ICANN Dakar Meeting
Discussion of Potential Motions before Council - TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 22 October 2011 at 12:00 local

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription
is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or
transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting,
but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much so welcome back everybody, this is now session in which we try and discuss the forthcoming motions that we will be looking at during the Wednesday open council meeting and the idea of this session is to have I guess preliminary discussion on the motions, try to get a feel for any potential problems, queries, questions that might exist.

Can I ask the room to make just a bit less noise please so we get can the meeting underway. Okay, they're talking too loudly they can't hear me.

And the motions that we will be considering during the Wednesday meeting are up on the Adobe or up on the screen if you want to have a look at them.

There's a motion that was made by Kristina and seconded by Debbie on proposals for process for improvements to the RAA, that's the registrar accreditation agreement.

There is a motion that was made by Jeff, seconded by me deferred from the previous meeting and that motion addresses the PDP work team final report.

And we have a motion on the outreach task force charter that was made by Olga and seconded by Debbie. So we have three motions that we can discuss if obviously if we wish to discuss other things that we feel might come up during the Wednesday meeting then we can do that.

So let me open this up for discussion, who wants to get us started on this? Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I guess just questions on the RAA motion, one of the issues that the registries had with the initial motion was kind of the notion that if we couldn't get consensus on something we had to keep going back and keep trying until we did. It's almost like the infinite loop.

And it's almost a presumption that if we couldn't come to consensus there was something wrong and we had to. So if you look at it, it seems like - I'm trying to find the exact provision but it's towards the end. Oh, it's the last one. GNSO council does not approve the new RAA, the new RAA is sent back and we just repeat, keep repeating.

So it seems like there's subject's I'll give you an example and probably not doing a good job explaining. But if there's something that's recommended by let's say the commercial stakeholder group that they want some sort of - something in the RAA, and the contracted parties come back and say no, we really don't think that that's an appropriate subject or we don't really think we've come as far as we can go.

And it gets up to the council level and the council you know says, yes, we don't have consensus on this or we don't have the two thirds, we have to keep sending it back. So there's never a notion that a topic ever gets dropped or that we just say you know what, it's not going anywhere, we just need to end the discussion on this topic.

It's always like go back, keep going back until you agree to something which is almost forcing someone who doesn't agree to have to come to some middle ground even if they don't think it's appropriate to do so.

And it's almost a presumption that the party that doesn't move to an opposite side of where they are it's a presumption that they're wrong.

So there's still kind of that defect in this motion I think and it's - you know the registries are still discussing it so I'm not necessarily saying the registries have a complete view on this.

But it's still like a presumption that you have to keep going back and doing it over and over and over until you get to something, so there's never the notion of no, we just don't want to move forward on this topic.

Marika Konings: Can I discuss that? I guess a couple thoughts. First if my recollection is correct, the GNSO council will probably have to approve with a super majority so the practical matter, just to pick up on your example, the likelihood that one single stakeholder group could force or prevent approval such that it would have to go back I think is small.

Having said that I'm not necessarily unsympathetic to the concern and I would certainly be willing to entertain a friendly amendment that would address your concern but also address the concern that I think is shared by the entire NCPH, mainly that we don't get to a point where we pass an amended version, there's a recognition that there's more work to do.

And you know we're two and a half years out from when we last voted on this and we still haven't figured out a way forward.

So you know I'm trying to be really pragmatic here, I want to try and find something that can break this log jam, get us moved forward, address the concerns that our houses had and you know absolutely Jeff I you - I am

happy to consider anything that you would want to suggest that would be a way to perhaps revise that and tighten up that problem.

But also sending out the process for what happens if there is in fact a major issue that somehow does not get resolved.

Stephane Van Gelder: Marika I have (Tim) next, (Tim) can you hear me?

(Tim): Yes I can. So yes, I guess you know my concern is bigger than Jeff's and I would hope that Jeff as a contracted party would have other concerns other than what he mentioned.

But there - my concern and it's the registrar's concern is that the notion that first of all the GNSO has the responsibility or authority to approve how registrars in ICANN, the only two parties to the RAA actually proceed with amending it.

There is in our opinion no provision in the RAA that sets that out or that makes the GNSO or anyone else a third party beneficiary to that agreement.

In fact it explicitly says there are no third party beneficiaries to that agreement. There's also no method for actually amending the agreement within the RAA.

And so to - for the registrars to step back and say well we're going to agree that the GNSO council makes the decision on how that's done just isn't going to happen. You know that will be a discussion that we feel we'll have with ICANN staff or you know with board members if necessary on how we'll proceed and amend the agreement and how we'll proceed and perhaps maybe establishing a sensible process for amending the agreement going forward.

But the agreement does have a provision for creating consensus policy that is binding on registrars within a subset of issues.

If there was the intention that the entire RAA and everything under the sun was subject to consensus policy then why is that provision in the agreement in the first place?

It would make no practical sense. So it's unfortunate that you know the actual amendment process was admitted from the RAA but it was. We need to deal with that but that will be you know negotiated between registrars and ICANN.

The - you know anything that falls within consensus policy is certainly within the purview of the GNSO.

We agreed to that when we signed our RAAs and we don't - we're not side stepping that at all. And we certainly can appreciate if the GNSO wants to make its recommendation as to how the amendment process should move forward.

But you can't expect registrars and I would hope no contracted party to you know agree that the GNSO can - that all that's needed is the GNSO to run majority vote to amend their agreement or to decide how two parties can negotiate their contract.

So those are the concerns that we have and every time I see this motion get reposted, it never addresses that issue. And so until it does there's no way that registrars at least are going to be able to approve that.

And even if this were to pass, I don't see registrars agreeing to actually you know proceed in a manner that it actually proposes.

So I see it - this creating more issues down the road. If you want to put a stop in the process, approve this motion. If you want things to move forward then let us keep moving forward.

We're not standing still, we've been having discussions with staff all along about how to proceed and try to get things moving on some of these amendments or possible policy changes and other things.

But if you want to put a stop to it all, pass this motion and you'll stop it dead.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks (Tim), I have Mason next.

Mason Cole: Thank you Stephane, I just want to step up a level and let the council know that when it comes to the content of the proposed amendments to the RAA, there are some issues with which registrars have portal but for the most part I think the desired outcomes of the council in terms of what operational impact those proposed amendments have, we really don't argue with.

I think that we've spent two years talking a lot about how to establish policy through the RAA and not two and half years talking about how to get to the desired outcomes of the community in terms of having registrars take care of the community's agenda through these process requests.

You know we've been down this road for some time now, I'll give you an example with law enforcement. We had very productive discussions with law enforcement about a dozen changes that they proposed to the RAA.

Many of which frankly are not technical feasible at this point, you just simply can't be put into place. We explained all of this really with law enforcement and we've offered our own motion to impose on ourselves some of the things that law enforcement has requested.

And I understand there's objection from law enforcement about the process, but not about the content. So as much as is possible I'd like to get away from a discussion of the process of establishing policy because it seems to me that the process is very clearly outlined in the GNSO's own bylaws.

I suggest that we use the process as established because the longer we talk about alternative processes the more time we waste getting to the proposed outcomes that the community wants.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Mason, Alan then Kristina.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I find the whole discussion somewhat frustrating at least part of which is because of how long it's been going on. And how long it looks like it's going to continue going on at this rate.

The RAA is relatively clear about how it gets changed, there's consensus policy which is subject to GNSO policy, things within the picket fence.

And the rest if you read the words it says ICANN can essentially unilaterally make the rest of the changes, they only kick in at the next resigning.

There is no discussion of negations. Now that's not having negotiation is counted as the culture of ICANN and therefore there are discussions.

But the way forward legally is relatively simple. Bottom line though is we're going to have to get something that we all agree on that everyone's moderately happy on to go forward because as Mason said, two and a half years talking about the process of how to talk about it is just pushing it a bit much.

The world is changing very quickly and we need to start getting to the position that we can actually make changes to the agreement, we being the community, not necessarily GNSO without a lot more delay.

Somehow we have to get there quickly.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Alan, Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: So Alan said most of what I'm trying to say much more eloquently and articulately than I would. I would just make a couple observations and first that to the extent that there seems to be some uncertainty as to what the scope of the topics would be, I want to make sure that everyone is clear that after the joint statement from the contracted parties house at our San Francisco meeting I intentionally made this revision such that determinations of what is and is not within the scope of the picket fence is made by the office of the general council, not us.

Not the ICANN staff which is exactly the same way it's done for the PDP process and that any topics deemed to be consensus policy would not really for lack of a better word be on the table.

I also will throw out there for consideration that I would be more than willing to entertain a friendly amendment provided it comes from the registrar stakeholder group to essentially substitute the entire content of this motion with one that would adopt the process that's set forth in the staff update paper that we recently received.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Kristina, any other comments on this? Any other comments on the other motion that we are considering? Any other comments on anything?

Any comments on us breaking half an hour early?

Kristina Rosette: Stephane can I make a suggestion....

(Tim):   I have my hand up Stephane do you see that?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes I've got you (Tim) Kristina's just making a suggestion then we'll come to you.

Kristina Rosette: Well after (Tim) speaks and before we break I think it would be helpful if we did do our usual introduction and particularly for those who are going to be incoming councilors who you know are at the table. I think that would be helpful.

Stephane Van Gelder: Good point, thanks Kristina, (Tim).

(Tim):   Yes, I just wanted to respond to the concept that Alan's thrown out there because it sounds like you know he has some sort of you know definitive legal advice on what's in our RAA and I just want to make it clear that that is not the case.

That you know the way he states it it could be amended that there's some unilateral ability of ICANN to amend it. That was the case it would have been done already. I'm sure of that.

That is not the case, there is some disagreement as to how some aspects of our RAA is interpreted but again you know if we want to go down that road, you know it's only going to delay and cause you know much longer time to resolve some of these issues.

And again what I propose is that we don't need a motion on this, allow the registrars to continue working with ICANN staff as we have been doing and well continue to do.

And I think once this is you know put to rest and there's no pending motions on this constantly, staff will perhaps feel more comfortable moving forward and working with us and not wondering you know which way they should be turning or going.

So that's my suggestion and hopefully if this does not pass again this time we don't see it continually reintroduced.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks (Tim). If there are no other comments I'll take up Kristina's suggestion for everyone to introduce themselves and for us to introduce the new councilors. Zahid do you have...

Zahid Jamil: So I went back and looked at this final report and what I'm seeing is there was apparently in the working group a process A. That's not what we're looking at right now.

The process A had strong support from everybody in the working group, process B did not have strong support, there was some opposition from the contracted party's houses and that's what was proposed in San Francisco and it's been further worded on now.

So we're basically not able to implement bottom up processes within the council. I'm not sure what kind of message that gives to community because I thought the idea was that when these things from working groups with consensus and strong support come to the council.

Our job is as managers is to implement that. So how do we go back and say well you're not going to get any movement even if you do all this work, spend all these hours in this whole process.

What are we saying to the community? We're saying we're just going to block everything?

(Tim):   Yes this is (Tim) I just want to respond to that Stephane because that's not the case at all. This is not a policy working group, this is not a policy recommendation that was being made to the council.

This was a - something that the registrars agreed to that we would participate in good faith and this group that would come up with this list of wants and asks for the next list of amendments for the RAA and that we would consider the you know next - their next steps.

And all that's true but to say that you know somehow there was some sort of consensus that you know needs to be now approved or whatever by the council, that's just not the situation with this working group.

It was, created a list of amendments, we have those, they've made their communications clear as to how next steps should proceed, we have those.

But there's some disagreement with that. But there's nothing really for - other than for the council to say thank you and we've got your work and we'll - you know we'll now carry forward with it, with registrars and ICANN in their negotiations or whatever are going to proceed.

But there's no policy to approve here so that's a total misnomer to say that it looks like we're just blocking everything because that's just not the case.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks (Tim). Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I just don't want to leave Zahid's comment just sitting there, true impression of what's going on. I'll quote something that Kristina had said early on in the discussion.

They were talking about working groups, I will say shame on the registries because we didn't participate in that group. We just didn't have anyone that had the time to do it and by the time we realized it things came out.

We did have people but when I tell you it's like I'll tell you that the IPC had people in the PDP working group but they didn't have really much time to

devote to it as much as they probably wanted to and as much as they had an interest.

The registries were in a similar position so to say that yes, the working group may have had strong support is not the same thing as saying consensus. I will tell you that the registries did not really participate as much as we would have liked to.

But the registries did not support part or B, and so I just don't want to leave the impression that you know we can't - we're not supporting the bottom up process.

If something has strong support it's not the same thing as saying consensus.

Stephane Van Gelder: You want to come back on that Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Just a very quick one, so that means that it's an SGO or conceptually does not participate then it has a right to just basically veto it or say well we're not going to accept it even though the committee has worked on it.

And I understand the difference between consensus and strong support but are we just going to take it and say thank you very much and just sort of following up with (Tim)'s point, thank you for the work but no thank you?

Jeff Neuman: No, you have to understand just like what was said in the earlier discussion that sometimes comments will come in late or at the council level because they didn't have a chance or they didn't have people that actually could - did participate.

Same point that was made just the opposite way, but as was made earlier on in the discussion. I just don't want to set the recommendation - what you had said, your statement was very strong, can we just tell the community we

ignored them and ignored what had happened in that group, and the community got together and decided this thing.

The impression you're creating is that the council is going against what the community as a whole has supported. And I'm just refuting that point.

(Tim):   And I just want to make clear one more time that what the GNSO council manages the policy development process. This was not a policy development working group.

So you know there's a big difference in how you know or what is actually done with the recommendations that come out of a group like this.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks (Tim), Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Stephane. SO I think that Jeff the point about whether this was something when it came out of the working group was officially a position of the contracted parties that was made prior.

And I think many of us accept that, that there was participation that maybe not full participation, it wasn't the official position. Having said that I think Zahid's point is really important because it is a consensus recommendation that came out of the GNSO working group.

And what the community is hearing is - it can be interpreted as total pushback by the registrar stakeholder group.

So I would urge the contracted parties, particularly the registrars, to take up Kristina's suggestion. Is there something that you can live with? Is there something that you'd like to propose back that at least shows due and serious consideration and, to some extent, accommodation of what was consensus within the Working Group?

Stephane Van Gelder: Just a quick clarification, was Process B consensus of the Working Group? Could you - I thought it was strong support.

Kristina Rosette: No, because the contracted parties - let's go back in time. Motion number one was to adopt Process A. That was flat-out rejected by a block vote of the CPH.

Motion number two was a Process B that was modified to take out negotiation - to take out non-Registrar Stakeholder Group members from being negotiating participants to observers. Then it was further modified to take out observers, so that - the negotiations are, in fact, just limited to ICANN and the Registrar Stakeholder Group. This is a further modified version in an effort to address the concerns that were articulated in the Joint Statement for the Contracted Parties House read in San Francisco.

I have to say that I really think that we've done all that we can to tinker with what came out of that process, to come up with something that you all would be - could live with. And I would just say I think we all need to start being very mindful, given that we are about to have a tremendous influx of new participants in this process, of what - of how our processes are viewed.

I think it would be really unfortunate if this would be perceived outside of ICANN land as a continued stonewalling by the Registrar Stakeholder Group to make further amendments. I'm not saying that's how it will be, I'm not saying that's how it should be. I just think we all need to be very cognizant of the (optics) here, because even if we're not, there are people who are.

(Tim): Yes, and Kristina, this is (Tim). You know, but you keep saying those kinds of things and using those kinds of phrases, you know, it's clear that that's how you'd like to have those things viewed outside of these - the ICANN circle. The point is that not everything under the sun is in the purview of the GNSO Council or ICANN staff or the Board of ICANN.

There are, you know, there are limits. This is outside the purview of the GNSO Council. So we appreciate and put to heart the list of recommendations as far as the changes that need to be made with the RAA and we're willing to sit down and consider those and how best to get those implemented, of the ones that are feasible.

But to say that - for us to capitulate that the GNSO Council approves our RAA, approves how it's amended, you know, it opens the entire agreement up to one big consensus policy, that is not going to happen. And to Mary's point, we have offered in the past our view of what this motion should look like, it's been rejected twice. This motion has been presented - I think this is the third time in various forms.

The previous two times it was rejected. So all I'm asking is that, you know, we need to have a practical limit on how many times a motion is reintroduced into the Council. And if it does not pass again this time, I would hope that we see the end of it and we can move forward with negotiations on any necessary amendments or other policy changes, and actually get something done.

Kristina Rosette: I...

Man: Hang on, Kristina, please, can I just - there's a...

((Crosstalk))

Kristina Rosette: Well, it just sounded as if (Tim) was saying that the Registrar Stakeholder Group has put forth an alternative motion. And if that is the case, I clearly have missed that, so if someone would please send that to me.

(Tim): I asked you specifically, Kristina, if you would accept - I said that what we would approve, basically, and I can't tell you word for word, was that thank you for the work that you've done. Registrars and ICANN staff take heed and

move forward, and we would do that. But like I said, that has never been taken seriously, it's never been introduced, you know, why waste my time when I can't even get, you know, a cursory agreement from you or nary your others, you know, that that would be something acceptable, because clearly it wouldn't be.

Kristina Rosette: (Tim), you're correct. That's right, that wouldn't be acceptable.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

(Tim): That's what I'm saying, we're at a stalemate on this and I think we just need to move forward.

Stephane van Gelder: Mason?

Mason Cole: Yes, I just - I guess (Tim) has made a number of good points there. I know everybody here is frustrated. I hope that we can get past the frustration.

Stephane van Gelder: Mason, can you speak closer to the mic, please?

Mason Cole: Sure. I hope that we can get past the frustration with, clearly, the community's frustration with registrars over the perception that we're stonewalling. I want to make clear, again, as clearly as I possibly can, registrars are not interested in stonewalling desired outcomes of policy development. We're interested in correctly applying the rules for making policy in a way that doesn't inappropriately assume authority where it doesn't exist.

So I really hope that we can get away from the idea that we don't want the outcomes of policy establishment, because we're just as interested in that as anybody else. We have to get ourselves correctly aligned on how that - how

policy comes into being or we're going to continue to have this debate over and over and the frustration is simply going to grow.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: I'll probably be killed by - for mentioning this, but I understand this has been going on a long time. And, you know, you asked for suggestions. What if we just took the process that's in the new gTLD Registry Agreement, changed the word Registry to Registrar, and propose a process just like that?

Would that be something that the Commercial Stakeholder Group - or, sorry, the Non-Contracted Parties House - to take back and discuss, if we just took that amendment process and then had that discussion with the registrars to get them to adopt that?

Kristina Rosette: We'll absolutely discuss it in Constituency Day. I mean, can I tell you right now that I'd accept a friendly amendment that would modify the motion and that's what we'd vote on on Wednesday? No, I can't tell you that without discussing it.

Zahid Jamil: This is a question, Jeff, is the argument that (Tim) and Jeff are making is that this work shouldn't have been done, it's not within the purview of the Council? Then the charter by which this working team actually went forward and did this, the Working Group went forward and did this, and the results of it - are they outside the charter of the GNSO altogether?

(Tim): No, this is (Tim), Zahid. That's not what I said. We never - we agreed - registrars agreed to do this work. We never agreed that the GNSO Council determined how our agreement is amended and that the GNSO Council approved any amendments to our agreement, you know, that's a whole other thing.

So what we're saying is we agreed to the work. We value the work that was done and the suggestions that were made as far as the amendments that are requested. And in fact we had been working on those things and the motion that we put forward at the last meeting is an example of that.

So we're trying to move forward on those. But, you know, we're also being forced to agree that the GNSO Council completely controls our agreement with ICANN. And that - we're not prepared to go that far.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, (Tim). Any further discussion? Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Yes, I'm just looking at the first paragraph of the Executive Summary. It says that the GNSO Council, when it formed its draft (unintelligible), told it A and then B, developing specific process and time to move forward additional potential future amendments to the RAA. It specifically asks for a process and a timeline to be worked on.

Okay, I mean, I don't want this to go on, but that's what the report says and that's what (unintelligible).

(Tim): And that was offered, and the Council can say thank you for those recommendations, we'll make sure now that the registrars and ICANN staff are aware of them. And then we can look at those and decide how to move forward. But that's different than saying that once the Council approves that process, that's how we have to move forward - two different things.

Stephane van Gelder: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, just to make it clear, I don't know, Kristina, how I amend the motion as a friendly amendment to say, so scrap everything you have in the rest of the motion and just look at 7.6 of the Registry Agreement. I don't know if I could do that. But what I encourage you all to talk about is looking at 7.6 in the new

Registry, new gTLD Registry Agreement, look at that and come back and say, "Yes, this can be acceptable for the Non-Contracted Parties House."

And if that's the case, I know the registries certainly have discussed this within our own group, that will be something that we think - because we worked really hard on that with ICANN staff and the community got many opportunities to comment on it. It's been in guidebook since version 2 - this process - and that was, God knows how many years ago now. Take a look at that and if you guys can live with that, then I think that's something that, I mean, I'd make a plea to the registrars to consider that process.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. If there are no more comments on this, let's just quickly try and introduce ourselves. This is probably something I should have done this morning, however, not everyone was here then, so it's probably better done to do it now. I just wanted to first of all welcome those Council members that will be joining us formally on Wednesday.

As a reminder, we will be having our traditional Open Council Meeting on Wednesday up until 6:00 pm at which time we will break and we will reconvene with the new Council. At that stage, the new Councilors will then take their place on the Council and we will thank the outgoing Councilors. So those new Councilors that are here that were able to be here for this weekend session, I'll start with Mason over there. Mason Cole, if you want to just say who you are?

Mason Cole: I'm Mason Cole, hi everybody. I - my name is Mason Cole, I come from the U.S. I am currently Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. I've recently been elected to the GNSO.

I'll be stepping down as Registrar Chair later this week. I'm looking forward to joining everybody in this role. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Mason. And the other new RrSG, Registrar Stakeholder Group, Councilor is Yoav Keren. He is not in Dakar at the moment. I hope he'll be able to participate remotely in some sessions. Welcome, Yoav, as well.

Next we have Brian Winterfeldt from the IPC. He's actually - can't wait until he's gone. We actually...

Man: Where's my applause?

Stephane van Gelder: Brian's actually posing as David Taylor at the moment, but he'll morph into Brian on Wednesday. Brian, do you want to tell us who you are in a few words?

Brian Winterfeldt: Sure. My name is Brian Winterfeldt, I'm a partner in the law firm of Steptoe & Johnson in Washington, D.C. I have a fan club of one, Adrian. And - so quality, not quantity.

But anyway, I'm looking forward to working with everyone and meeting everyone. And again, I'm posing for David Taylor until Wednesday and then I'll be taking my seat. I'm currently Treasurer of the Intellectual Property Constituency and I'll be stepping down and joining the Council on Wednesday. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you, Brian, welcome. Next we have two new NomCom appointees. We have Lanre who's sitting here on my left, welcome, Lanre, and Thomas, who's just next to Adrian, lucky guy. So Lanre, do you want to say a few words?

Lanre Ajayi: Thank you very much. I'm Lanre from Nigeria. I run a company called PiNet Informatix. I'm glad to be here, thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you, Lanre, welcome. Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: I am Thomas Rickert from Germany. I am a lawyer by profession, Schollmeyer & Rickert Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft. I am doing an awful lot of domain name related legal stuff, advising registrars, this includes also providing a local presence.

And I'm also Director of Names & Numbers with eco, which is the Association of the German Internet Industry, representing almost 600 companies - ISPs, but also 60 to 80 - I don't have the exact number at hand - registrars or domain related companies. Thank you. And I'm looking forward to working with you all.

Adrian Kinderis: And Stephane, if I could just add...

Stephane van Gelder: Of course, Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Welcome, Thomas, and the fact that you're associated with eco, which is no way aligned with .eco, which I'm at a good (unintelligible) myself about, then I apologize publicly. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: If I may add to that, you're all wholeheartedly invited to the reception on Monday to take - to look at what we're doing and to be convinced that we're not associated with .eco in any way.

Stephane van Gelder: I'm apparently going to do that speech in German, so if the Council wants to veto that, it's not too late. Welcome, Thomas, thank you.

Next we have two new NCSG Councilors. I believe they're not here - that's correct, yes. We have Joy Liddicoat and Wolfgang Kleinwächter, did I pronounce that properly? I know Wolfgang, but I can't pronounce his name.

Welcome to them both. And Konstantinos is standing in for (Bill). And we have one new ISP Councilor, Osvaldo Novoa. I don't know - is Osvaldo - is he here, or she, I actually don't know. Okay, welcome.

So those are the new Councilors and if any existing Councilors want to introduce themselves - oh, (Robin), I forgot (Robin). I'm very sorry.

(Robin) is standing in for Rafik, is that correct? So if I've forgotten anyone else, please accept my apologies and let me know now. Okay.

Do any of the existing Councilors want to introduce themselves to the new Councilors? Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Hi, I'm Kristina Rosette. I have less than 100 hours left in my role as IPC Councilor, not that I'm counting. So I'm sorry I won't have a chance to work with you all, but I'm not totally disappearing, which may or may not be a good thing, depending upon your point of view, because as of Friday afternoon I will become Vice-President of the IPC. So I look forward to working with you in that capacity.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Kristina. Debbie?

Debbie Hughes: Good afternoon, everybody, Debbie Hughes from American Red Cross and I wanted to say it's been a pleasure working with you all for the past three years, and it's also my pleasure to introduce, who is in his very first ICANN meeting, my colleague to my right. This is (Michael Carson) from the YMCA, and so please welcome him to ICANN and...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane van Gelder: Welcome. Anyone else? Adrian?

Adrian Kinderis: What are you laughing for, you're too French. Will we be getting an opportunity to say our goodbyes at the public meeting on Wednesday?

Stephane van Gelder: Yes, absolutely, though you can say goodbye now if you want.

Adrian Kinderis: No, no, I prefer a bigger audience and a stage, thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Anyone else? Oh, yes, could - perhaps the two Vice-Chairs want to introduce themselves as part of the leadership team for the new Council members, Mary?

Mary Wong: Well, I'm Mary Wong, and I'm an elected Councilor from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. I've been the Vice-Chair of the Council for the past year, and my term, at least for this year, will end with the Open Council Meeting on Wednesday. But I will be happy to talk with new and existing Councilors about processes, about things that we do within the leadership team and with the ICANN staff at any time. Thanks.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Mary. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: I'm Jeff Neuman, I'm an elected Council rep from the Registry Stakeholder Group. I've been Vice-Chair, like Mary, for the past year. I was appointed again for a second term as Vice-Chair on - for this next incoming year and I look forward to working with all of you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you. (Unintelligible)?

Man: Easier to say goodbye.

Stephane van Gelder: It's too early to say goodbye. You don't have to go at the same time as Adrian. Okay, thanks everyone. Just to add that if you - any new Councilors have any questions, please see us, the leadership team.

My name is Stephane van Gelder. I currently Chair of the Council and if I can be of help to anybody, I'd be more than happy to do so, so please come and find me or Jeff or Mary anytime you need us. Thank you everybody. We will now break for lunch - Liz, I'm sorry.

Liz Gasster: I just wanted to - I'm Liz Gasster from the ICANN Policy Staff. And for those who are new, just quickly introduce the staff, the policy staff that are here. Margie Milam to my right, Marika Konings to my left. I think Steve Sheng's still in the room.

We also have Julie Hedlund, who I think is tied up with the (ESSEC) right now, Rob Hoggarth, who was here but I think stepped out, Glen DeSaintgery, the GNSO Secretariat. So if we can help in any way, we're happy to. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you very much, Liz.

Liz Gasster: And Berry Cobb, Berry Cobb's a consultant to the Policy Staff over in the corner, thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, and all the new Councilors - or existing Councilors and new Councilors are invited to the dinner tonight, which I still need an accurate count of how many people are planning on going. The dinner is at the restaurant in the pool area at this hotel, so if you could, just at some point, pretty soon, find me so we can give the restaurant an accurate - actually, find me or Glen, hopefully Glen, and just let us know if you're able to attend.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks, Jeff, and thanks for working through the agenda for this meeting. I know that was a big job so thanks for doing that. We will now break for a working lunch.

In order to give everyone adequate time to have their lunch, I suggest we break for 15 minutes. I would ask that people then come back with their plates, whatever, but the next topic, which is the Board discussion preparation topic, is an important one. I think we, as a Council, do need to

make sure that we're ready for that discussion, and I know that Jeff, who worked on the agenda as I said, is anxious that we get our topics properly prepared.

So please rejoin at - what's the local time so I don't get this wrong again? At 1:15 so we can start that discussion.

Thank you very much. Operator, this session is now closed. Thank you.

Coordinator: The recording has ended.

END