

ICANN 52-Singapore

GNSO Public Council Meeting

15 February 2015

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Hi, everyone. It's 1:00. We'll begin very shortly.

If I could call the meeting to order, please, if everyone could please join us at the table now. Have we got a recording running? Thank you.

Hi, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Council public meeting here in Singapore, Wednesday, 11th of February.

We'll -- as usual, we will start with a few administrative matters and then proceed with the body of the meeting.

So, Glen, if you could take us through a roll call first. And then we'll get on with the rest of the agenda.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: I'll do that, Jonathan. Bret Fausett?

BRET FAUSETT: Here.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Donna Austin?

DONNA AUSTIN: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Johnathan Robinson?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: James Bladel?

JAMES BLADEL: Here.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Yoav Keren?

YOAV KEREN: Here.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Volker Greimann?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thomas Rickert?

THOMAS RICKERT: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Phil Corwin? Not yet here.

Susan Kawaguchi?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Here.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Brian Winterfeldt?

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Heather Forrest?

HEATHER FORREST: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Osvaldo Novoa is absent. And Wulf-Ulrich Knoben is the alternative for Osvaldo in the ISPs.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I'm here.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Wulf-Ulrich.

Tony Holmes?

TONY HOLMES: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Edward Morris?

EDWARD MORRIS: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Amr Elsadr?

AMR ELSADR: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: David Cake?

DAVID CAKE: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Marilia Maciel?

MARILIA MACIEL: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Avri Doria?

AVRI DORIA: I'm here. Thank you.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Stephanie Perrin?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Daniel Reed?

DANIEL REED: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Carlos Gutierrez?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: The ALAC liaison. Patrick Myles is, unfortunately, absent. He is the ccNSO liaison. Mason Cole, who is our GAC -- GNSO liaison to the GAC?

MASON COLE: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Mason. Thank you, Jonathan. Over to you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Glen. Thanks to you, everyone, councillors and others who have joined us here today.

I should highlight that this is a public meeting and intended, therefore, to provide the opportunity for anyone else -- we have a microphone up front and would welcome any contributions during the course of the meeting and indeed under the "any other business" item at the end. We haven't specifically specified an open mic session, but you are welcome to contribute to the meeting at any point during the course. Just make yourself known by coming up to the microphone at the front of the room, and we will work you into queue.

So I was going to seek statement of interest updates. I see we don't have Phil Corwin here. Does anyone have a way of contacting Phil directly just in case something has happened? Just wonder if anyone had the opportunity to send him a text message or something.

YOAV KEREN: I could email him.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Susan is going to email him. Thanks, Brian. Thanks, Yoav. So we'll call for statement of interest updates and note that Phil has published a statement of interest, which I think was -- is newer. Would anyone else like to make an update to their statement of interest? Anything to record? Thank you.

We've caught up on the minutes from the previous council meeting. So you'll note that we have -- we've posted the minutes for 11th December, 15th of January, and 29th of January. So, hopefully, those of you who would like to see them -- apologies that some of those were delayed in getting posted.

So, in terms of reviewing -- the next item is to review the -- oh, to just make sure councillors are aware, there is an Adobe Connect room. David will keep an eye out for hands up in that room.

And so, if you do have -- it's probably worth keeping that room open. So, if you'd like to do that, please go ahead. Just bear with me one moment while I pull up the action list electronically.

Sorry for that. Normally, I have a printout for the action list that I've marked up already. So I'm going to work off an electronic version. So, just to work through this, I'm just going to scan through it quickly. If anyone has any points they'd like to raise, please make it known.

There's talk of making a statement, a public statement. The opportunity may have passed on the IANA stewardship transition proposal. Can I ask that we bring that up again during the discussion on that particular item?

Avri and Tony, did anything happen on that? I don't recall that anything got developed on that.

Does it not ring a bell? There was talk of drafting a statement on the work of the CWG applauding the work done and offering some kind of public statement. Nothing -- okay. Let's -- have a look back on that in the interim, and then let's see if that still makes sense. And we can come back to that.

Just note Phil Corwin is here, Glen. So just if you could mark Phil present from now.

And, Phil, we did record your -- that you had posted a statement of interest update. I'm not sure if there's anything you'd like to say about that, but it is noted.

PHIL CORWIN: No. Just thank you. And I'm delighted to be on council. My apologies for being late. I just had the wrong room. But I'm here now.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Phil. Happens to all of us in this situation.

So I think there's a couple points that are worth noting that, out of the weekend sessions, which Marika has kindly tracked and added to the agenda -- and I think what we'll do is we'll probably pick these up. One item is the ICANN meeting strategy. The question is whether we respond to the proposed implementation. We heard of the implementation. And I think that is something we'll need to do some work on thinking about how we fit the council's work into the new meeting strategy.

Is anyone particularly interested to put their name forward for that now? If anyone's been thinking about that or -- all right.

Jonathan, what's the action item you're asking for?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: The item is that, essentially, we heard from the meetings -- we heard from the implementation plan that arised out of the new meetings strategy working group.

And the idea was that in particular meeting B is now a four-day meeting. And that impacts -- it's probably worth looking at all three meetings. But certainly meeting B is the four-day meeting. And I think what happened was there was an example of some work that's gone through. In all of the busyness, we tracked it going through. And, when we finally saw the implementation plan, it sort of hits home that, actually, this is potentially quite a sizeable impact for the council in the sense that we typically run our weekend GNSO sessions. And those aren't available in that new format. It's a Monday-Thursday format and doesn't commit for the council sessions. James?

JAMES BLADEL: James speaking, for the transcript. Are we assuming that those weekends will not be open to us for any of the three meeting structures?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: On the contrary. I'm not 100% familiar with the implementation plan. But meeting B, specifically, is a 4-day meeting. I believe -- maybe someone can help me here. But I believe the other two are still the long meeting format.

JAMES BLADEL: I guess as a council, are we just starting from the -- starting from the presumption that we want to continue to have weekend sessions at all three meetings throughout the year, if we can?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So, if we were to do that, that would require a -- we'd have to do something there. And so it's really -- I think we can discuss it a little now. And I'm sure we have the

time to do so. But, primarily, I think I was looking for someone to pick this up and start to, first of all, probably go through the different meetings. And then highlight where issues arise. And, if it is only on meeting B -- sorry, looking for the impact and then proposing a solution. Yoav?

Can we have all the mics on. Volker was keeping a queue for me. And I think he's got Tony ahead of you, Yoav. So Tony first.

TONY HOLMES: At the time I was just seeking clarity of exactly what you were asking for. Nothing more than that. But happy to assist with helping to look at that.

Just -- I took a look at that program. And the first -- the first meeting is just as it's -- we have now. Second is four days. And the last one, actually, has another day. It's eight days. So we have -- two of them have the weekends. I just -- my suggestion is that, to do a different format in the second meeting, maybe a one-day GNSO that includes the GNSO Council meeting. So, instead of having -- it's really short. Four days is much shorter than what we have now. So we need to have a different format.

My thought on this is that, in the upcoming months, years, our workload is probably not going to decrease. The contrary is probably the fact. And I do not see how we, as a council, would be able to reduce the time that we spent and continue to function as an effective policy making machine with the GNSO. Therefore, I would propose that we try to impress the urgency upon the meeting planning staff that two days ahead of the meeting, be it the weekend or be it other days, depending where the four days would fall out, be reserved for us so that the four-day meeting would be a six-day meeting for us.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. So we've got Bret, Phil, and James. I mean, as I said, it's no harm to have a brief discussion about this. But, essentially, the idea was for someone to pick it up and lead the discussion. This is from 2016 on. So right now it's a little way off when this has to be dealt with. So it's not an urgent matter. All right.

So Bret.

BRET FAUSETT: I'm happy to work with Tony on this and will put my name forward since I have, I guess, a reasonably strong opinion that we ought to try to work within the days that we've been given. I understand from Nick, when he was presenting to us, that the four-day meeting actually contemplated us working in that period. So, I mean, I would like to see if we can force ourselves to be disciplined and fit within the days allocated rather than expand this. Volker is shaking his head. So maybe Volker should be on the committee, too. And we can debate this inside whatever team we put together.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Phil.

PHIL CORWIN: Yes, thank you. Phil, for the record. There was some discussion of this during the business constituency meeting yesterday. And one of the members raised that we're going to need to check on the issues of both travel funding and actual availability of entry to the meeting facilities if we're contemplating still meeting before the official start of the four-day meeting. So we have some time to check on that. But we need to fully understand what the resources are available in terms of finance and meeting facilities and what's expected in this new context.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Agreed. James?

JAMES BLADEL: So I was just going to think something along the lines of what Bret was saying, which is that the short meeting is the issue, which is one year from this summer, summer 2016. So we have some time. I'd like to volunteer for that. I do note that the purpose and focus of that four-day meeting is policy and policy development. So I'm hoping that, like what Bret was saying, that we can somehow fit our existing sessions into that. But I think, if that's not possible, then we may have to work outside of it. But I'm happy to volunteer for that. It's Tony, Bret. And I don't know if we're keeping a list of who's all throwing their hat in. But I'm fine to help with that as well.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just a very practical point. You're right. It's a year off, so we've got lots of time. But one of the first things to think about is really to Phil's point. I would say two things. One is in reaction to Phil's point. You can see how I would anticipate there might be quite a hard line on this. Because what we'll see is the council saying, well, we should meet on the weekend. And the business constituency will say, well, we should meet on the weekend. And, before you know it, everyone has a specific reason. So I would imagine, I would guess, with that thinking in mind, there will be quite a hard line on it.

But, to the extent that anyone thinks that they would like to do something different, be thinking about the budget year and the financing part of it. Because, if you're going to be wanting to motivate for financing, you'll need to be aware of the budget cycle.

Tony.

TONY HOLMES: Thanks, Jonathan. It might be worthwhile if Volker is does join us. Because it sounds as if Bret and James and myself are all starting from the same point, which is to try to work within the time frame that was set. But I'm keen to participate in this because I've got some real concerns on the impact on constituencies, how they interact with policy work as well. The four-day meeting has been set to focus on policy.

I believe there was also an assumption that, because it would be focused on policy, the overall size of the meeting would be smaller as well as for a shorter time, which would enable ICANN to reach out to other communities where it's difficult to host meetings of this size now.

One of the concerns I have is that, speaking with a few people in the corridor, they've indicated that for them the thought of coming to a four-day ICANN meeting is far more attractive and easier to get into than a longer meeting. That doesn't fit very well with the thought that it's going to be a smaller meeting in terms of attendance.

So I think we need to work through, see how it impacts us in particular, but then feed that into some larger debate as well. Probably the earlier we do that, the better.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: That was exactly what I was thinking. I think that group needs to not only think about -- not be too internally focused. I think it might need some liaison with the other GNSO groups. Because that will help determine, you know -- so it's possible that we can coordinate a GNSO position on this and start to shape what the GNSO's meetings might look like rather than just thinking about it purely from a council. And we may be able to help lead that discussion.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I've got Avri next and then Volker.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking.

I really very much recommend -- and I'm not volunteering to get involved. But I really want to recommend that we try it before -- because it almost strikes me as the people who always put a lot of salt on their food before they've ever tasted it.

I think what we should try -- what we should also do is look at it experimentally and look at it so that, after it's done, you know, a certain amount of evaluation is done to see if it did work or not. But I think deciding that it won't work before we've ever tried to make it work -- prevents it ever working. And it -- I don't think that's a good idea, and I'd recommend we not do that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So, in essence, a component of that input says, think for our group, this little group, think of how will work, not whether it will work.

AVRI DORIA: How to evaluate after it did.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Clearly. And post evaluation as well. Volker. Last word.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Okay. That wasn't my intention, but thank you. Volker Greimann speaking, for the record.

Just to illuminate a little bit of my thinking, of the four-day meeting the first day is outreach. We could probably take that and do our own stuff.

The second day is intra-community discussions, which will probably be the same as stakeholder day in some form, i.e., the different constituencies debating of how to proceed themselves. I don't see ourselves stealing any time away from that. May be possible. If possible, we should try to do that.

The second day is interconstituency dialogue, i.e., working groups, policy making. And as many of us are in working groups and doubling up in various functions, I think -- I do not think that we would be able to have both cakes and eat them at the same time, i.e., participate in the policy making progress and be on the council and do the council work.

I see difficulties using those two days. And the last day, again, is a possibility that we add something there. But I see it as difficult.

So I'm just trying to look at this from a realistic perspective as shortening our discussions always seems to come at the cost of transparency.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thanks. That's a pretty robust and comprehensive discussion for an action item to form a group. But that's useful to have had that discussion. I think that sets the group up pretty well to start doing some work. So that's great. Thank you very much.

So, with that, we will close the review of the action items and the project list given that the other items that are open come up in the main agenda.

Any other comments on the action item or project list before I -- okay.

There's nothing under item 3, the consent agenda. And the next item is a discussion on the cross-community working group to develop a transition proposal.

Now, as you know, this is an item that is -- has a significant place on the agenda throughout this meeting. And, indeed, the cross-community working group has a meeting this afternoon at 5:15 local time.

So, in my mind, this was on the agenda and is on the agenda as an opportunity to take a brief update and just check if there are any issues or questions arising from the discussions that took place in the group that won't be covered that you'd like to raise.

In particular, I wouldn't mind some feedback from anyone on -- as you know, there was a discussion document produced and circulated to the meeting. And that discussion document posed a set of questions.

So I think it might be quite hopeful to know and understand how the different GNSO groups have dealt with that.

And I certainly think that it would be great to get that feedback so that we can know that going into the working group and the Q&A session this afternoon.

So is anyone -- it would be great to get some hands up to hear how that went on in the registrars, registries, non-commercial, if any of the commercial stakeholder group constituencies discussed it, and what, if any, outcomes there were from that.

Donna, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin; Just an update from the registry stakeholder group. We had discussion about the transition process yesterday where we went into some detail about where we are in the process, the two options that are on the table at the moment. And then later on in the day we had a discussion around the questions that were in the discussion paper.

I think we only got through the first four. And I have to go through the transcript and get some -- do some kind of summary of where we got to on that. So I guess that's just a brief update of where we got to.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: That's helpful. And just to highlight the purpose. It's twofold, really. One is to get answers to try to produce output from those questions, from the groups to aid the work of the working group. And the second is to actively ensure that, as far as possible, not only through the members of the group but through the councillors who will ultimately have to bring the votes to support the proposal or not, that's produced in the GNSO. So it's an effective tool for engaging the different groups to discuss and deal with it.

So any other updates from work that's gone on in the different groups or constituencies? Phil, go ahead.

PHIL CORWIN: Phil Corwin, for the record. We had some extensive discussion on this in the business constituency yesterday. We had filed a comment during the original comment period. We were one of the groups that favored what's called the internal solution.



As we've become more familiar and heard the briefing from Greg Shatan to the CSG group with the four different variations, two external and two internal, we're learning that they're all complex. And, to some extent, they all have similar elements.

But we're kind of waiting. Because, you know, the working group is waiting for legal assistance. They're going to be producing a revised document and putting it out for public comment again. So we're kind of still in our position but waiting to see what the next version is before we review our own position and see if we want to stay with that or modify it somewhat.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Jonathan. Ulrich-Knoben speaking.

We, in the ISPs constituency, we have a similar situation as Phil mentioned in the BC. We had almost an hour time of discussion devoted to that item. And there are two things we were discussing. The one was the question list. So we have tried well to frame that. So we saw that some of them were relatively general questions. And what we are going to do is to write it down and to come back with a -- a written form to answers from our -- with viewpoints from our constituency with regard to those questions.

The other point was we tried to accommodate the level of understanding the four models or the two parts of the models, the external, internal, and the flavor of them.

And then the question was what shall be in the future? How these groups, the CWG is going to handle these in the future? And we developed an opinion that it should be a way to -- to come up with some criteria against which these models have to be checked or -- in order to come back from our constituency point with answers.

So this is a task we took internally in our constituency to try to come up with a -- with a list of criteria we, from our point of view, see as necessary to be checked against. So it's models in order to find a conclusion or to come closer to a conclusion. Because that's what we have on our list. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So kind of an evaluation matrix. I think it would be helpful if you shared that once you are in a position or of feel in a position to do so, it may be of use to others. For me this is helpful, because it indicates there is clearly discussion going on in the groups.

One thing that was intended by that was that it was a stimulation to discussion that input was given. There's no reason why it shouldn't be written. In fact, it's probably very helpful if it's written. But, as you seem to indicate in your comments there, that the input can be in a form that's not necessarily a position statement but rather some thoughts, some guidance for the group in and around the issues. So -- Okay. Thanks. So Thomas next.

THOMAS RICKERT: It is my understanding that I'm supposed to give the update from the ccNSO council. I'm looking at Glen. I think that is correct.

So the ccNSO -- the CWG has -- the topic has been discussed in the ccNSO. And Patrick Myles has kindly sent a written report to the GNSO Council list. Would you like me to voice that feedback now? Otherwise, I would recommend councillors go and look at that feedback, because it also reflects the current state of play inside the ccNSO on the CWG.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Thomas. I think I saw something, maybe I skim read that. But my sense is it's work in progress still as far as the ccNSO council is concerned. Or is it -- I'd imagine that's still the case.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes. I mean, there seems to be divergence on -- excuse me -- on the internal versus external model. But the CWG also has discussed a process how to make decisions, how to deal with the situation if and when the GAC maybe has one country objecting to the whole proposal. So there's a little bit more to it.

But I recommend councillors go and read that for the full information.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking. Yeah. In the NCSG we spent quite a bit of time talking through it. And we've taken the questions, the nine questions, and actually created a drive document where we're starting to collect the various views of different people in the group.

We've taken, perhaps -- and this is not necessarily in the whole NCSG, although the whole NCSG is sort of part of this discussion -- a different approach and started looking at how we would try to integrate the models and the important aspects of those models to the various groups into a common model to see if we could create something that sort of aims towards a middle space to see what we can create. And so that's one of the things that we've put a bunch of effort into.

Going forward, not only will we continue to discuss it on a specialized list, but we've also talked about having regular conference calls within the group to make sure that we all stay. And the periodicity of those calls will probably increase as we start to have more to talk about as we get to the more critical decisions. And, as the member from the NCSG, I start to switch from being someone that speaks with personal opinion to trying to speak more and more a group opinion. So that's pretty much where we're at op it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. Any other comments? Heather?

So that's pretty much where we're at on it.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you, Jonathan. Heather Forrest. I'll offer a very brief -- it seems we're doing a round-robin just to see where everyone's at, so with that in mind, I'll offer a brief perspective from the IPC.

We had a lengthy discussion, not specifically on the questions at this point but let's say taking our mandate and our responsibility to make sure that the community is fully across let's say the background and the context. So we had a fair bit of discussion around the difference between internal and external model and got a bit bogged down in that discussion but had the questions on the agenda for an upcoming meeting so we'll report back. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Out of interest, I mean, arguably the CWG itself is a bit bogged down in that discussion, and it's something where -- what's been on my mind a lot as Chair of that CWG, or co-chair, is that it is a very important point but not the only point. Did anyone -- was any feedback like that received? Was any sort of feedback on the process or the workings of the group? Was there

any -- any thoughts or impact of that? So I've got Heather coming back on that and Phil, I think, is your hand up?

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you, Jonathan. In fact you've really hit the nail on the head. I think the trouble that the IPC has is really understanding is there a difference between the internal and external model and noting that the difference is really relatively tight. It's relatively small. So I suppose that's where we're struggling, let's say.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. I'm not sure there's a whole lot more to say on this, anyone would like to say it. Is someone else in the queue? I've got Avri with a hand up. Anyone else? Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, thank you. Avri speaking. I just want to sort of endorse that the -- Heather's, you know, last statement. One of the things that we've noticed in the approach we've taken of trying to integrate the models is that there really are only a few decision places where things come out differently and so by trying to build the integrated model we've pretty much discovered the same thing that they've discovered.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Good. Well thanks. I think that's useful input and significantly, I think as far as the council's concerned, it's encouraging to know that the discussion is taking place thoroughly in the groups and that you've taken that output from the CWG and are ensuring in addition to the work, any work that you're appointed, the group's appointed members will be doing the councils are also tracking it and ensuring the groups are aware of it. So to that extent, it feels to me like the discussion documents met the objectives of the CWG.

So let's close that item 4 for now, and just to remind you there is a -- a working group meeting of the CWG later this afternoon. And there's also, perhaps more significantly in the context of this conversation we've just had, a question and answer session where, to the extent that you have -- the groups have prepared and formulated inputs, you'll be able to bring those to that Q&A session tomorrow. So good. All right.

Item number 5 is then an opportunity for us to hear -- I mean, we did hear on the weekend updates from Thomas on the work of the cross community working group on ICANN accountability, so Thomas perhaps you could just remind us of any detail of any updates, and you may want to speak to the fact that -- you know, any linkage issues as well.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Jonathan. And I'm looking at Lars and I think, Lars, I'm not going to go through the slide deck. I discussed with Jonathan that we would only do a quick update to what happened between the weekend working session and today.

So as you will remember, I have given an update to the group, as I did during the previous GNSO calls. You will recall that our group first did a scoping exercise, so we established an inventory of ICANN existing accountability mechanisms, we did a -- an inventory of the public comments received, the community asks in terms of accountability. We looked at the areas of collaboration with the CWG, and we continued to closely interact with the CWG co-chairs on a weekly basis and we also amalgamated a list of contingencies that we need to take to safeguard ICANN against threats such as hostile takeover or financial crisis or others. So these are pretty much done, and we have subsequently further fleshed the -- the work areas out by splitting the work into two subsets, one of which would be looking at community empowerment mechanisms in more depth and the other

would be looking at review and redress mechanisms. And actually we've now entered a phase where we think about how to operationalize the community powers, how we can operationalize, review and redress mechanisms, and there -- the groups will now go to the next level -- level of detail by looking at individual review and redress mechanisms, talk about questions of standing, for example, who can get access to a review or redress mechanism, what are the conditions of standing, what is the standard for a specific review or redress mechanism, how is the decision-making body composed. How many people should be there? Are those making decisions appointed or elected? So we're basically coming up with a matrix that's -- that can be filled with life for the various accountability mechanisms that we have. And we will continue to discuss this during a session tomorrow.

We have, as you know, presented to a couple of different groups and we've encouraged the members as well as the participants to seek input and feedback from their respective groups. There have been some questions and comments which we will analyze, and we also had an engagements -- engagement session earlier today where we thought it was a good sign that there were no concerns raised in the sense that we were entirely on the wrong track. So there was -- there was no very critical debate, but there was one point which I think is worthwhile mentioning and that is that we were asked to make what we were doing as simple and transparent as possible. So the -- the accountability architecture that we're working on should be easy to understand. And that's something that we certainly have at the top of our list to keep it -- keep it simple.

We're going to have a meeting tomorrow from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. I know that this is not a nice hour for all of us to start working, but I really recommend that you come and sit in with us. It's an open meeting, although, you know, microphone time will be given to members and participants as a priority matter. But I think we're going to have a good discussion and very interesting things to report on, one of which is that I mentioned that we were working on the contingencies but you will also remember that the U.S. government has asked us for stress tests. So we have started working on a document, actually doing the stress test exercise. We can only finalize that once we have everything in place, but there are certain things that we can already test and there's a methodology for that, and we do hope that we can get group consensus on 5 out of the 25 areas tomorrow so that we have a fifth off the table more or less so we -- we're now really working on substance, which I think is a good thing.

So please do come visit the wiki site. It has all the documents and continuously updated documents for you. Go read through, and should you have any questions, please do come to the co-chairs Mathieu Weill, Leon Sanchez, or myself or I'm also sure that the members and participants are glad to answer any questions.

And final remark, I think it's -- and it's a personal remark -- I think it's very important to note that the co-chairs of the CWG as well as we, we sit as one, right? So we are having separate discussions in various fora, but one doesn't go without the other. And I think that we can't highlight that enough. We are working very, very closely with each other, we have two work areas, we have clearly demarcated charters that we're working on, but we are trying to seek ways on actually bringing the fact that the works are intertwined or interlinked and interdependent to bring that to best possible fruition. And I think you will see much more of that as we progress because the more specificity we have, the better we can cooperate on coming up with a holistic approach on things.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Thomas. Any questions or comments for Thomas on the report and update? Okay. Thank you. So next item deals with the progress towards launching the PDP on the purpose of gTLD registration data. This is the work that's been going on to deal with a PDP on the purpose of WHOIS including taking into account the work of the Expert Working Group. Susan gave us an update on the weekend and this is an opportunity for her to just take that further to the extent that any additional work has been done in the interim and also for any of you to provide any questions or input based on the work undertaken in the interim on yesterday. Go ahead, Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So there isn't much to report, but we, you know -- I did the update here in the GNSO and there was definitely comments that we collected and then all -- all things WHOIS panel, I participated there with the same presentation and we've captured those comments also. So the Board GNSO group team will meet once again and take those -- the comments from the community into -- into discussion, see if we think something should be changed in the plan, and then report back to the GNSO. And most likely, you know, then staff will just continue their work on drafting the preliminary issue report.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Any comments, questions, issues arising? Go ahead, Amr.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, this is Amr. This has probably been raised before and addressed but just to be sure, some of the ongoing WHOIS PDPs like the privacy and proxy services accreditation issues and translations and transliteration contact information, just to be sure, the outputs of those PDPs, they will somehow feed into the preliminary issue reports. Okay. I was just double-checking that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Well, staff could tell you if they'd be part of the report, but they will be referenced at least. I'm not sure exactly how that -- the mechanics of that works, but we're definitely -- part of the work we did was to make sure that all of the existing work and the work that's finishing up concerning WHOIS will be noted and considered.

AMR ELSADR: Yes. Since this is ongoing work I can see how it's unclear how it's still going to be included but just making sure there's someone looking out for those. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Amr. And just to -- this is not directed to you but just to remind everyone to identify themselves for the scribes so that you can be attributed properly. I think I had James up next.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, and just quickly James speaking. And I think that Susan addressed it at the end of her comment but some of that -- it's possible that some of that work may still be ongoing during -- there could be some overlap and some timing issues between the time that this issues report is out and those other efforts are still continuing. So I think they will inform that effort as best they can in whatever state of completion that they're in.

AMR ELSADR: This is Amr again. In the event that that occurs, it might be advisable to perhaps put some placeholders in a preliminary issue report pending the outcomes of those PDPs just to make sure they are considered within the scoping of the issues and perhaps later on in a charter draft or during the PDP discussions themselves. But I'm guessing -- I mean, if we're going to be talking about designing a completely new WHOIS and everything -- everything considered definitely want to take into consideration the discussions that are either going on now and still ongoing at the time of the post EWG PDP or if it is all done then great.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. I'm got Volker next.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. Volker Greimann for the scribes. Just one question. Is the thinking still along the lines of creating one PDP or is there -- is it more like breaking it up into sizable chunks that can actually be digested individually? I'm thinking that there will probably, at least in my opinion, have to be a minimum of three PDPs, i.e., one for the why, one for the what, one for the how. But even within that there will probably be logical points where a separation into multiple chunks might be advisable.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So in the presentation, you know, I don't have the slides. I'm not sure we can bring those up, but we are advocating for one PDP broken up into three phases, the why, the how, and the what. And within that there would sub-teams working in parallel with other parts of the PDP. So yes, it is rather complicated, but we gave a lot of discussion in how to -- how you would break this up and would it be feasible and the continuity, and the whole team agreed that one PDP with multiple phases would be the best. You know, one of the things that's still open for discussion -- well, all of it's open for discussion actually, but -- is there creating some sort of collaboration team oversight committee that can make sure that all the moving pieces interact okay and that, you know, if a decision is made on a policy for, you know, users in purpose, would that work for the privacy part of it.

So I think this will be a little bit different of a PDP than we've experienced in the past. I mean, it is because it's the first Board initiated PDP, so, you know, we may take a little different tactics if the community agrees on it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. Just to note before you come back on that, Volker, that there is -- three phases are now shown on the screen, the main display screen.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, thank you for illuminating that. It seems if done as one PDP to be a very daunting task that would probably involve every member of the community in one PDP that is in some form active in the working groups and policymaking. Everyone would have to be involved in that PDP in some form or another. And would probably -- we would probably be looking at at least five appointments a week to get together and have the different subgroups meet. If you want -- if you are interested in more than one subject, then this could easily devolve into a full-time job. So I would caution against having everything bunched up into one big PDP and rather have separate PDPs with one oversight committee that would keep everything going in one line. But having everything together is -- boggles my mind how that would work.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Volker what you failed to note is I'll be needing a full-time job when I step down from the council.

[ Laughter ]

Don't take that as volunteering. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Michele Neylon for the record. Thanks, Jonathan. And I just want to speak to -- speak to this because I really don't want us to create a full-time job for Jonathan. And I'm sure he'll be able -- he'll be able to find a full-time job without creating full-time jobs for the rest of us.

I served, as many of you know, on CWG and I think it is very important work, but I am very weary of the number of WHOIS-related activities that are on that visual thing that was presented to us a couple of days ago. The number of WHOIS-related activities -- no, not that one. That one is just on the EWG. There is another one floating around that was presented as part -- both as part of the all things WHOIS presentation and was also presented by Margie Milam from staff when she was giving an update on WHOIS-related activities.

Excluding either a super duper all encompassing massive EWG three phase I don't know what PDP or breaking it out into multiple PDPs, excluding that, ignoring that completely, there are a very large number of WHOIS-related activities that are either in process now or due to start up within the next few months. So I would caution the GNSO in terms of how they handled the timing of any of these activities. It's not -- not saying not to do something. I'm just cautioning you with respect to the timing of any actions.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. Michele, that was Michele Neylon for the record in case -- I'm not sure you identified up front, Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: I did identify myself, and I think the scribes are well used to my dulcet Irish tones at this stage.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin for the record. I too served on that working group and Michele and I don't always agree but on this one I think we are strenuously in agreement.

I would suggest that it might be very useful for the council if we got that WHOIS update, all things WHOIS, and matched up the PowerPoint slides in that presentation because they have dates on them so that we'd have some thorough appreciation of the cross linkages and the amount of work involved here. I appreciate that the group that has convened between the Board and the GNSO all think it's a good idea to have one PDP, but who is going to serve on it and what benefit do we have from rushing something through like that? I can -- I know people want this to be achieved, but it's just too complex to do it that way. I can't buy the rationale that we can actually achieve this.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thanks, Stephanie. I think Marika, you'd like to respond to that, and then James.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, this is Marika from ICANN staff. One reason I think why we've been talking about one PDP, if you do it in separate PDPs, each of those PDPs will require an issue report and charter. So the idea is you would have one issue report, one charter but the charter would clearly break down the work of those phases as well as the checkpoints that are required. Because otherwise you may have a duplication of maybe unnecessary process if after, you know, you complete phase one you actually have to start again with your PDP by requesting an initial report, developing a charter, and going to the next phase. So I think that at least as I understand the thinking of the process working group is to have it as one PDP, but it does not mean everything happens at the same time and needs to be rushed or very quickly done. I think the whole idea is that just by streamlining it from a process perspective you can start with the phase one and once everything is ready, the council confirms or approves that it's ready to move to the next phase it is able to do so without having to go and start all over again. I think that is the main reason around the

thinking of one PDP. I don't think that's unnecessarily to scare people. It just means it's all going to be, you know, piled up and a whole lot of work all at the same time because I think it will still be organized along, you know, a work plan that the working group would set out and would meet hopefully the expectations of the council with regards to timing, taking into account other initiatives or -- that may be aligned. But at least that's what I understand to be the current thinking.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. I'll just note that I've got a queue -- thank you, Marika. I've got a queue with James, Yoav, and then Kathy. James, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, James speaking for the transcript. I share some of the concerns that have been stated around the table, I think by Stephanie and others. But I just want to make a couple of points. First of all, I think some of this is a little premature. I think we're still kind of wrapping up this plan. It's not final yet. This is good feedback. We're still working on it, and I think that, you know, some of the concerns about workload have been expressed during this process.

I am a veteran of IRTP-A through D but I think it was supposed to be to E so I think that there's also something to be said about the dangers of breaking this up into interdependent pieces that constantly refer to each other and kick work backwards and forwards across that train. So there's -- there's no silver bullet here.

So I think it's a little premature. It's good to talk about these things, but I don't think we should presume that these things are locked down.

I do want to make one point, however, and I think it's to Marika's point. There are little -- you almost need a telescope to see the little gray triangles at the bottom there along that timeline where the council weighs in as this is phased PDP. And I would say that we need to take those checkpoints very seriously as we go through this work. And I don't want to presume that that is a -- you know, a check the box -- well, let's just say right now, I'm not going to allow any of that to come on the consent agenda. This is something that we're going to have to really look at and assess both the workload that led up to that checkpoint, whether it was the inputs or whether they were coming out of phase one and into phase two or whether we're finishing the whole thing and really make sure that -- that this thing is proceeding as, you know, as a manageable and realistic and, you know, proportionate piece of -- piece of effort here. And so I -- I just want to put my marker down and say that as we go through this process, as we finalize this work plan and as we go through these processes, I'm going to be pushing for some -- some very stringent examinations at those council checkpoints. And I think right now it says GNSO Council approval. I'd like to recommend that we change the language on that to GNSO Council review, GNSO assessment, GNSO Council whatever you want to call it. Approval means we approve it, and I don't think that should be a foregone conclusion. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, James. That's a good point, what terminology we use. We use approval to mean approval or not. But nevertheless, I take your point. It does imply that we will approve it. I'm going to go to the floor mic, Kathy, if you are ready, because just to give you the -- the preference since you're standing.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Much appreciated. Thank you very much. Kathy Kleiman, noncommercial stakeholders group. So a set of concerns and then a question at the end probably directed to Susan.



So echoing what Amr said, at a little bit more detail, how do we build from the work already done. Not just the work that's being done, which is considerable, proxy, privacy, accreditation working group, but just in the last few years we've finished the thick WHOIS working group, the WHOIS review team has worked -- is the mic on -- in addition to the EWG and it's dissent, which we should talk about, too.

So how do we build on that? Not just references, but into -- there was another complicated slide. And I saw a lot of references to the EWG report, which I understand from Avri to be one input among many. So how do we build in to the slides -- not just references, not just footnotes, but actual references to the work already done, the considerations that people have spent years already working on?

So that's one question.

Second question is whose assumptions are being used as we're building a lot of these processes for the policy requirements? Are we starting with EWG assumptions? Are we starting with thick WHOIS review team assumptions? Are we starting with WHOIS review team assumptions?

I think, actually -- I mean, there's a lot of kind of starting points. We have to -- I think, to be fair, we should build all this in. Because it all will come from community participation except, frankly, the EWG, which was not community participation.

So where are the assumptions coming from? Where are the backgrounds coming from? We have to build all this in.

And then I wanted to ask where the model is evaluated? It may be under system model. But the centralized -- the centralization versus the decentralization. This has been a huge issue. One database or many databases.

Can you tell me where that will be evaluated? Because that's going to be a big thing. Will the database reside with the registrar, the registry, or centralized or decentralized? Where does that evaluation take place?

And just a comment: I used to say I was going to die doing WHOIS. I think we're all going to die doing WHOIS.

>>JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Kathy. Before Susan comes back. Might want to come back right away, Susan. I'd just like to point out that the first preliminary issue report already did include references to all the previous WHOIS efforts.

And they will also be included in this issue report. So that's -- that's this -- this issue report is not confined to the work of the EWG, but on the purpose of registration data. So it's a broader -- the EWG feeds into that work, but it's not the sum total of that work.

I don't know if I've stolen your thunder, Susan, or if there was something else you wanted to say.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Well, no. You've definitely not stolen the thunder. But I agree. We could sort of walk through some of these slides again, but then that would be the third time this week. So I don't want to burden you with that.

So I -- you know, this is -- you know, maybe the view of the team that -- you know, the Board/GNSO team that was working on this.

But it's definitely my perception of this is the EWG was started. Whether you agreed with that or not, the work is there. Something had to be done with it. This team got together, gave a lot of thought to it. What was missing? What do we need? And it really needs to all go to that preliminary issue report, which staff is developing, which probably includes everything that people are talking about right now.

And then the community needs to weigh in. The community has not had the opportunity to weigh in on the final EWG report. And then on the fact that this could be, you know, this massive PDP. I don't think it's a foregone conclusion by the community that this will move forward to a PDP. That is something we have to decide. But I don't think we can make all those decisions and answer all of Kathy's questions until we have the report, the preliminary report. Get the comments back. Go through our regular process. Issue the final issue report. And then decide what we were going to do as a community.

So all of these are very good questions and input. And I encourage you to continue that. But you'll have lots of months, if not longer, to weigh in on it, too. This is not the only time.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Great input. Thank you, Susan. And also particularly highlighting -- because this is a unique set of circumstances. You referred earlier being a board-initiated PDP. It's a PDP that's going to take the input of an Expert Working Group. That's what this group has gone off to try to do some work to make sure that we do that and retain the integrity of the PDP process. So we're working through a process here. That's very helpful to highlight those elements of it. I've got a queue. Yoav, you're in still. You'd like to talk?

YOAV KEREN: Yeah. I want to echo James said. This is what Susan said just now -- this is definitely within the stakeholder -- different stakeholder groups to weigh in on the EWG. And that still didn't happen.

And I know I have a lot of -- what to say about that. I'm sure there's a lot of other people that, whether we need that or we don't need that and how is it going to do, I have a lot of concerns about it.

I'm -- the one thing I'm trying -- maybe it's taking back a little bit on Stephanie, what you said. I may be confused or my brain died for a few seconds.

Why is one PDP on an issue more complex than having multiple processes on the same time? I'm just trying to understand the logic.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Stephanie, would you like to respond? Or are you coming in next anyway?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think I'm somewhere close to next in line anyway.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: You are. You are.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'd like to respond and clarify. Because both James and Marika responded to what I had to say.

I think the problem -- and I'm busy doing the research. As someone who hasn't been doing all things WHOIS for the last 10 years or 15 or however, many it is, I'm trying to compile all the information, pulling it off the Web site, trying to read all the documents, trying to figure out which assumptions have been agreed and ratified by process, which have not, which were recommendations, what are open questions, what letters that the Board has received on WHOIS issues have been answered and which haven't. And this is not easy. And I need help.

So plea number one, we need a librarian to assist in this so that we can pull all this together.

Number 2: In response to my worries about the one PDP, I think we all bring to our work here our backgrounds in terms of how we approach work. Whether you're used to a particular type of project management, whether you're used to multi-year operational plans may influence the way you see the process.

What I see in the process is slides without the kind of depth that I want to see to figure out the cross linkages and the multiple strands.

And, therefore, I'm a little insecure that all of these things are going to be well-knit together and well-meshed. Because there are so many dependencies between thick WHOIS and decisions that are being made there, between the technical protocols that have just been agreed in WEIRDS, between the contract negotiations that went on in the RAA, between the new group that has started to resolve the WHOIS conflicts, between the work that we're already well immersed in this on the PPSAI. I need to map that on a project plan.

And these checkpoints that James referred to, those little triangles, they don't do it for me. I want to know exactly how we ratify and make sure that these decisions have been approved by council before we move on to the next phase. So that's where my insecurity is. And it may be just my unfamiliarity with ICANN project management. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I can't say whether it is unfamiliarity or not. But it certainly is a sizeable piece of work, and that's acknowledged by the other inputs. So I think these are valuable guidance to both staff and community people who are going to be working on the project.

I've got Avri and then Yoav.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking. I just wanted to do two things. First of all, I think that, you know, the people, whether it was Chuck the other day or Stephanie today -- this is -- if you look at this like an engineering program, it is definitely a complicated engineering program. And it is going to need serious project management skills. I wasn't thinking necessarily of an archivist. But perhaps the efforts of an archivist might be useful at this time, especially given the classic organization of ICANN document retrieval.

I also wanted to just make sure that, to the question about where the system model -- the system model actually, Kathy, does have a line that's in there of looking at the system model. And among the conversations we've had is looking at it and seeing is the system model even practical? Can it be done?

So those questions are, indeed, you know, questions that are on the list of things to be dealt with in that system model line right above the cost model line is and, if you can do them, what's the cost going to be on these things? So that stuff is in there and has been being talked about.

I think the people that said, yeah, we need -- but that's where the issues report is going to start to be what expands it, what fills in the spaces.

But I think anybody that has intimated that this project doesn't need a project manager -- all those that have sort of said, my God, this is complicated and what about the interactions is right. It really does need serious project management.

But, if you look at it like an engineering project, it's not that much harder than building a jet airliner.

They have been built before.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah. Susan wants to respond. And I've got Yoav and Amr. And then I think we need to bring this to a close. Susan, Yoav, and Amr.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: To the point of serious project management, one of the discussions we had -- we didn't put it out as a recommendation necessarily, but the community might think about it -- is let's hire someone that is -- can, you know, completely take this on as a project and manage it as a serious project that it is. And so maybe we ask budget for budget for that. So --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. I've got Yoav and then Amr. And then we'll close this discussion.

YOAV KEREN: Yeah. I'm sorry. I don't share your views, Avri. I don't think this is a jet. I've been involved in much more complicated development processes. And this is a simple database process that has some interest into it. Privacy for protection, some technical registries and registrars issues. That's it. And it's a simple database. This is not so complicated. It's -- we can have -- I'm all in favor to have a project manager to do that.

I think that if we have one process, we have everything weighed in. This is why we have the PDP multistakeholder model. This is exactly where everyone will have -- there's going to be a working group. You have your chance to say your things. This is what the GNSO and ICANN is all about. So I think that the way we're doing -- what we're doing now and having so many other processes -- and we're wasting too much resources on something that can be solved much quicker. Just my personal view.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Amr.

AMR ELSADR: Thank you. This is Amr. I was going to say, because there's a lot of folks expressing a great deal of concern about this issue here today. And I just want to say that I actually feel a lot better about this now than I did a year ago. I think at least on the foreign side of policy staff on the whole thing of syncing the EWG work with the regular GNSO process. So I'm talking about from a process perspective.

I'm grateful that we've pretty much moved beyond that first preliminary issue report. I think it's very interesting. And I like the way that the GNSO and the Board worked together on this group to

sort of have both groups feed into a new preliminary issue report. And that's an interesting way to do a board-initiated PDP. I think that's a good thing. And I'm glad that we are going to have this new preliminary issue report. And there is going to be an opportunity for the community to weigh in on that and provide comments to make sure that we get everything we want into the final issues report.

And that may address some of the concerns that Kathy might have had just a few minutes ago. And so I just want -- since I'm the last person to talk on this, I'll leave it on a pleasant note. Bit of a pleasant note.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Positive and pleasant note. It's been a substantial discussion. And in my perspective, role in the group, I'm pleased to see it as a potentially paid-for role.

So I'll put my hat in the ring for the project manager building the jetliner. No, that's not a serious comment. But thanks. that was a substantial discussion. Very useful to air the views.

So we move on now to item 7, which is an opportunity to get an update on the work of the GNSO/GAC consultation group. And you'll be aware we saw the proposals coming from that group, I think, on the weekend. Mason is going to give us an update including the output that came from presenting those proposals to the GAC and where this might go next, as far as we're concerned. Over to you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Jonathan. Mason speaking. Lars is putting up the slides right now. Would it be beneficial to the council if I ran through these one more time, or are we all probably familiar with --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: You can cover them at conceptual level rather than detail. But, if you need to refer to them, please do.

MASON COLE: No problem. Just as a reminder to the council, what the working group or the consultation group is seeking is a credible easy-to-use method, relatively easy-to-use method for the GAC to engage in GNSO work processes. Specifically, earlier in the policy development process than - - early in the policy development process rather than following the process when it's been voted to the Board and the GAC at that point offers advice to the Board.

What we've done -- what the consultation group has done is come up with a set of recommendations for a process by which the GAC would engage in a GNSO PDP at around the issues report stage.

So, just in the interest of time, I won't I won't go through the slides again. But, if there are questions about the process, I'm happy to answer those. These were presented to the GAC and, on the whole, were received positively, I can report.

So I think that the GAC is interested in providing its input during the PDP. The question is -- the question right now to be solved is how is the GAC going to organize itself in order to provide that input?

The reaction on the part of the GAC to the proposed process was overall positive. They didn't find it to be overly burdensome or over complicated. There were some questions about minute details of the process, but nothing that couldn't be overcome, in my opinion, anyway.

And the agreement -- the agreement following-- that presentation and discussion earlier this week was that we're at a stage right now where we're ready to try the process out with a real life PDP. And, in some ways, I hope it's not the one on WHOIS. But we'll find out. But right. It will be a test case for sure.

But we could go in and fine tune the process. And, you know, before we do that, I think there was agreement on the part of the consultation group that there's no need to do that. What we should do now is just, once the council is prepared to act on a new PDP, that will become the test case for the process. And we'll be off to the races at that point.

I think that's pretty much it, Jonathan, unless there are questions.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Mason. So my understanding on the basis of that meeting with the GAC is that we are essentially going to proceed with this on an experimental base, as you say, on the first PDP. I think we'll probably bring this to the council for some kind of formal signoff at the next council meeting. But, from our point of view, as far as the GAC's concerned, we're good to go.

Mason is right. There are some procedural issues as far as the GAC processing it. But, as far as the work of the consultation group and a test or trial basis from which to work, experimental basis from which to work, we have it.

Go ahead, Mason.

MASON COLE: Jonathan, forgive me for asking at this point. Do you want to bring up the issue of -- well, the possibility that there may or may not be a PDP before the end of the pilot program for the liaison? And what we -- the discussion about potentially extending that?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Let's pick that up as a separate point. Because it is an output from consultation group. I think there's a couple of questions or responses first. And I've got Bret first in line.

BRET FAUSETT: Thanks. Bret Fausett from the registry constituency. Quick question for Mason and maybe for general discussion as well.

Does this quick look process contemplate that, if we get the GAC involved early, that, after we take a count of the GAC's views, they are foreclosed from commenting to the Board?

And, if the answer is no, then you know, what's the purpose? I'm afraid that we're going to get the GAC involved early with a quick look. And then, regardless of what we do, they're going to comment at the end anyway.

So I'm just maybe playing the contrarian here when I ask the question and figure out if there's a way of getting them early and never again or whether they're just going to get in early and then get in again and again and again, as we've seen in the past.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I have an opinion on that, but I'm not going to say it. I'll defer to the queue. We've got Marilia.

MARILIA MACIEL: Marilia. It's a tough one. Marilia Maciel, the noncommercial stakeholder group. Just first of all, I'd like to thank everybody who worked on this proposal. I think it must have been

very tough work. It's a very interesting mechanism. And, in my view, it may bring in the GAC early, may prompt them to work intersessionally. And this is something that may facilitate their work. And, at the moment they're going to provide their advice, maybe they're more well informed and it will take less time. So I see this as a positive development, even though they will be able to provide their recommendation later on. I think that they will not wait until the moment they receive the documents on their table. They will be exposed to it. They'll be able to discuss among them. So I see this as something positive.

Preliminary recommendation number 1 that suggests that the issue report template should be modified and to include a space where existing GAC advice on the matter will be pointed out. My doubt is that to my view the issue report is a document that serves the whole community, for them to be formed. And if we put their advice that comes from the GAC, not advice that comes from other advisory committees such as ALAC and SSAC, my fear, my concern is that maybe we are giving GAC advice a symbolic weight that it does not have because it's an advice like other advices. I know that we all understand what the context is here, but we are preparing something that will be available for a community for years to come and maybe people that were not exposed to the process of developing these recommendations will start to see GAC advice as something that is different from other types of advice or with more weight. So have you pondered that and what are your views? Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Marilia. I will go to Marika next who wants to respond directly to that, and then I have a queue of quite substantial inputs. Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, this is Marika. Just to clarify, we called it out there to make clear to the GAC that we would be looking for that and putting that in, but that's actually already a standing practice. When we prepare an issue report we look at all the information available, whether that's from the GAC, the ALAC, or any other group that may have -- made an opinion on it. So I don't think that we're foreseeing, you know, creating a special page and header that would really call out the GAC advice over any others. It's really to reassure the GAC that, you know, when we do our research, if we have information that there is standing GAC advice on a topic, we'll definitely include that. But it's basically just reconfirming what we already do. So I hope that addresses your question.

MARILIA MACIEL: Just a follow-up question. So it's not a separated box or anything, just in the text.

MARIKA KONINGS: No, it may be a separate heading as we similarly have for other input provided other separate headings. It's not -- I don't think it's foreseen to change anything that we currently have in issue reports or in the PDP manual how it describes. It's just to make sure that the GAC understands that if we have that information we would of course reference that like we would do any other advice or input that has been developed on a certain topic by any other SO/AC or organization that is relevant.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So overall the objective is to facilitate GAC input, and I think we should use that word carefully. It's GAC input into the PDP process. It's not GAC advice. GAC advice is something which is given to -- obviously to the ICANN Board, and this doesn't take the place of or deal with GAC advice at all. It's simply a mechanism in fact to, in a sense, ideally avoid GAC advice having to be given later through effective engagement of the GAC early on in the process. Okay. Let me stop there and let others talk and come in. I've got Amr next.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks. I just wanted to point a couple of things out. First of all, the work of a GAC/GNSO consultive group is far from over. The purpose of the quick look mechanism was not to be -- not to get input from the GAC's -- substantive input on gTLD policy issues. It was basically a means for the GAC to identify a PDP that is about to be launched as something that may have public policy implications. So they would be able to sort of just weigh in on the initial issue -- the preliminary issues report, sort of saying that there is a public policy implication to this and we would like that recognized, and we will weigh in later on on the PDP. And that's where -- that's why this group still has a lot of work to do. We've gone over this earliest part of the PDP, but there still is quite a bit we still need to do.

My other point is on the recommendations we made regarding the quick look mechanism. We presented those -- these were presented to the GAC over the weekend, and then we had a second meeting which was a tighter meeting with the group, the group for the participants from the GNSO and from the GAC and there were a few other GAC members that came into the room as well and this was, I think, on Monday, if I'm not mistaken. We had this meeting and we were hoping to get some feedback from the GAC members there. But we didn't really get much. I think we did most of the talking. So I think it might be worthwhile to just recognize that we need to give them just a little time to take a closer look at these recommendations and maybe follow up with them and see if they have any questions or concerns over the coming weeks. So that might be something we want to do.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Certainly there should always be scope for that. But the take-away was -- you know, bearing in mind that the GAC meets at these meetings and the take-away I think we walked off with was they were happy for us to work. There were no objections to us opening up this as a new way of trying things. Avri. Thank you, Amr, for that contribution. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking. Bret, I actually tend to look at it a little different in that the more information we get from the GAC earlier, the earlier we can prepare ourselves to defend against it. To make sure it's covered, to make sure that we've responded to the points that we know they're going to make. So that when the Board gets the PDP, there are not all these questions where we go oh, we didn't quite cover that and then there's this blank spot that we've seen several times. So I actually see it quite useful in a defensive sense of making sure we've covered. And even if it's the point of saying, we've looked at that issue and have decided otherwise, it is worth knowing what the issue is going to be before the -- before the end of the PDP. So that's the perspective I've taken on a lot of this. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Avri. I've got a queue which includes Thomas, David, James, and Carlos and then we'll draw a line under that. So Thomas, go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT: Actually I indicated to the co-chairs that I would pass. But after I had heard Avri, I asked to get back in the queue. Because of the notion that we need to get information earlier to be prepared to defend, I think that's an inaccurate reflection of the mechanism. I think while the GAC is not part of the GNSO, still it's part of the overall ecosystem, and we certainly welcome information that can help our discussions from all sides. So I think it's important to understand where the GAC stands and maybe factor their thinking into the outcome or the work products that we're working on and thereby diminish the risk of a train crash. So I think that every piece of information that we can get is valuable, should be taken into account. It should not be perceived as them dictating the direction we take, but I think it needs to be known and analyzed and then incorporated. And even



though individual GAC members can only speak on behalf of themselves, maybe not even their governments let alone the whole GAC, they have the mind-set of a government representative and it's quite likely that they will inject those thoughts that the GAC is likely to have, even though it's not binding. And I think that's all valuable.

And the last point I make is I think we are all struggling to find the best working methods to be a good multistakeholder model, and I think the more areas of collaboration there are and the more we embrace what the GAC is doing, the more efficient the whole model becomes.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Thomas. Go ahead, David. All right. David will pass, and we'll go to James.

JAMES BLADEL: You sure? Going twice. Okay. So James speaking for the transcript. I'm going to go off on a limb as well and probably put myself squarely associated with Bret's comments and sentiments. I'm very concerned about quick look. I think it's a -- okay, I think it's a solid idea and I think it's very well-intentioned, but here's how I see this playing out, if I can be a little blunt here, is that unless there's some sort of backstop that says something along the lines of, you know, if the GAC uses the quick look to identify that there is or is not a public policy interest in a particular subject, then that they would refrain from issuing advice from the Board at the conclusion of the PDP. I don't think we can get them to say that, so I don't think that the quick look has that degree of value. I'm concerned that quick look could possibly dissuade or influence the work of the PDP, based on -- without GAC participation that it could just be a way of kind of putting a marker down on a PDP and then walking away until it's -- until it's finished. And I'm also concerned about the possibility that a quick look would be disregarded entirely and then some future ICANN meeting years from now, probably in Singapore, we would be complaining that the quick look was not being used sufficiently or as it was intended. So I'm just -- I get the intention behind it and I think it's well-meaning and commend the folks with the GNSO who I know are working very hard and in good faith with the GAC to get around this issue but just in practical terms I feel like this is kind of a non-start.

DAVID CAKE: I can -- having now remembered what I was going to say, if the quick look totally fails, what's the consequence? The main consequence is, we're back to where we are now, which is great. It is a trial. You know, it's an idea. We will refine and change it, and it's also -- yes, it's a new mechanism and it may prove to have some flaws. We're trialing some other new mechanisms including the whole GNSO response to the GAC communique, which among other things, we may in the future use to point out times when we think the quick look isn't -- is being abused or not being used correctly. You know, let's give it a try and rather than hoping it will be perfect, let's, you know, hope the coordination group will review its first two or three uses and see how it works. And this point was actually made by the GAC as well, they -- they more or less said, let's try it out a few times, see how it goes. This is not settled. If it proves to have problems, I doubt it will make anything significantly worse, and if it works, then good.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. Carlos, and then we're going to wrap this topic up.

CARLOS RUIZ GUTIERREZ: Yes, thank you. This is Carlos Gutierrez, for the record. I'm not going to say anything new, but the order I'm going to say it, it's important for Bret. And for James, I don't think this is an initiative. My recollection, this is a mandate by the ATRT reviews, the early engagement. So it's not this is an initiative that happened out of the blue. This was, I'm sure, in an

ATRT2. I'm not sure if it was in the first one already. I think it was in the first one. It was not fulfilled in the first period, so it was repeated. So it's not an initiative from anybody or any group. Second is not advice, it's input, as some have said before. Then there are two further intentions that also have been mentioned there. First, to get them to work intersessionally because this is a big issue. One of the biggest delays is that they don't do anything, or don't write anything between meetings. The second component of the proposal is hidden between the quick look by suggesting them to create a group. They tend to work as a plenary only. So it's more difficult for them to come to unanimous decision, so we have suggested that they delegate work to a small committee, hoping that this all works, and we even suggested that while they decide how to create that, the leadership should take this task. Let's see if they do it or not.

As we said, we are just expecting them to focus on two words, but we have covered that by public policy. I won't use the magic two words, but it's their call to say if the two words apply or not. And then the staff or the final report should have a specific chapter on that and delve on that. For example, we have had a discussion today on the geographic names and some countries have said that they have, under their local law, a geographic protection. Okay. This is an issue that they can bring forward that normally GNSO process wouldn't consider to go after each country.

And lastly is to have a way to communicated with them outside or in parallel to the communique, okay? So we don't have to wait for the communique. There might be some statements or some product that doesn't have to wait to be written in stone for the other process that we are discussing with them, which is how we are going to deal with the communique.

So sorry for repeating all of that, but I think the sequence is very relevant. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. I thought that was not necessary repetitive. It was useful input and actually it was a very useful discussion. I think it -- we had something like ten contributors there or something. It was great discussion and good input, that we can -- that can be fed into any further thinking of the GAC/GNSO consultation group.

We're going to switch items 8 and 9 now because we have some -- someone on standby ready to give us an update on the work going on in the GNSO review, and I know to all of us that's a particularly important topic for obvious reasons. So I'm going to invite former GNSO Councillor Jennifer Wolfe who has been leading the GNSO review working party and give us an update on the work of the GNSO review. Thank you. Welcome back, Jennifer.

JENNIFER WOLFE: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be back. Thanks. Hi, everyone. And sitting next to me is Colin Jackson from Westlake, which is the independent examiner, and he is going to be giving us an overview of what we received earlier today, and Larisa Gurnick from staff, who has been enormously helpful throughout this whole process.

So to give you a brief update on where we are in this process, there's a timeline you can see in front of you. Today, earlier today, the GNSO working party met and we were given, for the first time, a briefing on the findings and recommendations that are still in working -- work in progress, working text from Westlake, and that's what Colin will be providing here momentarily. But we received that for the first time. We were able to have some initial discussion, and I think we were pleased with the status of the presentation. Between now and March 3 everyone on the working party will receive in

full detail the working text, the data points that were gathered, and we'll have time to digest it, dig deeper into it, make our notes and comments, in either an email thread or via our wiki. And on March 3 we'll be meeting to discuss those in more detail. That will be made available on the wiki. So to the extent that you would like to review this initial working text, please do. Please let me know if you have comments, and I'll make sure those are included.

Between March 3 and March 20, the working party will aggregated all our comments to provide to us so they can take that under consideration. On April 23, the draft report will be provided by Westlake and then be open for public comment between April 23 and the June ICANN 53 meeting. And then on the 14th of July, the report will be formally issued.

So that's our time frame. Just to summarize, the GNSO working party is in existence to provide input, to be a liaison to you the council and to the community with Westlake and staff. And so to that extent I certainly welcome any of you to contact me any time with comments or suggestions so that we make sure that's incorporated. And you as the community of course have the opportunity to respond either through us or through the public comment period. So with that I'd like to turn it over to Colin Jackson to provide a very high level -- since we only have a few minutes and we had an hour and a half this morning -- so within the next few minutes, a very high level overview of their findings and recommendations, and then we'll be happy to take questions.

COLIN JACKSON: Thank you, Jennifer. This is Colin Jackson of Westlake Governance, for the record. We have been working on this for a while, as you know. The status of the project now is that we have delivered what is described as a working text. A better way of describing it might be an incomplete draft. There is a lot that remains to be done and there is a lot of material that remains to be added. Nevertheless, we have focused quite a lot on findings in respect of previous recommendations that have been made about the GNSO. The screen -- on the screen there you can see that we have five headings which are essentially the board working group report headings and the Board working group had some 17 or 18 recommendations grouped in these five headings. Can we go on to the next slide, please?

Oh, yeah. Okay. No, we'll go back one, please, and I'll talk about that one in a moment. So under each of these areas, the working -- we discussed the extent to which the adoption of a working group model has been successful. And largely it has, in our view. But there is obviously a rather more detailed than this available in the working text. We look at the PDP. One of our major -- we looked at the GNSO Council and the constituencies. We've got -- one of our major findings is in the area of diversity, which is not very -- not very high. It is dominated by North America with some Europeans and some cultural Europeans -- culturally European persons such as myself from the southern hemisphere who managed to get grouped in with Asia for ICANN's purposes.

And the gender diversity is also not what you might hope. So say that. I dare say everybody is aware of that.

We are recommending, for instance, that these things be measured, figures be collected, and that, if you can't actually measure something, then you never are going to be able to manage it.

We constituencies, we've looked at that. There have been attempts to form new constituencies. Back when the current structure was set up, there was a view that constituencies would come into

existence as the need was perceived and maybe some would disappear over time. That hasn't happened, with one exception. So we will be making recommendations in that area to try to free up that process.

We are quite aware that you really need more volunteers to do the policy work. The PDP needs people to make it work. You have, actually, very few people doing work in the PDP. And they work very hard. But that's not a really good model for an organization that is facing a rapidly changing environment. And we'll need to keep creating policy in a timely fashion. So some of our recommendations will be aimed at trying to avoid losing people who walk away or can't deal with, say, the robust nature of the debate that sometimes occurs.

We also looked at the improving coordination with ICANN structures as well. And I was interested to hear the previous item about GAC on that one. I don't know that we can offer you a lot more except to say that you should be clearly trying to work well with other SOs and ACs and -- so that you don't get surprised at the last minute by policy being found unacceptable in other quarters.

Now, that's nothing new you don't already know.

Can we go to the next slide, please.

These -- the previous slide I talked about is, essentially, the -- how the GNSO was meant to be a couple of years ago and the extent to which that has been realized.

However, we're not in a steady state here. We are in an environment where the Internet is evolving rapidly, as it always does, where the name space, of course, is facing some interesting challenges like the gTLD expansion, like IDNs and the APWG, the WHOIS replacement. Obviously, these are -- these are quite crucial challenges for policy organizations such as the GNSO.

So we will be coming up with some recommendations about that, even though most of our text is focused on where it's been. But we do need to take a look at where it's going.

The other point that is sometimes missed, I think, about the change to operating environment is the shift in the center of gravity, as I've called it. If you look at the numbers of people who are now on the Internet, a very high proportion are in China and India.

Those nations do not even appear to be represented anywhere in the policy process here in GNSO. There may be one. I don't know. But the numbers are very, very low when you look at them. We've got figures on this which we can show you.

So that is a further challenge, in my view, facing -- questioning the relevance almost of the organization and to stay relevant when you are going to need to address that.

So that is in process.

We will be delivering a draft, as Jennifer told you. We'll be having a call with the working group -- sorry -- the working party on the 3rd of March to discuss the text that we have just distributed.

And we will be seeking input from the working party then as we have had all the way through the process on our way to the first public draft or to the public draft, I should say.

And, at that, I'm happy to take any questions, if the chair so wishes.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I think we should take advantage of you being here. I think it would be great to -- I've got Heather first. Go ahead, Heather.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you, Jonathan. And thank you very much for your presentations, Jennifer and Colin.

You've presented a timeline. And I suppose we're all critically interested in the flexibility in that timeline. I understand that your report presented today has been delayed somewhat. Can you give us some background as to why that delay occurred, and do we anticipate future shifting in the timeline that you've presented today? Thank you.

COLIN JACKSON: Yes. I'm happy to discuss that. You are right. The timeline has certainly moved. That is because the process that was originally envisaged involved a single 360 survey that was meant to be done in two weeks flat and zero to a few interviews.

That's not how it turned out. The 360 took a very long time to reach critical mass, as it were, to actually get people engaged to fill it in, despite a great deal of promotion, I might say

There was a need for supplementary 360 that wasn't envisaged near the beginning. And then there was the -- once we started doing interviews, people initially weren't happy. And then suddenly decided they wanted to be interviewed later on in the process. So we found the whole interview process was quite protracted and we didn't conclude interviews until late last month.

So that is a good -- sorry? Yes.

And --

JENNIFER WOLFE: I'd just like to add in response to that, some of the extensions of time were due to working party requests to ensure that we gathered sufficient data. We had concerns based upon responses throughout the process and requested these extensions so that we could ensure we could modify questions, that we could extend periods of time to ensure as much participation as possible. So we do appreciate Westlake working with us and staff working with us to accommodate those extensions. And I think the results will see the benefit of that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, both. I've got Phil Corwin next.

PHIL CORWIN: Yeah. Phil Corwin. And this is strictly a personal comment. But, in reaction to your statement that the growth and use has been very substantial in India and China, as a personal comment, those of us who were in Beijing and experienced the difference in the Web sites that were available in the ICANN rooms versus those available from our hotel rooms and those of us who have read increasing press reports about growing censorship within China to the point where businesses and academics in China are publicly complaining about their inability to do work because they can no longer reach essential Web sites and use essential search terms, I, of course, will wait to see the recommendations.

But my personal concern is that I'm all for outreach to get greater diversity, including geographic and cultural diversity. But we need to make sure that those involved -- who get more involved with

ICANN are committed to a free and open Internet free of excessive censorship and restraints on access to public information. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Phil. Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. Volker Greimann speaking, for the scribes. I had the privilege of being able to sit in on the presentation this morning. And I thought it raised a lot of very interesting topics that we are now only able to touch upon.

One of the topics that most interested me was the topic of activating more volunteers and more participants. And I wonder if you could just say a few words on that topic.

COLIN JACKSON: Yes. You need more volunteers than you have to meet the policy -- the requirements of policy that are being needed from the organization because you, essentially, only have a few -- a double handful of people who do most of the work. And that's a real problem. It's -- it can be very onerous. I understand that. Being part of one of these groups can take a lot of time. But, if you have to be part of several groups in order just to get the work done, that is probably inconsistent with doing anything else in your life.

So there is a pressing need for more people. There's also a pressing need for a wider pool. So, as I alluded, not just mostly men from European or European-derived nations, if you see what I mean.

So there's a couple things coming together in the diversity, taking a more diverse approach will help you recruit more, hopefully.

But also there have been instances where people have grown quite disaffected with the whole organization maybe as a result of trying to engage with it, trying to form constituencies, trying to do other things.

There is -- sometimes there is actual hostility to people coming in, people -- newcomers to the GNSO find it difficult to break in. Sometimes that is because it is just hard to understand everything. And we all understand that. ICANN is a complicated place. And so is the GNSO.

But also there is actual hostility. And we have documentary evidence of that, which shouldn't occur, in my view. And I would think that many, many people would agree with that.

In order to improve your pool of volunteers, you need to celebrate people coming. You need to actually try and attract as many as you can and celebrate when they arrive.

That's my perspective, anyway. And thank you

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much. I think I'm mindful of time. That's fascinating and helpful input from both of you. Thank you very much.

I'm personally looking forward to seeing the draft report. Can you remind us when we can expect to see that?

JENNIFER WOLFE: Jonathan, the initial text, working text, the work in progress should be distributed today or tomorrow to the working party and will be on the wiki. So you can certainly take a look at that. It will be April 23rd when the report is released for public comment.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Thanks again for giving us that update.

Now we've run up quite close to the top of the hour. We have two other items we were going to deal with. And that is to deal with the item 8, which was the potential CWG for use of auction proceeds. We agreed on the weekend that we would send a letter out. Or I would send a letter out on behalf of the GNSO looking for other SOs and ACs to join us in a CWG on this subject. So I don't think there's anything more to be done there. But I'll just pause for a moment in case there's any update or input from your discussions yesterday. Phil?

PHIL CORWIN: Yes, briefly. At the BC meeting yesterday we devoted some time to this topic. And I would say two things: One, there was a general consensus that while we don't know what we think the fund should be used for, we -- there was a consensus that they should not be just dumped into general revenues for ICANN and used for operating general operating purposes.

There was also a strong feeling that the CWG, given the engagement of the community now, everyone's so heavily involved in accountability and the transition, that we shouldn't rush into this. Kind of -- this is a very large jar. And there's about 35 million cookies in it right now. And there's going to be a lot more cookies before all the strings are delegated. And there's concern that, if the CWG starts right now, the only people to actively engage in it will be those who want to get their hands in the cookie jar. So we think there should be some delay in moving forward with this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: That's both very interesting points. And, I mean, I provide two remarks. The first is -- remind me your first one, your concern about moving now while we're busy. And the first point was?

PHIL CORWIN: The first point was a fairly strong consensus that the money shouldn't just -- from the auction shouldn't just be dumped into general operating revenues.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So my understanding is that that -- yeah -- that that consensus, whilst important, is not necessary in the sense that the Board has been very clear this is ring fenced money. So I hope that that consensus isn't required. But the point taken.

On the second, I think the challenge we've got is -- and so it will be useful for others to think about this and perhaps provide input on lists -- is by -- there's a balance between doing something, while we're all very busy, perhaps doing something more slowly whilst we're all very busy versus doing nothing, which risks the Board taking initiative themselves and saying, look, the community doesn't seem to be able to do anything about this and it's high time. So my temptation is that we start to do something, but don't rush it. But, you know, that feedback will be very useful, if you can provide it. And I'll just hold off for -- maybe I'll put a seven-day timing on sending out a letter or something like that while we wait for further feedback.

Any other thoughts or input there? James.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Jonathan. James speaking. Yes, I'd like to see this kind of get rolling as well. The process at least of the discussion. I know that both the registry stakeholder group and the registrar stakeholder group made comments to the Board about -- in their discussions with the Board about the potential for engaging some of these funds at the issue of -- and the challenge of universal

acceptance and adoption of new gTLDs, which is symmetrical in some ways. Because that was the source of the windfall for ICANN, if you will, for the institution. So I look forward to kicking off those discussions. And I think that's something that the council can facilitate. And there's other groups, I know, that are starting those conversations as well.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Great. Thanks, James. I'm mindful we're at the top of the hour. We had another item which is the ccNSO update. And Patrick Myles, unfortunately, I understand has taken ill. Thomas, as liaison to the ccNSO, are you in position to make a couple remarks as to the update from the ccNSO before we wrap up the meeting?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, very brief. Patrick Jones sent a more detailed report to the council list, as I mentioned earlier. But at the moment in the -- there's -- in ccNSO, the IANA stewardship transition is certainly a matter of superior interest. There are discussions on that one.

One particular area of concern for them is how they ensure that the ccTLDs are brought on track speaking about those ccTLD operators that are not members of the ccNSO. And that -- so they're talking about outreach in that regard as well as how to find consensus on a proposal that might come in. So it's -- there is discussion about procedural aspects to make sure that everything's possible to be finalized in time.

They have discussions about the strategy and operating plan. And I think one point worthwhile highlighting for the council is that the ccNSO is quite disappointed with the KPIs, the key performance indicators, in the budget so that the community isn't able to monitor and assess progress on an annual basis. At the moment there are 21 -- or 20 KPIs in the document. And they are, obviously, asking for more. And I think that's something that's also good for us to take a look at.

Final point I'm going to make is FOI, framework of interpretation report that has been discussed in the GAC and where there were some concerns by the GAC that caused quite some substantive discussion in the ccNSO. Because, I guess, the ccNSO was taken aback by the fact that the points that the ccNSO thought the GAC had agreed to are now challenged. And that would be particularly with respect to RFC 1591, which could trump local laws in some cases. And the GAC is frowning upon that. That's an unresolved issue. I think I should leave it there and recommend the reading of the full document

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Thomas. Now just one final point on this topic before we move to any other business and towards closing the meeting.

We missed meeting with the ccNSO at this meeting for logistical reasons. One proposal we have is that we meet -- we hold an online meeting, an Adobe Connect room meeting together in relatively short order beyond this meeting. Can I get a show of hands if there's any support of that? Anyone who would be in support of that?

All right. I'm not going to record that as a vote. But it seems like there's reasonable support for that. So it feels to me like, given that we're running a number of community working groups of which the ccNSO is a cocharging organization amongst others, plus the kind of issues that Thomas highlights, it feels to me like there's reason to do so. So it's useful to have your support for that.



I'm going to move to any other business and call for any other points or items that need to be raised at this stage.

All right. I'll highlight for you that we have a wrapup meeting of the council tomorrow. I think that is -- can someone remind me? I think it's around 1:00 p.m. tomorrow, is it? 12:30 p.m. tomorrow. And there will be lunch available. So we'll be serving lunch there. So we'll look forward to seeing you all at 12:30. Please do come. It's an important way of closing off the meeting. We'll make it as efficient as possible and wrap up all of the items that have been covered. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: It's listed as 12:00 on the schedule. Is it 12:00 or 12:30?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Glen, can you confirm that? Or is anyone else able to confirm?

It's 12:00.

AVRI DORIA: The schedule definitely says 12:00.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: My diary says 12:00 as well. Let's work at 12:00.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: It's in Indiana. Sorry. Hullet.

If you guys want to start at 12:30, that would be a good thing. Because then we could make it to the thick WHOIS implementation review meeting. Just saying.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I think we're going to have to stick with the schedule. I don't want to mess with the schedule. Otherwise, it causes confusion. So we'll work to the schedule as set. Thank you very much. There was some good discussion on a number of topics. Thank you all councillors for participating. And thanks to everyone who attended the meeting in the room or come up to speak at the microphone. With that we'll close today's GNSO Council meeting. Thank you.