

Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting
Preparation Board GAC Meeting
Saturday 13 July 2013 at 16:10 local time

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

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Coordinator: This is the conference coordinator just reminding that this call is being recorded.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi if I could -- everyone could start to make their way back to the table for this next session please. All right can we - can the counselors please join us back at the table to we can deal with the meeting between the GNSO council and the board or the GNSO and the GAC and the board tomorrow.

I'm actually - Okay everyone we've thinned out a little here and so - and we've got some pretty critical topics to deal with. So if there are any councilors in the room that aren't at the table be great to have you here.

I see Yoav, (David), (Pake), Brian Winterfeldt if we could have you all at the table please. Okay so let's start this next session which is an opportunity to prepare for and discuss our interactions with the board and the GAC.

We've nominally got an hour from 10 past 4:00 to 10 past 5:00 local time. I guess the session will be recorded as well so we might as well start the recording at this stage.

Man: Yep. Prep work and GAC preparation scheduled originally for 16:10 to 17:10 per the original schedule.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks everyone. So let's really - I'll make a couple of remarks and then I'm going to put up some slides I've worked on a little. These slides - so there - I had a couple of discussions I think with (Heather Dryden), chair of the GAC and all with the members of the board GAC working group on implementation -- the BGRIWG.

And those discussion have as you know resulted in our meeting in Beijing when we spoke with the GAC about our - the GAC's perspective better engagement with closer engagement with the PDP process and in general the work of the council and the policy work going on within the GNSO. That was a constructive meeting I thought in Beijing and there were a couple of suggestions that came out of that.

And the GAC is certainly keen to progress with those. With the board there have been - I'm pretty keen to take the discussion two ways really.

One is to bring them up to date with the work of the council -- some of the initiatives we've been undertaking, some of the current activity. I'm not sure that the board is aware of the sort of dynamism and the nature of the council's work and some of the policy things we're doing.

And then I think there's two or three items we'd like to discuss with them. I'll put those up in front of you and we can - you can affirm those and/or add to or delete them.

So I think it may be - I'm not sure which to do first. I suspect it's not absolutely critical which order we take these in.

Let me take the GAC first if you'll indulge me on that one. I think the frame of that meeting is clearer.

So let me take that with you and then we can see - and then we can move onto that with the board. So I'll put this slide up which is my - as I say it's really my preparatory notes for that.

But I think it'll be useful to inform the discussion as well. So basically and I think you've seen - I - a version of this on the list.

We really have an opportunity here to - the structure of the meeting proposed is that we'll say that the GNSO -- we'll talk about from a council perspective some issues. And based on this morning's discussion I've tweaked that a little bit.

We'll hear back from the GAC on their latest work. And then the third component of the meeting is to talk with the GAC to move on from Beijing on engagement with the GNSO policy process.

So those are the three components. Nominally with kind of equal weighting.

And here are some suggestions for what we - I mean we've got a relatively open ticket what we say from the GNSO, from the council, ourselves. What they have requested is an update on the INGO NGO PDP.

So that's certainly something which we need some time for. Based on Brian your input to us now I wonder - we probably need to allocate - if these are - I'm just going to nominally work on these three main bullets here from the GNSO, from the GAC and GAC engagement in the GNSO policy as being approximately one third each.

We've got a 90 minute session where it looks like 30 minutes each. And if that's the case Brian your little presentation summarizing - Brian? Brian Peck? Just to make sure I've got your attention.

Your presentation that you gave earlier I mean I think that we need - we probably need to give 15 minutes to that given - of that 30 minute slot. I mean it took you I would say approximately 10 minutes to walk through that.

And I Mean we want to highlight the work that's being done, where we've got to to date and some of the innovations and the attention we're paying to it. I mean it's clear and it's on the table that the GAC in some ways doesn't particularly want the GNSO to even be working on this.

But to the extent that we are which we are I think we want to demonstrate the professionalism, thoroughness and innovation with which we're working with it. So the question is really -- and we've been tasked by the GAC.

So this is - I haven't put this on. They've asked us to come back.

The question is what sort of time do we need for that. Yeah John if you want to make a comment?

John Berard: Yeah I didn't pick it up when you were making your presentation this morning. But there was a consolidated IGO paper that was issued by the OECD in the early part of - well actually July 10.

Have you seen that? IUs that - have you seen it?

Man: No have not.

John Berard: All right. So I'll forward it to you. It was sent to me.

It speaks specifically, you know, in the - speaks about a lot of stuff. But it focuses on the notion of acronym - on acronyms.

And so I would guess that the conversation with the GAC will focus quite sharply on, you know, no matter what you're doing if you're not dealing with the acronyms then you're not doing what it is we need you to do.

Man: Okay.

John Berard: So I don't know. Where are we with regard to answering a question like that and acronyms for the protections?

Jonathan Robinson: Well actually that's helpful John, a, that question. And b if anyone anticipates any other specific or challenging questions that we should be prepared to deal with that's helpful to hear now.

So...

Man: Thanks John. That actually is one of the core issues that is going to be the focus of the public session on Wednesday. You know, how do, you know, should acronyms be protected at the top or second level.

And the various propositions that are being considered by the working group are covered in that. So we can definitely address how it's being currently handled by the working group if that question's raised tomorrow.

You know, I think we could also briefly raise -- and depending how much they want to get into it -- I mean as you know this is a discussion going on between the GAC and the board as well. I mean both the GAC and the board are struggling with this issue.

And I think, you know, one area where the working group has been leaning towards is like I said leaning towards is that, you know, the concept of a trademark clearinghouse and a clearinghouse model as a way to, you know, provide protection to these organizations for their acronyms. Rather than outright reservation or, you know, barring of the registration of acronyms.

And I, you know, to the extent that the IGOs have been working with the working group they have also indicated, you know, a willingness to consider that model as an alternative to outright protection. And my understanding is even within (unintelligible) of the GAC they're also willing to consider that as an alternative to outright protection of those names.

So we could certainly say that, you know, here is an area that the working group is being creative in trying to come up with a solution. And that's something that is - that the IGOs have at least indicated some willingness to consider or support at least within the working group.

But it is also an issue, you know, that is the subject of, you know, where they're trying to get some guidance from the community in the public discussion session on Wednesday.

Jonathan Robinson: So just to make it - to recap then. I mean we've got - at the moment we've got - the question is what topics do we - and our opportunity to say here's an update from the GNSO. The GAC said that we want to hear from you on the INGO stuff.

We have an opportunity to introduce our own topics. Based on what I heard this morning I'm proposing to put in a few slides on this - on the PDP process and talk to them about that.

The question is also one of the things I'd like to do -- Chuck I'll come to you in one minute -- from both - in both of these is divide up the work a little bit. I don't want to be the one who stands there and represents the GNSO council, the GNSO and everything.

So to the extent that we - like it was - can be sort of spread amongst us in whatever way, I'm very happy to have volunteers or to attempt to delegate it myself. So I put policy implementation as a third bulletin there.

It's square bracketed meaning could stay, could go. I - and in fact with the INGO PDP and a comment on the PDP process we may have enough for our 30 minutes -- especially with a bit of interaction on either of those.

So over to you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. Chuck Gomes from VeriSign.

Well first of all on the PDP process and you're probably way ahead of me on this -- you'll recall this morning that Jeff Newman suggested that we communicate some of - at least some of Marika's presentation on some of the stats. I think doing that for the GAC would be very smart.

Now I wouldn't do the whole presentation because it's - I wouldn't go into the detail of all the things we're thinking about for improvement. I would just probably mention that we're brainstorming on lots of ways to improve the PDP.

But we'd like you to see some stats of overall PDP processes and how long they take including the stat with regard to the CCNSO. Because all the criticism right now is focusing on the GNSO and the PDP process there.

And the work you did on that was outstanding. So I would highly suggest under PDP process that you show at least a couple of the slides or, you know, from - that show the facts about the PDP.

Because they don't know it. Most of the community doesn't know it.

And most of us didn't know all those things because we're at a - we're down in the nuts and bolts of it. So I highly suggest you do that with the GAC.

Wouldn't take very long. But it would be really important information to get out on the PDP process.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah thanks Chuck. I thought when you said I'm probably way ahead of you I thought there's probably no chance. But in fact I am.

And that's exactly what I intend there. I mean and that first bullet although it was on the basis of the method that the received - that that received this morning and in fact we discussed it and others.

But so certainly under that first sub bullet from the GNSO I envisage putting up some of the slides from Marika's presentation or an edited version of that and talking to those slides. So and then we go into the INGO PDP.

Question is that's probably enough for that first session. What I could do as the third bullet is make reference to the document which summarizes the current work that staff produced in advance of this meeting.

I'm not sure -- is there any other point that we should make to the GAC about the current work of the GNSO that we feel they should be cognizant of whether it's how we're working, what we're doing or what we anticipate doing. For example we could talk about the fact that we have various improvements coming along over and above to the PDP process.

Any other thoughts or comments on what you'd like to see in that section?
Okay so hearing none we will either stick with those two or if I can think of -
Wolfgang did you have something you wanted to add?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Do you want already to close or do we go point by point?

Jonathan Robinson: No, no, sorry. So I wanted to give you a sense of what it looked like. Then make sure you had the three main bullets.

Now we're under the three sub bullets of from the GNSO. I then want to come work my way down to - well I'm not going to say what the GAC's going to tell us.

But certainly I'm going to come onto the third bullet which is GAC engagement of the GNSO policy. So if you're on that we'll come to that in just a moment.

Okay so I'm going to close off that first bullet. It's got - I'm going to talk about the PDP process with grateful acknowledgement of Marika's sterling work on preparing those slides.

We'll hear from (Brian) on the INGO PDP. And if any of you have anything that wakes you up in the middle of the night or in the next five minutes please tell me about a third bullet if you want something in there.

I think we've probably got enough to fill up our first half hour with a bit of exchange. We'll then hear from the GAC and an update on their latest work and advice.

And then third we have the opportunity to talk about their engagement with GNSO policy. I'll produce another slide here which has a bit more detail.

Now this has become slightly confusing in that there's the board GAC recommendation implementation working group. This is one of the areas they've focused on.

It was their intention to meet later today. I can blow this up a little bit if that helps.

Let me just blow this up for you guys. So we can see.

We're really now focusing in on that third bullet -- the GNSO PDP process in relation to the GAC. And what I thought we could do there was have a brief walk through of the current engagement points.

Now Marika I think we've got something on there haven't we? And we've sent it to them already?

So we should remind them of - come - yeah. Fire away.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I know it went I think to the BGRI.

I'm not sure if that went as well to the whole GAC. I know we spoke about it or saying that we would develop that.

But I don't know how far that went along...

Jonathan Robinson: My recollection is and I'm pretty certain of this -- we sent it to the BGRI working group and said look these are where you have current opportunities for engagement. And they said thanks, that's really interesting, we'll circulate it amongst our colleagues.

I recall that. I can't be 100% sure but that's what I recall.

So I think we could talk to that briefly at the outset and say look, there are a number - is it a Word document or a slide? Can you remind me?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. It's actually a Word document and it has a table I think with three columns.

Basically the first column says, you know, this is the point in the PDP where we ask for input. Then the column next to it says this is how we do that.

And the third column says how would you like us to do it? Because we're not getting input.

Apparently there's a missing link. And I think then the further discussion would be is there anything missing from this list of what currently exists that we may want to consider as, you know, the last stat in that conversation possibly.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. And what - I think we could very usefully potentially take away and I'd love your input on this -- because then we go onto the next one which says updates on the BGRI working group and related work to include, you know, where does the GAC want to be involved other than these points that we highlighted? And one of the things we - that came out of our meeting with them in Beijing was this proposal for a reverse liaison.

In other words someone from the GNSO. Now my sense about our discussion in Beijing was we were pretty positive about that.

And what we mean by that is one or two people. And I think we had some - even some volunteers.

We may say it's one from either side of the two houses of the GNSO or any responses to that? Can we go into the meeting with a response then.

Zahid and anyone else -- John Berard? Zahid, John, Yoav.

Zahid Jamil: Yes I think your recollection is the same as mine which is that we were supportive of something like that. And yes I mean I'd be happy to do something like that as well.

Jonathan Robinson: You say happy you mean you support it and you in principle be prepared to volunteer as well.

Zahid Jamil: Supporting and volunteering.

Jonathan Robinson: John.

John Berard: The overlap of the meeting schedules suggests that anybody we appoint as a reverse liaison is not going to be able to attend these meetings.

Jonathan Robinson: That's not the issue.

John Berard: It's just a practical matter.

Jonathan Robinson: It's a point. Good point John. Yoav did you - I assume you had something to say but you may...

Yoav Keren: Yeah it's actually responding to this. Because if you maybe remember my idea was that we'll have - it will be easier if we have two so if someone can attend it's always better to have two people from - two from the GAC, two from the GNSO.

They don't have to call it a liaison.

Jonathan Robinson: Stop you there a moment Yoav. I don't want to break your thought but the proposal as I understand it at the moment when they talk about a reverse liaison they mean someone from the council or potentially from the council, potentially from the GNSO liaising with the GAC and being available to talk about what's going on.

I don't think - I don't understand to envisage that they will have a - they actually have the current opportunity to have someone here at our table which they don't avail themselves of to be clear.

Yoav Keren: Well...

Jonathan Robinson: So I - go ahead.

Yoav Keren: That's one option. And then John's comment is still true because no one from here will be able to sit in both places.

But my idea was maybe to try and form some kind of a joint committee that talks to each other once a month or something like that. Two people from the GNSO, two from the GAC just get together on a call for an hour and talk.

And the people from the GAC can go back and report. That's easier.

I don't know that's an option? Maybe it's not the best one but that's...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I understood the proposal to be looking for one or two volunteers from the council to be available to liaise with the GAC. Quite how that's - so maybe that's something we want to talk about tomorrow.

I think what we could - yeah (Brian) I'll come to you. Maybe what we could say is we're very - we're receptive but we - the mechanics need to be fleshed out and just hear a little more. (Brian)?

Brian Winterfeldt: I'm just wondering if it's possible -- I mean do we need someone there all the time shadowing what the GAC's doing? Or someone who just goes for part of one of our sessions to give them an update on what we're doing at the council and to seek their feedback on particular projects?

Jonathan Robinson: I think I was understanding possibly more the latter which deals with John's concern then a little more. But I don't know - we didn't necessarily flesh it out.

So it's open to interpretation.

Brian Winterfeldt: And I also think that it's - and I do think the understanding is that they're looking for council members to go brief the GAC not necessarily anything in reverse. And I'm also happy to volunteer actually if you need someone else as well.

Jonathan Robinson: What about my - thank you (Brian). What about my comment that maybe just from a council point of view just to think about.

I mean maybe - we probably don't need to resolve this now. But, you know, where do those - is there any merit in those volunteers coming from different houses within the council or is it irrelevant where those two volunteers come from?

Any strength of feeling on that in either direction? Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: I think that will become problematic because then we have these weighted issues and stuff like that that we need these two or four or, you know, I mean that'll just become - so the council has to sort of put their faith into somebody and say all right, you know, your job is just to bring facts back and submit facts. And if there's an issue on policy you better make sure that the council's behind you depending on what you say to them.

You can't go off on your own tangent.

Jonathan Robinson: Fine and so my sense is then reading that if that's the position that we are looking for more than one -- probably two so the two can do the job. And in a sense perhaps provide some sort of check and balance on each other and just some sort of cover as well.

So that all seems very, very sensible to me. Any other comments or issues arising from that?

Jen I sense you may have something or you...

Jennifer Wolfe: No I agree with (Brian)'s point. I don't think it has to be somebody sitting there all the time.

I think having one or two people that could report and having some checks and balances makes a lot of sense. So I was just agreeing.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. All right so I think we have a form of consensus here. And I'll get you John, you about to...

John Berard: John Berard, business constituency. That's great.

I think that (Brian)'s idea, Jen's second, terrific. Just keep in mind that the reason that we have gotten to this point is that they can't call one person out of that herd to represent the GAC.

So I suspect that two does not solve that particular problem. I'm just - my - I think that the...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Let me make sure we're clear because - let me let you finish.

John Berard: Sure. So the reason that they don't avail themselves of the GNSO liaison is that no one member of the GAC - they can't even speak for their own government until they get approval from the government so they can't really speak for all of them until they go through that whole process. And so it puts them in an awkward spot when they're asked questions before all that process is taken care of.

Even if we have two people meeting with two people to kick things around I'm not sure that that solves their problem.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So here's my understanding of it and here's my veneer of interpretation on this. My understanding is that the objective of these liaisons is to provide GNSO related updates to the GAC.

It is a reverse liaison from the GNSO to the GAC. The GAC is not looking to match those liaisons with two of their own for specifically in part the reasons that you talk about.

Now my question then does loop back to your point. If we're going to do that I'm not sure the GAC meets intersessionally.

When the hell are they going to hear from - but maybe we just have to carve out a bit of a schedule. Maybe it's at 6:00 on a - after a long Saturday that these two poor liaisons go across to the GAC and give half an hour updates or the GNSO.

It's - the practicalities of how it's going to work. Zahid you have something to say or...

Zahid Jamil: Yeah. My understanding is they do have intercessional calls. They have con calls.

They don't just meet in the face to face meetings.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Zahid Jamil: I mean I could be wrong but...

Jonathan Robinson: Then so be it. Then that - I mean I see Avri nodding and so there is - okay.

So we can - on that understanding I think where we've got to is we're proposing to have two from amongst us, had a couple of volunteers already. Haven't decided it.

I recall Wolfgang you might have volunteered in the past or maybe I'm imagining that. But we've had certainly had some names - we've had more than two names in the hat already so that's great.

I think we can usefully discuss this with the GAC and go back to them and say we're positive about this, we're receptive. So that's great.

The one - there's another questions on these bullets which says how will early GAC input be handled? Now I don't know whether we're in any kind of position to answer this point at this stage.

And so I would suggest that we - that if it does come up we haven't really got to that yet. But these are the live questions.

It's, you know, when might the GAC be involved, how will their input be handled. They need to understand the volume of work.

There's a response to reverse liaison and default timeline for shared GNSO PDP steps. I'm not quite sure I understand what my - that's - so I think we can continue that discussion.

We're a little bit disjointed because of the lack of the BGRI working group meeting and where they've gone next. But Avri would you like to say something?

Avri Doria: Yeah I wanted to ask a couple questions - Avri Doria speaking. I wanted to ask a couple questions.

One is I don't understand why you all are calling it a reverse liaison. A liaison is a liaison whether it's a liaison from this group to there or a liaison from that group to here.

So I don't quite understand the reverse liaison except that it somehow diminishes your role in doing as a liaison to the GAC. The other thing is I actually have difficulty understanding how it would work unless that liaison or one of the two if that's what you're offering are actually there while they're meandering through their work.

And when an issue comes up that they're discussing can sort of say the conversations in the GNSO have been blah, blah, blah. And they can come back to the GNSO and say, you know, they were talking about XYZ.

And these are the kinds of issues that they were bringing up. And if you're doing something like that I can understand working and being really valuable.

But for your liaison - I can't call it a reverse liaison. For your liaison to the GAC to be such that you're appearing for a half hour report that kind of makes it no different than what you're doing now which is going there at one time, at one meeting.

So I'm having trouble understanding how this works unless you really do do a proper liaison such as, you know, ALAC has done the GNSO where there's someone that's here most of the time. They miss a little bit because of other important.

But I think if you're going to send a liaison to the GAC you should send it as an equal who's sending a liaison to another group. And not sort of mush it around.

But that's just a thought.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. They're good thoughts.

And two thoughts in response before I open it to others to - I mean the reverse liaison comes from the perception that the GAC would send a liaison to us. But that's not how they work.

And this is a discussion of how they -- it's their perspective -- how they might work with the GNSO, I think hence the concept of a reverse liaison. That's just by way of explanation.

I accept it's blundy terminology. Second to your point of how it might work -- I don't think we've fleshed that out yet and we quite know what we - what our mutual expectations are.

So there's opportunity to discuss that a little more. My sense is what we'd be going into tomorrow is saying yes, good idea, we're receptive, we're open.

Because I suppose where we're coming from here is that the relationship between the GNSO and the GAC is up for discussion. It's how they - how we might engage and work more effectively.

So there isn't a presumed existing way of working and that's what's being discussed. It's how do they better engage with a policy process perhaps mindful of the criticism that they're coming in way too late and torpedoing policy process by their advice to the board.

And so we could take it positively and say well, they're trying not to come in too late. I realize for some there's a fear that they - of them coming in too early and just stopping any progress being made.

So thoughts?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. This is Evan subbing as liaison for Alan.

We have - ALAC has also been talking to the GAC about some kind of a liaison relationship. And definitely that kind of thing is worthwhile.

But I think there's a useful link to be made between the conversation that's being had now and the one earlier about the defense of the PDP. And that is to have something where you either get in kneed deep with a multiyear commitment of being able to be there for 1:00 am phone calls or you miss out.

Maybe a bit of a binary choice that for instance people like GAC reps are not able to make. Perhaps there's some particular kinds of policy processes where some kind of a different method could be used where say you make a brief stop at occasional points where various groups can come in.

Again this is something to use your term hasn't been totally fleshed out. But something that allows this kind of -- I won't call it lightweight but lighter weight involvement in the process that allows somebody like a GAC member to be able to come in without having to make that intense contribution of time that's necessary of the other members.

Just thinking that might be - that's the kind of thing we're trying to engage with them in.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Evan. I'm just making a quick note of that. I would - if - are there any responses to that that feel that, you know, any - taking the temperature of that? Anyone think that that's, you know, because clearly the feedback we've had from the GAC previously is it just for whatever reason doesn't suit our working style, our methods, our mechanics to get right into the PDP process as a working group member.

It's not the way it's going to work. So let's not - so any responses to - I don't want to mischaracterize Evan's proposal of some form - but it's effectively a

lightweight, lighter weight engagement with the PDP process and the working group model.

Evan Leibovitch: As opposed to none.

Jonathan Robinson: Wolfgang go ahead.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: You know, I think Evan puts the finger in the right direction to where we are in the process of enhancing communication and collaboration. And I think we have to differentiate between two different elements.

One is the enhanced - I would call it enhanced communication which means they inform us about their activities at an early stage and we inform them at an early stage about our activities. So this does not yet mean full inclusion into policy development processes.

But it's good to know at an early stage, you know, various opinions, information and things like that. But it means the enhanced collaboration, you know, which means the inclusion into the bottom up development processes for policy would be, you know, there'd be a higher level.

And at this stage we have very no level of communication so - between the GAC and the GNSO council. And probably, you know, one way could be also that we start issue based forms of enhancing communication and collaboration.

There are some issues that are of higher priority for the GAC and some issues which are of lower priority for the GAC. And, you know, in particular the inter-governmental organizations and all this is is of high priority for the GAC.

And so this could be a good case to improve it. Because we're - I'm really - I expect some very tough discussions with the GAC on this inter-governmental organization issues because, you know, they gave an advice and they expect that there is no need for policy development process.

And now we have the policy development process. And let's wait and see, you know, what will be the outcome.

But this could be a good example to say okay if we would have started earlier to communicate we could have avoided this (unintelligible). So that means this is really let's say a confidence building measure which allows us to avoid conflicts at a later stage of the PDP.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay I have - see Avri would like to make a contribution. I'm conscious that we should probably wrap things up at this stage.

So Avri go ahead and then I'll...

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria speaking again twice in one day. It's way too much.

I just wanted to point out and you'll probably get more of this when you have the discussion with the ATRT to coming in. But one of the issues that they have taken up especially at the request of GAC members is the whole PDP and their participation in it and ways to participate.

So I just wanted to throw that in the pile that the issue -- and it's something that they're actually looking for an outside consultant to actually come in and help us think about further. So just that's part of the whole equation of that discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri thanks. That's a very helpful heads up.

And I suppose where I'm coming from and where I'm thinking and where I hope we should all be thinking is in, you know, it's very healthy if there are outputs coming from ATRT2 or any other areas. But to the extent we can anticipate these ourselves and start to implement the productive, constructive changes that anticipate these all the better.

So wouldn't it be great if the ATRT2 by the time they get to make their recommendations we've done it all anyway. I - that is - I'm being slightly flippant about that.

But in a sense that's what I'd quite like us to achieve. So we're seen to be, you know, proactively self-improving rather than waiting for some external review team to come and tell us what to do.

Great. Thanks very much. One of the things that's missing here is perhaps a diversity of contribution. I may even go on list and try and solicit some input from someone.

For example I'm wondering if there's any volunteers or anyone who you might think we could volunteer to do the brief walk through of the current engagement points and opportunities to input. Of course Marika could do it.

But - and ideally it might come from other councilors. So if anyone - yeah, our absent friend in the great tradition of volunteering someone we could volunteer Jeff since he's - has made substantial claims to being an architect of the PDP process and so on. Maybe we'll do that.

All right. Absent any other volunteers we may volunteer Jeff. Right.

So moving onto the board. In a way it's quite a neat segue because what we have with the board is essentially a two component meeting envisaged here.

What I want to try and achieve and I put this slide up as - well let me just say what the two components are. One is to communicate what we're doing well as a council.

And you might think well why do you want to do that? And my - and I think you've heard quite a few times through the course of this morning about misperceptions that existing within the community about various elements of the way in which we may be working or not working as the case may be.

And for me one of the things I'd love to achieve is in some way communicating where we're doing things well. That's not to say I want to be unduly defensive or not open to where we could do things better.

But I'd like to do that. So that's really phase one of our communication with the board.

And then phase two of the meeting should be to pick up some key issues. Now I've notionally got three issues up here that I'd like us to talk about.

What I've picked up from this morning is that we could probably usefully talk about the motion on the ICANN bylaw recommendation or at least the underlying principles of it rather than necessarily the motion and see where that discussion leads us. We could put some of the slides on the - in the similar summaries.

We plan to do the GAC on the PDP is broken issue. And then my first bullet point there is around the multi stakeholder model and the extent to which the multi stakeholder model is being used as if you like a defense of ICANN.

And it's being - and so in order to uphold that and not pay lip service to the multi stakeholder model, you know, how does the GNSO feel about our role being respected and appreciated. So those seem to me like three talking

points I've kind of either gathered from discussing with people or divined a little bit.

But are those the three that we really should be talking with the board about? Does anyone feel strongly that any of those shouldn't be being discussed or should be?

Are there any volunteers to lead any of those three other than myself? Yes Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: I'm definitely not volunteering. Thank you.

But the issue about bringing up the motion I think will be helpful because it'll help us in our discussions on Wednesday. So I think that's definitely something that should be up there.

There may be thoughts and insights that the board may have which will inform our debate.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Zahid. Any other support for any of those points for them staying on the list or being removed? Anyone feel strongly? Jen?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yeah it's Jennifer Wolfe. I just want to agree with Zahid.

I think the bylaw recommendations should definitely be discussed. It's a great opportunity to get some feedback before Wednesday.

And I also think that when you frame that Jonathan we should take out - there was a lot of political discussion going on today about how it was worded. And really focus in on just the importance of getting some rationale back from the board when they don't agree.

So I think that's the underlying issue to the motion. So I think if you could be careful to frame that discussion so we don't get off on a tangent and really use that limited amount of time we have to get their real feedback on the underlying concept.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jen. I appreciate that. I mean so really we're talking about a principle.

And also I mean I think it's critical here and that the, you know, I don't like the sound of my own voice. I'd be very happy to say nothing.

Clearly I will say something. But to the extent that any of you want to chime in at that - on these points ideally we have a topic leader and we may still manage to pull that out of this.

But, you know, there's a danger here that we'll have Jeff as the topic leader on that which could be a good thing. But it could be that someone else maybe who's not the maker of the motion might be better placed to introduce it.

It may give it a degree more neutrality. How do we feel about presenting the PDP is broken slides and giving a little bit of a heads up as to what we might be able to do to improve that?

Because I think there's a broad based perception including at the board level that our processes don't work well and aren't as fast as they could or should be. And so to me it seems like that could well be another point of discussion that we could usefully share with the board.

Chuck has got a thumbs up there. Any other - so well in the absence of dissent I think that's going to stay on the list.

How do we feel about the GNSO being representative of the multi stakeholder model and being, you know, this - I'm not sure my thoughts are as well formed about this one.

But certainly we've probably got quite a lot in the first two. And it may be that that's more a theme than a specific topic.

Anyone else? (David).

David Cake: I just wanted to make a - just a suggestion for a possible other topic. Do we want to actually talk to the board about the whole reconsideration request issue?

Because I appreciate that we've sort of done with it - dealt with it at a formal level. But I think it would actually be valuable to get some sort of informal discussion from the board about how - what they - how they think it happened, what, you know, will they think that will happen again and, you know, how they feel about the - their perspective on the whole issue.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So two thoughts here. One is I'm conscious actually that Joy made a point earlier and she's not in the room at the moment about a potential topic for the board.

I think if we are to talk about the reconsideration request we need to be very specific about what we're talking about there. We - as I understand it it's on our agenda to talk - it's specifically on our agenda to talk to the ATRT2 team about that.

And that's about the reconsideration process and then accountability and transparency tool. So that's our intention there.

As regards the other issue, well I suppose in a sense the outcome has been achieved there in that what was desired was to modify the rationale such that

it didn't set an unsatisfactory precedent. And so I'm just wondering what we would talk with them about.

That's really...

David Cake: Well and my - I mean why did I think they came up with a rationale. We - sounds so problematic, how do they think we can avoid that happening in the future.

I don't know. I mean that was just a suggestion.

I feel that we dealt with it at a formal level. But there could still be some value in sort of, you know, informally just hearing from the - from individual board members how they felt about the issue.

Is it something that they feel wasn't just a one off or that they think it does show, you know, longer term issues with the process and that sort of - but I mean I'm happy to take it off. I mean I'm sure that particular issue will be addressed with the board in other discussions in other forums several times over the week. So it was just a suggestion.

Jonathan Robinson: (David) I appreciate it. And I've got two other thoughts.

One is I'm slightly - I'm loathe to in a sense ambush them with something that they didn't know was coming down the track. There's also another issue and that's that the portion of the board that dealt with this is not the whole board.

Maybe I'm wrong there. That - yeah so there's issues there that I feel perhaps we aren't as well framed.

Yeah. Okay. Any other thoughts or comments on the topics we've got at the moment and how we might interact with the board?

Zahid Jamil: Completely off point and it might be. So I'll make apologies before I begin.

You know, last time in the public open sessions we heard a lot about the plural and the singular and things of that nature. And it's out of our hands now there.

That was a board decision. And the board has actually in a sense taken this you're not to do anything about it.

Does the GNSO feel any, you know, does it want to ask the board whether they'll be doing anything about it? Is it something we even want to consider?

Because it's one of the things I'm tracking the GAC transcripts as they're going along. It's been going on for now 40 minutes talking about just that one issue.

So I'm just - I don't know. I mean I wanted to see whether anybody thought that was a useful point.

Jonathan Robinson: There may be a higher level point for that that encompasses that one Zahid which is -- and I also haven't thought this one through. But this is - the fact that that is one example perhaps where the guidebook have a certain - there was a certain understanding in and around what the guidebook said.

And I'm not actually that knowledgeable about this particular issue. But then later - so maybe that's the bigger issue is that the change is relative to the guidebook and that reliability of that whole process.

But again I would have the same caveat as I said with (David). I'm a little nervous to sort of throw in something which is potentially legal implications and we haven't forewarned them about.

So that - yeah okay. All right. Well I mean I feel relative - I think given other discussion that we had on the - it's not strictly correct to call it the bylaw recommendations. Really it's the feedback with the board and/or the staff when it goes against GNSO policy work -- whether that's something that we managed to spend a lot of time on.

And I suspect we could well have an interesting discussion with the board. So we've possibly got enough to talk about already.

I haven't seen us run out of things to talk about in sessions with the board. Especially if we're going to have some introductory stuff which talks about - gives them a little bit of an update on what's going on with the GNSO council and the policy work within the GNSO from the horse's mouth as it were.

So that sounds like we're in reasonably good shape for both of those meetings. I'm going to probably have to burn the midnight oil a little bit on shaping them up and maybe dragging some of you into the fray.

Perhaps that's enough on that for now which usefully brings us back on track as far as our sessions are concerned. I know it's a long day and we're all being - we're in a windowless room.

I don't know quite what to suggest. I think what we're going to do is probably - let me tell you what I will suggest.

What I think we're going to do is try and cut out one session and roll it over to tomorrow. But at least we will continue for the moment with - and we'll try and wrap up around 6:00, 6:15 rather than push it right through until 6:30.

So try and cut half an hour out of this. I'll do some work with (unintelligible) here.

But in the meantime let's get on with the report from James and Mikey. I'm not sure who's delivering that on IRTP Part D. I sense it's you Mikey. So if we can just stop the recording and on that last session and prepare for the next session. Thank you.

END