisms for early engagement in the PDP. We did bring those up during the GAC and GNSO meeting but there wasn't a lot of time to discuss.

And my understanding is having met with the small leadership team of that group that the idea would be that indeed a single liaison. There seems to be support from both sides to make it a permanent feature. Of course there is a certain process associated with that with selecting, you know, timelines but basically making it permanent in practice just means that there is a travel slot

available for that person to come to ICANN meetings and represent and participate in the GAC related meetings during the ICANN meeting.

On the other two items, as there wasn't a whole lot of time to discuss, nor any feedback has been received so far, I think the idea is to have a kind of survey go out to both the GAC and the GNSO to obtain input on some of the questions that are raised, as well as some of the suggestions that have been put forward in those documents, which will then help the consultation group think through what the next steps should be.

On the quick-look mechanism there are some enhancements we've improved. There are some simplifications. There are some other ideas for the subsequent steps in the PDP. But of course, and I think this is where (Carlos) is going, at some point there needs to be a consideration, you know, both by the GAC, as well as in the GNSO whether these would need to become permanent elements of the PDP process. And if so, those would then need to be incorporated either in the PDP manual or bylaws.

James Bladel: Thanks. Does anyone feel strongly that the, and maybe you want Mason to leave the room? Does anyone feel strongly that this pilot program of a GNSO GAC liaison has not been worthwhile? So okay, now, I'm sorry? Okay, Wolf-Ulrich and then (Susan).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf speaking, just a question to be clear here. Is it about the continuous position or the continuous liaison? Is it about the person? The name of the person? So what is it about? Then you decide to have a permanent one does it mean that the permanent one until he steps down from that by himself, or are we going to refresh at some time, you know, the appointment? What is your question? Sorry.

James Bladel: Mason? Now is your time.

Mason Cole: Marika? Correct me if I am wrong but part of the review process, at least my recommendation in the review of the function was that it would be renewable one-year terms with no limit to the term itself, so I'm not sure. I'm not sure where the consultation group came down on that? Was that adopted Marika?

Marika Konings: I think there is a review and I think there is also some kind of term. We need to double-check, but a note on Wolf's question actually I think Mason's term was only extended until June I believe, so at that point the council would consider. And, my assumption is that as it is then, you know, a permanent feature we'd basically start the process again, at least that would be my understanding on the role.

                What would be put forward in April would be kind of confirming that the role would become a permanent feature and likely also associated with that selection process and timeline that would need to be factored in for a selection process.

James Bladel: Thanks and Mason you had a quick response?

Mason Cole: No. I think that's accurate, but let me take an opportunity just to notify the council. I've talked with James about this. I will not be reapplying to be the liaison to the GAC for another term, so it's been a two-year process. I've enjoyed it very much. I really enjoy working for the council but two years is enough and I'm off to do some other things with ICANN so I just wanted to let the council know.

James Bladel: Thanks Mason. And, you know, I can't think of anyone better to kick this off from just an idea or where nothing existed before into a role that I think we're sitting around the table people want to see remain permanent. It's going to be tough to fill your shoes. Okay. I saw a lot of hands go up including Marika and Marika?

Marika Konings: No. I just want to correct one item I said before because actually the recommendation as Mason said there is no term for the liaison but the role is reviewed and reconfirmed by the GNSO council in its decision every year.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. So here is what I have, I have (Susan), (Phil), and (David) on this topic. (Susan)?

(Susan):   Well thank you Mason because I do think you just sort of jumped in and did it and further defined it. I do think we need a little more definition to the role as we move forward and that we would rotate between affiliations. So, you know, I mean I'm not sure of your registree/registrar but you know, so the next person we should decide on another stakeholder group to be in that role to represent. And, that we go through a rotation and, you know, or at least at the end of so many years every stakeholder group or constituency if we go that far has someone that has sat in that role.

    I just think it gives it a broader picture to the GAC.

James Bladel: Thanks (Susan). Marika you had a follow up?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika just responding to (Susan) because actually there is already quite a detailed selection processing criteria that we've used. I don't think that basically says that, you know, where someone needs to come from with specific criteria. Someone needs to fulfill and the way it's done basically the council leadership kind of ranks people based on those criteria and that's, you know, how the selection is made.

    But maybe before we indeed have the motion on the table it's helpful to share that process because there are like a number of minor changes that the consultation group has suggested, so I can take as an action to share that after this meeting so you all have a chance to look at that and review and to provide any comments or input you may have.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Marika. (Susan) we'll take a look at that and possibly incorporating it into that process that Marika is going to circulate that around. One thing I do think that is important is because this is; the way it was done last time I thought it was a good approach that Jonathan and Volker and (David) employed was that once they had submitted all of the ideas that the candidates were kind of reviewed by the chair and vice chairs.

And then their recommendation was ratified by the council and I think that helps preserve some degree of confidentiality like the NOM COM, you know, for those candidates who weren't selected?

(Susan): Brief comment; but considering the issues we had with electing you with chair and the fact that, you know?

James Bladel: I see a very distinctive difference here (Susan).

(Susan): I don't.

James Bladel: Because I think that's an open election, whereas this is more of an application. Are you saying that we should have elections for this role? Okay, and I'm just commenting on the confidentiality of the process that was used because folks might not be willing to submit or volunteer if they felt that they might not be ultimately selected. It's kind of like NOM COM, you know, where folks submit their CVs for consideration and nobody wants to be known as the person who didn't get it.

(Susan): I look at the same as like a CCT review where everybody steps forward and then...

James Bladel: Okay.

(Susan): ...they were picked.

James Bladel: Well we can have that talk.

(Susan):   Yeah, we can decide on that. I'm not worried about that. I'm worried about the rotation.

James Bladel: Okay. So let's capture the rotation when we talk about this in April. The next up is I have (Phil) and then (David). (Phil)?

(Phil):   I want to start out by thanking Mason for this work and I know that and in my role co-chairing at IGO review he's been extremely helpful and I certainly thank him for those efforts, and I understand why after two years you'd like to do something else. But I do think we need to make this a permanent position particularly in the new accountability arrangement.

                  The quick-look program is necessary but not sufficient. We need to put a face on a designated official go-between who the GAC will know that we can rely on to deliver a message to the GAC, that the GAC will know who to, you know, communicate, use to communicate to the council because we have some major mega PDPs coming up, or already just started, and we don't want to see again.

                  We need someone to basically cajole the GAC to be aware of what they are doing and participate so we don't have another situation that appears to be occurring with the PPSI and the GAC reaction in the communique, so great thanks to Mason and strong support for making this permanent and any way.

James Bladel: Thanks (Phil). I have (David) then Stephanie and then we probably need to put a button on this because we've got just a couple more topics. We're already over time and Lars wants to make an announcement, so (David)?

(David):   Yeah well first of course I'd like to thank Mason for doing a good job in the role and demonstrating how much value there can be in it. I can understand you might not only want to move on but also thanks for making the move.

You know, I think we'll make the move to a permanent position a little bit easier.

I do think the mechanism that we used to select Mason for the role was I think was a good, fair mechanism and then ended up choosing a good candidate, but it wasn't discussed widely with the broader council. It was pretty much a leadership decision and leadership run process. Actually, I mean if we had ended up choosing that as the process by which we used to select it as a permanent role I don't think there'll be anything wrong with that.

I think it was as I said a solid, fair process that's loosely based on the way NON COM does things. But we might want to consider; I think whatever process we do choose to choose the new liaison should be one we have discussed as a council and, you know, with the whole council should have some and the whole GNSO for that matter should have some opportunity to have some input into that process as we move from a pilot to a permanent role it's important to review those processes.

And I think moving from, you know, a pilot to a permanent position is going to be great but there is a bit of work to do on it.

James Bladel: Thanks (David). Stephanie you've got the last word on this.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. Yes, kudos to Mason. I think this is an incredibly difficult job. I think it's really an ambassadorial function and it requires those skills. I think there should be no shame at all the people put themselves forward and they're not selective. And I would encourage an open and public discussion on what criteria we need and a recognition of how difficult this is, and how this role and the changing role of the GAC with its new functions is going to be critical to our survival here.

So, I think this is an extremely important thing to discuss and get the council all agreeing on what we see as our skill set we need. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. We are over time. I've got a couple of quick points here and then we can maybe bring this in for a landing. So first up is I skipped the thing on the auction proceeds. We had a pretty substantial discussion on that over the weekend, as well as I believe that the board has had some discussion here in Marrakech.

So, what I propose is that we just maybe put together some thoughts on a draft response and take that to the list so that be looking for that traffic on the list. We covered the Red Cross issue when we were speaking about the communique, so we're going to fold it into that effort. Thanks again to those who volunteered. And (Carlos) I know that you had raised a point, a question regarding the, you wanted to talk a little bit about our interaction this weekend with the CWG on Internet governance.

I'm wondering if you would be open to moving that to the list as well?

(Carlos):   Yes. We'll move it to the list. But there is another issue that I wanted to mention to put in the list the working group that should come in on the budget. We had this discussion on Saturday or Sunday after (Unintelligible) made the presentation. Please don't forget that one either. Thank you.

James Bladel: Did we capture that one, the one on the budget? Do we have volunteers for that? We do. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for the reminder. (Marilia) and then (Glen).

(Marilia):   Thank you very much James. This is (Marilia) speaking. I have a topic for any other business. We were discussing the strategic change in Internet governance this week and we were discussing the sessions that ICANN is going to propose for the Oasis forum. For those that do not follow, the Oasis forum is part of the meetings and they happen to have a follow up on the world summit for the information society.

It is a big meeting sponsored by ITU. Sometimes there are 1000 attendees, so it's a big thing. And ICANNs going to have two discussions; one of them related to the transition and discussing the results of the transition. The second one is going to be organized by the GTE only new detail d's. And my point is that   I don't know exactly the scope of the session.

It concerned me a little bit that we are starting a discussion on the new detail d option precedes and how this session, which probably it's going to be attended by a lot of people, is going to be framed.   I think that one of the first questions that we will face in the working group is exactly if we are moving forward right now with the new detail d program, the relation between this working group and the reviews that are happening.

So I'm a little bit concerned on how they are going to frame the message in with this forum. I'm not sure if they have communicated to you James, but if they have not, maybe it would be interesting for us to ask them what will the session be about? How are they going to frame it and if you can report back to us that would be interesting?

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks (Marilia). And just for clarification, when is this forum? Is that coming up quickly or is that later in the year?

(Marilia):   I don't have the dates in front of me. I know that the application period for sessions has just passed if I understand correctly. But usually it's mid-year more or less, so we have a little time but not that much and they already know about the session and the framing we can even help if they want?

James Bladel: Okay, and which group is coordinating with that?

(Marilia):   GDD. It's (unintelligible).

James Bladel: Okay. So can we work with? Okay. I'm getting nods from staff that thanks you for that. We will take that as an action item and we'll bring that back to the

council for discussion on our next call. Any other business before we go to Lars. He has an announcement. (Glen)?

(Glen): Thank you James. It's (Glen) here just to say that the meeting, the constituency travel has come to me today and said that they have to have the names of the supported travelers by the 29th of March. You'll be getting a note from me. But I thought since then many of you here around the table and in the room, it's good that you make a note of this. I see Greg's here.

And I think (Unintelligible) was also here, so if you could please think about this and get the names to me by the 29th of March. For the counselors, I have put you all down and your names have already been sent through to constituency travel, so if there's any change that you might be for example that your slot might be given to somebody else in your constituency or stakeholder group please let me know as quickly as possible.

And, I'm sorry this is so quick but it has to be because of the location that we're going to and the hotels. So whoever comes last will be furthest away from the venue.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Ouch! That tells me I must have got in just before the deadline for this meeting. So...

Man: I just want to point out that in Helsinki everything is within walking distance.

James Bladel: Thank you. So yeah Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks this is Amr. I just want a clarification that this is also being sent out to the SOAC leadership list, just so that the stakeholder group and the constituency chairs know about this right?

(Glen): It will be sent as normally the request are, and that is to the stakeholder group and constituency chairs who are the ones that usually make the decision who in that group gets travel support or not.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you for that note (Glen) and that note will go out. We'll send it around, make sure you circulate it on your SGs and Cs. So kind of a short turnaround so please don't let that one delay. Was that your announcement Lars, or did you have, Lars has something else so if we could just have a few minutes for Lars?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you James. I just want to say this is my tenth meeting at supporting the GNSO, and it's been by and large a pleasure. But there will not be an 11th one. I'll be joining the review team at some point between now and, well tentatively Helsinki but I promise Marika I won't leave before there is an adequate replacement.

So it should be within the next couple of hours. And thank you very much and I'll see you in the corridors I hope in ICANN 56 but unfortunately no longer around this table. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Lars. And thank you for all of your help over the years in those last ten meetings. And I think that, you know, we can't say enough gushing things about staff whenever the accolades go around and you're definitely a part of that team. And I know that Marika will, and her team will find an adequate replacement and, you know, we look forward to working more with (David) as well, who is just coming onboard.

So I think what we're hearing today in the wrap up is with Mason and Lars, you know, the table is going to look a little different next time we're all together so let's keep that in mind. You know, hug your friends you never know they could be gone. So okay thanks everybody and for those who traveled, you know, safe trip home and we'll see you on the list. We'll see you in, we'll talk on the phone and we'll see you in Helsinki. Thanks.

END