LONDON – GNSO Council Public Meeting
Wednesday, June 25, 2014 – 13:00 to 15:00
ICANN – London, England

>> We'll get going in about one or two minutes. Just giving you a warning, we'll get going in one or two minutes. The meeting will start in one to two minutes. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: If everyone could please take your seats to prepare for the meeting to begin in one minute, we'll begin in one minute.

All right. Can we have a soundcheck? Are we ready to go with the recording? Good to go.

Right. Hello, and good afternoon to everyone, at least in London time. Welcome to the GNSO Council Public Meeting here in London. A special meeting because we've had great weather in London all week. So hopefully we can continue to enjoy that right through the afternoon and into the evening when we have the gala. Personal welcome from me as a Londoner, a resident Londoner for many, many years. Great to have you all here and welcome to London. Welcome to our council meeting. We'll start with a roll call, so Glen, if you could take us through that, please.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Thank you, Jonathan. I will.

BRET FAUSETT: I'm here.

CHING CHIAO: Present.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Present.

JAMES BLADEL: Here.

YOAV KEREN: Here.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I'm present.

THOMAS RICKERT: Present.

GABRIELA SZLAK: Present.

JOHN BERARD: Present.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Present.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Present.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Tony Holmes.

MARIA FARRELL: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Amr Elsadr is absent and Robin Gross is a temporary alternate in his place.

ROBIN GROSS: I'm back!

[Laughter]

DAVID CAKE: Present.

MAGALY PAZELLO: Present.

AVRI DORIA: Here.

KLAUS STOLL: Present.

DANIEL REED: Present.

JENNIFER WOLFE: Present.

ALAN GREENBERG: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Liaison. And Patrick Myles is here and is a liaison.

PATRICK MYLES: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: The full Council is present. Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Glen. Our next item is to call for updates to statements of interest. As you may well be aware, all councils are required to provide

and record online and for public consumption a statement for interest. So here we have call for any updates to those statements of interest. Seeing none, we'll move on to the next item. Here is this item 1.3, an opportunity to review or amend the agenda. I have some proposals here that I suggest we do. We have a number of decisions we might need to make, including a number 10 to progress the work of the GAC GNSO consultation group. So I propose to bring 10 up ahead of 7, 8, and 9, and move 7 to the end. In doing so, I have to acknowledge that Maguy Serad from head of compliance at ICANN has kindly joined us here to be prepared to deal with 7. And so thank you, Maguy, and I know you have been informed that we may struggle with the time and really appreciate you being here in the event that we do get to that item, but given that it's not absolutely urgent we may have to roll it to our next item. So just publicly recognizing and acknowledging that. Thank you, Maguy. All right. Any other items on the agenda. Bret?

BRET FAUSETT: I had suggested on the list we might find some time, if we could just to talk about next steps for the working group. I don't know where that fits in, but there seems to be some discussion among the members of the Expert Working Group that we've seen throughout the week that the GNSO will get this at some point and we should perhaps start thinking about how we're going to receive that and what our next steps will be as a council.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Bret. Good point. I agree and I'm very sympathetic to that. I'll put it on the any other business item. And we do need to find that. I'm

just mindful of the fact that many of us have already said we haven't had a time to properly read let alone digest the report. And although we have had report on the weekend session, I'm conscious that others may need more time. I think it's time at least to talk about where we might go next with this. Any other comments or items on the agenda? Good.

We note the status of the minutes of the previous council meeting which have been posted. And we can then move to item 2, which is an opportunity to review the outstanding action items and any comments on existing projects. As usual I'm just going to focus on things that are either open or need attention and are not dealt with in the body of the remainder of the meeting.

So we did talk about whether or not we would put any input into the strategic plan. We had a -- I would say a pretty full discussion with this, together with the ccNSO. I didn't get the impression, when we had our meeting with the ccNSO or on the weekend sessions, that it was anyone's intention to do anything other than that. But we certainly, at least indirectly, although I wouldn't want to suggest that the ccNSO hasn't done their own work, but we did hear from them and contribute to it. Does anyone have any other comment on whether or not we want to put input in? I think that the -- that the comment period may have closed. Can someone remind me where we are on that comment period? We need a council liaison to the thick WHOIS implementation review team. And we normally have Amr lined up to do that, and in his absence I won't formally commit him. But that remains an open item.

I believe all the other items are covered elsewhere in the agenda. I'm happy to be reminded if I've missed something there. Any comments on the project list or the open action items or anything that should necessarily be added at this stage? We'll pick up items as we go through the meeting.

All right. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. Thank you. Avri speaking. I'm wondering, do we have -- and I should have taken a look at it before so it could be a dumb question. Do we have reviewing and approving the charter of the cross community working group on Internet governance somewhere on our list of things that we have to tackle?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: It's a really good question. That was raised by Rafik in our informal meeting yesterday. It was raised on list to me as an SO chair. I did talk with Olivier in part -- not in private but in passing and indicated to him that it was something where this had just come in in the last week and we hadn't had the opportunity to deal with it. So what I would like to ask is it's put on to the action item list would be great so that it's formally recorded that we intend to deal with it but we have not yet had the chance to do it. So thanks for that reminder, Avri.

All right. Item 3 is -- we move on to our consent agenda then. And here we have the confirmation of Becky Burr and John Berard as permanent co-chairs for the cross community working group on a framework for cross community working group principles, otherwise known informally

as CWG squared. Now I think John would like you to object to this being on the consent agenda so that he got off the hook as being the co-chair but I'd encourage you not to object. Any comments or questions or -- John.

JOHN BERARD: Yes, I just wanted to pass along the fact that Becky Burr is pleased to be co-chair of this working group.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: John, I'm sure you're equally pleased, and we'll welcome you and Becky as co-chairs of that group.

>> I just want to congratulate John on a recursive acronym.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: All right. Item number 4 is our first substantive piece of work for this afternoon's meeting and that is a motion which we have considered previously and was deferred from the prior meeting, and this is the approval of a charter for a PDP working group for IGO and INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms. Thomas, perhaps you would like to present the motion and open the discussion. I don't think it's necessary to read it at this stage but just to set the scene and then we can open the discussion.

THOMAS RICKERT: Sure. Thanks, Jonathan. You will remember that last year the council has unanimously adopted a set of recommendations regarding designations of IGOs and INGOs, and one of the recommendations that we adopted at the time was to open up a PDP looking at the possibilities of opening up curative mechanisms such as the URS and UDRP to the beneficiary organizations that we had identified. And with -- with this motion we're now going to institutionalize that, basically. That --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: That's great. Thank you. Thomas, that's fine. So just to make sure we are clear, we've had the opportunity as a council to look at this preliminarily in our weekend preparatory sessions. We've had some discussion on it, and one of the opportunities that this public meeting provides is for anyone else to provide input in addition to the council from the GNSO or the broader community. There's a microphone in front. Please feel free to come up to the microphone if you do feel you would like to make a contribution to this or any other topics on our agenda today. So I'll call for comments, questions, any points to be made in respect to this motion. Contribution from the microphone, Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Jonathan, Chuck Gomes. I've said this to a few of you privately, but I strongly encourage on this one that before the working group gets started that there be some diligent conversation with members of the GAC regarding this issue. I heard some comments in the board GAC meeting that relate to this and talking to some individual GAC members. So all I'm suggesting is -- and it doesn't really affect passing the motion,

but this is an opportunity to put the principles, even though they're not finalized, Jonathan, that you're working on with the GAC, to work and make sure that we have a real good understanding of government's position on this particular issue before we get going. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. I've got Thomas and then Avri.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks. Chuck, for your insightful comment, I took away from the joint GAC GNSO meeting that Heather sort of flagged this -- this PDP as an opportunity to further collaborate. So I think we will pick this up. We've sent a note to the GAC, i.e., Jonathan has sent a note to Heather this morning or yesterday evening, I don't -- I don't recall, where we emphasized that we were -- we would like to continue the conversation on this very subject matter.

One point that I'd like to add to my opening remarks, because I think there's some confusion with respect to the potential outcome of this PDP and those that have not followed the GNSO's weekend conversations on this should maybe take away that one outcome is not necessarily amending URS or UDRP. Some of you will remember that there has been an effort to work on this a couple of years back, so some community members approached me, said well, this is a huge task and, you know, that might not even be feasible. So just to emphasize that a potential outcome is to have something new. So leave URS and UDRP unaltered and then have a special mechanism. But this is certainly not

to preempt the outcome of the PDP, but that's just one potential result of it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Thomas. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, thank you, and thank you, Chuck, for the points. I actually think one of the things we may want to look at is, is it possible to actually pilot some of the things that the collaborative work group has been thinking of on this one. And the other thing is, we need to perhaps also add to the work of the collaborative team some sort of explanation that one doesn't need to be in the majority on a working group and get their way all the time for it to be a worthwhile thing to participate in a group. So we obviously have some capacity building to do in terms of what it means to participate in a working group and how working groups can achieve a consensus at the end of the day, even if somebody isn't in the majority and doesn't get everything they want. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. I very much appreciate reference to the consultation group and the work that's being done there, and I think it's something where there's a sort of -- as Chuck said, we've got a goal we're getting to in terms of making better -- more structured our interaction with the GAC, but there's no need to not take advantage of the initial good will if that's engendered. In any event, this is going to be an ongoing process. So that's both points well taken. Just on a piece of information, just to confirm, I know it's gone to the list, but I sent a letter that I drafted

together with Thomas, and you've all seen, to make sure we formally inform the GAC of our intentions in and around this. Now, as we discussed in our preparation session, paying yet another email or letter across is not sufficient in and of itself, but we wanted to go on record as indicating the work that is ongoing in this respect. Bret.

BRET FAUSETT: Thanks. One comment and a question. I think it -- I think one possible outcome of this working group is that the working group concludes that a process intended for trademarks is not appropriate for NGOs and that trademarks have very different characteristics than NGO names. I think that's one possible outcome. And so, you know, understanding that that's a possible end point of this work group, that we decide that the URS and UDRP process should not be changed, I think it's very important that we have the GAC members and the people advocating for this participating in the working group so they can understand the possible paths here and understand the rationales that might lead to one result or another.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Bret. Any other comments or questions? All right. Seeing none, I think we're in a position to put the motion to the vote. Threshold, you'll note from the agenda is, one third of each house or two thirds of one house. Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note there's still a blank text in there for the liaison.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Why does that surprise me that you diligently remind me of that. Thank you, Marika. Any volunteers for a liaison from the council to the working group? There we have one. Thank you, Petter. Going, going, gone. Sold to Petter as the highest bidder.

So if we could record that Petter Rindforth of the IPC will be the GNSO council liaison to the PDP working group.

Any objections to voting through a show of hands? Let's do that then. So anyone not in favor of the motion, please raise your hand. You record that Robin Gross.

Anyone wish to abstain from the motion? All those in favor, please raise your hand. Thank you.

If you could record that the motion passed. And we'll record the vote accordingly, Glen.

All right.

Item 5 is the second motion we have up for consideration today. And that is a motion to consider and evaluate the new gTLD program. It's a motion being presented to us by Bret Fausett of the registry stakeholder group. So Bret, I'll hand over to you to introduce the motion.

BRET FAUSETT: Thank you. The motion is -- I won't read the motion. But it is available on the council Wiki site, and you can click through it, too, from the agenda.

The motion goes through the history of the new gTLD process from 2005 to today. Understanding all the actions that have been taken, all the internal reviews that have been built into the process. And then has three "resolved" clauses.

First it attempts to create a committee to examine the issues arising out of the first round and anticipating issues for subsequent procedures that may lead to additional new top-level domains.

I -- you know, in thinking about how we would do this, I realize that it was premature to identify issues now for an issue report that no one person, even no small group could anticipate all the issues that we might want to consider for issue reports.

So, to start the process, we've created a working committee to identify those issues. And that will be the first step here. It's designed to be an open committee. And there's some friendly amendments, I believe, as to what the language should be. And we'll get to those in a minute. But an open committee of the community to consider the issues. And, hopefully, we will put together a neutrally worded set of issues that are appropriate for future consideration by the GNSO.

I see this first stage as being very non-contentious. I would hope that people would take their advocacy hats off, and we'd come away with a neutrally worded set of issues that we want to take to staff for issue reports. And then we, as a council, can figure out whether we want to move them into PDP status or not.

The second "resolved" invites the new gTLD committee of the board to provide its own input to us as to what they would like to see for issue reports and something for us to consider.

Obviously, the experience at our level is different than the experience at their level. They've been dealing with issues that have affected all of the applicants and, in fact, all of the GNSO community. So I think it's important to get their input into that.

And then the third "resolved" asks for a series of just status reports from ICANN staff on various things that they have been doing or anticipate doing so that we can get a feel for the timelines that ICANN is working under so that we can set our own work schedule accordingly. So that's the introduction, and I'll be happy for discussion.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Bret. Any comments, questions, other input?

I will note that I proposed a friendly amendment. Did you cover that?

BRET FAUSETT: I noted the friendly amendment, and I would certainly take that friendly amendment.

And I had a question for Marika also at some point. We can get to that when we get to the wording issues. Kristina?

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Kristina Rosette, IPC asking personally.

The problem, I've been having when I think about this motion -- I'm not opposed to it in principle -- is trying to figure out the timing in terms of when do you anticipate starting the work? Somebody said this morning we've got 350 TLDs delegated. There's another 1100 to go. Are you envisioning that the committee will start now and kind of run until that last one is delegated? I think it would be helpful. And, if you're not, what mechanism would you anticipate would take into account issues that might arise after whatever cutoff you're going to propose?

BRET FAUSETT: That's a very good question. Certainly for the third "resolved," I think that can happen now. And, hopefully, it happens in a short time. Those are just status reports.

As for the issue spotting that the committee does, I think it's important to start now because so much of it is still fresh in our minds. And, if we wait a year, we may lose some of that. But I can see this being a -- not a standing committee but a committee that lives for, you know, a year or two. Identifying some issues now, the things that are clear to sort of everyone and then you know, may have a life after now for the things that happen that -- on items that we didn't know about.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: Okay. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Ching.

CHING CHIAO: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, Bret, for the motion.

To follow up on that status report, it's good to have a process to recollect or, for example, the webinars they have been doing. I think the status report has been provided from time to time. So I think it's a good time that we can capture in the sense of a year-long progress or to see how effective the program is being rolled out, how the progress is being made.

So I think, at least from my perspective, it's a good reflection of what's been doing.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Any other comments, questions, inputs, concerns? I'm sorry, Maria.

MARIA FARRELL: Hi. It's Maria Farrell, for the record.

Perhaps one of the first things this work could involve doing is to identify some of the particular work items or topics that in some sense are closed. That could be looked at. I'm thinking maybe it's not relevant or appropriate, but just an example might be the applicant support group looking at how it was rolled out, how many people took it up, et cetera, so that it's a relatively discrete topic that can be looked at in its totality now. So there may be a menu of topics that can be looked at usefully now and perhaps even dealt with and put to the side as we roll forward in terms of sequencing.

Just secondly, I was involved in a panel earlier on this morning which was organized by the new TLD applicant's group and the registry

consistency and was an informal chat about some issues. I know Kristina took part in it, too.

And it just might be a useful resource to go look at to see issues from sublime to ridiculous from nitty-gritty operational issues all the way how or whether the GNSO is accommodating new membership, structures our new members. So just as a laundry list of possible topics, that might be one place to start or AoC review potentially and others.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. That's a constructive suggestion. Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN: For the record, this is Volker Greimann speaking. I also think that the open committee and the ability of the GNSO Council to review and discuss the current round will give us an opportunity to review current issues that have been taken as implementation of current policy and review these if, in fact, council believes that they may need a policy revision or policy clarification for any subsequent round. So I support this motion.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I've got Dan and then Avri.

DANIEL REED: I just want to echo support for why I think this is important. The gTLDs were clearly a big transition for all of us. To maybe echo something my

grandfather used to say to me, one of the lessons of life is to make new and original mistakes, not to make the same ones over and over again.

And so. In that spirit, you know, I think the real objective is let's look at the lessons learned and so that we can make sure that what happens going forward is as positive and productive as possible.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Dan. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking. One of the reasons I wanted to sort of -- one of the reasons I seconded it and want to argue for the motion is that I think we've already seen motion in other parts of the ICANN community in the parts of the community called staff where people are starting to think about how to do the next round when I think that some of us are not even certain that the next batch of applications even comes in a round.

So I think it's very important that the GNSO sort of declare by sort of saying we started to look at this that there is no going ahead with a next round until such time as this one has had the full analysis and thought and then a policy process to talk about how it is we proceed with new applications for new gTLDs in the future.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Yoav.

YOAV KEREN: Yeah. I just wanted to say about this is that it's very important -- I don't want to say anything right now on this motion. But it's very important that the full economical consideration and analysis of this whole program will be taken care of and will be looked at. And I mean not only in a specific -- you know, did it benefit ICANN's bank account or not? But in the global view.

My personal feeling -- this is totally my personal capacity. My personal feeling is we're a little too early to actually learn that. I'm not saying we should stop moving. Because this is in ICANN timeline usually these things take a long time. So we should start moving on this.

But this -- it should be considered that there needs to be some more time to see delegations and actual TLDs growing and see what is happening. Are they working out or not? Yeah, that's it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Not preempting the vote, but I'm hearing some good comments in support of it. I'll also hearing that this needs to be segmented by topic, if possible, and that we will see where that leads us. The other thing we need is someone to lead this group. Bret, I don't know if you feel you'd be in a position to do that. I don't want to put you on the spot. But I do think we'll need someone to corral this group.

So we could do it one of two ways. You could either volunteer up front, or we could get a bunch of volunteers to join the group and then see what the group wants to do about having someone chair or lead the group. But we should certainly have it on record that we'll need someone to chair this group. And so that's worth noting.

BRET FAUSETT: I'd be happy to chair the group, but I think the group ought to elect its own chair. I'll throw my name into the hat. And, if no one else wants do it, I'll do it. But I would hope that the group, once it gets constituted, would pick its own leader.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: The way we often do this is with an interim leader. Avri, that's what you were going to suggest anyway. Yeah, that's fine. We can go ahead with you as a interim chair or lead of the discussion group. And then, once we get the group formed, the group can either elect to continue with you or nominate and elect a new group leader.

I think we're in a position to take this to a vote.

BRET FAUSETT: Before we do, do I need to do anything formal to accept your friendly amendment to the wording except to say I accept your friendly amendment to the wording?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I think that's good enough. It's on record. It's not recorded on the screen yet, but it's a small change in wording from -- I forget what the original was. Here, let me note the original. Maybe I can just confirm what the change is, Bret.

BRET FAUSETT: The change is that we are changing in the first "resolved" clause, the word -- the phrase "open committee" to --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Discussion group.

BRET FAUSETT: -- "discussion group."

That's the change to that.

I did have a question for Marika. I apologize for still being relatively new to the council, even though it's my second term. I noticed in the previous motion we had a "resolved" clause number two that directed ICANN staff to call for volunteers within seven days. I thought it was sort of implicit that, if we passed one, that there would be a call for volunteers. So will that happen with or without the language in the resolution? Marika is nodding yes. So good. I won't add that as a new resolved.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Without further ado then, let's put this to a show of hands. Is anyone of the council not in favor of the motion? Anyone would like to abstain from the motion? All those in favor, please raise your hands.

Thank you, Glen, if you could record that the motion was passed unanimously.

Right. Item 6 is a discussion item in dealing with -- further dealing with a letter we received on the 16th of June from the new gTLD program

committee regarding protection of IGO and INGO identifiers. And this follows on the back of the ICANN board having adopted the GNSO policy recommendations on IGO and INGO protections that were not inconsistent with the GAC's advice and a request for additional time to consider the remaining policy items. Subsequently, the NGPC has written to us asking us to consider reviewing, according to our own bylaws, some of the provisions in that -- in the output from that PDP working group.

So I think we've had -- we have -- and in preparation we've had a prospective draft motion on this item circulated. There's a table which identifies the differences between what was and what is being suggested. And there's an opportunity -- there's a draft of what might be the recommended policy modification.

So we've got some documents in the background as to where this work might go. And we are not in a position to take a vote on that now. But let's open it up to discussion, input, and comment.

Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Jonathan.

Maybe as background information, you will remember that the set of policy recommendations on IGO and INGO designations that we referred to earlier in this meeting was partially adopted by the ICANN board. And there was some recommendations in there that were in conflict with existing GAC advice.

We received a letter from the NGPC that, obviously, is undertaking some efforts to reconcile the friction between the conflicting advice that is there.

And we analyzed that. And some of you who were present at the last ICANN meeting I think will remember quite high-handed debate as to how the board asked us to reopen this and negotiate the existing policy recommendations.

But I'd like to clarify that there is a process available for the GNSO to revisit existing policy recommendations. So this is nothing that we do on a -- what's the correct word? We don't negotiate or that's not a haggling phase, but there's a formal process. So the GNSO can address this following due process.

What we've now done is we've analyzed the NGPC letter. And it, basically, turns out that there are two areas of concern one of which is making the claims service that we had recommended in the set of recommendations earlier permanent.

The recommendations that we adopted spelled out that we would grant the 90 days' claims service for certain designations.

So this shall be made permanent, permanent being for the lifetime of the TMCH.

The second area is the opening up of curative rights or looking at that.

And, as you will remember from the discussion we had a few minutes ago, that's already underway.

So that leaves the council of the GNSO with one specific task, i.e., potentially revisiting the original policy recommendation that was adopted last year. So should this motion go through, then the PDP working group will reconvene and look at that very question.

There is one area where we might need to seek more clarification on. And that is the question whether the claims service that we're discussing is meant to be both a pre- and a post-registration notification as is for trademarks and the trademark clearinghouse or whether that is limited to post-registration notification. And that's something -- that is the way that we read it, the post-registration part of it. But I guess that we will reach out to the NGPC particularly to get clarification on that so that we're -- we know exactly what the request was that we received.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Thomas. You described that well. That's helpful. We've got John and then Alan.

JOHN BERARD: John Berard from the business constituency. I think, if you look at the agenda we have before us today in total, you'll see that there has been a lot of work being done to move from a feeling that the only alternative is to compromise to one where we have the opportunity to collaborate. The letter from the board we read, I believe, as a positive step in bringing together the best thinking of the GNSO Council, the GAC, and the board to solve a problem so that the board, in fact, doesn't have to implement what might be thought of as a nuclear option to either ignore unanimous GNSO policy recommendations or to

ignore GAC advice. So this is an opportunity and we are taking it to try and collaborate in a way that can satisfy the desires of each to an extent that each can be happy with. So you've got a motion with regard to the IGO, INGOs. You've got a response, the letter to Heather at the GAC. You've got the -- this initiative. And then later in the agenda we'll be talking about the GAC liaison. So I think all of this is part and parcel of a new -- I won't say a new dawn, because it's too hackneyed. But I will say a new and collaborative approach that I think can yield not just on this issue but on others as they emerge in the future.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, John. I've got Alan up next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of short comments. First of all, it's interesting to note that although the request from the new gTLD policy committee is asking us to support essentially what the GAC is asking for with regard to Red Cross national names, what they are proposing for the IGO acronyms is far short of what the GAC is asking for. So there's already compromises that are being worked on here and presumably they're prepared to tell that to the GAC, otherwise they wouldn't be asking us, I hope. But it's interesting that those are two different -- there are two different takes on that.

In the general issue, we have always struggled with what if we make a mistake on a PDP or what if the world changes and we need to make a small change, do we have to start all over again with an issues report? And this is the first time we're using new rules which allow us to take a

pertubation, a change in a PDP without initiating the whole process. So I'm very encouraged that we're trying it, or at least maybe trying it, if only to be able to say we have the ability to make changes. Because up until now we really haven't been able to answer that question of what happens if we need to make a small change. We continually in our PDPs put a review stage saying, we should look to see whether it was successful, but we've never known what to do if the answer was no. So this is a really positive action.

And lastly, I find it really encouraging that the board came to us before taking action and saying we'd prefer to do it without nuclear options and without refusing it. Let's see if we can work together. So I find all of this exceedingly encouraging. And that's all the way from the substance of whether we approve the changes or not.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Alan. I think notwithstanding your very good points, just make for the record that it's the new gTLD program committee, much as some of us might suspect them of being the new gTLD policy committee. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Jonathan, and I'm going to mix it up a little bit perhaps for those of you who have been following my comments on this throughout the weekend sessions. So I just want to state a couple of things at the outset. I have no serious concerns about the changes that are being proposed or asked for or sought in this letter. I think that there are, as I believe Alan pointed out, some clarifications needed on specifics and

particularly if they align with what the GAC has made specific in their requests to the board. And I also want to point out that I'm speaking now all alone in a number of different ways in that my stakeholder group is still determining its position on this and we really have not decided -- truly are undecided on where we come down on this particular issue. But I want to note that setting aside the substance of the matter that I do have some procedural concerns, as I've indicated before. This is a -- that the recommendations that were approved at the Buenos Aires meeting were the result of a successful Policy Development Process, were unanimously received by the GNSO and submitted to the board, with the understanding that they were in some areas in conflict with the GAC advice on this subject and understanding that that has made the board's job a little difficult and that we are -- but I don't know that it's then incumbent upon us to make their job easier. You know, we had this process to amend or revise recommendations. My understanding was that was to be used in cases where the process, the PDP was not followed or there was some material omission in the information or the use or the conducted of that PDP. I don't think that we have any of those criteria in this case. As far as I'm aware, the PDP was valid. And I'm concerned that this is simply a matter where the outcome of the PDP was unsatisfactory to other -- to other groups and other structures. And I am concerned that that speaks to a broader relationship where the GNSO, this council and the bodies we represent, are a check box in a larger conversation between the board and the GAC on important issues.

So I -- I understand that I may be alone in this -- in this perspective, including within my own constituency, but I -- I do believe that this is

something that I would like to raise in this context and perhaps invite other feedback, and noting that if we do proceed down the path that it seems as though we are on, that we must give specific instructions to that reconvened PDP working group or consultive group or whatever we call it, so that they understand very clearly what is on and off the table as far as outcomes so that we do not iteratively repeat this process. And I'm looking forward to hearing feedback on this in either direction between now and the time that this motion is presented for a vote. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, James. And note on the specificity, I think that's a key point that we should record and capture. I also want to make the point and remind all of us that we committed -- and this is not in any sense to contradict but rather to reinforce some of the points you make, James -- is our commitment to working effectively with the board and the GAC but to upholding our central role and critical role as the place where GNSO policy is made according to proper and thorough processes.

JAMES BLADEL: And the bylaws.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah, and the bylaws. Thank you. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. James, I don't think you're totally alone. I think that, for example, in my willingness to look at this, I think we're taking that first step. I think that if we don't end up with a motion that contains a bunch of whereases that show that there is new information, that there is new thought that we consider, that there are things that we did not consider accurately after going through, then I don't see any way that there could be a resolved that says we reopen it. So I think that I very much agree with what you're saying. I think this first step of saying yes, we're going to talk about it, is -- is the thing we have to do. But the next step of actually passing a resolution to reopen it is only something we do if it meets the conditions that you basically mention, that there is sufficient reason to believe that we did not take some issues into full and proper consideration. I think just the fact that someone who participated in the group and who had chance to input doesn't like the outcome is not a good enough whereas clause. But I think if they can show that we didn't consider point X or we didn't consider point X clearly or properly, then we may have a reason to go back. But -- so I don't think you're at all alone, except perhaps in being the first one to stand up and say it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Avri. I've got Bret and then Thomas.

BRET FAUSETT: I think James' concerns were well stated and I would support them. I think we ought to be thoughtful as we proceed between this meeting and the next as to how we proceed with this. We talked over the weekend and I think it's important to remember some of the history here, that this was a 13-month-long working group that was exceedingly

thorough. I expected the members of the 13-month-long working group who participated in this would tell you that the only thing worse than doing a 13-month-long program once is having to do it twice. So I think we need to be careful about making sure that we're not doing work that has already been done.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Chuck, please go ahead.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Jonathan. Chuck Gomes --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'm sorry. I skipped Thomas. Sorry, apologies, Chuck. You're happy to defer? Go ahead, Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: We may be saying the same thing. In the case -- certainly, say it differently, Thomas, if you disagree. Especially as chair, right? In response to Bret, I think it's fair to say that in the case of the Red Cross extended names, it wouldn't really be work redone. It was -- you've heard me say this before. It was put off because it came in late in the process and we were trying to get the thing closed. So in my personal opinion, I don't think it's redoing work that was already done. In my opinion, we didn't do a thorough analysis of that particular one because of timing when it happened. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thomas, I think it's -- thanks, Chuck. I think it's appropriate we close the discussion with you. I don't have a queue -- Maria and then we'll call it a day. Thomas and then Maria.

THOMAS RICKERT: A few points of clarification. When this PDP working group is going to reconvene it's only tasked with looking at very specific and narrowly-phrased questions. So we are not talking about whether there should be additional entities benefiting from protections, not are we looking at additional designations. We're talking about the length of the notification, and in that the -- I guess we -- you know, this is like half year back since we concluded our work, or a little more, and since we've seen the registries and registrars as well as the community working with the TMCH, looking how cumbersome that is, so that might impact the deliberations. So I don't see that as duplicating efforts that have been invested in earlier. So I was open to the suggestion that we -- that we should consider this, but I do share the concern and we should be firm with this, that this can't be an iterative process. Again, unanimous decisions by the council, that says something, you know, and that shall not easily be jeopardized.

Having said that, from a procedural point of view, I would like to call for an extra or special meeting from the GNSO Council. We cannot vote on this today because there is a motions and documents deadline that needs to be abided by, but nonetheless, I would like to make it possible for the working group, if it was asked to continue its conversations, to take that work up as soon as practically possible, so that we don't run into the summer vacation period but rather get that pulled off earlier.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Thomas. So we have a specific proposal for a special meeting. I have a queue that I haven't managed perfectly, but I've now got it back in order. It's David, Alan, Maria, Avri.

DAVID CAKE: Right, thank you. Meeting on the weekend, I am an advocate that we have some flexibility now. In response to the way we handle policy, I think we were -- those who remember the last meeting in Buenos Aires, I think we were quite vocal on the fact that we did not feel a resolution to the differences between the GNSO and the GAC positions should be crafted by the board but instead should be crafted by the GNSO. The board, I think, have looked for a way to -- working fully within the bylaws to enable that, and I think this is it. I think we should -- you know, having more or less requested this situation, we should take it up. And I do feel that some of James' concerns are quite valid. We -- I think we should all understand that we are working towards better integration of the GAC into GNSO processes which hopefully should enable -- mean that sort of public disagreements in policy outside the policy process are less common, but we can all agree that they weren't done in this process and that perhaps that's a -- you know, a mistake that we may have to clean up a little bit. I think that we should go forward with this, even though there are some real concerns about it becoming a regular -- I would not want it to become a regular process, and I think we should address other mechanisms to ensure that it doesn't have in future policy processes in quite this way. But for the moment, it may be the best we can get.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. I've got Alan, Maria, and Avri in the queue, and then I propose that we close it at that point. So Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I strongly support the comments that were made that we phrase this such that it is not -- it cannot be perceived or taken as a general reopening of the subject. The last thing we need is someone saying oh, and once you're already talking about it, how about this. I support what Chuck said, and I think the national names are not something we really discussed in any thoroughness. And I think the same is true in terms of the IGO acronyms. We ended up coming up with a number of alternatives to PICTMUNKs (phonetic). This is not one of them. We carefully stayed away from extending trademark clearinghouse privileges past the 90 days because we really didn't think that was on the table at all. So I don't think we every seriously considered this particular option. So I think it falls within the category that people feel comfortable with.

That being said, I would not object to reopening something simply because the world had changed and we had to rethink it. I think we need to be flexible enough to do that, if that's what's needed, but in this particular case I don't think it applies. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Maria.

MARIA FARRELL: Maria here. Mine is simply a question about how we sequence and resource the work. And in the NCSG, for example, the same people that we would most likely ask to be involved in this endeavor would be the people who would likely be populating the working group for the charter we just voted on, the INGO, IGO. So can we look at sequencing them, perhaps if this is a short and sweet one doing it first. I'm not sure but, you know, I'd ask the council to look at that because I don't think we'll be able to cover them both -- if fact, I can tell you, we won't be able to cover effectively both groups running concurrently. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Maria. I'm reminded that we did talk, I think informally yesterday at least, about whether we could start to schedule this out and start to plan for should the motion result in the work being reconvened. We can do some of the preparatory work like calendaring, looking at who might participate, and I think in doing that we can accommodate your point as well. So I think we can start to do -- without -- and it's delicate here because we don't want to preempt the outcome, yet at the same time we want to be prepared for an outcome. And so I think we can accommodate that in that way.

Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking, I'm not sure -- and I probably misunderstood when Thomas was talking and said "when we restart this PDP effort." I would think we were still in the "if."

I would have resistance to having a special meeting to get this on. A couple issues have been brought up here that may or may not have gotten adequate treatment in the previous PDP. I think that that question needs to be argued. That question needs to be shown. Someone somewhere needs to make argument showing that something wasn't covered and giving that as opposed to "the decision is wrong and we don't like it."

So I don't see any way of being ready to take this up in a quick manner. Because we did talk somewhat about national names. We never went far down the path. But perhaps we went down it far enough.

We did not talk, perhaps, as much as others would have liked about acronyms, but we did talk about acronyms.

In terms of the extra time limit on trademark clearinghouse and such, that is a completely new idea that I don't see falling under the original PDP at all. And, therefore, don't see how it could be a subject to be -- to be dealt with in a new PDP.

So I think that, you know, as part of the caution that some of us are saying, jumping into the fact that we're just going to do this and calling an exceptional meeting to get this on track when, at the moment, we've, basically, got a request and a couple unsubstantiated issues that need substance. And I'm not sure who is going to provide the substance was an issue -- it's almost like there was an issue report required on the questions so that we have something to make our decision on. Because at the moment it feels to me like we're all sort of -- I'm hand waving when I say I think we covered it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Let's just make sure -- let's try and level set here and make sure we're all on the same page. We have a meeting scheduled for the 24th of July. We have a proposal from Thomas that we meet separately and ahead of that meeting for reasons of expediency, if you like, speed. We have Mary from staff here who can talk to us about the likely process or the process, the implied process based on the bylaws and where we are. So let's hear from Mary and just make sure we're 100% clear what the likely process is whether or not we meet up early to kick that process off.

MARY WONG: Thank you, Jonathan. This is for clarification. Because the particular section in the GNSO's PDP manual that we're talking about that allows the council to start this process is new, I think as someone has said, and has never been used. So it's probably important that we understand how it's used.

And, secondly, for clarification as well, this particular provision and what's under consideration now does not reopen the PDP or the working group I think as Thomas mentioned earlier. Instead, what it does is that the council can amend or propose an amendment to a policy recommendation. That proposal then goes back to the original working group that's reconvened for the very specific person only of considering that specific proposed modification.

At the same time or at whatever time, the proposal also has to go out for public comment to the community such that at the future date, the

working group's recommendation vis-a-vis the specific proposal, any and all public comments received vis-a-vis the specific proposal comes back to the council. And the council then decides what it wishes to do to proceed with this original proposal, to amend it or not to proceed at all.

And, in terms of the timing, with regard to the motion that Thomas, I believe, will be proposing shortly, whenever it is that you consider it, the current thinking is that the working group will be reconvened and given a specific time frame to come back to the council with a particular recommendation one way or the other. The time frame being recommended is 45 days. And the proposal itself will also be put up for public comment at the same time. And the rule says a minimum of 30 days. So maybe that would be 40 days. So that's an answer to Maria's point, which was just the concern over having a new PDP on a related topic and this particular work item.

Then, finally, in terms of the special meeting that Thomas is calling for, a separate provision requires that for something like this there should be a 14-day calendar notice. So, in other words, you're looking at a potential council vote on whether or not to adopt this proposal and send it back to the working group in 14 days' time at the earliest. And the hope is that by giving the proposal out to you this week, as Thomas has done, that in the intervening period that you'll have a chance to consult with your constituencies and working groups. So, hopefully, that helps.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Mary. I think that helps us recognize that there's a pretty tightly scoped process. It may not be a bad idea to put a briefing note to that effect to the council list, if you don't mind, if I could ask you to do that.

To my mind, the only question is whether or not it's appropriate to bring this ahead of the 24th of July meeting and have a specific meeting to consider this and/or anything else that's urgent.

Thomas, you proposed it. Avri, you spoke against it.

AVRI DORIA: May I ask a clarifying question? Because I'm being dumb at the moment and not understanding.

We have to, in the first instance, vote on the change to the PDP? Is that what our first vote would be? That we vote on an amendment that we send to the group to think about?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: A proposed amendment.

AVRI DORIA: So Thomas is going to propose -- or has proposed -- I didn't realize it was an amendment to the PDP that had been proposed -- would actually propose language that amends the PDP change. And we would vote on that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: On -- well -- I've got James then Alan. Mary, would you like to clarify just to answer the question.

MARY WONG: That is correct. The meeting, whether it's a special meeting in 2+ weeks or a regular council meeting, would be a specific vote on the proposal that Thomas circulated, in other words, on the substance to be sent back to the working group and to be put out for public comment.

AVRI DORIA: May I continue to be dumb?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Please do. Mary, if you can stay --

AVRI DORIA: I can't stop being dumb. But anyway -- in the first instance, I thought you had said that we're sending the amendment. Are we sending the amendment, or are we sending the wording of the question?

MARY WONG: Apologies if I wasn't clear. The council -- assuming the council agrees to send an amendment, you will be sending the amendment, the amendment to the PDP recommendation.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I have a queue that is James, Alan, and Bret.

JAMES BLADEL: I guess, like Avri, I'm struggling to get my mind around the sequencing of all these next steps.

My question was -- and I'm struggling. Did the letter contain any specific time frame or recommended turn around for a response? Or are we up against any sort of external deadline that maybe was not included in the letter like some sort of commitment made by the NGPC to get back to the board? I'm not really sure --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Good question. Thomas, you motivated for the timing. So, if you could respond on the timing. I mean, to the best of my knowledge, the NGPC letter does not specify specific timing. But, in any event, you proposed us having the interim meeting. So perhaps you could speak to your thoughts on timing.

JAMES BLADEL: If I can jump in on that, Jonathan. Even if the letter itself does not contain, I wonder if it is predicated by some other timeframe or project timeline that is driving that. Thanks.

THOMAS RICKERT: The answer is there is no external deadline for us to deal with this expediently. But using the word: "expediently," you will remember the original PDP was promised to be dealt with as an expedited PDP. And I think it would be good for the council and the GNSO to be seen as being very responsive to such requests. You know, we are invoking or

potentially invoking this class for the first time. We've heard Jonathan, I think it was, applauding the NGPC for reaching out to the GNSO Council and seeking our collaboration on that.

And I would like to honor that as previous working group chair offering to deal with that as soon as practicably possible. I'm just afraid that with the summer holidays coming up, we're getting close to the next meeting. And I don't want us to be seen as a potential road block for getting this issue sorted out one way or another.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So I have a queue. Without wanting to cut the discussion unnecessarily, we do have other business to get to as well. If possible, if you confine yourself to the timing. In my queue I have got -- I have James. I then have Alan. I've got Bret, Dan, and Chuck.

JAMES BLADEL: I've raised my question. You can remove me from the queue.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'm sorry, James. Yes. I actually have crossed you off. I had James. I now have Alan, Bret, Dan, and Chuck.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. My understanding of the process is that the vote that we would take in a special meeting or next meeting is to pass back -- is to reconvene the working group to discuss a specific change. Now, I don't

know whether we need to word it as a recommendation or just give the substance.

The working group would then come back to us and say, yes, we agree with it or, no, we don't agree with it or conceivably propose something different. Then there would be a formal vote of the council to decide to agree.

So passing it back to the working group does not guarantee that it's a done deal if they say yes. It comes back to council, and council has to decide at that point whether they like it or not. So all we're doing is getting the wisdom of the working group to help us make a decision, not a done deal because we're passing it back to the working group.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: For the record, I see nodding heads from myself and Mary and others around the room confirming that that is our understanding of the process. Bret.

BRET FAUSETT: Two quick points: First of all, Thomas, I assume that the motion is going to come from you to move this forward. I think the sense of the room is that the wording of the motion is going to be quite important to whether we pass it or not. So I think it may be overly ambitious to think we can agree on that wording on an expedited time scale. So I think it's going to be very hard to get the wording by the end of the July meeting. I would work toward that.

Second point is, at the same time, I don't see anything that would prevent the working group from getting reconstituted right now without an act of the council and reminding the members of the previous working group that this is on their radar, this is coming down the pike. Let's remember what we did before. Let's look at what we've been asked to do here and start thinking about these issues in anticipation of a council motion that will be passed at the end of July.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks for those two points, Bret. And on your latter point, that is my understanding of the intention at least to start to think about scheduling when that group might be together, putting them on notice to do as much as possible on the preparatory work.

I've got Bret, Dan, Chuck, and then John. I do think we need to try to close this off. So, if we could introduce Dan, Chuck, and then John.

DANIEL REED: I just want to echo the importance of moving expeditiously while still respecting process. I'll go back to something John set at the outset. There are built-in structural conflicts into the whole ICANN process. This is an opportunity for us to reason together to resolve one of those structural conflicts. And it's important for us to do so in a timely and effective way.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Dan. Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: Thank you, Jonathan. With regard to timing, one thing different about the two proposals from the new gTLD program committee is that there are no provisions in the existing registry agreements for this -- for these two things. So they're not implemented right now.

In contrast to many of the other protections that were a part of the work where those terms were temporarily put in to the registry agreements. Just call that to your attention. What you do with it is up to you.

I saw Avri shaking her head -- and I think she's right -- that what I heard correctly that there needs to be an amendment for us to -- that's then sent to the working group. If that's true -- I see some nods over here from staff -- then I think the motion has got to be structured differently. But, rather than try to do that here, I suggest you work with staff, get it worded according to the provisions and follow that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Chuck. John.

JOHN BERARD: Thanks, Jonathan. John Berard from the business constituency. I find myself in the odd position of disagreeing with myself.

[Laughter]

I know, it's really wild.

I'm -- I want to expedite this process as an offer of good faith that the council is willing to collaborate with the board and the GAC. I'm more

than willing to agree to an interim council meeting to vote on what I think will be a properly worded motion. But when I -- you know, Bret -- what Bret said got me a little concerned about, well, you know, we know we're going to do this, so let's just -- a nod and a wink and get the working group back together to begin thinking about it.

My feeling is that that undercuts the deliberative process of the council, A, and, B, sets a bad workaround precedent for difficult issues that might come down the road before. And we're confronted with the point that well, you did it then. So, even though you haven't voted on it yet now, why don't you just get the working group -- you know, get the band back together and begin to practice?

So I don't know that I would do that. I think I would like to move as quickly as we can within the framework of the rules that guide our work.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So, John, I worded my previous comment on that subject quite carefully. I said we should be prepared for an outcome but not presume that outcome. If we work that way -- I was talking about something subtly different to what Bret was. But I still think there's no harm in us scheduling the potential slots for when we might meet and checking availability. It doesn't mean we presume that that will happen. And that's different than reconvening the working group.

JOHN BERARD: Jonathan, I understand. But we're not the only ones looking at what we're doing and trying to decide what we really mean. And, you know, I

just want us to be careful that, when we begin to implement taking action on new rules and that have yet to be implemented -- you know, yet to be exercised, that we don't create improper impressions.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I've had James patiently in the queue. We really have to bring this to an end. I think we've got a pretty clear idea where we're going. So, unless there's something new to add, my understanding is that we're going to work with the existing July meeting. We get to polish up all of our understanding and the associated documentation in the time we have available to us between now and that meeting. And we understand the need to work expeditiously without rushing.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Jonathan. And thank you for the indulgence. I'm very cognizant of the time. So I'll be very, very brief. I find myself agreeing with at least one half of John, whichever half I'm not sure.

But, since this is the first time this process has been used, we have to be careful about telegraphing outcomes, particularly when it's used again. If we don't start forming the working group early, then perhaps that will be taken as a signal that we're not supporting the outcome or something like that. So, even the absence of future actions would be important or at least interpreted incorrectly.

The second bit -- and it just occurred to me while I was listening to -- where did he go? Chuck. He raises an important point about contracts.

It occurs to me that some TLDs -- this is for all gTLDs, not new gTLDs. Some are not connected to the trademark clearinghouse. That is an important consideration that we must make sure is on the plate of this review team is that we are now asking TLDs that -- incumbent TLDs that have never used or connected to the trademark clearinghouse we're now going to make that mandatory for them potentially as one potential outcome for this process. And I think we need to make sure that that's captured and that we contractually have a way to do that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Couldn't agree with you more. And we're in danger of getting -- I think it's a good point. We're just in danger of getting into the mechanics of how this might work.

So I think we're pretty clear where we're headed on this. It's going to come up at the next meeting. We'll prepare thoroughly for it. And we're not going to have an interim meeting.

So thanks very much. That was a thorough discussion.

And it seems unnecessarily so.

So, as you saw from my proposal earlier, we will now go to item 10, which is an update on the work of the GAC GNSO consultation group. So we're moving to item 10 now.

As co-chair of the group, I think it's probably incumbent on me to give you a very brief update. You've all been present on weekend sessions, prior updates, and our meeting with the GAC. You're aware of the purposes of this group and the objectives, which is to foster an

improved early engagement of the GAC with a policy development process in exactly to avoid in some ways what is happening now or at least to oil the wheels of our effective working together as a broader community.

Right here, I think I'm going to come to the point, given the timing. Really what we're after here is a go ahead from the council to proceed down the route of appointing the GNSO liaison to the GAC. Now let me be crystal clear here. The intention will be to agree the specification, move ahead with the recruitment process, which will involve the three of us, myself and the two vice chairs as currently documented, and seek to appoint the individual subject to a vote -- a motion before the council and a vote on that. So that's really what we're after. There are two other associated actions for the meeting. The first additional action is to permit -- and, really, this doesn't take a lot -- but give access by the GNSO liaison to the GAC to the GNSO Council PDP liaisons as, potentially, a supporting group for that GNSO liaison to the GAC. So they have, if you like, a resource available. So it's not a material change to what we do. It's a slightly additional burden on the GNSO liaisons to the GAC.

And then the third action was really for the GAC alone, but you might want to peruse it, is to fill in the survey of how they perceived existing notifications and information conveyed to the GAC. So what -- the material you have in front of you really is a proposal to formalize the GNSO liaison to the GAC and a specification. So I'd like -- like you to either support going ahead with that or give an indication of what changes you might like to see to that or an objection if you have it. So that's really what's before you now in this item. Comments, questions,

input. Can I take that as support for the council chair and vice chairs to go ahead and commence the recruitment process for this? Bearing in mind this is a one-year pilot. We're not committing to this for life, but we are -- we are going ahead with a one-year pilot and we expect that GNSO liaison to the GAC, subject to council approval, to be appointed and in place by the next meeting in Los Angeles, ICANN 51. John.

JOHN BERARD: So the -- this is John Berard from the business constituency. Historically at the meetings, the three international meetings, the schedules really don't allow much interaction except for the scheduled hour between the GNSO Council and the GAC. There are other opportunities where individually we can dive in and listen or -- but not -- not in terms of consultation. And so the person that we pick or that gets picked to fill this spot is going to have to have extraordinary organizational and communication skills because most of the reporting to us will be asynchronous. It will be on the interim telephone calls that the council has or via email because I think he or she will be spending almost as much time in the GAC room as the GAC does, right? So it's going -- I just think it's going to be an extraordinary individual that fills this spot. I'm sure we have many candidates who are extraordinary, but I -- I just worry that we may be asking somebody to take on something that is -- is not just important but really considerable. I don't know, I worry about that. David?

DAVID CAKE: I think you're right, in the sense it's the real -- the timing issue is a really big one and, I mean, but of course, that's one of the reasons why we've

created the position, because the opportunities for people in the GNSO to directly interact with the GAC are few, aside from with active councillors. I think we are assuming that that person would indeed spend most of their -- a lot of their time at ICANN meeting within GAC and would only have a few opportunities to interact with the council directly and of course the broader community, but, I mean, we're assuming they will find a few and yes, they will have to rely on email and other forms of communication probably quite often in order to get quick feedback from councillors and so on. I mean, I think the -- the root cause of the problem that you have -- the problem that you have identified is the reason why we are trying to have this person. So I agree it does need an organized person and that ensuring that they are well and truly up on every aspect of -- well, not every aspect but with what is going on within the GNSO while they are spending most of the time in the GAC will definitely be a challenge.

CHUCK GOMES: I would just hope that you three would cast as wide a net as possible to identify the right candidate for this position.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: And John and Marilyn, I know you're at the microphone, but if you will just indulge me one additional comment in my sort of capacity as chair of that group, what in my view this is about is primarily having someone on the spot who is knowledgeable and informative about the GNSO, the ways of the GNSO, the ways of the GNSO Council, and the policy development mechanics and current policy issues within the GNSO such that they're on hand and available. They're primarily a liaison from the

GNSO to the GAC rather than a two-way information feed. The specification provides for them to feed information back, for it to be two-way, but it's primarily about being on the spot and being able to answer questions and take course correcting action when and if the GAC appears to be veering off course in its knowledge and understanding of GNSO mechanics or policies. So it's not a negotiator. It's really a conduit for current and best information. That's my perspective on it. Marilyn, I've kept you waiting.

MARILYN CADE: Not a problem. Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I am the CSG officer in the BC and I came to the microphone about this topic having not had a chance to raise an observation to even the BC's councillors, but I did want to just raise a question for all of us. I've spent a fair amount of time at ICANN. In fact, maybe 17 years. And have spent accordingly a fair amount of time in and out of GAC rooms. And also experienced the previous experience that we had when we did have liaison-type exchanges with the GAC, particularly on subjects where we had a liaison in the early days on the WHOIS task force that I chaired, for instance, for two years. I really appreciate the direction that the council has been going in trying to think about the role of liaisons. Notice there's an S at the end of that, in strengthening the understanding of the -- the governments of your working methods and the policy councillors of their working methods. But I wanted to just raise an observation to you to think about. When we founded ICANN, there were 25 governments who came regularly. A few years later there were 40. We're really almost doubling or tripling the number of participants from governments, that is both the official GAC representative and the

additional staff that now come with many governments, and we should expect that to continue to grow. So I'm wondering if, as you approve this, you also really want to take a -- I'm not sure, Jonathan, that -- I do think an experienced hand can explain the organizational structure of the GNSO, its various subparts, and how even functioning or decision-making happens. You can be current, perhaps, on the "hot topics" but I think we need to be really realistic that a lot of this is going to be spotting an opportunity to bring into a smaller set of players from each side into further engagement and that that can be a major outcome or benefit of the liaison. It is going to be impossible to keep up with the workload that you guys have in currency and be an interpreter and an expert and be in the room with the governments and listening to the kinds of issues that they are also grappling with.

So as I looked at the job description, I'm not disagreeing. I'm just -- was struck by the -- the growth and because I do spend a lot of time with some of the governments, I know that they are seeking to bring increasing numbers of new governments, additional staff, and that's going to be a whole burdensome challenge on a single person. Something -- just something to think about.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: A single person is what we have the resource for at present, but it may be that we can be creative in how we deal with that. And one of the ways, of course, that was suggested was taking advantage of the PDP liaisons from the council. Are there any other comments or questions on that, or can I take it that we can proceed down this road? Seeing no

objections, we will continue down that road. Thank you for the comments and input on that and ultimately the support to go ahead.

So that closes item 10. We come now onto item 8. As was on the agenda. A discussion of a cross community working group to develop a transfer for the IANA stewardship role. What we actually need right now is to get this drafting team up off the ground and to set the program of work out for the working group. What we have out is a call for volunteers for the drafting team. And the volunteers from that drafting team from the GNSO specifically will be four, one from each stakeholder group. What we don't yet fully understand, and arguably it's up to the working group to determine, is its relationship with the developing and emerging accountability track and also its link with the coordination group on the IANA stewardship transition. So I think this is one of those overarching, important issues, and it's just an opportunity to have -- I mean, John anticipated that this could fill the meeting, but it may be that it -- it -- that there is not a lot to be said about this. We really need to just get on with forming the drafting team because the drafting team is really going to set the scope for the work of the working group. But I understand that many of us -- there's been a lot happening, a lot in parallel, both at this meeting and prior to this meeting. Some of us may or may not be confused about the various initiatives and how they overlap, how they might interrelate, so I think there's an opportunity here to seek clarification, have discussion, or indeed simply proceed to convene the drafting team and get on with it. So let me pause there and see what comments, questions, or input there are in and around this cross community working group. I should note that this was initiated by really myself and Byron Holland in our capacities as

chairs of the respective GNSO and ccNSO organizations and we have been joined in support of that so far by ALAC and SSAC. Wolf-Ulrich, go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Good afternoon. Nice to see you, from this perspective. I didn't have that opportunity for almost four years. So now I'm back.

I was not in Singapore, so I couldn't follow exactly what happened. Now I saw this many different opportunity -- different initiatives here. We have this initiative for the coordination committee on that item and now there seems to be the initiative for the cross community working group, and I was just looking briefly to that draft charter of that, and it amazes me how many kinds of different levels of organizations we -- and discussion we try to establish right now. So I understand the proposal here. Maybe we would like to establish at first a kind of committee, coordination committee as well, with a working group, with sub working groups, and so on. That's my understanding of what I got here.

We're discussing in our constituencies as well how we can cope with the item. We are discussing within our stakeholder groups to coordinate ourself toward these items, so there may be different coordination groups and different levels to be established. Has this been taken into consideration and how this all is going to be coordinated in a way that we don't, let me say, lose track from the task we will have and the goals we shall have? That's my concern here. So to really understand what this coordination group here within the GNSO plus the working group plus sub -- maybe sub working groups are going to do. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I hear a question, and I will attempt an answer. I don't presume to have all the answer. But let me attempt an answer here. We are a bottom-up multistakeholder organization. It's incumbent on us when there's a challenge put before us, like has been done, to form our own effort in a bottom-up multistakeholder way. That is what this cross community working group attempts to do.

In addition, ICANN has been charged with providing a facilitating and coordinating role. Now almost by definition ICANN does that by virtue of the fact that we are all part of this ICANN model. But I think in attempting to do that and also in recognizing that this particular issue spreads out beyond the normal ICANN community, the coordination group has been suggested proposed by ICANN as a mechanism to provide an overall coordination of the numerous initiatives. One analogy that I've heard -- and I'm not saying it's the definitive analogy or even the final answer -- but is to see the coordination group as responsible for in some senses pulling together or coordinating the patchwork of inputs that are going to come from the different groups. And that -- that's the sort of -- and those patches may even be of different sizes or different shapes and so that is the requirement, it seems to me, potentially on the coordination group, to assist with making sure that this doesn't -- that if you -- you might have an analogy of a program manager and a project manager. There's other ways of looking at it. But that's my two cents worth. I don't presume to know it all, and it would be great to hear from others how this starts to stack up.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: If I could comment on that just, my fear is, now as usual, we have the problem of participation. Well, it may be that in this process, in this many coordination committees, every time the same people are going to show up, have to show up. And that is a problem, what I see, that's just, well, to -- to coordinate in the right way. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. Marilyn, please go ahead.

MARILYN CADE: My name is Marilyn Cade. I appreciate the opportunity to follow Wolf because I'd like to pose a couple of questions to be considered during the discussion and possibly during the next steps. I think we're all sort of pathfinding right now. I kind of feel like I'm wandering around a maze and trying to figure out which maze I'm in today and which award I'm going to get at the end of that maze. And I say that because I think we are really groping our way toward how certain activities are going to continue to relate to each other and how to make sure they cross pollinate each other but don't overlap. So that, I think, was one of the questions that I heard Wolf asking. And I think, since we're going to have a public forum tomorrow on the ideas about what the functions of the coordinating committee is -- coordinating group is going to do, maybe we should just keep that in our mind and think about part of what your discussion is going to be, helping to inform that. Because I'm quite aware, as Wolf said, we're all in the process of trying to figure out within the GNSO community who the three representatives are going to be, trying to understand what their functions are going to be. I kind of feel like, you know, I'm at the beginning of that particular maze without

clear directions. And this is not a criticism, it's just a comment about I'm very anxious to hear this discussion. I do think there is a possibility of having the same people in the same -- in both places, and that might be something to talk about, about whether that's a good thing or a bad thing. And since there's high interest from many, many people in the community on this topic, that there ought to be sort of a separation between the folks who are in one of the groups and those who are on the other. It's just an idea. But I'm also going to mention that I think there's some amount of feedback loop needed between the cross community working group on Internet governance so that we -- I happen to be on that -- so that we stay sort of out of the transition and, you know -- and we sort of think rationally, not just you guys, because it is a cross community working group. We kind of think rationally about who's doing what.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Good points. And I think that's excellent fodder for the drafting team. Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Jonathan. Chuck Gomes. One of the things I became aware of today in conversations with key people from one of the ISTAR organizations is that the technical community has done quite a bit of work already, and so I caution that in proceeding with this that we do everything possible to make them feel comfortable for where we're going. Now, maybe that might mean the cross community working group focuses mainly on names. I'm not necessarily advocating that. I just think we need to make sure that they don't think we're trying to

take over their domain, and if we're cautious there, I think we can make this whole thing work effectively.

I am mindful of one of Marilyn's points that there is quite a substantial discussion on this tomorrow. It's appropriate that we discuss it here as a council, but there is much to follow tomorrow. So I wonder if we've reached the end of the tracks as far as the end of the discussion for today. Tony.

TONY HOLMES: So I share a lot of the concerns that have been voiced here. And I would also support that as the way forward. Because I'm well aware that this is sucking an awful lot of energy out of our constituencies. And whatever we promote to go forward, we have to make sure that it doesn't have a negative impact elsewhere. And I don't think we've got that whole picture clear now to make that decision. So I would support your approach, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: All right. Let's draw that item to a close then. That's item 8, our discussion on the cross-community working group to develop a transfer process for the IANA stewardship role.

Next item is an update on the GNSO review working party. You should, I suspect, I heard, perhaps on the weekend sessions, I think perhaps on the update -- correct me, if I'm wrong -- the review group gave -- there was an update in the public meetings over the last day or two, was there not? So there have been various updates.

Here's an opportunity to hear in the public council meeting from Jen Wolfe, who is assisting us by chairing the GNSO review working party.

JENNIFER WOLFE: Thanks, Jonathan. I'll be brief. I know some of you already heard some of this, so I apologize to the extent any of this is repetitive.

We did present over the weekend session to the GNSO Council. We did have a meeting of the working party on Sunday. And I know staff has been making the rounds to all of the specific groups over the last couple days as well.

Just a couple of updates, though, for anyone who has not heard this information. The time frame has been slightly extended in that we were hoping to complete all of the questions by July 1. But, in order to ensure everyone has had the opportunity to review the questions, the scope, the language of the questions, we're extending that until July 10th. So our working party will be meeting on July 10th. And we certainly invite anyone and everyone to provide comments to us on the scope of the questions, the nature of the questions. I do just want to also add -- I know there's been a lot of questions about is it open-ended, is it closed ended? Are we gathering quantitative and qualitative data? So I'd like to be very clear that there are open-ended questions where those taking the survey will have the opportunity to really say whatever you would like. We do have a catch-all at the very end of the survey so that, if any question did not cover something that you think is important to the review process, you'll have the opportunity to provide that in that space. And we certainly think we have addressed most of the issues. But, to the extent we haven't, please let us know because we do want

to ensure the survey meets all of the needs that we have to gather important data.

When we move into the survey process -- this will probably be late July -- we're going to continue running the survey. It will be an online survey through probably the month of September so that we ensure we give everyone ample time to participate.

There will be two surveys -- a short version and a long version. The short version will be for those who either don't want to spend the time or are less familiar with ICANN. So there will be an opportunity to self-select. I'd like to take a shorter 10-minute version survey. That, obviously, will be a little bit shorter.

There will be a longer more in-depth survey for those of you who have a lot more knowledge and are willing to spend the time. We are ensuring that the technology will be such that you could take it in shorter sittings. So, if you only want to spend 10 minutes at a time, you could make that work within your schedule. So we hope that's going to make it very encouraging and easy for everyone to participate.

So I certainly do encourage you, within any of your constituency or stakeholder groups, to ensure that we get as much participation as possible so that we have really valid data.

Staff has selected Westlake Governance to be the independent examiner. So, just for clarification for everyone, the independent examiner will be assisting us in ensuring that we have the right survey method in place and then also taking a look at the questions and

providing any expert guidance. And then they will be conducting the independent review part of the overall GNSO review.

As the GNSO working party on this matter, we will also have the opportunity to take all of the data gathered and provide our own set of analyses and recommendations. And, as we move into those phases, we'll, of course, continue to update you and invite your comments.

Just one additional point that I know has come up, when you do elect to take the survey, we will ask for your name and some basic information about you. But we will also provide the option for you to select that that is anonymized in the data presentation so that you can feel free to answer questions candidly. But we do want to make sure we just receive one survey per person.

So I think that is everything I have on my report. But I'm happy to take questions about the review and our time frame going forward.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Hand up from Avri. Go ahead, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. In their selection of Westlake -- I guess it was a staff selection. Does -- was this -- what was the decision based on? We have seen Westlake do reviews before, and I don't know that any of us would talk about them having been sterling reviews. So I'm curious on what base -- do you know on what basis they made this? Was this in consultation with the SIC, or how did they -- how did the staff pick these? Were they the only applicant?

JENNIFER WOLFE: Sure. Thank you, Avri. I'll answer this to the best extent of the knowledge I have. I know there was an RFP. It was done by staff in conjunction with the SIC. I know it was based on the RFP criteria. I don't know, Marika or Mary, if you can answer any further on this point from staff. No. That's as much as I know. But I can certainly gather more data to present back. Okay. I will do that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: John.

JOHN BERARD: Jen, thank you. This is John Berard from the business constituency. Jen, thanks very much for taking the lead on this for us. I appreciate it.

We had some discussion I think it was on Saturday regarding scope. And I'm wondering, in the conversations you've had after that, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, I guess today is Wednesday, is it your sense that the community understands and endorses the scope of the GNSO review as it stands? And are you contemplating any changes in the presentation that you made to us on Saturday?

JENNIFER WOLFE: We have continued to take all the comments and expand the scope. So we actually made a lot of progress from where we started in this process. We have extended the time frame until July 10th to continue to solicit feedback. So, to the extent you think the questions that we have posed right now do not address any issues, please do let me know.

It is posted on the Wiki. And I think that link has been circulated. And I can certainly make sure it's circulated again. But, yes, I think we have addressed all of the scope questions that have been raised. And, again, we did put in this sort of catch-all question. So, if we missed something that you think should have been included, there's still a spot to provide that feedback. I think that we have, but certainly welcome anyone's review and comment.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Maria.

MARIA FARRELL: This won't be news to Jen as I mentioned it on Saturday. I think Jennifer has done incredible work on this. And it's a phenomenally complicated process with lots of moving parts. I really appreciate that.

And my concerns are about how what I perceive to be the board direction on how this review should be conducted. I believe the scope is very constrained. It seems to be quite purposefully constraining the ability of the review to look at substantive issues, issues of structure, issues of real politic, questions of the GNSO's efficacy, questions of the GNSO's relationship and status with other parts of the organization and how it runs.

So I think there's a real issue with the constraint of scope here. I think there's an issue with constraint of methodologies. They're very, very much focused on quantitative methodologies, which are a very useful complement to a full review which should include more than simply a tick box survey and questionnaire. It's very good that there's going to

be an open-ended question and response box at the end of the questionnaire and survey. But I think that's still very -- it's just too limited. I think it's a fearful review. I think it's fearful of people saying awkward and uncomfortable and difficult to implement things. But I think we're at the stage in ICANN's progress where we really need to look at the maturity of the model and to embrace the fact that, you know, unexpected things will be said. The review can't be constrained ahead of time.

And I think we really should have the courage and the foresight to look at a review that isn't trying to simply be a technocratic exercise in looking like a review, sounding like a review, but not actually producing review results that are unexpected or difficult or just simply -- you know, not those that are predicted.

So I really -- you know, really thank Jen for the work she's done on this and is continuing to do on this.

I'm just concerned with how -- what I perceive to be the board direction on this as a sort of a trouble-limiting exercise rather than taking, you know, once or twice in a decade chance to look at the main policy making body of ICANN and see, well, how are we doing our job? Can we do it better? And are there people who should be listening to us? Are they listening to us? Those are my concerns.

I appreciate that Jen has gone very far in trying to accommodate those. I just think this is sort of almost the original sin, to use the phrase of the week, of how the review has been conceived. And so, unfortunately, those concerns persist. But I'll certainly keep an open mind. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Let me give you one thought. I know Philip has come up to the mic.

Let me give you one thought which might challenge that thinking. I'd be interested to know. we might be able to pick this up another time.

But what if that was what the board wanted to do and that's what the structural improvement committee feels is within the scope of its work and the way it wants to conduct it?

What if we were to initiate our own review subsequently that took matters back into our hands. So, instead of kicking against that, let them do the work they want to do within that perceived limited scope. And then let's pick it up ourselves and do our own work with the scope we want to do afterwards.

And that's -- I just wonder if that maybe isn't perhaps behind some of the thinking here that it's kind of up to us to do something.

So I think that's -- I'm probably throwing quite a big thing out there for us. And we probably can't discuss it now. But I just wonder whether we can't -- whether this isn't an opportunity rather than a problem for us. So that's just a thought. Philip.

PHILIP SHEPPARD: Thank you. Philip from the brand registry group. I had a rather interesting meeting with staff today on this where we focused on the question of scope rather than the whole thing in the presentation some of you may have seen in your own groups.

And I certainly concur with the concerns that Maria is expressing. And I'm a little surprised at what may be a difference in the messaging that we're getting from the board or perhaps a misinterpretation that we're getting from the board.

Because one document that I had referenced in some contact we had with the SIC earlier on was the board resolution from September last year, which was part of the decision to push the timetable of this review back a little bit, which is fine.

And, in the wording of that resolution, it's all about ICANN being different at the time the review is now taking place. It's all about scope and structure and the importance of making sure that parties and new parties to ICANN are all involved in the GNSO and in policy making. And that messaging seems to be wholly different to what I was just hearing Maria was saying which may have been the particular guidance which I haven't seen. And I will do subsequently in terms of the note that came perhaps CC'd to you on this. So it may be worth us just looking at those two documents and seeing if there is a difference in the messaging we're getting from the board. Because it may be not as intentional as we're interpreting it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Philip. I've got Marilyn, and then did I see a hand to my left? Tony.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. And I am one of the GNSO survivors of the last three or four year -- several year ago cycle on the review process. And as is Philip and Tony and many of the rest of you.

When the first -- and Maria, who I will say a word about. Speaking of a survivor in a staff role to a much understaffed GNSO, managed to keep herself and us sane.

We did a self-review in the earlier process. But we were in a very different stage at ICANN. We had a very different level of budget, a very different level of community, and a very different level of volume of work. We were still incredibly overburdened by needing to take on a self-review. But, in that case we had no choice, I think, in terms of available resources. The only thing that I would -- my -- the reason I went to the microphone was to say, look, guys, we're in a different stage of complexity. I really appreciated the comments you made, Maria. But we're at a different stage of complexity. But we're also in a different stage of resources. And we shouldn't be thinking that taking on work ourselves as extremely busy stakeholders is any substitute for using a few of the financial resources of ICANN to provide work that you and the rest of the community can digest and comment and even stand back iteratively for improvement.

Since I think we're all better at that than at the original part of having to do our own review. And, although we did make it through and it was not useful to the volume of work that we were dealing with at that time even, my two cents on redeploying ICANN resources.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Can I just make some clarification on that to make sure we understand the point completely, Marilyn? Because, in a sense, I responded to Maria by suggesting a self-review. A self-review needn't necessarily only deploy our own resources. So these are not inconsistent suggestions, perhaps.

MARILYN CADE: Okay. I just -- I was commenting on -- I think perhaps sometimes we are not -- in the budget somehow we're able as an organization to find money for some things and perhaps not for others. And I want -- that was my purpose in commenting. Because if the self-review does impose work on an extremely busy group of stakeholders including all the cross-community working groups and the policy work and the attention to ICANN's role in the Internet ecosystem and, et cetera, et cetera, I think part of our frustration and our overload is that we -- and this is not a comment about how we're working. It's a comment about how we may need to push others to work for us.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. I think I understand that clearly. I had another hand up, and that was from Tony. I'm mindful of the time. And I'm just going to say, Maguy, I'm really sorry. I thought at one point we were running like a Swiss train, and I really thought we would get to you. And then we drifted away from that, and then we came back home. But I think we're not going to make it. I really appreciate you -- Okay. If you're willing to give us two minutes, great.

Let me go to Tony. I don't want to cut this item short. Let me go to Tony. And then we'll go to you, Maguy. That's great. Let's do that then.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you, Jonathan. Tony Holmes. Similar to Marilyn, sometimes I feel like I'm still just recovering from the previous experience of this GNSO review. But that doesn't put me off. I think this is an incredibly important issue that we need to get right. I did raise some issues when this was discussed in council earlier in the week, some questions on the scope and the breadth of this particular study.

Since then, we have had some further discussions on this within the ISP constituency. And there is a fair degree of concern. Much of it, I think, tallies with the sort of issues that Maria was raising. There's also a lack of clarity in my own mind as to how some of this overlaps between the structural improvements and the review itself. I'm not clear on that in every case.

But I think the worst thing we could do is even think about setting up a third strand at this stage. I don't think that would be helpful. I think it duplicates the work. And it's going to be probably an issue of timing. It isn't going to work clearly well there. And, again, it's going to have to be resolved.

So I think it's more important to try and influence the scope of the GNSO review now as it's been set out. I hope we can do some of that maybe by providing some of the input that Jennifer referred to. But probably we need to be a little bit louder, if we do have concerns about

this, in other ways as well. Certainly, the ISPCP, they felt strongly enough about this to try to make some of that representation early. And I would encourage others to do exactly the same thing.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Tony. I'm very mindful of the fact that we've kept Maguy here the whole period so --

JAMES BLADEL: I just want to say that we haven't been ineffective, as I said on Saturday. When this thing first came down the pike, it was a statistical analysis. It is now a subjective analysis. It was then sought to be delayed, it was not delayed. It was then sought not to have structural assessment and now it does. So I wouldn't want people to think that we haven't had some influence already.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Point taken. Maguy.

MAGUY SERAD: First time of the microphone from this end. Good afternoon, everyone. Maguy Serad, contractor compliance. Thank you for recognizing and apologizing. I accept it. I understand the challenge we all have with the time constraint. All I ask of you, we've taken the liberty of providing a PowerPoint presentation. I'm not going to bore you, don't be scared. It's over 40-plus pages. But what we have done, if you focus on slides 4, 5, and 6, it shows a before, a now, and a future, which was one of your requests. I've added lots of links. I've added lots of supporting

documents that the team helped in bringing forward. Basically what we've done is done the heavy lifting on your behalf, bringing you the data, focusing a lot on the metrics and bringing you the information that we had committed to delivering to improve on the uniformity of reporting as it was issued, I think two years ago. So that was my comment. We are always available, Jonathan, to participate. Next time just I cannot be here all the time. Next time hopefully you will have more time. But if you have questions, do send us your questions, and we will respond very timely. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Maguy. Both for your patience and for your succinctness when we did come to you. We'll put the presentation on record. This is -- for the purpose of this record is for item 7, an update, and we were seeking an update from ICANN's Contractual Compliance department. Actually I think this may work very well for us. You've given us the precursor, you've given us the information, and hopefully we can have a follow-on item of a similar nature at our next meeting where we can do a more Q&A format. So I think -- thank you very much, Maguy. That, in essence, concludes our formal agenda, and we've had good contribution from the rest of the room. So that's much appreciated, in addition to from the councillors themselves. I know Bret raised the next steps for the Expert Working Group. We've put that on the schedule for the wrap-up session tomorrow morning. I just can't quite believe it's Thursday already tomorrow, but it is for the wrap-up session tomorrow morning. So we are aware of that and will track it on the action items. So let me just check if there is any other business that anyone would like to raise, both from the council or from within the room prior to us

bringing the meeting to a close. Well, thank you very much. I think that was an effective meeting. It was thorough, we conducted it well, and we got through some good business and aired some important things. So thank you very much, everyone. Thanks to everyone who came to the meeting in addition to the councillors. We appreciate your time and contribution. That call -- that closes today's GNSO Council public meeting here in London.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]