**Transcript GNSO Council Public Meeting in Los Angeles,
15 October 2014 at 13:00 PDT; 20:00 UTC.**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council Public meeting, held in Los Angeles on 15 October 2014 at 13:00 PDT; **20:00** UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio stream is also available at:

http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gnso-council/audio-gnso-council-15oct14-en and via the Adobe Connect:

http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gnso-council/ac-gnso-council-15oct14-en

On page:

http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-gnso-council

List of attendees: NCA – Non Voting – Jennifer Wolfe

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Volker Greimann, Yoav Keren

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Ching Chiao, Bret Fausett

(Bret Fausett arrived late)

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Tony Holmes, Osvaldo Novoa, Gabriella Szlak, John Berard, Brian Winterfeldt, Petter Rindforth

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Klaus Stoll, David Cake, Avri Doria, Maria Farrell, Magaly Pazello, Amr Elsadr remote participation - proxy to David Cake in case of connectivity issues

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed- absent, proxy to Thomas Rickert

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles – ccNSO Observer – absent apologies

Mason Cole – GNSO Liaison to GAC

ICANN Staff
David Olive – VP Policy Development
Marika Konings – Senior Policy Director
Rob Hoggarth – Senior Policy Director
Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director
Steve Chan – Senior Policy Manager
Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst
Glen de Saint Géry – GNSO Secretariat
Josh Baulch– Manager, Meetings Technical Services
Julie Hedlund – Director SSAC Support/Policy Director absent apologies

Jonathan Robinson: Good afternoon here in Los Angeles. Hello, everyone. Welcome this afternoon's GNSO Council meeting. This is our public meeting so we encourage any contributions and participation from anyone else in the room as well as the councilors at the table.

Apologies for the change in venue at the relatively last minute, although I know you were all given some notice. We exceeded or agreed to accommodate a request to change the venue and it's left us with slightly sub optimal seating. Normally we would be in a kind of crescent shape and be able to engage with one another effectively as well as with the audience. So what - with other participants.

So what we have decided to do is encourage anyone who's in the room so that they're not seated behind us at the top of the horseshoe to come on to either side of the room. We have a roving mic and I expect we're going to have a standup mic in the front.

So please be aware, we welcome contribution from GNSO and other participants and we will encourage that during the course of the meeting especially - well we have a specific section of open microphone at the end but there may well be contributions during the course of the meeting.

So, Glen, if we could proceed with a roll call and then we'll take it from there?

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Jonathan and I will. Bret Fausett. Not here yet. Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yoav Keren.

Yoav Keren: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Gabriella Szlak.

Gabriella Szlak: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: John Berard.

John Berard: Here for just a bit.

Glen DeSaintgery: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Tony Holmes.

Tony Holmes: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Maria Farrell.

Maria Farrell: I'm present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: I'm somewhat present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Amr. David Cake.

David Cake: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Magaly Pazello.

Magaly Pazello: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Klaus Stoll.

Klaus Stoll: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Daniel Reed is absent and he has given his proxy to Thomas
                   Rickert. Are you happy with the proxy, Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. Jennifer Wolfe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Patrick Myles.

Patrick Myles: I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Mason Cole.

Mason Cole: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: And for staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Steve Chan, Mary Wong and David Olive. Have I left off any staff and myself. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. Welcome again, everyone, and especially Amr who's at some very late hour in the evening where he is. Amr, you may have noticed there was a link sent around by Glen earlier for councilors to join the Adobe room so there is a link to the room for councilors and you may want to join us in that remote participation room.

Amr Elsadr: Hi, Jonathan. Yeah, thanks. I think I'm in the AC room. I'm having a little problem with my Adobe Flash plugin to my browser but I'll try to join the AC room...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: You may be in that public room. I think there's a councilors' room that you can join. Anyway welcome. So our first item is to just make a call for any update to statements of interest. Any updates? Gabriella, go ahead.

Gabriella Szlak: Yes, just to tell everyone that I've updated mine online and I'm only putting there that I'm also CEO of a startup that is called (unintelligible). It's not related to DNS or anything related to domain names but I just wanted to update that. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Sounds like an interesting venture.

Gabriella Szlak: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So Item 1.3 is an opportunity to review or amend the agenda. I note that I already have some points under Any Other Business from Jennifer Wolfe, from Alan Greenberg, from Thomas Rickert. So are there any other amendments or additions to the agenda that anyone would like to make?

Okay, seeing none the minutes of the GNSO Council meeting of both 4th and 25th of September have been posted and approved on the 11th of October. I think that covers our last meetings, yes it does, brings us up to date.

So now we have an opportunity to briefly go through the previous action items. And actually that's a timely opportunity to remind you of the session on Friday. I know all of the councilors who - all of the existing or remaining and incoming councilors have been made aware

of the session. Very much hoping all of you will be able to join us on Friday.

There's a formal agenda during the day although it should be quite different to the run of the - the regular meetings we have here during the course of an ICANN meeting.

It's a specific opportunity to talk about the role of the Council, the role of the Council within the GNSO and the role of councilors and to try and really place you in a good position particularly incoming councilors but everyone to orient the whole Council with one another and be in good shape to make productive work during the course of the year ahead. So we're very much looking forward to that.

We have invited participation from an additional representative from each of the main groups or constituencies that have representatives on the Council. I would like to check - would like to ask you to make sure that each group that you're in has someone coming. Typically that would be the chair but it needn't necessarily be the chair so it would be good to know we've got representatives of the different groups coming to that first session from 10:00 to 11:30.

I understand also that the GNSO-selected Board members will be there for that first session as well so it proves to be - promises to be an interesting day and a useful mechanism for ensuring a productive year ahead.

I'm just casting my eye over the action items and seeing if there's anything we need to cover now. We'll get to many of these items during the course. Can I just check on the Expert Working Group final

report and the proposal for the four volunteers. Had that group had its initial meeting, the working group with the Board, or is that tomorrow?

James Bladel: I believe it's this afternoon. Jonathan. This is James speaking.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, hi James.

James Bladel: I believe it's later today.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Okay great, so that's taking place so just to remind you that the Board requested Board GNSO Working Group to try to chart a way forward for integrating the Expert Working Group output into the GNSO policy development process.

Right so everything else - oh there's the Board Working Group on the Nominating Committee. James, is it correct that you volunteered to take a lead on that subject to close - subject to the initial comment period being complete? Originally it was John but we weren't sure whether someone was going to take over from John once you're off the Council. And somehow your name has come up, James, so I wanted to check that.

James Bladel: So I'll be blunt, that's not ringing a bell. It's possible that I - I don't know, can someone help me or refresh me here?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, we weren't sure. Can anyone else - does anyone else recall? John, do you recall the position...

John Berard: I do not recall. This is John Berard. I do not recall James being tabbed to pick up. In fact my name is attached to that primarily because I didn't

think it was appropriate for the Council to participate in the first round but thought once the constituencies and stakeholder groups had submitted their comments that it would be possible for the Council to knit together a consolidated point of view where one would exist. That was what I was willing to do.

I don't think there's really any heavy lifting in this assignment but I do think that if there is broad agreement that it might be very effective for the GNSO Council to, in the reply period, offer such comments. So I would be willing to help whoever would put his or her name on it but that's...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah thanks. That's perfectly clear. There's been - so what we need here is if someone is - ideally we should have a volunteer. Is anyone particularly interested in this and willing to step up? John's kindly offered to assist in any event. Tony. Yeah, okay great. So we have Tony Holmes volunteering to do that.

There's been a pretty - or a pretty substantial session on this this morning. I don't know if any of you attended it. But there was a presentation that involved the Board Working Group and significant amount of input from the mic.

So, John, just to sort of put it on record, I mean, I understand exactly why you said the timing and we - that point was well taken that we - the Council should await until the stakeholder groups and constituencies have put their input in.

But I don't, in my view, and I'm open to anyone else having their view of course, I don't think that precludes the Council having some input over - I'm not sure we're just synthesizing the views of the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

John Berard: John Berard. I guess this has become a bit of a thing. The Council is increasingly asked to comment, get cards, get letters, emails, faxes, the whole thing. And I have been unwilling to comment where I think it would usurp the role and responsibility of the constituency and stakeholder group.

So it's possible that my polemic on this might make me a bad rapporteur but I'm willing to play that role because I do think that, as we have seen in other instances, when there can be cross community consent or consensus it makes a very powerful statement. So that's what I would seek to do and I will certainly serve as Tony's ghostwriter on this to the extent that he'll let me.

But that's my perspective. If that doesn't comport with what you want to do - and keep in mind the next time the Council meets I won't be here to complain about it so.

Jonathan Robinson: So we don't differ at that level but the question is is there anything more in addition? So, Tony.

Tony Holmes: Well it just seems appropriate to comment that may take on that was exactly the same as John's so if there's any deference I should make it clear it was exactly along those lines.

Jonathan Robinson: Well we have a volunteer to take that task forward in any event and we can debate, if necessary, any substance of the comments at the time it's drafted.

All right so that covers us over on the action list. In terms of the project list I'll just remark and remind you that we've got this in a particularly nice or improved format. Does anyone want to comment or question any item on the project list at this stage? We've clearly had a thorough review of various projects in the run up to this meeting.

Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. One further improvement we're planning to make to the projects list is following your request as well to have more details on implementation status that will build on the section that we already have there but get our colleagues from GDD to actually update as well in the same cycle as we do and so you have all the information in one place concerning status of policy projects but also policy recommendations that are in the process of being implemented.

So you probably see there is already information there that I think everyone appreciated the more details information that you got over the weekend. So we'll - for the next iteration we'll include them in the loop of updating the list.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Marika, who would you include in the update?

Marika Konings: So we'll get colleagues from the GDD teams so Kaitlin, for example, who also provided the update.

Jonathan Robinson: So I attended a meeting on - this is Wednesday - it must have been Tuesday evening I think. And that was a - what Fadi called a round table. And he got a group of the senior management, what he calls the Global Leadership Team, to meet with the chairs of the stakeholder groups and constituencies and to talk about how things, things broadly, what issues were on people's minds and how we could do things better.

One of the topics that came up was that inevitably this excess of information and a perceived difficulty with processing, dealing and managing that information. From memory - so this isn't a hard record - representatives of IPC, ISP and BC, I think the sort of CSG generally, and the Registrars a little, backed this that an improved format of information describing the policy work of the GNSO was desirable.

I think it's really important that councilors share this document, this project list, with their respective chairs with that in mind, their leadership groups or their stakeholder groups and constituencies such that that feedback can be given or made reference against this document.

Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. In that line of thought another change we're going to make, as I think you're all aware of the one-pagers that we provide to the GAC. And they are publicly available and posted on the GAC Website. But I've heard several people commenting on how useful those documents are.

So also when we do this cycle we'll push those out as well to the Council and post them on the GNSO Website so people can also share that with their communities which is basically just a one page overview of, you know, what is the PDP about, what is the next opportunity for input and what is some of the background and where you can find further information.

So hopefully between the project list, the one pagers, the information that's available on the Website as well as the wiki there should be a way to find your through different formats of information.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Marika, what I think might be helpful is specifically to write a little covering email for distribution to the Council list to be then sent out to the various groups to say, "This is the status quo. If you've got suggestions for improvement please bring them to us." Thanks.

All right that's Item 2 dealt with unless there's any questions or comments?

Item 3 is the consent agenda for which there are no items. Item 4 is the adoption of IRTP Part D final report. Just checking, I'm assuming, James, that you made the motion but I don't have that immediately in front of me.

James Bladel: That's correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, James. So perhaps you could briefly represent the motion. I'm not sure it's necessary to read it through in detail but - I know we have dealt with this in some detail over the weekend but for the

purposes of anyone who wasn't here at the weekend maybe just a brief summary of the status quo and the call for any questions or discussion.

James Bladel: Certainly. So this is the final report and recommendations of the IRTP-D Working Group which is IRTP the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy, a consensus policy that governs how registries and registrars transfer domain names between one another.

This particular working group was the fourth in a series of working group PDPs that was chartered I want to say back in 2008 to address various categories of issues surrounding transfers.

This working group issued recommendations regarding the use of TDRP, some refinements to that policy which is a transfer dispute resolution policy as well as some recommendations for improved resources for registrants on the ICANN homepage and the continued use of the standardized form of authorization, or FOA, as part of the transfer documentation process flow. This was considered to being - possibly eliminating that step.

The - and one other change being that registries - gTLD registry operators were removed as the first level of this TDRP dispute and that all of that now will be handled by the independent providers and our indications are that that is a very infrequently used policy.

So all of our recommendations had full consensus support. There were healthy examination and debate and each of those issues and including a very substantive, in terms of quantity and quality, of public comments that were fed back into the changes between the draft initial

report and the final report. And all of that work concluded in early September.

So that's where we are. And we now have this motion that was prepared, you know, with staff and with me as the chair. I made the motion. Avri seconded it. And we are ready to go.

Jonathan Robinson: Any comments, questions, discussion?

James Bladel: The IRTP groups tend to bring out that reaction in people.

Jonathan Robinson: So I've got a slight procedural issue here and that's - I understand that Bret Fausett, who is a councilor from the Registry Stakeholder Group, is not currently present. He's currently on his way. So there's really a couple of options. We could defer the vote or I could ask if anyone had any objection to him voting when he does arrive. Alternatively we'll have to have absentee voting and he'll be given the opportunity to absentee vote and then we - it just delays the outcome.

So I think the desirable outcome, given that we understand he's on the way, is to permit him to vote when he arrives. Any comments or questions on that? James.

James Bladel: Just to be clear, we still have quorum in both houses.

Jonathan Robinson: Correct.

Volker Greimann: I second this proposal.

Jonathan Robinson: Who was that? Volker, thank you. So are there any objections to permitting Bret to vote when he arrives? Okay, so we're expecting him to be here any minute. I think we'll record the vote now and I'll formally record his vote when he arrives.

Okay, Glen - well I think we can probably do this via a show of hands. Can I - I'm going to put the motion to the vote then given that there seems to be no further discussion. Can I ask if there anyone who would like to abstain or - to abstain from voting on the motion?

Glen, you record there are no abstentions. Would anyone like to record a no vote to the motion? There are no "no" votes, Glen. Could all those in favor raise their hands? Thank you. And we note from the Adobe Connect that Amr has raised his hand in support of the motion as well. And subject to Bret's satisfactory arrival we will record his vote. So we'll confirm the outcome once Bret arrives at the meeting.

Item 5 is the second motion on the table today. It's to adopt the charter for the cross community working group to discuss Internet governance issues affecting ICANN and to make recommendations to the chartering organizations on these issues.

This motion was presented to the Council by the deadline by Avri. Avri, let me hand over to you to make any reviewing comments and present the motion.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. Okay so the motion is, as I've presented before, it's to approve the charter for a cross community working group. This is a charter that has already been approved by ALAC, ccNSO and SSAC.

The resolved approves the charter and then, number two, indicates that each GNSO stakeholder group identifies one member to serve on the CWGIG, the CCWG Internet Governance, by the 15th taking into account the charter requirements that best efforts to be made to ensure that its members have sufficient expertise, commit to actively participate and where appropriate solicit and communicate views.

The GNSO will collaborate in outreach. And the charter calls for each of the chartering organizations to appoint a co-chair. I also understood that there was the offering of a friendly amendment, even though this has been sitting here for several meetings now, four weeks - four months. So I guess I'll give - I should turn the floor over to the arguing of the friendly amendment knowing that there is one. But the charter has already been approved by other groups. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. John, I see your hand is up but I know that the friendly amendment was proposed by Brian. Brian, I don't know if you want to confirm that or add anything. It's been discussed on list. Okay. All right, John, go ahead.

John Berard: This is John Berard. I think there was a portion of the delay because you asked that it be deferred, Avri, yes?

Avri Doria: I do not believe I ever asked that it be deferred.

John Berard: No/

Avri Doria: The first time I spoke about it it was on the agenda as a discussion item so I only discussed it. But no, there was never a request for

deferral. The first time it actually came up there was no one making a motion. The second time it came up said oh, okay, I'm an observer in the group and, you know, sure, if no one else here is ready to make the motion I'll make the motion so I made the motion.

John Berard: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, for the record, as far as I know the first time this came onto our radar screen was just prior to the London meeting. I think it was, from memory, it was raised as a point at that stage and then I put it formally onto the agenda but not as a motion anticipating that should it get traction it would come forward as a motion.

I think we missed a meeting with it coming forward as a motion but perhaps discussed it a little more and then finally it's come to us as a motion at this meeting. So it has been around for some time. I've got Maria and then Brian.

Maria Farrell: Maybe I should defer to Brian because I've got questions about it in which he might answer in his - which I raised on the list. Do you want to go first or shall I?

Okay, sorry. So it's Maria Farrell for the record. I'm a bit concerned about this basically because I don't quite understand the repercussions of the friendly amendment to the motion. It seems to ask for representatives to be appointed per constituency rather than per stakeholder group. And that would seem to increase the number of participants from the GNSO.

However, we're having a discussion on whether that is or is not consistent with the charter. And we've got quite a difference of opinion on whether that may be the case. We're also trying to work out what the repercussions of that are. For example, does the number of potential representatives exceed the number of constituencies in the Non Contracted Parties House of - in fact, in the GNSO Council altogether.

So that means, you know, is the question of will there be fewer representatives than their constituencies if we move to a constituency model. I'm not happy that we've worked through the implications of that in the couple of hours we've had since the friendly amendment was proposed.

And also I'm a little bit worried about if we move to per constituency model in NCSG we certainly have members who are members of the stakeholder group but that are not members of the constituency so I'm worried that, you know, potentially two groups of people could be disadvantaged by this.

But I suppose the overarching concern I have really is that it seems to me - it could be - a change to the charter or a change to the interpretation of the charter and that could jeopardize the initiative - joint initiative of the ccNSO and At Large Advisory Committee who've already voted to accept this.

So I would love to learn more and have my, you know, concerns put to rest. I'm a bit worried that we - even though this thing has been on the cards for months now, you know, I'm not trying to be mean about this,

Brian, but it's just we've had this thing come up in the last couple of hours and we haven't figured out what the implications of it are.

So maybe you can answer some of those questions. That would be wonderful.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I would just say that we - my thought is that we should keep our discussion to - with reference to the charter and the interpretation of the charter. I mean, to the extent that the charter should have had, you know, we might have an opinion about how participation should have been structured but that's not the point. It feels to me like this is about what the charter says and is what is being suggested consistent with the charter or not.

I had a queue which was Maria, Brian, Avri. I sense that you might want to respond directly first, Avri. So come in with a quick response to Maria and then we'll go to Brian.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I have two points. One of them is a point of order in that we are discussing a friendly amendment before it's actually been brought up, other than making it on the list. And I don't know whether one really has to make the request for a friendly amendment before we discuss it.

And the other thing is on the point what the charter says is six from each SO AC, from each supporting organization and AC, plus it's co chair. So how we allocate that six is up to us.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so just on the point of order I'm taking it that the friendly amendment was proposed to the list therefore is in play, so to speak. Brian, go ahead.

Brian Winterfeldt: Sure. Brian Winterfeldt for the record. We did make the friendly amendment on the list. And I do apologize, we literally just - this issue came up yesterday in the Intellectual Property Cwt meeting so that's sort of the explanation for the timing that, you know, when we had our meeting and we got together and we were going over the motions for today.

Greg Shatan was part of the group that worked on the actual charter. And the reason why we proposed a friendly amendment is because we feel like it does actually have the motion conform to the language in the charter. So what we're proposing was a friendly amendment. And Avri and I did talk about this very briefly just at the very beginning of the meeting is that the link between the motion was originally drafted we feel like actually doesn't completely confirm with the charter language. And so the idea is actually to have them align.

Jonathan Robinson: To be absolutely explicit, can - I mean, given that we've been told that the language of the charter is six per SO AC plus the co-chair can you make it clear how the amendment is consistent with that?

Brian Winterfeldt: So I guess to be clear so the language of the charter is what you stated but specifically to go with the intention of the drafting team when that language was drafted is why we have proposed a friendly amendment to - for clarification purposes. So does that make sense?

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, Brian, I was distracted by another message, please go ahead.

Brian Winterfeldt: So the language in the charter this was actually a clarification that is along the lines - it's in comport with the language by specifically it flushes out things in the way that the drafting team intended them to.

Jonathan Robinson: So would we or would we not end up with six per SO AC and...

Brian Winterfeldt: Yes, we would. It would not change the numbers.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. I've got a queue. I've got someone waving at me from the mic but unfortunately they're behind a few others. Just to be clear - just on a practical point, the - both the audio and the visuals aren't that great like for example James is in a bit of the shadow at the end of the table and, Greg, to some extent you are as well. So if you could, you know, feel free to wave.

So I've got a queue that is David and then Greg and Avri back in.

David Cake: Okay so my reading of this amendment is that it demands essentially that we have - it would change it from four representatives, one from each SG, to seven; two for the Contracted Parties House, two for the NCSG, three for the CSG. Is that - that seems correct.

Now that would obviously put us over the seven so what - we can sort of do that because we have seven people, including the co-chair. But it means that that co-chair must also act as the representative of their stakeholder group - well in this case.

So I think in that sense asking that a co-chair be also active as a representative of a stakeholder group I would say appears to me to be - well technically within the reading of the - the strict rules I would say

sort of does somewhat undermine the intent of the charter in that it means that person changes their representative role sort of retrospectively somewhat in this case.

So, yeah, it's - it definitely a sort of borderline case but I think the argument can be made that it is sort of changing the intent of that charter.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi, Greg Shatan from the IPC, a member of the CWG on Internet Governance. And I was active in drafting the charter including in the paragraph in question. And the number of - originally it was two to five per SO AC and the number was increased to two to six specifically to accommodate the seven potential members from the GNSO.

The intent was to seat by constituency. And of course if the NCSG, you know, wishes to exercise a prerogative to do so otherwise I suppose that's their prerogative.

So - and furthermore when the organization was seated, albeit pre-charter, we were seated with members by constituency so this would not, in fact, expand the working group of members that currently exist but would just place them there consistent with the charter. Indeed if the charter went through the way that it was initially proposed certain members would have to leave the group perhaps including myself.

And while of course I could act as an observer, as could anybody, that was not what I signed up for. And the charter was specifically designed

to accommodate exactly what the amendment contemplates. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. And we're going to go to Amr in the online first before going to Avri.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I just don't say - first I can see where Brian is coming from and I do believe he was correct in that the language of the motion is not strictly consistent with the charter as is it's actually more restrictive for the GNSO than the charter allows in terms of membership to the cross community working group.

However, I also agree with David and I (unintelligible) see how the charter specifies that one of the acting - one of the (unintelligible) co-chairs should be counted as a member that would represent, in fact, actually a constituency rather than stakeholder group.

I (unintelligible) the language in the charter sort of suggests that there are (unintelligible) the co-chair of the GNSO is specific to a (unintelligible) constituency within the GNSO so it just leaves it (unintelligible) would be selected (unintelligible).

I also feel that the language (unintelligible) be appointed co-chairs exclusive from the six just really makes that clear. And although the language of the motion is not consistent with the language in the charter I (unintelligible) amendment being suggested is consistent (unintelligible). Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, Amr. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. First of all I do think that the motion is consistent with the charter as. I think that the amendment...

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, Avri, the motion as is or as amended?

Avri Doria: As is, is indeed consistent. So I think - I wasn't quite sure I understood everything Amr said when it was going on but I thought he was admitting that perhaps the motion as it stands is not consistent and I think it is. You don't have to use all six; you have to have at least two. So the motion is indeed consistent.

Going back slightly in the history of this group when - at one point, yes, we all joined and NCSG had far too many members. And so then there was a decision by the group that was not enforced but there was a decision by the group that there would be one per, you know, that there would be one per SG, right?

And so I dropped out of being a member of the group and became an observer just like Greg says he might be forced to if it were to pass this way. That's a step I've already taken and it is actually survivable.

But it felt different being an observer than being a member and I always put observer at the top of my mail, you know, make sure people know I'm an observer and not a member.

Now in terms of accepting the friendly - the friendly amendment - the friendly challenge as it were - a Freudian slip, I apologize for, it really wasn't intentional.

There's a part of me that's inclined to just sort of yeah, yeah, yeah, that's the way we always do things. We always say there's one registrar, there's one registry, there's one NCSG and there's three CSGs. That's just the fact of life.

You know, that's the way we pretty much run everything that there is three from one stakeholder group and one each from the rest of our stakeholder groups. Fact of life, yeah, why not accept it? And when I said that to my stakeholder group I got a certain amount of pushback.

Now it would actually be impossible, I believe, for the NCSG to say oh okay, we'll go with the constituency model because well we have two constituencies, we take two. Yes, but we also have members who are not members of any constituency so therefore when we have to play that game we end up going one for the stakeholder group and one for each of the constituencies.

And that works out nicely because we get three, they get three, you know, we feel like we're balanced, and the Registrars have one and the Registries have one. And I guess they feel balanced against each other and, you know, they let us get away with it.

So it really puts me in a quandary and I think that I am going to reject it as a friendly amendment. I think that if we do an amendment we need to do one that is explicit.

Because as the GNSO Council we can say one from the Registries, one from the Registrars, one from NCSG and three from CSG and make it explicit because the language as it is now leaves the ambiguity that people have been talking about that is that six, is that seven, does

it go to eight, you know, what do we mean because if we went the three NCSG, the three CSG and the two from Contracted Parties House we get to eight.

So I believe that I can't accept this as a friendly amendment. I believe that if the amendment is recrafted to say one each from three of them and three from CSG, then at least it's understandable, it's clear but I would ask that it be voted on because if two of the stakeholder groups are going to be asked - three of the stakeholder groups because I'm not suggesting that NCSG as for three, I think we could stick with one - but if three of the stakeholder groups are going to go with one and allow the other stakeholder group as we always have done, we certainly have a precedent for that, to continue at the level of three because of their organizational style, we should vote on it. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So I'm going to make sure on what's being suggested here. As it stands you don't consider it friendly and therefore it would have to be voted on. However, you would consider a variant of it more friendly but perhaps still not sufficiently friendly that it wouldn't have to be voted on.

Avri Doria: I would consider a rework of it practical.

Jonathan Robinson: Fine.

Avri Doria: Right, whereas this one I do not even consider practical.

Jonathan Robinson: Fine. So a rework which sounds to me to be potentially materially similar could work at which point you would still ask that we vote on it so technically you would consider it unfriendly.

Avri Doria: In a friendly sort of way, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. Alan. Sorry, I've lost my queue there. I'm sorry. I've got Volker next and then Alan.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I would just like to seek some - raise a point but before I raise that I would like to seek some clarification maybe you can provide that. How would voting then actually look like? Would these multiple representative from one stakeholder group have one shared vote or would they each have one vote on that group?

Because I think the current balance of power in - to seek term - just to coin a term - for the GNSO Council and the GNSO altogether, is quite well balanced between Contracted Parties and Non Contracted Parties, and by increasing the delegates from one house only this would be severely disturbed, that's my question and my point would be that I'm very disturbed by the timing of this.

Normally when we have any last minute amendments or suggestions for change there's at least some warning ahead of that that there is someone drafting or some work going on so that we can mentally prepare and have an inkling of what is coming. This is just strung up on the Council and I have severe misgivings about that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker.

Avri Doria: Can I respond?

Jonathan Robinson: I'll just make a practical point to note that this is precisely the point of why we have those Tuesday meetings - why we've instituted those Tuesday evening meetings to have a form of discussion around anything that may be controversial or challenging so we can air it in that context. So just to remind all of you that should this happen again in the future, if there's something last minute coming out of the constituency or stakeholder group that's precisely why we have a Tuesday evening session.

Greg, over to you.

Greg Shatan: Just to respond to a couple of things that were said, I think it's not a matter of organizational style of the Commercial Stakeholder Group but rather organization substance. The Commercial Stakeholder Group is really a lightweight framework for three disparate constituencies. The constituencies operate almost entirely at the constituency level. There is very little in the way of structure to the CSG or action to the CSG as a whole. So I think that the idea this is just a question of style is anapest.

I think that as well the idea that somehow we would share 1/3 of a vote when we all have differing views and that we're there, you know, to express those views directly because we do represent in one case ISPs, another case, business users and solution providers and the like and the other intellectual property interests is exactly what we're trying to avoid losing the direct voices that are currently sitting on the stakeholder group.

As far as timing, unfortunately the first time I noticed this was while we were here so I didn't offer my comment to Brian until that time but that is what it is. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. I skipped over Alan.

Alan Greenberg: A couple of comments. I find the current discussion sort of a backdoor attempt to reorganize the GNSO Council again. When it was organized into houses and stakeholder groups, which was not what everyone envisioned, the various stakeholder groups did meet as a unit periodically, not just the three constituencies, and seems to have died out.

All of that notwithstanding, I'm a little bit confused about what's actually on the table at this point. If indeed this motion is - amendment is reworded in some way and approved does that imply seven or six GNSO people sitting on that group? I'm confused.

Because if it's seven that means the motion - the charter has to go back to the other groups and that's a death knoll for the whole thing so.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I understood it was seven. And if it was seven it was still consistent with the charter.

Avri Doria: Yes, the charter says six not counting the co-chair. So it would be six - it would be three stakeholder group people, three constituency people and then the co-chair is not counted in that...

Alan Greenberg: So that means one of the seven is accepting to be the chair and perhaps less partial.

Avri Doria: No. Sorry. That would only be if NCSG was also insisting on going by constituency. I am saying that if it were amended to count NCSG as a standard SG then we would just have one.

Jonathan Robinson:So just to make sure, because, Alan, you sought clarification there, to make sure everyone is clear, we have a friendly amendment that we've been told isn't unfriendly. We will need to vote on that or have it modified and in which case Avri has indicated that she would still expect us to vote on it. So really the question before us is, Brian, do you wish to proceed with the amendment as is or do you wish to propose an alternative...

Brian Winterfeldt: I'm happy to propose an alternative along the lines of what Avri suggested. I think that does actually make it even clearer. And I would need to just work on the language for a couple minutes.

Jonathan Robinson:Whilst Brian works on the alternative language for the proposed amendment, are there any other comments or questions in regard to this? Avri.

Avri Doria: I do have one other comment, and I have a question - a response I think to a question Volker asked. I do want to say I'd have to go back to the transcript before I swore on a stack of various bibles but I did ask the first time this came up when I wasn't the one making a motion, whether we had settled the whole issue of numbers. And I was assured that we had.

Also, so I just wanted to make that particular point that I did ask that before. Oh, Volker, in terms of the question you had asked whether

there's any sort of normalization of the votes that the three would count as one vote. And there was actually a conversation at one point I believe in this group about whether we did normalized votes and the answer was no, there is not a notion of normalized voting. Because that's obviously a solution for having more people.

Jonathan Robinson: Can you just clarify what you mean by normalized voting?

Avri Doria: Normalized voting means you get three votes and it doesn't matter if you have 63 people, they get three votes.

Jonathan Robinson: So in this context that might be per stakeholder group or per entity, fine. I know Amr has been patiently waiting. Amr, why don't you come in at this point if you still have a point to make?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. Two points, first I actually don't agree with Avri when she says that six plus one is consistent because that would assume that the NCUC and NPOC, for example, or NCUC specifically takes the existing co-chair as its representative on the cross community working group. But I'll vote for the (unintelligible) so technically we could have seven GNSO representatives excluding the existing co-chair who is a member of the NCSG and the GNSO.

The second point I'll want to raise is that the charter does allow for the existing (unintelligible) co-chairs to appoint more members to their cross community working group in the event that there is an increased large amount of work loads so that might be something to take into consideration especially when folks who have already been members on the cross community working group that a restricted membership

(unintelligible) might exclude them (unintelligible) continuing as members.

So if there are members who are prevented from continuing the co-chairs of the working group could appoint them especially if their input has been substantial so far. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. Avri, did you want to respond?

Avri Doria: Yes, I wanted to respond. I think that under some interpretation of the friendly - I mean, of the amendment as currently offered one could get to that interpretation.

In terms of the rewrite that I suggested, though it would still be a - not accepted as friendly as opposed to saying unfriendly - but not accepted as friendly, there would be one from each of the stakeholder group - each of three stakeholder groups and then three from the constituencies that are defining themselves as being constituencies and not a stakeholder group.

Was that a better way of putting it in terms of not saying it in a way that was taken as prejudicial?

Greg Shatan: Since I'm sitting back there drafting I'll - it's Greg Shatan, I'll speak slightly out of order to answer. I think that works. And I think if we assume that Rafik will continue as the co-chair that gives your aggregation, you know, to the two seats that, you know, you should get.

Jonathan Robinson: How's your wording come on, Brian? No pressure. All right, perhaps you'd like to read to us the revised wording then, would that be okay/

Brian Winterfeldt: I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: And you could post it in the chat actually, that would be helpful as well so it's in the chat on the Adobe room.

Brian Winterfeldt: I'm actually coordinating with Lars so he's going to - as soon as we're finished he's going to put it in the table - on the screen so we can all see it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Avri Doria: While he's doing that...

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: ...doing that can I say Greg brought up an excellent point that there's still a variable left in this and that is the GNSO Council appoints - name here - to serve as member of the IG to serve as GNSO co-chair of the CWGIG and to serve as GNSO Council liaison to the group. So we have not filled in name here.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, name here could be associated with any particular stakeholder group or constituency so I think we should be very careful

not to presume that outcome in the proportioning the seating. Do we have a name - do we have a proposed name in any case?

Avri Doria: Rafik is currently the co-chair. Greg suggested that he could continue to be the co-chair but that is - sure, I would be happy to see Rafik's name there.

Jonathan Robinson: Any objection with - or concerns? Do we know that he is willing to stand - to continue to stand as co-chair?

Avri Doria: He is.

Jonathan Robinson: Any objections to Rafik being in the - remaining in the co-chair position?

Brian Winterfeldt: I just revised language to Lars to post for the group to look at. But I can read it if that would help.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I think - sorry, I've got some questions here and then we'll move to there. Osvaldo.

Osvaldo Novoa: Just a clarification because I just noticed we don't know if there are any more candidates for co-chair, shouldn't we have some time for - if any other candidate appears?

Jonathan Robinson: I think it's a good point and the was one of the reasons why I was reluctant to sort of record the affiliation of the co-chair in this discussion. I think it's specifically called out in the charter as the co-chair. My only question is by what mechanism do we appoint the co-chair? So perhaps we have to put out a call for volunteers.

Osvaldo, go ahead.

Osvaldo Novoa: Just on the same line perhaps we just leave open the GNSO candidates for the members of the group and leave - just say that we will decide - we will designate the member without saying how we are going to do it or how many...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I meant the same thing as that. So there is no rush to decide the co-chair and I specifically feel - and I sense that others might, correct me if I'm wrong, that we shouldn't presume the affiliation of the co-chair in our decision here.

So, Brian, are you ready to read out the revised proposed amendment?

Brian Winterfeldt: Sure. The revised proposed amendment, just trying to keep it simple, the RrSG, the RySG, NCSG, BC, IPC and ISPs will each identify one member to serve on the CWGIG.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri so - are you clear on that wording?

Avri Doria: I'm clear on the wording especially with the name here left blank. I won't accept it as a friendly amendment.

Jonathan Robinson: Heather, would you like to comment?

Heather Forrest: Jonathan, forgive me, I'm out of order but the text on the screen does not say "will each" it says "will identify."

Brian Winterfeldt: Can you please fix that, Lars?

Jonathan Robinson: So I think the point of procedure where we are now is to put the amendment to the vote since it's not accepted as friendly.

Volker Greimann: Amr had a comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Amr - is it a comment that you can read out?

Volker Greimann: Yes, Amr commented in the chat that it also says, "by October 15," which is today so is every group ready to nominate their member by today?

Jonathan Robinson: So I think that wording is going to have to change, right? Yeah, I mean, can someone suggest an alternative date? Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I didn't mean to suggest an alternative date but I was just encouraging us to - now that we've discussed this for 20, 30 minutes to find out that this is something that we can't live with isn't there the possibility to find the set of language that could be accepted as friendly?

Maybe I'm missing something but I think it's a pointless effort to discuss something aiming at finding a consensus language to then find out we haven't reached that. Maybe we are that close to something that is acceptable and if that were the case I think we should spend another couple of minutes to find wording that is acceptable to everybody.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, and thank you. Thank you for that and I know, John, you're in the queue but I'll just remind everyone that we did a lot of work in the run-up, you know, in preceding time to - we should be mindful of the sort of reputational impact of the outcome of these discussions, you know, our ability to be seen to get things done. John.

John Berard: This is John Berard. I couldn't agree more Jonathan and Avri just a point of clarification. If we were to put Rafik's name into the motion where it says Name Here, in addition to this friendly amendment, you would be okay with the combination of the two.

Avri Doria: Yes.

John Berard: you know I certainly think that I can get behind that.

Jonathan Robinson: Brian.

Brian Winterfeldt: I can accept that as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or questions. So do we have a perspective friendly amendment that is - Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, it looks like we actually have three friendly amendments possible. We have the one that is there. We have the one that says October 15 plus 722, and we have the one that puts in - Rafik's name replaces here. If those three can go and I could accept the three of those together.

Jonathan Robinson: Brian can you - I've got Volker but can you confirm what the status of the proposed amendment is.

Brian Winterfeldt: I'm sorry Jonathan. What are you asking me? I couldn't hear you.

Jonathan Robinson: I would like you to confirm that - I mean as I rewrite the (unintelligible) of these variables, the proposed amendment as it is written up there has a problem with the date. In addition, there is a blank in the motion, which doesn't have a name it. What are the proposals? I understand that the proposal may be to move that day forward by a week and I've got Marika on the point to order and then...

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. If people have their Adobe Connect open, I have captured the changes that were discussed and the proposed (line) which is between brackets. So it would now read the RSG, the RYSG, the NCC, the BC, IBC, and ISPC will each identify one member to serve on the CWGIG by the 22nd of October 2014. And I've added as well Rafik's name in brackets and the results clause number 4.

Jonathan Robinson: So in effect, thank you Marika for the efficient compiling of what I believe is to be Brian's proposed amendment.

Brian Winterfeldt: Yes, I am happy to accept that as my friendly amendment to Avri's version.

Avri Doria: And I am happy to accept that as a friendly amendment.

Jonathan Robinson: And who is the seconder of that motion then?

James Bladel: That's me right here.

Jonathan Robinson: James are you going to play your trump card at this stage.

James Bladel: No, I am totally on board and would like to continue to be the seconder of this motion.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful, just when we thought you could throw in a curve ball, you saved the day. All right, so I think that puts us in a neat position to put - Volker I apologize.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I am still a bit concerned about the new version of the motion simply because it also encourages stakeholder groups to fraction up into smaller and smaller groups in order to get more presentation as constituencies on various working groups, and therefore more votes. And I think this is concerning. This should be analyzed. I find the one stakeholder group, one vote rule, or procedure that we have structured so far much more compelling and I urge that everybody consider where this may lead and if this is really the way that we want to go in the future.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Volker. (Unintelligible).

Man: Simply thank you Jonathan. I would simply like to echo what Volker has just said. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: We've got a hand up from (Thomas) I think ahead of James but I know I've got James as well and Brett.

Man: Just a quick point to ask that we take this question offline to be further discussed during the wrap up session maybe. I think we have a

motion, which has consecutive on the table, and we should proceed to voting on it.

Jonathan Robinson: It's a fair point on the point of order. And I am understanding that that was the similar point of order being made by this or James are you still in the queue?

James Bladel: Yes, that is. I wanted to also take this offline and proceed to a vote.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, let's take it offline then and let's proceed to a vote on the motion. So can I have your attention - sorry Brett I thought you withdrew your hand. I am sorry.

Brett Fausett: Just a quick clarification and I apologize. I am having difficulty hearing over the air conditioning. Sorry, if it has been answered, I apologize for missing it. What's the airplay between the change in the motion and the voting that will happen in the group? Is there going to be one vote per member or is there going to be voting by houses? Have we changed the voting structure by changing the membership?

Jonathan Robinson: It is not up to us to set the voting of the group. That is being determined by the charter. My understanding is that the GNSO is in a position to put up to six members on the group and plus a co-chair and each of those members and the co-chair will have a vote. Is that correct? That's what we believe to be the position.

Okay can I call for the vote please? I would like to check. We can do this by a show of hands. So John.

John Berard: This is John Berard. I would encourage having Glenn read off each of our names and having us vote that way.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so we are going to have a roll call vote. Some people are having difficulty hearing. I apologize for that. We will go through a roll call vote. Glen is that okay?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes that's fine Jonathan. It's on the motion of the amendment. Okay shall I start?

Man: It's on the amended motion.

Glen DeSaintgery: The amended motion. (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Ching Charles).

(Ching Charles): Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Brett Fausett.

Brett Fausett: No...

Glen DeSaintgery: John Berard.

John Berard: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry. Thomas Rickert for Daniel Reed.

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Maria Farrell.

Maria Farrell: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Kenny Holmes).

(Kenny Holmes): Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: David Cake.

David Cake: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thomas Rickert for yourself.

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Gabriella Schittek.

Gabriella Schittek: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: (unintelligible).

Man: Abstained.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: No.

Glen DeSaintgery: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery   (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery   Sorry someone did vote no (unintelligible). In the contracted party house, there are five for, two against, no abstentions. In the non-contracted party house, there are 11 - sorry. There are 12 in favor and 1 abstention. So in the contracted party house, it is 71%, .4% and in the non-contracted party house, it is 92%, 3%. So the motion passes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Glen. Thanks everyone. Interesting discussion. I did say yesterday that I thought this was going to be a simple and quick agenda to work our way. Apparently, that might have jinxed the process. Great.

Greg Shatan: (Unintelligible). I would just like to thank the council for allowing me to work with them and thank you for the vote on this motion.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. I would just like to make sure - sorry. You have a point on this.

Man: There was an abstention because it is justified no.

Jonathan Robinson: Glen did you record (unintelligible) abstention.

Glen DeSaintgery: I recorded (unintelligible) abstention and would he like to provide input on his abstention.

Jonathan Robinson: That's right. Thanks for reminding us. It is customary on abstaining to provide some information as to the motivation for the abstention.

Man: (Unintelligible) and Glen. This is (unintelligible). I have abstained from voting because since this amendment was suggested so early before the vote I did not have the opportunity to speak to most of the membership of the (unintelligible) either on the substantive (unintelligible) in terms of membership as well as the deadlines for appointing now representers to the (unintelligible) which is October 22. So I will (unintelligible) either yes or no. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you (unintelligible). Yes exactly. Okay Bret since you went physically present when we cast the vote for the prior item, which is Item 4, the motion on the IRTP Part D Final Report; we got the consent of the council to wait for you to provide your vote. We have all voted. But rather than go to absentee voting, we thought we would just record your vote when you joined the meeting physically. So please go ahead and (unintelligible).

Glen Fausett: Okay Glen if you could record the vote was yes, in which case my recollection is correct. Item 4 passed unanimously. Thank you. Right next. Hopefully a less controversial item and an update from (Mason Cole) as in his capacity as GNSO liaison to the GAC. This is on the agenda because it seems this is the first meeting in which we've ever had a liaison to the GAC. It provides also some interesting points and I thought it would be an opportunity to hear firsthand from (Mason) any reflections, thoughts, or input that he would like to make. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Thank you very much Jonathan. Mason speaking. I don't have a presentation to share. In fact, I have just very few notes to share with the council because I have been in this position now officially only a few days and I am still working on getting my hands around the best way to establish a liaison relationship with the GAC, but let me just

share with the council a few things this afternoon and then I am happy to take questions as well.

So I have spent the past three days here in Los Angeles learning more specially about the workloads between the GNSO and the GAC and my intention even though there is a formal written document that describes the presumption of how the role is going to operate. My hope is to fashion the role within those parameters in some way that is useful to both the GNSO and the GAC.

So Jonathan and I - and most people were here for this on Sunday when the GNSO and the GAC met together in our public session. I gave a brief presentation that outlined our expectations of the council and the initial working model for the role. And I believe that was fairly well received by the GAC.

There was some feedback during the session with the GAC that I think spoke to the one main concern that I had which was not falling into a role where the GAC viewed the liaison position as one that would advocate from the GAC to the council itself. The role in fact - my liaison positon reports to the GNSO and is meant to convey information from the GNSO to the GAC.

So since that presentation on Monday, the GAC has discussed - they have discussed the liaison role briefly, but what they've discussed more in depth is the part of the same problem that they faced for some time now which is their perception that the GNSO - the GAC is primarily on the receiving end of the community's workload. They don't necessarily generate policy work themselves, but they find themselves in a position that they want to contribute to policy.

So you add all of those things together and they find themselves overwhelmed with work and part of the liaison's role is going to be organizing information form the GNSO in a way that is relevant and prioritized for the GAC so that if they are going to provide input they can do it in an orderly way. So the question isn't providing more information. It in fact is streamlining that information and focusing it correctly within the GAC with the specific objective to get timely input that they say that they want on policymaking.

So I want to be careful to impart to the GAC as well that the council values that input but - and isn't necessarily impatient with the GAC but also isn't going to wait for GAC input per se. That we will value that input at several points along the line, but council business is going to proceed and we do need the GAC to find a timely way to contribute.

So in the coming weeks what I am going to be focusing on is collecting various forms of data. I've been working with Marika and others on the staff who have been invaluable in this effort I might add as usual, but we are going to be collecting various forms of data that flows from the council out to the community.

And then we are going to move them into an outline that is digestible by the GAC and the information would probably be presented to the GAC in a prioritized fashion according to the maturity of each item in the GNSO process. Probably giving weight to the earliest of those - the pieces of business that are the earliest in the process because that's where the GAC is interested in contributing, and then provide the GAC also with specific inputs on how to provide - or specific instructions on how to provide input to the council.

Other than that, I am certainly open to any input that the council has on a good way to continue to shape this role. I am open to any ideas and would encourage them from council colleagues. That's pretty much it Jonathan. I yield the floor.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mason. That is helpful input. I should note that (unintelligible). Any comments or questions for Mason. (Unintelligible) go ahead.

Man: Mason what kind of access do you have to the GAC's discussions. I am thinking specifically of the so-called closed session that they have where they go and draft the communique. Sometimes things come out of that communique that you really wish you had someone in the room who could say you know that's very vaguely worded. I am not sure how we are going to deal with that. I wonder are you going to have access those kinds of discussions.

Mason Cole: I have access to all GAC session except for the closed sessions so I am not committed in those sessions just like everybody else.

Jonathan Robinson: (Carlos).

(Carlos): Yes a comment I made on Monday I think (unintelligible) to Jonathan is to remember that there is a new leadership in the GAC and only one member, the chair, has been previously in the leadership, so all (unintelligible) are (unintelligible) so it is a good time to refresh the ideas. Also with the new leadership in the GAC.

And the second point that I noticed on Monday is that only half of the secretariat or one of the two secretariats of the GAC was present. It's

also a point that should be addressed with the new leadership if this is going to be continued like this or if they are going to join forces in terms of their support staff. Thank you very much.

Mason Cole: That's an excellent point. Thank you for pointing that out. I have introduced myself to the GAC leadership and I am hopeful that with the change in leadership it will bring a cooperative - additional cooperative spirit with the GNSO. And I agree with you. I hope that they are correctly staffed so that we can have a good working relationship with the GAC.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so John.

John Berard: John Berard. Mason I think I heard a GAC chair use the word piecemeal when talking about the policy development process. I certainly feel - felt her pain when she said it, but there were also a couple of instances where the GAC seemed to be operating differently. She made reference to a small group working on the next GLT round and a second small group working on something else that escapes me right now.

But - so it strikes me that our approach to offer them milestones perhaps as opposed to waiting until the policy is birthed to then deliver it to the GAC for comment might be - it sounds to me like a prudent and potentially fruitful way to build the relationship that you are trying to build so I commend you on that.

Mason Cole: Thank you John. The fact of the matter is thanks to Marika and others the GAC has been presented a thorough review of the PDP process that we - that the GNSO Council undertakes to establish policy. So the

GAC in theory is aware of all of the points on that spectrum that they can offer input.

I am also aware of subgroups that have been formed within the GAC to take on various pieces of GAC business and I hope they continue that practice because it seems to be a practical way for the GAC to organize their work. And even if they don't meet whatever definition they have of (varying consensus), they at least will have the ability to more - in a more fleet of foot manner provide information to the council.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah and so just go ahead John.

John Berard: So John Berard again. That one subgroup you are talking about is Brett and the discussion group that we have going on in the next round of new gTLDs. Are you talking...?

Jonathan Robinson: Let me help you out John with some clarification. The - I am - and Mason can comment on this as well. I think what you heard was there is some - and I think I heard this as well. That the GAC is considering and starting to think about breaking up. It is the unified GAC way of working and recognizing that in order to deal with the myriad issues and volume of work it needs to break up into groups, so that's what I think you heard.

Just to remind you of the way in which we are working with the GAC, the work of the GAC GNSO consultation group of which Mason is a product is still a work in progress and a key second out of that is to consider a mechanism by the which the council and the GAC leadership meet on a regular basis as a part of the so called day to day cooperation track.

So we and Mason are actually involved now with that GAC GNSO consultation group. So the things are knitted together but none of that is the same as the work that Brett is leading on the new gTLD program, which is a GNSO consultation - GNSO discussion group.

John Berard: It is not unusual for me to get ahead of myself. I am sorry Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: I hope that was helpful rather than - yeah thanks. Okay so I think with your - I think we should probably move on from that. We've got that Mason hopefully clear on what is going on, so thank you Mason and let's hope that the good work continues.

Item 7 I expect may be relatively brief, but we have a prospective update on the correspondence between the GNSO and the ICANN NGPC within and around IGO acronyms and Red Cross identifiers. Thomas I don't know if you would like to make a stab at providing us with an update. I mean there was a resolution in fact that we were informed of yesterday that touches on this work. I am not sure if there are any other based on informal conversations or there is no formal correspondence at this point.

Thomas Rickert: Which is correct, so let me just briefly summarize where we are for the benefit of those who haven't been able to attend the weekend session. So we basically have two action lines currently underway stemming from the resolutions on IGO and NGO and (unintelligible) made by the council last year, one of which is that we have a letter that has been sent by the GNSO Council to the NGPC in response to a letter that we received in which we've been asked to revisit two of our consensus recommendations which were conflicting with GAC advice and we've asked the NGPC to enlighten us on what exactly they would like us to

consider or pass on to the working group for the working group to consider and that outcome is - or that response is still pending.

We understand that the NGPC wants to further discuss with the IGOs and with the GAC as well with ourselves to see what the areas of the - yeah where potential for reconciling the friction between the GAC advice and our policy recommendations is, so that's work underway. Also we have the curative rights protection working group with is led by (unintelligible) and Phil Corwin, so that's a work in progress and the latest news that we heard is actually that the NGPC has you know made it past the resolution whereby they grant provision of protection for the Red Cross country names.

And I should note that this resolution contains a set of wording whereby these protections shall be provisional until such time when the board, the GAC, as well as the GNSO have found a resolution for this. So I think that is very respectful of our policy process that was mentioned there and that obviously the NGPC only wishes to bridge the gap between this point in time and such time when this issue has been resolved or maybe the GNSO (unintelligible) have been turned down. Whatever the outcome of that process might be.

Jonathan Robinson: thanks for that update. Any comments or questions in relation to this piece of work or this ongoing issue. James.

James Bladel: So just quickly one question. Did you say that the letter contained a commitment to - on an interim basis to do something with these strings until this policy process is completed? I may have missed that the first time around. Can you maybe expound on that a little bit.

Thomas Rickert: You heard that correctly. The NGPC has sort of chosen to temporarily reserve the Red Cross/Red Crescent identifiers as have been mentioned in the original set of policy recommendations where protection is not going that far. I would - you know if you are interested in the exact list of strings it is out there, but I would need to defer that to ICANN policy staff. I think (Barry) is the (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Just a point of clarification. I don't want to send James down the wrong path there. It is not correct that anything was contained in the letter. It is correct that those temporary protections were granted by a separate meeting of the NGPC.

James Bladel: Okay thank and that's what I missed. Because they voted on that recently inter-sessionally outside of this exchange of letters. Is that correct?

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: And we didn't ask for that in the letter and they didn't offer it. They acted (unintelligible) to that (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Thank you for clarifying. That's why I was confused. It didn't - I thought it was inserted in some later draft of the letter that I wasn't seeing. And then of course the question, which probably is not Germaine for this body is what do we do with those names that are already perhaps allocated so we will have to talk about that.

Jonathan Robinson: The resolution is in the chat. I suspect it covers new gTLDs only but I haven't checked because the new gTLD program (unintelligible) resolution. So I guess some new gTLDs may - yeah since they are not live that may have - okay fair enough. (Unintelligible).

Man: Just wanted to add that when it comes to the (unintelligible). We have started informal discussions with direct contacts. Yeah so we hope that we (unintelligible) can input. Continuous input from GAC and also they can reach out to (unintelligible) especially.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay if there are no other comments, I think we will move on from that item to the next one, which is Item 8, the point on name collision. And this relates to a request from - well a follow on from ICANN board directing staff to provide information and work with the GNSO on any prospective policy recommendations and respective name collision. I will note that there was a session, a detailed session on this today earlier in the program, and I will also note that this is something, which was perhaps discussed by various constituencies, or stakeholder groups during the day yesterday. Are there any updates or input in relation to perspective policy development work coming to the groups that anyone would like to report to the council? Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I just like to make a quick point reflecting on the discussion we had over the weekend relating to this point. When we were debating the impact of name collision issues on Drop-Catching, which I think was mis-guided notion. And, I was wondering whether where the council maybe wants to try to set the record straight to take the issue of Drop-Catching entirely out of this topic which as far as I'm concerned is

completely unrelated. I think it would just confuse the audience and would distract from the focus of this potential area of work.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, and just a brief point of verification before we go to James. I dug into that a little and as you may have done, and that Drop-Catching reference comes back from the JAS report. JAS actually introduced the concept of linking the two which is why the staff is picking up on it. I'm not saying, I disagree with you, should be separate but just on the point of the origins of it. James.

James Bladel: Just to support Thomas, and I think consistent with my intervention of the weekend, that that is what is described as the Drop-Catching problem or the Drop-Catching aspect contributory aspect to the main collision problem, is in fact a separate problem which is distinct from the inclusion itself and should not be included in either this report or in the subsequent policy work.

Jonathan Robinson: So, I do note that the registry discussed this and made some initial progress thinking about this. So, I expect that what I'd like to do is say, that we'll put this on the agenda for the next council meeting. And, if we could record in the action list requirement to go back to the groups and come back to the council with a firm view on what if any policy development work needs to be done within the GNSO in relation to name collision, if possible.

So, essentially read the report, go back to your groups come back with input or recommendations. I know the registry's did some work on this and I would expect a view to be formed that would be good to know how other groups feel about this. Are there any other comments or items on this point? I've got Maria then Thomas.

Maria Farrell: Thanks, it's Maria speaking. Just on the point, the policy committee of the NCSG -- is got this initially on Sunday and we had a pretty clear view across the board about we thought it was correct to isolate the trademark and other issues from the technical name collision issue. So, basically supporting what Thomas and (unintelligible) had to say. I'm sure we'll go into in more detail as of when. But, that was our initial response.

Jonathan Robinson: And Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I am (unintelligible) are suggesting that we all take this back to them discuss what areas policy work are. So, I'm a little bit unclear as to whether we've agreed on potential sets to avoid the confusion with the Drop-Catching issue. So, will you, or is our leadership going to (unintelligible) to maybe get these documents ordered and have it removed or, you know, I'm uncertain to what the next steps for this.

Jonathan Robinson: Thomas, I think we can-- I think what the desired output is-- okay, Marika go ahead.

Markia Konings: Yes, this is Marika, the paper itself is just intended to, you know, generate this kind of discussion. It's not trying to say, you know, you need to adopt that paper and that is the scope you're looking at for the policy development process. It's really to start the conversation and give your view that is unrelated but you choose to still address the issue.

I think it's part of the issue report request that un-specifies the scope of that issue report should be. And, that specifically should not include

Drop-Catching or trade make with these issues. I think that is for you to specify, but I don't think it needs specific changes as such (to the paper are) required unless you are requesting additional information from staff on that specific item or other parts.

Thomas Rickert: I would prefer to get this out of the way before we even start the discussion whether there are areas for (unintelligible) development. Because I think it' so unrelated that we shouldn't even burden the discussion with respective groups with it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thomas isn't the point, that if it comes back somewhat which is going to with the sense of the room anyway. But, if it comes back from the respective groups that that's a strong -- I mean, essentially what we're going to do is we're going to produce an output as council that says, we want to take no further action on this. It's nothing to do with us. Or we do want to take some action on it, we want to do some policy work and the scope of the policy work we want to do is ABC and in our view and others that have expressed AB and C will not include Drop-Catching.

So, we will set out-- assuming we do this and policy work we'll set up a scope of that policy work. And, all I'm saying at the moment is I'd like the groups to come back and tell us-- and we possibly needs a little drafting team within the council to scope out that tissue report based on the feedback we get from the groups.

Is everyone okay with that? All right in the interest of time let's keep this moving on. Yes, so we have item nine now, which is an update, an opportunity to update in essence, I guess a placeholder for an update with respects to the Cross-Community Working Group to develop a

transition proposal. And, I suggest if there's anything to discuss on the accountability Cross-Community Work Group that maybe this is an opportunity to discuss that now.

I'm not sure how much there is to say here, on the Cross-Community Working Group to develop a transition proposal now is, the group met earlier in the week. There are a number of proposals around that work about how that work will continue. It's intended to be a communique coming out of that meeting. And, the prospect of a face to face meeting is a very aggressive timetable. And, there's a necessary condition that the work is linked to that of the accountability Cross-Community Working Group.

Any comments or questions in and around this issue. The one point I would say, there's been a note to, that I actually drafted out to the SO/AC Chairs. And in fact, it's gone to the council looking for members to form a drafting team on the accountability work, which is not strictly saying, that this topic but I thought I would mention it here because they are so closely linked.

So, we're going to need two representatives from the GNSO. Now the way we handled that with the IMS stewardship transition was I think we had from memory we had, I think that was Avri and James, we had one from each house. So, that seems like a reasonable way to do things again going forward. So, I think Thomas you put your name forward on the list, as well as a perspective participant in that. So, we really need some volunteers which may include Thomas one from each house in very short order to participate.

Is there anyone minded or mandated to participate in that now already? Or, would you like to reflect on that a little? I know it's very short notice.

Woman: For clarification you just said that Avri and James are in that group already? In that drafting team, I'm confused.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri and James were on the drafting team for the Cross-Community Working Group to develop a transition proposal for NS stewardship, and I apologize because that is the heading of this item. But, we need another drafting team, and we need a willing volunteer from each house. I think ideally we're going to put two from each SO/AC and Thomas has thrown his name in. But, if there are other volunteers we need to know them quickly and we'll need to find a way of deciding if there's more than one from each house. Keith go ahead.

Keith Drasek: Thank you for Jonathan, Keith Drasek, Registry Stakeholder Group. Just to be clear Jonathan are you asking for a volunteer from the council or generally from the GNSO from each house?

Jonathan Robinson: You know, I think we are looking for a volunteer from the GNSO from each house. I think we're looking for the most competent and qualified person to do this, and there will be plenty of scope. It's really, really important to remind everyone that they'll be plenty of scope for members and participants to participate in the actual work. So, really this is about creating the charter rather than then doing the work and it's pulling together people in short order from the GNSO.

Keith Drasek: Okay, so thanks Jonathan, Keith to follow-ups. And, just to be clear this is the ICANN Accountability charter, sorry Cross-Community

Working Group Charter Drafting Team. Okay, so I will put my hand up to volunteer on behalf of the contracted parties. I'm sorry, yes and if there's anyone else who would like to volunteer then I'd certainly be willing to step aside. But, I'm willing to put my hand up, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: We should record you as that. I think we need to put out a call for volunteers in short order. So, while we have a couple of volunteers already I think we need to put out a call for volunteers. Quite how we decide amongst multiple volunteers is going to be a little challenging. James.

James Bladel: So, I have a question actually for Keith, I'm sorry that you sat down. But, just to clarify this group will be participating in a Cross-Community effort to draft the IN transition proposal that will be submitted to the ICG. Is that correct?

Keith Drasek: No.

James Bladel: Thank you. Because I just want to point out that Keith and I are both members of the ICG and I would think that would be inappropriate.

Keith Drasek: Yes, it would have been and yes so just to be clear, Jonathan if I may. So, there is the ICG, for the IANA transition, the IANA Stewardship Transition Group. And there's a Cross-Community Working Group that's been formed underneath that. And, so that the drafting team has already done its work on that Cross-Community Working Group. This is a new process, this the Cross-Community Working Group for the ICANN accountability track.

The things that we've been working with over the last several months, in terms of trying to come up with a community-based process for dealing with the ICANN accountability issue. So, there are still two separate tracks interrelated, interdependent, but two different processes we're talking about.

James Bladel: Thank you for the clarification. And, I think that's where my confusions coming from. Because we have repeatedly - you and I and others on that group have -- emphasized the link between the accountably effort and the IANA transition effort, which is something perhaps unique to the naming community versus some of the other communities that are submitting proposal.

So again, while I think you're perfectly suited to represent the GNSO and contracted parties on this. I'm a little concerned that we have too few people occupying too many seats on these very critical efforts. And, it's nothing personal Keith it's just that I'm just a little hesitant.

I think that one of the reason why I'm not sticking my hand up for some of these things as well. Because we have actually said in the IANA Coordination Group that, you know, we're wrestling with right now is how do we check and make sure that that accountability concern is satisfied in the naming community proposal. Now, maybe the answer is, we had Keith on that proposal and then he says, thumbs up it works it fits with what we needed it to do. Maybe that's one answer.

Keith Drasek: Thanks James. So, just to respond quickly what we're talking about right now is just the Charter Drafting Team for this new Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN accountability. It's not actually, I'm not volunteering or at least not at this point for actually participating

in the working group. It's more about the Charter Drafting Team. So, again I'm more than happy for somebody else to stick their hand up and take the responsibility for moving this forward. But, I'm willing to throw my hat in the ring.

Jonathan Robinson: So, just Alan reminds me, I thought I made this clear at the outset but one I'm not sure we've got time to go into this in a lot more detail. But just in case there's any doubt, this was prior to this meeting when this agenda was set. It was an opportunity for an update on the Cross-Community Working Group to develop transition proposal. Here we're talking about a second trust Cross-Community Working Group on accountability, which I somewhat loosely introduced into the same item. So, I accept that it's not as clearly articulated as it should be on the agenda. (Gabby) did you still have a point to make?

Gabriella Szlak: Yes, just to add that with the league (unintelligible) (unintelligible) before she can just member trust these trusting teams (unintelligible). And, if you're not interested we might find someone from the business to as well. Perhaps if we can.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. So, I think what we'll do is we'll get these, we'll make sure we put a call for volunteers. But, it sounds like somebody's attempting to volunteer Avri again which is great news. Perhaps.

Man: Just wanted to be sure of one thing. I thought that Chuck was on the one for CWG. And, so I'm kind of confused.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's take it off online, let's put out a call for volunteers with a clear wording for what we're looking for rather than introduce any more confusion here. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: It's all good to send out a call for volunteers, but the email that you forwarded to the account clearly states that the first meeting with this group is going to be tomorrow morning. And, I have volunteered to participate in this because I will make myself available. But, certainly we have to have the candidates that we could agree on to be on to get this done before tomorrow morning. I'm more than willing to step down from that, withdraw my proposal.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I accept that, there's an extraordinary timetable on how to balance meeting that kind of tight timetable. And, paying due care that anyone who's interested can put their name forward is a challenge.

We have, I'm going to draw a line on that item because of the time. And, I know some have to leave at 3:00, so our next item was to thank the outgoing counselors. But, before that I do that I think I'd rather go to another business and make sure we pick up some points here.

I have three items at this stage. One introduced by Jen Wolfe from the GNSO review, one introduced by Alan and one introduced by Thomas and one introduced by Avri. So, I'll ask you to be as brief as you possibly can. We'll start with Jen Wolfe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you Jonathan, I will be very brief, I just wanted to provide an update on the GNSO overview. We did have our working party meet this week and determined our timetable and next steps. Our next big milestone will be on December 19th, when the Westlake Team will provide the GNSO Review Working Party a draft of the report and their finds. So, that will be a very important time for all of those of you are appointed to that review working party. I know that's right before the

holidays but we'll have a month to review and then we will be scheduling two hour's phone calls to review it, discuss, and provide our comments.

So for those of you again who are on the review working party, it will be very important to have those dates on your calendar. And, for all of you on the council if you could just confirm who is appointed from your group to the Review Working Party. We really want to make sure everybody is represented because we only have one month to look at the report and say, hey do we think they understood this, did they get something wrong or right. And, it's up to the review working party to provide those initial comments.

So, we'll be providing those comments by January 19th. And, then-- let me just double check these dates here. Then Westlake will update their report, and the second draft report will be provided February 13th, and then that will go out for public comment through March 27th, and the final report will be April 30th. So, just wanted to update everybody on those dates. You have any questions let me know.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jen. I'm going to move us through the different items then quickly. So, Alan I go to you next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. This is my last council meeting after eight years and I what calculate to be about 120 council meetings. And, some uncountable number of Working Group meetings. And, I just like to thank everyone for the way I was welcomed eight years ago, and have continued to be welcomed over the period for the uncounted things I have learned from Councilors and especially the five Chairs. And that goes for Bruce, Avri, Chuck and Jonathan.

I don't think I could be going on to the job I am now of Chairing a lack without the experience and what I have learned here, so, I appreciate that. And, I perhaps mostly appreciate the friends I've made in this group. And, I thank you very much for the opportunity.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Alan, I think we owe you a round of applause. And, we were going to thank you for our profound contribution over a substantial number of years. So, we will still do that, and I'll come back to you in a moment. Just wanted to cover up, I perhaps should have left you to the end of this little list and under the circumstances. But, thank you for those kind words and much more importantly for your contribution over the while.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I do have a meeting at 3:00 sharp so I may have to leave before the thank yours. But, do thank you very much for the thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. We'll capture the next item will be from Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: As you will all now we have a change in the GAC. GAC leadership, Heather Dryden will step down at the end of this week. And, I think it would be more than appropriate for the council to officially thank her for her contributions and for being instrumental in improving the relationship between the GNSO and GAC over the last years in particular. And, also for the council to welcome Thomas Snyder, as the new GAC Chair we're hoping to have a very fruitful working relationship with him.

Jonathan Robinson: I personally welcome Thomas personally but that's a very good point I think on behalf of the council I'd be more than happy to both

write to Heather to thank her for her contribution to the community and working with us. And, to welcome Thomas, so that's a good suggestion. And, if we could capture that would be great. Thank you very much. And, Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. While, we've been having this meeting an open community meeting was held on Human Rights and ICANN, and it was very, very full meeting with I believe a lot of many parts of the community participating. They put out a call for yet another Cross-Community Working Group on Human Rights. And so, I wanted to pass that on, and they plan on scheduling an event and such for the (Marrakech) Meeting. But, I just wanted to inform this group that we're going to have a request for another drafting team for another Cross-Community Working Group real soon now. So, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, thanks Avri. And, that brings us neatly onto item ten. One minute before three Alan you'll be pleased to notice. And, that's the opportunity to thank our outgoing Councilors of which there are quite a number this time with varying degrees, of varying lengths of service but none the less I'm sure you'll agree all valuable and very useful contribution.

So, I'm going to note our outgoing councils are. Jennifer Wolfe, for the NCA (unintelligible) appointee, Ching Chiao, from the Registry Stake holder Group, John Berard from the Business Constituency, Magaly Pazello, from the Non-Commercials Stakeholders Group, Klaus Stoll, also from NCSG, Alan Greenberg of course who've heard from already, our ALAC liaison, Maria Farrell, NCSG, and Petter Rindforth from the IPC. So, thank you all very much and if you could please

stand up and David I think would to say, would like to present you with a token of our thanks.

Thank you all again, I think that does bring us to the end of the meeting. I know we haven't had a specific dedicated point for the open mic. So let me just give one moment in case there're any other contributions that someone's is waiting to make. John.

John Berard: So, I-- this is John Berard a former council member. I will miss these family get together they're better than Thanksgiving, in my case. But, there were over the four years I sat in one of these chairs, I was reminded of and was reinforced in two concepts that I think I hope will convey. And, one of them is collaboration need not be cynical. Okay you can listen and talk to people without trying to leverage them for advantage.

The other thing I think is really important practically as Jonathan said earlier about the optics that sometimes we talk about here at the council, is that a compromise is not capitulation. It's okay to get involved in a give and take you're not giving it all away. And, I really think that's important those two things have been in the back of mind say, for three and half years for the four years I was here. And, I hope that I was able to exhibit and display some of that. So, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: John wise word compromise is not capitulation, thank you. Maria.

Maria Farrell: Yes, I'll be brief, I just want to say that I have absolutely loved being on the Council and not least because it is part of the organization that makes the policy. We do the hard yards, the GNSO rather than the Council but we've got the working groups who've got to comprise.

We've got all of that hard work that we do, and I just want, you know, just remind and (unintelligible) the work that we do on the council. And particularly in the GNSO working groups we make policy, and a lot of people are concerned about the GAC (unintelligible) -- what and ugly term -- of account.

But, I just want to remind us, you know, that we do the policy. We don't write slogans, we don't write talking points we write policy those are coincided documents that have been through many iteration, you know, that have been put together by many different people. You know, I personal climb about in terms of compromise, and I think, you know, slogans are not policy and talking points are not policies, policy is the policy. So, let's not forget that.

And there are all sources to change the model and change is a good thing. But, I really think we need to continue to make the policy and to stand up for the policy. Too often policy is not the first position in a negotiation. It is something that has been worked on very hard by a lot of people with a lot of compromise.

And, I just want to pass that on to other new councilors coming in I think they're a terrific bunch and it's been wonderful. And also to say thank you to Jonathan who makes the Chairman for Council look so much more functional then perhaps it should be. So thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: We're supposed to be thanking you, not (intelligible), but thank you. Actually one thing I wouldn't mind asking your outgoing Councilors for is a few words of wisdom on an email, because I think we could usefully roll those over to the induction session. So, to the extent that

you've got any two three, four, five, six bullet points your sort of received wisdom would be much appreciated.

So, if you could even if just come to me I will share them with the council. You may or may not have lost your council mailing privileges by then. I'm sure we're not a bank that marches you out to the doorway after your email is place. But feel free to put them in whatever direction you'd like either to myself or the Council, and we'll be sure to use those. Thanks again everyone, we'll draw the meeting to close at that point.

END