Transcription ICANN London
GNSO Council meeting with the Board
Sunday 22 June 2014

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

(Jonathan):   We could - are we ready to go with the next session? Thank you. If I could have your attention everyone in the room, we're about to commence the next session which is the GNSO working session here in London on - with an opportunity for the GNSO to meet with the ICANN Board - (Ching).

(Jonathan):   It's great to have you here, thanks I'd like to make - extend a personal welcome to you as a Londoner and someone who never sees weather like this which is what I said to the Council yesterday.

And so it's mildly depressing to be stuck inside a room but hopefully we can enhance the quality of being stuck inside the room with (good interchange). We - as you know these are our GNSO weekend sessions on a Sunday, we've actually by a combination of accidents and design end up with a very well-structured day.

We met with Theresa Swinehart this morning and that was immediately followed by a discussion with Fadi in which we covered some of the critical topics at the moment, including the, you know, the top three items for Theresa. And that led neatly into some of those flowing over into our discussion with Fadi and then unto talk about some other issues, some of which we will touch on now.

We met with Global Domain Division, I want to call them the Generic Domain Division, but the Global Domain Division which (Akrum) - for the first time we met with (Oral Akrum), Cyrus, (Christine) and (Chris), so that was very useful. We then gone on to talk in some more detail about NTIA stewardship transition and accountability issues. So I think we've had - and now we finally had the expert working group on Whois in a session just prior to this.

So it feels like we've had a very good warm up to meeting with you and on that note I apologize that the room is a little warm. Yesterday in true style it was a little too cold, we were all frozen and so now it's a little too warm - maybe tomorrow it will be all right. So welcome all of you.

Man: And (Jonathan) the statistician will tell you the one (leg) is too cold and the other one's too warm and then on average you're comfortable.

(Jonathan):   Maybe it is all right then. On that positive note I wanted to start with a couple slides at talking about recent achievements and so on before we went - we dive into the detail of some issues which you - we were flagged with you over the last 24 hours. Before I do so (Steve) is there anything you would like to say in the (need) to sort of opening remarks or any comments?

(Steve):   Thank you very much (Jonathan), the usual. It's a pleasure for us to be here. We take these interactions quite seriously.

We want them to be substantive; we want to get to the heart of whatever is on your minds as well as on our minds. The temperature is already warm and I'm expecting it will be perhaps yet warmer by the time we're done. So let's just plunge right in, there's much - there's a lot of content and it's a mix - successes and some things that are perhaps less so. And of course we're meeting with you today as the Council and on Tuesday we're meeting with the various different parts of the GNSO.

So it's a sort of combination process that - so we get a lot of different facets of interaction with the GNSO. I know looking around the room that the ICANN Board is inter-dispersed almost perfectly with other people, it must be you guys and so this is good. So we can all talk to our neighbors and increase the bandwidth here - take it away.

(Jonathan):   Thanks (Steve), so I wanted to - I've got two slides here, I'm not going to take a long time. I want to say this for a couple of reasons, one because I think it's useful you hear it directly from us what we've been up to but we don't want to spend a lot of time on that.

Second, we have a culture here and it came up to some extent this morning that we have a culture of kind of - of criticism - at times very constructive criticism, but often criticism for return sake. My suspicion is we hear a lot of criticism about you, the Board and the senior staff and various things. I suspect you hear criticism about us the GNSO Council and the GNSO. I don't think everything's perfect within the GNSO by a long way.

I don't think the Council functions like a perfectly well-oiled machine. But I think we do a lot of things well and we spend a lot of time working on thorny issues and trying to make good progress. And I'd kind of like you to know that so you hear that element as well as the criticism and so there's some sort of balance perspective. So in a sense it's in that spirit that I've prepared these two slides.

And so the first one talks about some strategic objectives and these are worded as they were conceived back in Buenos Aires when we had what we called a Council Development Day, it was the first time as I said to you on a previous occasion, it was the first time we had got together as a Council and had an induction and development session. The kind of thing you would naturally do in most team type situations and something which we had never done, at least as comprehensively as that.

What we came up with was some core objectives which we will reevaluate in full at the end of the year when we meeting again for a similar session in - at that the LA, at the annual meeting and we hope and believe it will be a useful meeting to do on an annual basis both for checking strategic objectives, but also for naturally inducting new Council because that's when the changeover in the Council takes place.

So we targeted an effective working relationship with the GAC, a demonstrable efficiencies and effectiveness of the Council. An ability to attract new volunteers to the GNSO working groups to have your acknowledgements respectful in appreciation of the work that is done in the GNSO, which was a very sensitive subject and I personally feel we've made some progress in that respect.

And to - for us to have more substantive discussion in-between our meetings - don't forget we meet every three to four weeks on a regular basis dealing with substantive work and making a decent throughput through the work of the Council. I'm not going to go into any kind of deep dive on any of these topics, for me it's important to highlight to you that we are thinking strategically, we are trying to develop the way in which we work and that's really to record that.

And I'm happy to have any discussion on it but that's really the purpose of this slide - next slide please. The second is to give you a little highlight of what's been going on since Singapore and this is - I know you get briefings, you've probably had briefings on policy and certainly some of you will be very close to one or more of these issues, but it's no bad thing that you hear it in a little composite from us.

So really what - one of the critical issues in this whole organic structure that is the multi-stakeholder model is effective into working between some of the silos, whether those are within the GNSO or within - or cross community. And as you well know that one critical area is ensuring that the GAC is properly

engaged with GNSO policy. We've made tremendous strides in the work that we've done through what we call a consultative group.

We deliberately didn't call it a work group; it's a consultative group between the GAC and the GNSO. And one of the outcomes of that - there are others, but is a proposal to produce a liaison from the GNSO to the GAC so that the GAC is regularly and frequently informed on work going on in the GNSO, in particular that might have public policy implications. And so we have on the table for the GNSO and for the GAC a proposal to institutionalize at least on a trial basis for a year a liaison to the GAC - at first - a step - a first step in that direction.

You know, we had a thorny decision which I neglected to tell you in my communications -- although I am sure you are well -- came out on a (knife edge) decision on the Spec 13. But we got through it and we navigated our way through it in a constructive and in a way that we didn't tear each other's eyes out and we didn't fall apart at the seams. We managed to navigate a genuinely challenging issue for the GNSO for all sorts of reasons I won't go into now, but we produced a constructive output.

We put input into the meeting strategy group, the work of the multi-stakeholder innovation panel for which again we have some challenging thoughts, so there's a number of things that's clearly the initiation of the (curative) rights PDP and work going on on cross-community working groups. There's also a particularly important initiative which is being well supported staff on the progress of PDP improvements.

We're well aware that one of the criticisms I referred to earlier was the speed and effectiveness of the PDP. There's a very natural tension between feed and effectiveness and efficiency versus due process. We've got to navigate that but we're making progress and have a number of improvements that are on the way. So that's my sort of little positive entrance into our discussion.

We can dig down into some of the points that we (talked again now), I want to do that.

But there's one other thing I'd like to do and I think it's very important in front of you the Board. Because again and in this climate of regular criticism we fail to acknowledge things and all that we perhaps we should have (at times). And I'd like to acknowledge the tremendous support we - and this came out this morning but I think it's important that you hear it as well - the support we receive from the policy staff that support the work of the GNSO in a spirit that is both - is well beyond the regular work of an employee.

It's very positive, hardworking and very, very helpful to us, so I think it is important that you know that and we publicly acknowledge that. So that's my sort of introduction, thank you for hearing me out briefly and now (Steve) we can pick up on some of the other points that we shared with you by email.

(Steve):   Do you have that list in slide form at all, or you've got it on your screen?

(Jonathan):   I certainly have it on my screen, I don't know that it's available in slide form so I was hoping it's been shared with you by email and I'm happy to lead us...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Jonathan):   Yes?

(Bruce):   (I'd like) to ask a question just on what you just said. If - (let me speak into the mic) a little more closely - can you give a bit of insight into how you prioritize work at the moment within the Council?

                Because I'm certainly hearing - I heard from the Commercial Stakeholder Group this morning that, you know, they're struggling with just the huge workload, lots and lots of comment periods and things to respond to and (evidently) the Council has similar concerns. I just need you to understand

what prioritization process you ran through to work at, which topics to focus on?

(Jonathan):   In some ways I wish you didn't ask that question (Bruce). When I came into the Council there was a (pride) to even taking on a chair.

There was a sense of - there was - and what some people talk about, there was a seriousness - there's a perception of too much work, too much work, too much work. I then said, well let's develop a mechanism for prioritization and people said to me you're crazy, we've been there before - it's a problem, you'll never agree, you'll just go down. And so I took a different approach at first and said actually let's just try and do things effectively - well and in an organized way and focused on organization rather than prioritization.

And for the most part that's worked actually, that's been very effective. I - we - I don't think we felt in terms of what you might call our bread and butter work, our regular GNSO policy work we have been overwhelmed. Now a part of that I think is because the new gTLD program has been executed on the side and that's taken a lot of attention away from the need to develop what I might call run of the mill policy work.

So I don't think our workload has been - and I think others may disagree with me - but I haven't felt our bread and butter workload to be overwhelming and therefor for a need to do that. What's changed probably over the last 6 to 12 months - I want to express this carefully because I don't want to - but it's a kind of wave after wave of apparent initiative.

And that some of the - of various more broader issues, whether it's the - a number of different issues that have appeared to overlay on top of that and have almost been a distraction from the other work and that's what's made - what's changed the dynamic from what it was. And some of those are ad hoc, small initiative; some of them have created a bigger picture stuff. But it almost

doesn't matter whether it's expert working group, (structure) panels, IANA stewardship transition.

And when you lay all of those on top that's what moved it from a tolerable steady state I think, but let's hear from others.

John Berard: I think one of - this is John Berard with the Business Constituency - one of the things that help the Council get more done is that we're not involved in the public comment period.

I mean that's the purview of the constancies and the stakeholder groups. And so that is a fair share of what takes up the time at the constituency and stakeholder group level. We have in recent past written short letters on specific com- on specific subjects but we have generally, you know, we benefit from not being pulled into what is an ever expanding - an increasingly accelerated public comment trade.

(Steve): I'll try to use this one - the message that (Jonathan) sent out listed five big items, recent developments which I think we've covered, Board engagement and involvement with the Community, GNSO Board seats - an estimate of 25 minutes.

Another 25 minutes on expert working group on Whois and another 25 minutes on issues recent developments were relevant with the ICANN model and 10 minutes on (IVN) development and adoption. I would like to start if I might with the Expert Working Group for a couple of reasons. One of which is you just finished meeting with them and they're delivery of their report basically puts the ball back into our court - the Board's court of figuring out what to do next.

So just a moment's recap of the sequence of events - we've known for a very, very long time that there was some deep issues with respect to the way Whois is structured. We took the opportunity in tandem with the receipt of the

Whois review team's report in 2012 to pursue a dual track of fully supporting the Whois Review Team's recommendations and adopting those and directing that those be implemented. And at the same time opening up a fuller dialog about is it time to go back to first principles and if we did what result that would have.

The Expert Working Group was chartered - redirected from a formality point of view the Board directed management to pursue this. This came out of a Board meeting in November 2012 and in rapid order the Expert Working Group was convened and Chris DeSpain and I participated on behalf of the Board. I can tell you that it was an extraordinary effort - very, very intense, vigorous. An enormously talented set of people and you met them, they were just here.

The output of that is now the beginning of a dialog, not the end. There may be people who expected that the natural sequence would be that that report would be hardwired into GNSO for a policy development process. That strikes me as premature but the big question that we need to ask is where are we? What are our next steps? And one important input to that is what is the GNSO's perspective?

What - not only what do you think of that report but what do you need before you feel ready to tackle this? And any input that you have available, any guidance - and it doesn't - we can have some discussion now, but it also can be a thoughtful and more indebt process. And we do not at this instance have a forced timescale, we don't have a forced procedure. We're back in sort of open field if you want, looking for how to think about it.

And relatively quickly we will pick a path, but I want to emphasize that our ears are wide open and we're keenly interested in what your reactions are without any sense of commitment. So that's a substantive discussion which I and others are very keen to hear.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Steve), any comments, questions or input on this? And just to remind you to please state your name before speaking at the mic.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes, well like everybody else I compliment the Expert Working Group for an incredible amount of work and very constructive work in my opinion.

It seems to me that the next step is policy development but that's a little bit of a trivial thing to say. Because I think we're going to - there's a lot of policy development that's going to have to happen with regard to the many things that are proposed there. And I suspect this is a case where it will be really smart for us in the GNSO to divide it up into some sort of meaningful segments to make it realistically that hopefully could happen in parallel.

I don't know if we have enough resources to do it all in parallel or not, that would be more ideal. But I think a next task if and when the Board passes this on to the GNSO is for us to put our heads together and figure out how can we design maybe multiple parallel working groups that maybe all come together at the end or something - I'm kind of thinking live right there. But this - I think in my personal opinion the work that the Working Group did will greatly facilitate policy work going forward and complimenting that.

That doesn't mean it's going to be easy or short because it's significant change but I think breaking it up into parts will help make it more realistic.

(Jonathan): Thanks Chuck, I've got Avri next and then James.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Avri Doria speaking in CSG/GNSO Council. One of the things that I - in reading that and I must admit I've only read it once and read it quickly and not necessarily clever enough to have absorbed it all.

But one of the things that people in the IETF for example have started working on is doing a privacy analysis, a privacy threats analysis from a

protocol and technical point of view. You know, certain of the obvious things that is our big data stores, our nice juicy threat - privacy threat for pervasive monitoring and such as that.

So one of the things I wanted to look at -- and of course I'm sitting next to a person that could probably take this further within the Board -- is is there any interest request -- however - whatever -- to have an RFC 69 73 - a privacy analysis of the privacy threats that this EWT type of protocol, type of behavior, type of data collection might actually cause.

And I'm not talking about policy - I'm not talking about privacy as policy, I'm talking about the protocol and data threats that this solution might engender. So that's just something I wanted to put on the table, thank you.

(Steve):   And let me thank you for the very specific clarity about distinguishing the privacy policy from the privacy threats due to the structure and operation of the data store. I think that is a very, very key distinction and both are very important but they're separate.

(Jonathan):   Thanks (Steve), so we have a queue of questions and comments but as you just did now, if there is an appropriate response by all means come back, I don't want to just force us through a series of queues.

And including elsewhere in the room, so if someone wants to make a direct and specific response by all means do come in with that. I've got James next followed by Kristina, (Brian) and (Elliott).

James Bladel: Thanks James Bladel speaking, North American Registrars. So I agree the next step - the next big milestone for this body of work will be to feed this into the GNSO policy development process.

But I think that there are a number of preliminary tasks that need to be complete before that can - before that jump can happen. I think first the

assessment that Avri mentioned I think should be done. But also coupled with perhaps some other feasibility studies and even a legal analysis so we don't get into trouble like we did with Whois and all the different jurisdictions that are now tugging at that issue.

It sounds like - and without going too deeply into this issue, it sounds like there's still a loose thread of the potential dissenting opinion from one of the working group members who would love to figure out what - if that's going to be published or bolted into this final report. And then anything that's revealed through the public comment also I think needs to be merged into that.

So I think there's a number of - there's probably a big chunk of work that still needs to happen in front of this report before it can even be considered fully baked and ready for a PDP.

(Chris): (Jonathan), it's (Chris), can I just break your response (chap) if that's okay. So James thank you, I just want to pick up on your point about, you know, there's stuff to be done beforehand.

This is very, very useful feedback because one of the things that we need to decide is what stuff should we do before we roll it into a PDF and what stuff should we leave to be done with the PDP? And one of the examples I've been using is legal advice. Should we say you guys do that when you're - when you're doing a PDP or should we give you that to start with? So that sort of discussion in the GNSO to come back to us with feedback would be incredibly helpful to workout.

So stuff you think we should get done before we give you the thing to do the policy on would be incredibly helpful.

(Ray): (Jonathan) can I...

(Jonathan):   Yes just try and (unintelligible) come back on that and I know (Ray) you'll be (unintelligible).

(Ray):   Yes I'm sorry I don't mean to preempt the queue I just - that's an excellent point (Chris).

                My concern is that if something does go into a PDP and runs into those roadblocks along the way that there's a presumption that the PDP itself is somehow failed or was premature or something like that. So, you know, we can do it that way, it's just we need to be aware that's one possible outcome and we don't want to presume the (outcome).

(Steve):   And I think (Chris) was saying tell us in advance all the things that you would like done to make the PDP process more likely to succeed rather than to run into roadblocks.

                So that's exactly - in fact that's exactly what this dialog is focused on and this isn't the only opportunity but it's the first opportunity to engage in that. And we're very, very strongly oriented toward listening to that because we understand - in fact the whole purpose of the Expert Working Group if you like was to begin that process in a way where from prior experience we know if we just sent over to GNSO saying Whois is broken, please fix it, start a PDP. Well we've been there, done that multiple times so that's why we chose a strategically different approach. And this is more of that that we're continuing to execute on.

(Jonathan):   Thanks (Steve), we've got a queue and I'm just going to make it clear who that is. And if someone has to come in immediately through a sponsor (without loose a threat) let me know, but otherwise we've got Kristina, (Brian), (Elliott), (David) and then (Ray) - Fadi please.

Fadi Chehadé: To be very clear, especially after our discussion this morning we're not going to do anything until we hear from you - nothing, I'm not moving. Nothing top-

down, we're going to wait to hear from you. We want to be responsive to how we can make you successful but we're not doing any feasibility studies, we're not doing anything until we hear from you.

(Jonathan): Thanks Fadi, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, IPC - I would just add a step before the steps that James articulated, namely for the constituencies in the stakeholder groups to have enough time frankly to read and understand this really tremendous piece of work.

I haven't read it, I've made it to Page 10 but I think that's in large part because it was released, you know, not barely 10 days before the, you know, we all started traveling. So I think - it's important I think for the Board to understand that that process for the constituencies and stakeholder groups to read it, to understand it, to have the opportunity to take advantage of the sessions this week to listen to how the - what the EWG is saying.

Listen to the questions and answers that are being presented and then formulate their views as to what they believe should be the next steps in terms of PDP which then will feed into the Council. My point is I just - at least from the IPC perspective this is obviously an issue that is of significant importance to us, but don't expect to hear from us this week.

(Jonathan): (Okay) it's worth making one brief comment on that, that there used to be some form of moratorium on new information coming out ahead of an ICANN meeting. And if someone has experienced it Elliott would be able to tell me exactly what that was - I think it was three weeks.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Jonathan): Fifteen working days which is of three weeks.

Fadi Chehadé: This report carefully observed all that, this report was delivered three months before or four months before the ICANN 51 meeting in October somewhere.

(Chris): (Jonathan) can I just - (Jonathan) just to take the heat out of all of this (I need to just) - just reinforce it, we're not - this is the first of a discussion. The fact that the report has been tabled, it's been tabled, you're going to have meetings with the EWG to discuss it, nothing will happen until we've talked.

You've been through it, you've come back say (Kristina) of course the, you know, the constituencies and the GNSO will need to do their work to come back to the Council, etc. so there is not pressure.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Chris) and Fadi, no heat implied. Really the issue here for me is actually it almost goes to the trusting, it's what should we expect of one another.

Because if our expectation is three weeks then it shouldn't happen, if we're no longer operating on that well then it could happen. I sort of don't mind really, I'll probably get crucified for not minding but, you know, it's up to others to decide if we observe it. I'm just noting that there was a - and maybe we did it in this instance but I'm not sure we always do, so let me (not hog the mic) - (Brian) is next.

(Brian): Kristina actually made that point so we can go to the next person in the queue, thank you.

(Jonathan): (Elliott).

(Elliott Knots): Thank you (Jonathan), (Elliott Knots), (two counts). I think we all need to remember that there is in this room and at ICANN meetings an overrepresentation of commercial interests and (nation stayed) interests and law enforcement interests and businesses on all sides of the issuance and an under-representation of non-commercial interests, privacy interests.

This report was a strong piece of work, I think the process was a good one. But from the formation of the working group there were serious concerns raised that there was a significant under-representation of privacy and non-commercial interests. And I think because of that that the dissent that James referred to earlier that Stephanie Perrin put out need be paid special attention to and extra attention to.

And anything that happens going forward from here need explicitly call that out. I have no problem with the process and whether that was included or not, I'm not complaining about that at all. But going forward we really need to pay attention not only to that but to pulling in more information on the other side of this story, thank you.

(Steve):   Let me just pick up on that, (Elliott) thank you very much for that. I think you raised a very important point and my mind goes immediately to and how can we make sure that we're going to get the input that we need there?

We had trouble finding people who were willing to participate originally and Stephanie I have to give her enormous credit. She was very earnest and she brought a lot of expertise into the group and personally I found it a real joy to have her there. But as noted she was in the minority and so the other question was how do we flesh that out? Do we do it through the organs that we have here and going particularly to the non-commercial user constituency or the NPOC or to ALAC?

Or do we in addition - we'd certainly have to do all that but in addition do we reach out to organizations that specialize in that (FAPFF), I'm sure there's others around the world. Specific suggestions would be very welcome from you or from others.

(Elliott): Okay that's great, so let me make a couple because first you could have - the day that the working group was constituted said that Stephanie was going to be in the minority simply by looking at the members of the group.

You know, that's not a non, you know, everybody should bring their stuff to the table and everybody did. And so of course given the constitution of the group she's in the minority. What I'm calling out is, you know, very much, you know, what you have said and more. That makes it incumbent upon the process, however it's going to be carried. You know, Fadi said they're waiting for direction from the GNSO, then that exact type of reaching out need be done.

That's great so let me speak to the Council, speak to the EFF, speak to (EPIC). Go out and cultivate that information, go out and bring that information into the process because it was underrepresented in the working group and it was a lone voice in the wilderness. So I think that's right (Steve), I mean you came up with two great ones there right off the (cuff). I mean I'm happy to take away and think of a number more but that's exactly what needs to be done.

(Chris): Sorry I'm going to respond to this, I just want to - (Elliott) I appreciate what you said, but I think it's a little unfair to characterize it that way.

Because what it does is it undermines the willingness of everybody else on the (EFF) Working Group to listen to the input from those who come from a privacy background and to make extreme - real compromises in order to get everybody across the line. To suggest that, you know, a person (regularly) is always going to be in a minority is an unfair characterization on the efforts put in by others to actually come to the center, to the party and to reach compromise.

(Elliott): Then (Chris) you didn't hear me, what I said was looking at the specific constitution of this specific group that was an easy conclusion to come to. You generalized it and I agree with what you said there, that's right.

So again I'm not - I don't want that to be a, you know, well that was poorly constituted. It was what it was and I think everybody did do good work, everybody brought themselves to the process. But here we are and it was as it, you know, many feared it would be.

Man: So taking the point that (Chris) is making and the point that you're making, one of the things that I think is absolutely incumbent on all of us is to look at the substance of what's said as opposed to simply looking at the list of people who were there and saying, well that's a political process and we weren't represented therefore we don't subscribe to the result.

That's not acceptable, this was a serious piece of technical work looking at a hard set of issues and the work should stand on its own authorship irrespective. And I would counsel everybody involved because as (Chris) said a bunch of very smart and capable and determined to be objective people looking at a full range of issues there and as much sensitivity and privacy and everything across the board.

Stephanie brought particular expertise but that was listened to and did not run counter to the ethic and instincts of everybody, it was simply in addition to that - I thought (Shareen) you had your hand up?

(Jonathan): Well there's quite - there's a queue know, (unintelligible) I've got we've got a good point I think (unintelligible)...

Man: But (Shareen) on this one...

(Jonathan): Yes so there' questions (auto dialed in), I've got in the queue - I've got (David), (Ray), (Sheri) and (John) and I've got (Faulkner) asking for a direct

response on this and (John). So we'll have (Faulkner) and then John and then we'll get back to the queue which is (David), (Ray) and (Sheri).

(Faulkner): Thank you (Jonathan), (Faulkner) speaking, I've raised this point before and I will chime in with what (Elliott) said.

ICANN in my view needs to do a better job reaching out to those constituencies, interests - whatever you may call them that are currently not represented or not coming to ICANN for whatever reasons there are and to try to activate those interests, be it privacy officials, contact them through the GAC, ask the GAC member to provide contacts to the direct data privacy officials so that you or whenever a working group's constituted may reach out to them and sort of tell them this is going on, this may affect your interests.

Inform them better involvement earlier and reach out to these parties because they have a lot on their plate (though as this) and they might not see that something is going on which might be relevant to their interest. So outreach to parties not represented currently might be a solution here as well.

Man: Thank you (Jonathan), if this were 2004 I would be very receptive to (Elliott)'s point.

But at 2014 and many of the companies that were represented on - who had members on the Expert Working Group have had a history of dealing with responding to modifying their policies on the basis of government intervention, NGO intervention, lawsuits and otherwise. I believe that companies are far more - incorporate far more the care of data protection privacy in their practices and I wouldn't want to suggest that the lessons of the last ten years were somehow thrown out once they went into the room to discuss the RDS.

(Jonathan):   Just to remind you of the queue, we've got - we're going back into the queue now. We've got (David), (Ray), (Sheri) and then back to the microphone - (David).

(David):   (Thank you), so when we look on ICANN often we have a great tendency to focus on the issue - this big issue at hand.

I think this is one example and other examples would be the, you know, to do with the RAA and other things that really demonstrate that ICANN both as an organization and as a community could really do - benefit a great deal from serious capacity building in its ability to deal with the ever growing complexities of international privacy policy. It is a very specialist, complicated area - people who like Stephanie who I think literally (dictated) experience dealing with it are wonderful but there are very few of them around.

And that is - so I think - and I'm glad to hear from sort of what (Steve) said it appears that is a message the Board understands, that we need to do some capacity building on privacy. I know that as a stakeholder group we are - we realize that we have particular expertise in this area and we are trying to do it. We have a privacy discussion hosted by the NCSG from 3:00 to 6:00 in this room I think on Wednesday - 3:00 to 6:00 on Wednesday, but that is only part of it.

We - as (Faulkner) said we need to also look at national privacy organ- data protection and privacy agencies through the GAC. We need to possibly, you know, as an organization think about when we are looking for policy stuff this is something we need to - an area we need to feel this capacity building on privacy law is something we should be - we should definitely think about how we can best do it within this process- this crucial process of replacing Whois.

And of course we all know Whois was made with some quite - has a (unintelligible) that she made with some quite perhaps naïve - in retrospect naïve assumptions about privacy, but in practice at the time they were fine -

they seemed quite reasonable. It's only that we are still sort of stuck with them so long after this is really the problem. And yes we need to step up all over and I encourage everyone to sort of participate, reach out to anyone you know. And absolutely that includes people from companies like, you know, Facebook and Google who have a huge expertise in dealing with modern privacy things as well. All of us we need to reach out and get privacy people involved, please.

(Jonathan):   Thanks (David) - (Ray).

(Ray):   Thank you (Jonathan), I'd like to bring this topic back to what's presented to us to discuss.

First of all Chuck you were right on, it can't be a (omniverse) policy, it's got to be a group of them. And (Ira) thank you very much for your intervention with regards to what's going on in the ITF and if there's more work that needs to be done then certainly it should be. As far as next steps along the line this is an effort that requires first of all an understanding of the report. And so Kristina I emphasize with you with regard to that, I would expect to hear from you this week but not about this.

So yes it has to be understood by everyone that's going to be involved in discussing the policies around this report. So that's going to require probably a little extraordinary effort in the fact that you may want to sit down and construct a policy development plan - in other words what kinds of data you need to gather, what kinds of policies could be extracted from this report as far as policy development work.

Come up with the policies that will be as part of an overall collection of policies that will implement as appropriate and as the community desires this report. Now you don't have to accept everything that's in the report, you can reject it - there's nothing that says that this is the solution. There may be

something's where the GNSO might want to work through getting some more technical work done inside the ITF.

There may be things that are implied tasks that would come out of analyzing this report in terms of polices that are not immediately apparent. So a lot of hard work upfront analysis and description, putting together a framework as far as what types of policies are going to be appropriate is probably the best way to go. And the best people to do that are the members of the GNSO. If there's some things in there where you think that there might be a need for some additional guidance certainly frame the question and send it to the Board.

But for the most part at this point the Board should actually not be involved in your policy development process, it's yours. And so the final outcome of this will be dependent upon how well everyone amongst the entire GNSO can work together to develop a cohesive set of policies. If you need to bring in more voices, if you need to do that fine, do it. But the Board is not going to try and solve these kinds of problems for you. So in the end we're leaving it up to you to decide what you want to do.

You know, as far as I'm concerned if you don't like the report at all, reject the entire thing - do something else. But the point is you need to come up with a policy, thank you.

(Jonathan):   Thanks (Ray), we'll take two more contributions from people who have patiently waited and then we'll probably close this topic and move onto one of the others - (Sheri).

(Sheri):   I have a concern that this which I consider as (surely you're) looking at the computer based project eventually are going to hate the policy versus implementation issue big time.

Unless someone, I don't know who at this stage lay the various steps towards what I call now the working part - the working group is doing a user requirement, right and then it's going to be handed over for the GNSO to do a policy and then somebody's going to jump to implementation. And I said this before, there is a stage missing in the middle from user requirement implementation called design. Who's going to do the design and who more importantly is going to sign off on the design?

And the signoff is a step missing in our culture generally on the design stage. And what will typically happen here is that the PDP will be done, it will be handed over but it will not be at a level that you can go and build your database. It has to be a design in-between, so who's going to do the design and who's going to sign off on the design? Usually the users who are on the system are the people who sign off on the design, all right.

So you need to think about that, that's just a suggestion, you don't need to answer it now but it's something that is missing from our cycle as a group.

(Jonathan):   (Sheri) thanks, it's something you and I have discussed one to one, I've heard you talk about it publicly. I feel strongly about this specification design implementation issue.

Clearly one of the other sort of identical parallel themes is the iterative nature of those in modern development work. I mean I do think that you raise a point here that's the reason I want to just make sure we capture it is it's not only relevant to the expert working group, it's relevant as you said to policy implementation work. I know Chuck is here, I wouldn't be surprised if J. Scott was here as well, the co-chairs of the Policy and Implementation Working Group.

So I just want to get it on record that this is a challenge for all of us as a community rather than only specially in relation to this work. Just a reminder to - you want to respond (Bruce)?

(Bruce):   I just want to raise I guess (Sheri) has mentioned one development methodology which is often referred to as waterfall style where you have a very clear requirements design build.

Quite a number of other things that we do probably follows more of an agile front which is develop something, get feedback, improve it. And I think we need to understand both of those aspects because in either case someone's going to be signing off on the changes, you know.

(Jonathan):   And I meant - that's what I meant when I said iterative. So just to remind for Board members, counselors and anyone else announce yourself before you speak.

(Chris Gorsillis):   Thank you Chair, my name is (Chris Gorsillis) for somewhat multi-stakeholder model because those are (NGL) also from academia and business.

I just wanted to raise the concern of I'm sure that you have somehow addressed this issue in the report and that is the question when you have introduced a model of dated kind of pre-released access to the Whois database. So have you considered and have you solved the issue of defining the for example law enforcement actors globally? Because as you know you have a lot of institutions which might be considered law and enforcement agencies which are actually not and otherwise we ask. So who would we actually (integral) in your proposal to (cramp) and revoke those permissions, thank you.

(Jonathan):   Thank you (Mike), would anyone like to respond to that or should we go right - so that's very useful it seems perhaps these add the issue in and around the output of the Expert Working Group to the extent that any of us have had the chance to digest it properly or even preliminarily.

So I hope that's been useful (Steve) and (Chris) and Board colleagues to - for a preliminary pass on how we might deal with the work fairly correct. So we had a couple of other topics in here we - there really are three others that we could touch on, I'm going to suggest that we focus on one first and perhaps skip one entirely. So it seems to me that Board engagement and involvement and also the interrelationship with GNSO Board (seats) is something we could usefully discuss.

I don't think this is unduly contentious, I think it's just useful to share our perspectives on this whatever they may be so that we have as close to a common understanding, that is the nature of this topic to me. But there are some points in here. I personally - Point 4 which is all about volume, workload, demand and bottom-up, I think we've had a good airing of those issues through the course of today and over the weekend. So my temptation is to leave that and make sure that we do cover the IDN development and adoption point.

So, but first before we get onto IDN development adoption and if anyone has a problem with that sort of tweaking of the agenda please let us know. Let's go into this issue of Board engagement and involvement of the community and talk through and around any of those issues. And like I say I don't want to focus simply on the interrelationship between the (findings we do to) director and the appointment from the GNSO.

I think that teases out an underlying theme which is what we can reasonably - what the community can expect the Board member involvement in the community, how community interests are represented at Board level and to try and discuss some of those issues for which there are a series of questions. So I'm open minded as to how we discuss that. You know, for example (Bruce) is - I think you chair the Governor's Committee do you? I mean you may want to make some remarks.

Others within the GNSO may want to come up with questions or statements in or around this. I don't want to prescribe the course of this discussion, it's an opportunity to have what I think is a relatively uncontentious discussion but certainly might tease out a couple of either sensitive or interesting points. Anyone want to lead on this?

(Paul): I'd like to - I don't know if I want to lead but I want to make a couple of remarks. The - there is a long-running dichotomy of points of view about the Board.

It's quite obvious that the Board is structured as a someone large group compared to ordinary boards and draws people from - specifically from different parts of the community. That's beneficial in terms of bringing expertise in but it also raises as I say a kind of dichotomy, is the Board a traditional board that oversees the financial and managerial health of the organization?

Or is the Board a representative body that is bringing the cross occurrence of the different constituencies in for thrashing out from a policy point of view? The answer - my answer and we can have a full discussion on that, is that it is only the first. The policy resolution issues should take place in the policy bodies of which the GNSO is clearly one of the major ones. The role of the Board is to oversee the processes, oversee the - that things are going well.

To help set strategic direction and to hold the management accountable in a number of different ways. And that with that point of view every single person who joins the Board, you know, even including liaisons in my view who don't have a vote, everybody who sits in that room has a responsibility to act on behalf of what's good for the ICANN community as a whole and the ICANN corporation as a business.

And the idea that we're more like a parliament or that you bring the interest of a particular group into that room is in my view not consistent with the official

duties. It's certainly valuable - it's enormously valuable to have the experience of coming from different communities. We have people who have legal experience, we have people who have policy experience, we have people who have government experience, we have people even a few of us who have some technical experience.

All of that is very helpful but having that experience is not the same as being the spokesperson for that community in competition if you will with other things. So the kind of people that we need on the Board are people who have the maturity, the experience level and the point of view and the skillsets to operate in that mode.

And what we ask of every single group that brings people onto the Board, whether it's the NomCom or whether it's a supporting organization or ALAC or any of the advisory committee's that are appointing ongoing liaisons is to send people who come with the maturity level and skills and the commitment to operate that mode. And we ask equally of each of the appointing organizations to hold - to keep in mind that that's the role and the job that the person is doing as opposed to being their lobbyist if you will or their spokesperson.

And there are many other avenues for communicating your points of view formal and informal alike. So that's my opening ensemble and I will step back from this and (Bruce) you will bring a calmer point of view here.

(Bruce):   Well certainly I think right (Paul)'s ex- use of terminology here that when you're coming from the GNSO or the ISO or the ccNSO what you bring to the Board is a perspective from that group but you're not representing the group.

And that's because the Board's not a parliament, it's actually a corporate Board. And the Board's responsibility, you know, I'd say that and the corporation is more of a law of the way the organization is structured. But having said that, you know, just to sort of give you a feel for how practically it

works, I have been led by the GNSO, in fact I think on the longest voting Board director currently. My approach to this has been that I follow the activities of the GNSO, I'm on the GNSO Council manning this by regular postings.

And typically when a matter comes before the Board the way the Board structures it's process is it appoints what we call shepherds to actually take that issue, help out the questions from other Board directors, help (liaise) with staff on that particular issue. So when - so for example the output of the PDP comes from the GNSO to the Board it's typically me or Bill Sheppard that takes on and shepherd's that issue.

When I've read the PDP report if any Board directors have any questions we will attempt to answer them from our own personal knowledge of the topic. If we can't answer them, you know, we would help engage the staff to help answer the Board's questions or even suggest people in the community that Board directors could speak to if they wanted to try to understand something further, so that's certainly how we look at those issues.

ICANN there is direct meetings of stakeholder groups, I've met with the Commercial Stakeholder Group this morning with (Bill Grey). Also I was on a call a few weeks ago with the Registry Stakeholder Group, in each case I listened to what those groups had to say. I summarized their comments, I sent those comments to the Board (manning) for all Board directors to read. So just sort of giving you a bit of a feel for this is how it works in practice.

So I'm not saying there's an issue, it's, you know, I'd be interested to hear why you think it's a problem. But I think the GNSO Council members - sorry the GNSO elected members of the Board do keep in close touch with the GNSO community. And fundamentally (I rally this) to make sure that we fully understand the issues and the policies that are being brought forward to the Board.

But the Board as a whole needs some votes on this and we work through those documents that you provide us. If that helps any but I'm not really seeing any real conflicts in this area personally.

(Jonathan):   So we have a hand up from Olga, let's hear from you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks and thank you for putting this on the agenda because it really - it's a way for us to be able to discuss how it is that the Board comes to consensus on things.

One of the most important jobs of the Board members is to try to reach consensus on things that sometimes represent very different views among the different communities. If they character of an obligation of the Board member were to change from one where you primarily must take into account the good of the entire organization then what you would have instead is the type of board where each board member would represent the viewpoints of let's say their particular community or let's say shareholders.

In that kind of a board then what you would have is a lesser ability to resolve between differing viewpoints. You would simply have a restatement at the Board's level of views that have differed within the community. So I think right now it has a very traditional structure in terms of a nonprofit organization with an obligation of every Board member to the entire organization and that's actually serving us quite well.

(Jonathan):   Thanks Olga, I've (Ray) and then possibly James - I wouldn't mind making some remarks as well, so go ahead (Ray).

(Ray):   Thank you (Jonathan), I'd like to echo comments that (Bruce) has made, Olga has made.

From a perspective of an SO-appointed Board member I do keep myself aware of what goes on in the regional registries. I subscribe to all five of those registry's policy list and so forth. I regularly attend the Council meetings - the Address Council as does (Carl Wave), we both do that. We periodically attend RAR policy meetings, which by the way are in every sense of the word and ICANN meeting and in fact that that's where the policy development work takes place in those part in that community.

So - but I never really argue the perspective of ASO unless I think it is probably the perspective that's best for the entire organization. More often than not I will be arguing from the perspective of some other part of the community in what I think is best for the entire organization. Olga makes a very good point with regards to types of Board. If we were to be viewed and they expected to act as representatives you are sitting the Board up for failure, because we would never reach consensus.

We would always be involved in protecting the special interests of the group that sent us there and we would have to negotiate. We would probably have to get some kind of an arbitral at times to settle matters. So it is much better for us to do what we do which is look at the organization as a whole, look at the corporate organization as a whole and work to reach consensus in what we as a collective body think is best for the organization.

That's why I hope you put us there and that's why I hope you continue to support us in that endeavor.

(Jonathan): It makes me think you'll jump in easier than that of a GNSO Counselor, I think this job is to represent their groups. But I see we've got James, are you still in...

James Bladel: So thanks and I think it's helpful to hear this feedback, these perspectives on how the individual Board members view their role and their responsibility to the greater community and not just the constituencies that send them.

I have a question as a non-Board member in this vein and perhaps this is a little out of date. But I do recall at some point there was some discussions about certain Board members then being asked to recuse themselves from certain issues that might affect their stakeholder group. Now I'm trying to reconcile the earlier part of this conversation with the idea that just in case a Board member might want to represent a stakeholder group they have to be, you know, side lined from voting on certain issues.

Is that still an occurrence and then if so can you help me understand how they match with the idea that Board members serve the entire community?

(Jonathan): Thanks James I'm glad you said that point and just for the clarity to everyone that is what Point B on this slide means, it's understanding that relationship where you sufficiently remove from that because you're acting wholly in the interest of the corporation then how to understand why any kind of conflict of interest might persevere.

James Bladel: Right and if I can be just provocative for a minute, if that is truly a concern - sufficient of a concern that someone would have to be recused then is that person suitable for the Board hypothetically? It seems like those two principles are not.

(Steve): So I think it would be helpful for (Bruce) and I both to respond and maybe others. My - I'll make mine very short.

We recuse ourselves when we have a personal conflict that is focused on the appearance or sometimes even the fact of financial or quite similar. But it's much narrower than I'm from this community and this is of interest to the community and therefor I shouldn't have anything to say about it - not that at all. But I think it would be helpful to hear multiple voices on this.

(Mike): Well we've got (a bunch).

(Jonathan):   Great (Mike), I've got a queue here but - of responses but (Sheri) you were on this topic as well, perhaps we should defer to your first.

(Sheri):   Okay the role of a director is to act in the collective interest of all stakeholders, not a single stakeholder.

                And the test is at the time you make a decision because it's all in your head. At the time you make a decision are you able to make a decision in the collective interest of all the stakeholders, not a single one? My observation on the Board that this is happening - I come from the NomCom so I don't represent this is happening. My observation is I've not seen people recusing themselves because they feel a conflict with a particular and so (HE) organization.

                The recuse as (Steve) has said is usually on a personal level. So for example we're making a decision about an application for a new gTLD and someone has a commercial interest so they - this is right, it's a personal conflict not an organizational conflict, thank you.

James Bladel: Can I respond very quickly (Jonathan)?

(Jonathan):   Sure.

James Bladel: Sorry, this was very helpful the distinction between a personal conflict. And I would point out that if this is the case where the Board member is refusing themselves than, you know, I think that that is, you know, responsible and a respectful thing to do for the integrity of the institution.

                But my concern would be if they were the vote where the rest of the Board or some outside structure or some other organization would ask a Board member to recuse themselves, is that something that's ever occurred?

(Jonathan):   Let's leave the response of that in the queue, we've got (as much) as (Bruce), (Chris) and (Mike) and if it's not satisfactorily answered come up with.

(Bruce):   Yes I mean generally James it is standard practice on the Board that you have a board of conflict of interest policy which is published and as (Sheri) said you look at that on each decision and whether you have a personal interest.

So that could be direct financial or it could be indirect and that, you know, maybe your wife or someone like that that's directly involved, or it could be perceived. And we actually have conflicts in interest subcommittee that looks at that in each case and makes a determination. Where we move beyond just doing it on a case-by-case basis was for new gTLDs.

And the view was that really from a Board efficiency point of view the feeling was that there were - there was a pretty heavy workload for a couple of years really now that's been on new gTLDs generally. And there were Board directors including myself that do have commercial interest in the new gTLD area. I work for registrars, you know, I - now that's not in the case of all gTLDs and in fact in many cases I'm involved in looking at reconsideration requests.

And the vast majority of those have absolutely nothing to do with that company, they're completely immaterial. When they do I individually recognize those and I recuse myself from that specific instance. So the fact that we did that in the new gTLD committee was really an efficiency thing because otherwise every single meeting we'd have to do an analysis of 20 odd Board members to decide which TLD's could they be affected by and not.

And, you know, making some specific ruling for Brand TLD's for example, which Board directors have involvements in Brand TLD's and which don't. So it was predominantly done for efficiently reasons, but the standard conflicts

policy is on each case we look to see if there is a direct conflict of interest with that particular TLD or that particular office lease that we might be signing or a particular employee that's been hired. You know, all of those things we look at those individually if that makes sense.

But for me myself the vast majority of stuff that's come through has been the GNSO I haven't recused myself, it's the only when it's been something that I can directly identify. I did in in the case of the (Triple-X) that came to the Board for a decision. And I might recall that that probably was going to make a material difference to the income of (revenue team) of my employer. It didn't have a direct influence on me, I think it paid more or less but the perception would be that I get some benefit from that, so I recuse myself on the decision of (Triple-X).

(Jonathan):   Thank (Bruce),we've got responses from (Chris) and (Mike) as well. Okay (Chris) thanks - (Mike) (are we good)?

(Mike):   Thanks I think it's a very useful discussion and one that we have repeated on the Board, so I'm glad to see it's happening over here.

And I think the critical thing is that we need to be more transparent because we often desperately need the input of people coming from ACs and SOs to guide us on some of these issues because we maybe do not understand annoyance. We can get a soft paper but the ten year history - and (Bruce) is the most brilliant historian on (Genesis) issues. But we often need a deeper understanding than can be conveyed in the staff briefing paper.

And that's when our colleagues are absolutely essential and we shouldn't lose that. As we look through our changes in accountability structures we shouldn't look at that. What will often happen and there are three elements - or there are three opportunities for recusal. So the first and let's say it starts in our conference policy, the first is that you indicate where you're coming from and in the voting everybody knows for example it's about re-delegation.

(Chris) and I are appointed by the ccNSO, it's obvious that we have an interest in the area and that's adequate and simply by putting in your statement of interest and updating annually that is generally qualified, if people may have missed an issue about it, you might choose to disclose it. The second issue is where you have a conflict which would lead you to prefer either to not vote or to obtain, but for you to participate in the discussion because you can add value.

However either we or you yourself personally or in discussion with General Council and the Board Governance Committee might choose not to cast a vote on an issue or abstain on an issue. But you make your voice known, you give the Board assistance by giving history and then obviously the most complex is where you step out of the room because the conflict is so clear and precise.

So the question is do the SOs and ACs then present us with people who have no conflict, no interest in anything that's going on in our camp? And potentially we then have people who are so vanilla that you may as well another point give everybody to the NomCom. And as we've seen in the round group table there are some superb directors who have come through the Nominating Committee but they lack the history and they lack the knowledge in most cases.

And we try to balance that on the Board, the Governance Committee tries to achieve that balance, but it's something that does need to be looked at. One of my colleagues will talk about the German model where you separate an oversight board and a policy board or an operational board. There are dozens of ways of doing it. But what I'm saying is please don't take the expertise away from us - really please because without it we're at the mercy of very one dimensional documentation that we then have to rely on for decision.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Mike) and if I - I mean I've spoken publicly on this as we're thinking from a contracted party's point of view, I mean we need the expertise practical operational expertise at Board level as well.

Personally I've had experience of this issue via for (John Puliair) on the Board at (nominate) where member elected directors have to deal with a very similar position. But I'm not sure all of us have a chance to, A, experience this, and B, none of us are as aware as you are of the time you spend discussing this, figuring this out, work it out. So from my point of view it was critical to have this discussion and kind of air it.

And there's one thing we haven't touched on and we've just coming up for ten minutes but we do want to go to the final issue, but it's a perception that the Board used to be in some way more engaged with the community. I think we've touched on that peripherally in talking about these issues and how for example (Bruce) talked about tracking issues yourself, (Ray) and others. So I think - but I just - whether or not we spend a couple of minutes discussing that, that was one of the final threads.

Nevertheless I think there's been a very, very constructive discussion and personally feel that it's very useful to be able to have got some of this out to simply understand better and hear what - where the challenges and perception might be. Does anyone feel that an issue either than we've highlighted on the agenda and/or from the Board that needs a final item of clarification or point? Or are we satisfied that we've aired this thoroughly?

Wonderful, well we're on track then, we've ten minutes to go and we aim to finish respectful of your busy agenda. But there is a final point we wanted to raise on the issue and I'll lead on that Ching on the issue of IDN development and adoption, so please go ahead.

Ching Chiao: Thank you (Jonathan) and my name is Ching Chiao from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

I mean although the topic, I mean the title is the development of the adoption, for the sake of time we'll focus on the development part which is the IDN VIP projects. And just let me start by saying that the GNSO welcomes and appreciates the progress that has been made on the VIP project. I mean there's barely an issue has historical just like the Whois one which we just talked about.

It seems to me at the personal level and some may share the concern is that the urgency and the priority is kind of a bit lower than the AWG which under the spotlight. But nevertheless with the slowdown of the - I mean the slowdown stage of the IDN ccTLD or the Fast Track, I think our works on the IDN gTLD. Some launched on the operation already needs to be speed up kind of more. So actually during the hour weekend session the Council and the staff have a very productive discussion on the IDN and VIP project.

We particularly interest in the progress on the Project 2.2 which is the Label Generation rules which a certain milestone which we're very proud to know. But somehow Project 7 which is more policy implementation and delegation - I mean which is kind of bit on lone to us but those are critically important to - not to us and not only to us but also for the gTLD operators.

So perhaps the Board like what you have done for the EWG maybe can give us a head's up on how we as a Council or the community should be prepared for the policy-related works as it is - the VIP project is more designated one and which potentially we requires the policy change on the IDN delegation also operation. And furthermore on the bigger scope as the Council also interested in how the ICANN right now coordinates the work on the top level and those on the second level which now follows the IDN current guidelines to help ensure industries continue to engage and to protect the users from the security risks. So let me stop here and let...

(Jonathan):   So Ching thanks, I've got Mike - Mike Silber and Ram - anyone else? And take it away.

Mike Silber: Thanks for raising I think a very important issue. It's one at the moment an Ram and (Cohae) will talk more about it in terms of the Board IDN Variant Working Group.

What we've is a section that there wasn't enough attention being paid to universal acceptance. And I think the two issues go hand-in-hand is the one is technical, the second is the policy and then the third is taking it up. So you would have seen I think a really good piece of staff work in terms of the universal acceptance paper that came out last week. It's a good paper but I think it's a little short on details.

And part of the reason why it's short on detail is because we need people to start filling in and coloring in some of the detail. Again it's not attempting to be attempting to be instructive but it's also indicating that steps need to be taken. Given that the working group is a highly technical working group and I'm a complete incompetent when it comes to technical issues, the risk taking on acceptance while we are looking for a hunt for it, it might be a more appropriate hunt but for now we are holding onto it.

And we're looking at initiatives opportunities of working with staff around universal acceptance. And then I'm particularly passionate about finding ways to incubate where ICANN can provide a - an opportunity to incubate interested parties, people with skin in the game. Because the problem with ICANN is we don't like many of this all, very little. We need people who can actually take this and exploit it commercially going forward and we need to give them a little push and a nudge to say run.

Take your communities and run with it because if it's commercially viable people will run with it and we need to find ways to help make it viable and increase that adoption. But let me hand it over to the colleagues who are

actually more technically proficient and that would obviously have a deeper understanding.

(Jonathan): So Ram, (Quway) and Edmon - Ram.

Ram Mohan: Thank you (Jonathan) and Ching thank you very much for bringing these up. Ram Mohan, I chair the Board Variant Working Group.

Two common historical, first of all the Board views the work on IDNs' and IDN variance to be very important and continues to provide both time as well as resources to ensure that that project and the projects that come up as a result of it are properly funded and get the level of attention that they require. That has been a commitment from the Board for years now and that will continue to be in that same direction.

The second thing is that it's also important to get it right, so that has been a significant focus and the direction that the Board has been providing to staff. And it's something that in the issue we have to provide to the community as well. The work that's being done here there is a pretty good opportunity to rush the work and to get pieces of it that are not just right. And in these cases there is no opportunity to un-ring the bell.

So the focus is ongoing in a conservative manner and in a very structured disciplined approach to the work that is going on. We have here Sarmad Hussein who is the staff lead on the project. Sarmad could you speak just briefly to the first question which has to do with the implementation of those two project - the 2.2 and the Project 7 and then I'll - between (Cloe) and I - will cover the rest of the topics?

Sarmad Hussein: Thank you, so there are two implementation project, the 2.2 which is a generation of label generation rule set and the 7 which is eventually name implementation of radiance.

So we are actually currently executing Project 2.2, which actually takes the (uncoil) good points that side of (uncoil) good points which are P-valid - protocol valid and selects a subset of those points which again actually go at whichever level in the route. The process for developing this label generation developed and is now being followed through. So as steps for this process, Step 1 was developing a maximal starting repertoire which was released on 20 June, so about two days ago.

That work actually has taken about almost a year in making. It analyzed 97,973 code points which are P-valid or contact (OA& or J) and short list 32,790 quote points and covered 22 scripts. There still about six scripts left which will be covered in the second phase of MSR, towards the end of this year. And now this MSR is a starting point and this has been handed over to the communities.

The communities are actually developing their generation talents. So currently we have an Arabic generation panel, a Chinese generation panel is being formed and then we have (Accordion) and Japanese generation panels and (unintelligible) generation panel in the process. And as soon as these generation panels are formed and they give more concrete to the accommodation on which part of this MSR is actually going to go into LGR.

And those are in corporate into the LGR, we go into the next phase which is Project 7 which is implementation of the LGR. So that's what the status is right now, thank you.

Ram Mohan: Thank you so much.

(Jonathan): Just a time check for you, I'm just noting that we're getting close to time.

Ram Mohan: Understood, so I think the short form of the answer to Question 1 is Project 7 is in many ways dependent upon the prior project getting to a good state.

We're not there yet, when we get there I think we'll have much better answers for what we do with Project 7. Now to the second question, the answer is yes the Council should get prepared for work, it's going to come. But in terms of rough guidelines I'd say probably first quarter of 2015 is what it feels like might be about the right time when this kind of work would start to come through your way.

And to the third question, I think it's a great question that you've raised, the IDN guidelines of the second level, that work was done a while ago but it has not been touched up if you will or looked at in recent times. I think it's entirely appropriate to start to look at how to streamline and coordinate the work between what's being done at the top level and at the second level. So that's a great suggestion, it's something that we should work together on.

(Jonathan):   Good, (Quway) and Edmon and then we'll draw because we've come to the end of our time, so just bear that in mind.

(Quaway):   I think a lot of GNSO people you might just note IDN Variant but you are not really kept really detail to look at the problem and complexity of the IDN Variant.

Particularly you just one week before I fly into London the trademark lawyer come to me to complain what they worry about the policy will impact to them. So in here in the GNSO I know you have a lawyer here, you have a (commission constituency) people here. I like you to aware what the IDN and what the impact to your company or your clients.

Let's check an example like a Chinese characters. Every - many Chinese company in Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao, Singapore even in China, before they choose for a company in Chinese character they always go to the fortune teller to perpetuate the numbers of the stock of their Chinese characters. Because the numbers of the (struck) in that Chinese character for their company's name can be mean very fortune or very bad.

Let's take one example like the combination of the number of the stock 32 it's good but if you go to a 34 it's very bad. And that's not only for the company name, if you are choosing the Chinese characters or you have a company registered in Hong Kong, Taiwan, whatever you will face that problem, like Coca-Cola. The second problem is not only the company name including the family names.

Every Chinese family when they choose their name for their kids they always go to the fortune teller to calculate that number of the stock. The same as the company name. Now for IDN Variant because they try to match the traditional character and simplify characters. So what I did is one proposal of course it's not final yet, but I saw one of the (oppose) say you can - the variant name list is only you can choose one character from the whole traditional characters.

For example like a, you know, the flower or something like that, you know. In Chinese you have a five or six ways to write the characters, but the problem is the stroke - the number of the stroke is different. And so if my company choose this character for my company name or my family names it's not be chosen based on the panel generation that is recommended. It's not in the list. If you are not in the list that means it's abandoned, okay.

Then originally your company name is at least two characters combined, it's a good fortune. Unfortunately one of the characters is not in the list, you are not choice. You have to choose what panel generation developer for you and not a characters. Then you combine these character, your company go into bankrupt. And I don't know how you can resolve it, this is a very big part of issue in the company name, family name you think I Chinese community all over the world.

So I really urge for GNSO peoples don't think about IDN Variant as not an impact to you, it is - it's very critical. And so it's very difficult I that we need to look carefully to work it out all kinds of possibilities. An important thing is in

the panel generation it - worse developer that I know very few of the lawyer, very few of the registrar or registrant or user participate in the panel generation - it only came from the registries.

Fortunately by early in May we have a workshop in Japan, I think that JPI's and Japanese do very wonderful job. They invite 40-some people, including the registry, JPI's, (JP-Nick) and the company and the government and the registrant to join in together to understand the (stew) situation. So I like to raise this issue for you to understand we take the IDN Variant very seriously, just like Ram say it's critical and it's important, but we need to do it right.

If we met the part of the (invent) to your company original (in the) Chinese character is a very fortune to be (a pin) in there and certainly after the IDN Variant decision part of the (defining) you are going to bankruptcy - I think your company go into (sewer). And I think that is not a good part of things.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Quaway), I'm going to give Edmon a last word and then we really must wrap this up for the - I mean we are on a very tight schedule, we've overrun - yes Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yes Edmon Chung here, I'll try and be very concise. Three point on actually building on what (Quaway) motioned and what Ram mentioned in terms of making it - making sure we do it right. And also the implications on policy. and I think (Thomas) mentioned that earlier in the week as well.

One of the things I want to raise is to the Board's attention is that currently the generation panel, especially the integration panel actually I should say the integration panel and the LGR procedure's document that the Board resolved and that the Board passed, it specifically asked for expertise on policy to be included as advisors in the integration panel.

Currently the implementation by staff does not include that at this time, so we want to raise the issue precisely what (Quaway) mentioned and precisely

what others have mentioned. We - I won't rehash all the arguments that were put in to add that into the LGR process document, but it is in there and right now I'm bringing up to people's attention that the roster right now that we have does not include it. So we want to make sure that that's included. Second point...

Man: Edmon just very briefly on that, as far as I understand inclusion of advisors is discretionary and optional, it's not a requirement for the panel. So I just want to make sure that the record is clear that there is not a requirement for these panels to have advisors.

Edmon Chung: Agree, but I think that that's part of what was raised just now, both from (Quaway) and I think (Thomas) earlier in the week. There is an importance on having some policy expertise on the panel, so that's the point that I want to make across. And it is part of the design of the original LGR policy.

So the second point that I want to bring up - I'll bring up is I think the - what (Mike) had mentioned about the universal acceptance, I think that's very important. I want to bring your attention to again the JIG report - the Joint IDN Group between the ccNSO and GNSO report, it was passed on from the two Councils to the Board. The Board hasn't really - it doesn't seem like the Board has made any decisions on it or accept it or not.

I know the latest document refer, you know, references it but the question is whether the Board will consider that report and whether it will accept those recommendations. The third point I want to go back to I guess is what Ram mentioned, I very much encourage to revisit the - it's time to revisit the IDN guidelines and part of the JIG report points to that as well.

And also the Project 7 is extremely important because if that's - for those who don't know, that's the project where we talk about how the variant if there is a variant, how it's put into the zone and, you know, in the roots and what the process is in terms of delegation. And that has potential implications on the

applicant guidebook, maybe addendum or, you know, some kind of changes to that as well as the ccTLD Fast Track and the ccTLD general IDN process.

So that - I understand that's some dependency but, you know, I think we're past the point that there will be - very likely will be variance so let's get that work started sooner

(John):   (Jonathan) very briefly may I - this is really a substantive set of discussions and perhaps needs much broader discussion.

May I invite the GNSO Council and your representatives to come and engage with the staff as well as the (BBWG) - the (Board We're In Working Group). Let's set up a session and let's get through all of these topics and let's drive this to something that's useful for the entire community.

(Jonathan):   Thanks (John), we'll take that on as an action to move that forward, that's great.

Man: I think I can add a very short one, I - if I know that IDN (Warsaw) would be happening in I think the day after tomorrow, if in the GNSO you are (trailer) lawyer or you're a commercial company, I really encourage you to go there to (express) because it's critical for your companies.

(Steve):   You're looking at me (Jonathan) so I guess I get to wrap up, thank you. Two things (Betheon) let me introduce you - will you stand up for just a second?

We have a new addition to our Board Support Resources Group, (Betheon Conusell) has joined us and we now have a - and Wendy Profit moved over from another part of the organization. So we now have a much fuller group that's working with the Board. And echoing what was said earlier about the staff that supports the GNSO, we too at the Board are extremely impressed with the quality of the staff.

And the energy and commitment that we see across the Board in the Policy Support Group and the Board Resources Group and throughout the rest of the organization, so I wanted to share that with you. And in closing I think we've accomplished what I always consider the primary goal which is to make sure that we use the time in a substantive and meaningful way. I think we've dove right in and we got to a bunch of things that were important.

And so I hope that you feel as well served as I know that we are and the number of action items out of this and some very good ideas to think about. Thank you all very much.

(Jonathan): Thank you (Steve).

END