

**ICANN Singapore Meeting
GNSO Council Wrap-up Session
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 23 June 2011 at 12:30 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: The call is being recorded and you may begin.

Stephane van Gelder: Good night. Hello everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Council's wrap up meeting and as usual we don't have a set agenda for this meeting. The idea is to have an open conversation and talk about the issues that we've identified as coming out of the Singapore meeting week, and any other topics that Councilors want to address or anyone in the room obviously.

Just to start us off can I bring to your attention the document I've just sent to the Council list, which is a document that I prepared with (Jeff)'s help to identify the main action items that have come out of this week.

There are several of them - action items from the Board resolution on new gTLDs, action items from our own Council meeting yesterday and I've also taken some less formal action items out of the interaction we had with the ccNSO during the week on Monday.

So if you recall we discussed a number of possible joint efforts and areas where we could - both SOs could help each other and work together. So if you can have a look at the document and I'm sorry I couldn't send it any earlier, but it was - it's been a busy week.

And with that let me open it up straightaway to any discussion that anyone wants to start. Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Stephane. I had a chance to quickly peruse your document you sent out. You are going to prepare it to present tomorrow. There's one point I would like to talk about, the general improvements, so if you'll just highlight these three points.

And at the end you say, okay, the potentials are more or less complete. So you remember we had a discussion about the iteration points of the new process, and from - that is not really fixed.

So I - if I'm not wrong there's something in the Bylaws saying that there will be - shall be a new process every three years or that period kind of thing. And it may be also in the hands of the Board, and we were talking about, okay, different use about that.

Sometimes it was said, "Okay, well maybe it - a new review not before the other one has been finished." I wonder whether this shouldn't be highlighted here in your presentation.

If not, call the Board - well to - may support - looking at this so that we have a - we're going to have a - an idea what is really - what is it really about? So I think we should know in the future really what we have to expect with regards to this iteration process. Thanks.

Stephane van Gelder: Very good point. Perhaps not include it in the slides but if I can remember, if my brain cells have kicked in, perhaps just mention it during the presentation tomorrow. How does that sound?

I mean, the question you're asking Wolf is are we supposed to start a review once again now that we, you know, we've come to the end of the cycle but we haven't really come to the end of the previous review yet.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The problem is the Bylaws say that a revision cycle should commence in three years.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes, well you can enlighten us as to whether we're supposed to start a new revision process now. I actually thought it in - pushed back to five years.

Man: That's correct. It's five years. What - the Structural Improvements Committee is actually looking at when the next overall review cycle starts up again, because it's not just an issue of the GNSO review, it's the review of all ICANN structures.

Back in Mexico City the timeframe went from three to five years, but even if you count by the years from when the Board approved the independent recommendations and the Board of Governance Committee, you would very quickly see that it's July of 2013.

So the - there are going to be further discussions about what is the appropriate trigger and when those timeframes occur. Some folks are advocating for a later in time period, but even if GNSO gets subject to something in 2013 it's not likely to be anywhere near as comprehensive as what you all just went through. It's likely to be a little bit more a pro forma but then again you can't predict.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just remind us when the previous recommendations were released.

Man: The Board approved most of the recommendations you recall in Paris in July of 2008, so five years would be July 2013. The question there is what does that mean, "commence the next review?"

Is that hire the - or identify the independent reviewer? Does that mean have them ready? These are all types of issues that the Structural Improvements

Committee's going to be talking about in the months to come, so it might not hurt to engage them.

I don't know whether they're going to be that focused for your report, you know, tomorrow. But, you know, having them engaged and having them be aware that you all are aware of those issues I think would be useful.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks. So I propose to just make a mention of that during the presentation tomorrow. I do agree with Wolf that it would be useful just to make sure that the Board is aware that this is something that we're looking at and probably losing a little bit of sleep over. Christina.

Christina Rodriguez: My question doesn't relate to the Board presentation itself so - but more just to the GNSO improvements. So if you'd rather I ask it later I'm happy to do that.

It's actually a question for Rob, and that is that a number of - several constituency and stakeholder group requests relating to kind of Web site support and the like that were put in for budget consideration was denied on the grounds that they're included in the toolkit. So what's the ETA on the rollout in that?

Rob Hull: You all recall the prior implementation report identified that there are a couple of outstanding issues in terms of being able to deliver the toolkit, and two of those areas were Web site support and organizational record keeping.

All - just all but two GNSO eligible entities submitted their checklists to us, and we'd certainly like to hear from the IPC and the ISPs as to what toolkit items they would like to have.

What we're planning is having a meeting with the IT team and representatives from each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups who

have asked for the support in an attempt to identify what the overall package will look like.

What our IT team folks have told us is they can't produce one off solutions, and so the discussion is to be what is the model for Web support? The term that our IT team is currently using is Web presence to look at it in a very comprehensive way.

A number of the groups have already accepted the confluence wiki tool, and they're using that as a means to provide information and circulate it. The broader picture is what does that whole Web presence look like?

Does it include a Web site sufficient for it to be a confluence wiki, which is tremendously more robust than the social tech system was. So the bottom line would be coming out of this meeting, if your individual communities can identify, you know, one or two people who would just sit in on some discussions about that, help us identify those.

We had set aside - not probably till tomorrow funds in the FY12 budget for that purpose, so that's probably what folks had communicated when they said, "Well it's already there."

It is there. It's just a matter of identifying precisely what that delivery would look like.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Rob. Just looking around the room for - Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: A different point if I may.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: This is in regards to the IRTP resolution and how we did it yesterday. So there was a follow up on a chat between Councilors as to how we got to that process.

And I also - I - also I know, you know, I trust, I mean, the ISP CP are not very well involved in this part of it because it's an inter Registrar function problem.

It may touch other of our Registrant Council, and as a Councilor I understand so that we had to talk about and had to move that forward. So I myself - I found it a little bit - not very comfortable in that process because when I went through all these motions, it was a very large motion, you know, and detailed motion.

I was also thinking for myself what is my position or what do - how shall I view that as a manager of the process? I can't deal with all these details, which I am in such a emotion in it.

So I wonder whether this - what do I bring to represent it to the Council or maybe we could find other ways in the future if such very detailed processes have to be set to - for - set out for implementation.

So it's just having discussions of how we should do it, because I - personally I didn't feel comfortable, maybe others as well so with that and I just could prove that I don't have anything against (Susie)'s motion but the way it was done seemed to me at the very end, because it started then to be amended and amended again that there must have been some problems with that until to the end and I couldn't mention anybody else.

Just I would like to start this discussion how we could deal with such motions in the future. Thanks.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Wolf. I'm glad you brought that up. It's obviously the elephant in the room and something that we need to talk about. I've got Marika and (Bill).

I - can I just say that just for the benefit of you all, I had a chat with Mikey this morning just on the discussions around this. Just to very quickly summarize, I think there's a feeling from the group and the volunteers that put in so much effort that the Council in part dismissed the effort that they had put in, which I don't think is true.

And I portrayed to Mikey the fact that I don't think there was any intent from the Council to do that, and that both groups were just trying to do their jobs and trying to work through this situation.

But just to make you aware of the fact that I think this kind of situation and misunderstanding shall we say also highlights in my mind just the amount of stress that we've all been under for so long with the new gTLDs, and other stuff that we've been having to cope with and just coming to the end of this process I think we're all just sometimes at our wits' end.

And when, you know, talking to Mikey this morning it was clear that although there was misunderstandings there was no ill feeling. So it's true that we did face a difficult situation and let's talk about it. Marika, Christina, Tim.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. You know, speaking on our RTP meeting as well, I think it's a more general discussion, because coming up with the motion itself literally translated the recommendations of the Working Group into a motion.

It was, you know, hard for putting in front the Council recommend so - and I think those two recommendations that actually were deferred to a later date, they had been in the report from the initial report onwards.

So we had numerous discussion at the Council level, two public comment periods, so I think - and I understand. I mean, the inter-Registrant/inter-Registrar transfer policy is very specific to Registrars.

So I do understand that it's not an issue of general concern, but I think what we do see not only in the IRTP Working Group but also in other Working Groups, that not all constituencies and stakeholder groups are represented, you know, often for very good reasons.

So my question would be how can we make sure because, you know, we give updates. We, you know, do workshops. How can we make sure that, you know, issues are raised with the Working Group at an earlier stage and not when the final report is done, because then we avoid indeed situations where a Working Group - Working Groups feel that the Council is changing their recommendation or disagreeing with them while, you know, in this case it's just deferring a decision.

But I do think it gave the impression on the discussions we're having on Sunday that so many people didn't like the recommendations, and I think people in the Working Group feel, "Well why didn't you tell us before, because these specific recommendations were already there from the initial report onward?"

So is there a way that Working Groups or Staff can communicate in a better way with, you know, maybe especially those groups are not directly involved through, you know, a stakeholder group or constituency representatives in certain efforts?

Is there a way we can do that better to, you know, avoid those kind of impressions?

Stephane van Gelder: Christina.

Christina Rodriguez: Marika said most of what I was going to say. I just almost think that we need to come up with almost - I hate to use early warning system, but in my mind that's kind of what it is.

And whether it's a kind of, you know, look, Council needs to understand this Working Group is, you know, three meetings away from finishing its initial report, but attendance hasn't been great or there's not wide representation or, you know, they've taken a particular interpretation of a document that we understand your stakeholder group may understand it currently or whatever, because what I really don't want to have happen is, you know, I had two choices.

I either did what I did or we sent it back to the Working Group, and I would really think that we would send something back to the Working Group as an option of last resort.

And so in order to ensure that it really does remain the option of last resort, I think we need to have, you know, earlier, clearer communication. And frankly, you know, the WIPO folks hadn't really picked up on what, you know, that specific issue.

So, you know, could that have been avoided? Theoretically possibly, but it's a practical matter now.

Tim Ruiz: But how can we make it clear...?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Right. We just want to get clarification.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes, but let's just let everybody talk and, I mean, I've got an extremely long list but...

Marika Konings: If I can just, I mean, you don't need to respond now but just to clarify, I mean, because I - as I said those recommendations were there in the initial report, proposed final report.

We presented on numerous occasions to the Council and also workshops without notices and announcements highlighting the recommendations, and if people have ideas what more specifically needs to be done I think that would be really helpful.

Stephane van Gelder: Yes, you made that point. Tim.

Tim Ruiz: What we need to do is perhaps to, I mean, you have this idea of the liaison but we don't have really anything formal around what the liaison's responsibility is except for, you know, if some issue gets raised by the Working Group that they want to get vetted at the Council level and vice versa.

That, you know, that there's some - I don't know if it's the Committee situation or whatever, but that there's some sort of assignment amongst - and maybe it is to the liaison, amongst the Council to monitor what's going on with the Working Groups.

But I guess I thought of that before but I thought of it more in light of making sure that as the Working Group gets going, that it's - it has sufficient representation, that participation is ongoing, et cetera, et cetera so we don't get to the end and find out that a bunch of us have problems because although they say there's consensus, only one stakeholder group actually participated in the PDP.

So I could see it from that point of view. From the other side, when work starts getting - the work product starts coming out of these Working Groups, again maybe there's something we can look at and we can do there.

But I think it's on all of us to spend time reviewing those for our stakeholder groups or whatever the stakeholder group arrangement is for monitoring those things, and making sure that they're aware of what's coming out.

I do think though that one of the problems at the Council level is that we - it seems to me that - and I'm not sure exactly how it started because it didn't seem like it was that way in the beginning when I first got on the Council, but a final report gets posted and then right away we have a motion and we're talking about it at the very next Council meeting.

And sometimes, I mean, there's this - a matter of, you know, less than weeks, eight, ten days between when the report gets posted, the motion's there and the Council's talking about it.

I think at least in this case with transfers the, you know, a motion was posted without any thought that it was actually going to be, you know, any vote on that at that very next meeting.

But perhaps what we need is a discussion first of the report, which is something we don't do. We - the report gets posted and we don't discuss it as a Council.

We just go straight to a motion and that's where our discussion happens. Maybe we need to make a point of discussion of the report prior to having a motion placed on the table.

Stephane van Gelder: So you tried to do that twice Tim only recently with the - both that one and the PEDNR. Maybe that's one thing that we can look at is the way that you've been putting motions forward just for discussion at one meeting, and then we come to vote at the next meeting. (Bill).

(Bill): What we have here is a failure to communicate and, you know, well two things. First on this particular point, what Tim just said is very sensible to me in terms of having a prior discussion around reports.

But more generally I don't know if everybody has - if there's enough collective discussion and mind share about how the respective roles work in the new architecture, and so you can get expectations built up, you know.

If there are people who believe that now with the Council's newly articulated role of the Work Groups, just kind of go off and do their thing and then we just, you know, rubber stamp, you know, I - to me there has to be a two-stage process and it has to be understood that it's a two-stage process.

I will say this from the idiosyncratic or self-interest with respect of the - of Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, we don't have the capacity to cover all the Working Groups.

We just don't have the people. We don't have the pro bono volunteers to be in all those groups, so at the end of the day when they come out with outputs and it comes to the Council level, that's the stage in which it's easier for our stakeholder group and its constituencies to begin to really hone in and sort of say, "Well wait a minute, you know, are we okay with everything?"

And that someone has to be understood with that - if it's being defined in the minds of the Working Group members as the Council as some sort of freestanding entity that's monkeying around post hoc with our stuff, that's I think the wrong perspective because the Council is the elected representative of the stakeholder groups.

It's the stakeholder groups that are trying to get a second look at this thing and, you know, make an assessment before we take action. So maybe there simply has to be a clearer mutual understanding of how the respective roles work.

Maybe we have to be more self-conscious in the way we approach the outputs that come from the Working Groups and talk about - because I don't

think - I don't remember us ever having conversations like, "Well we - should we be careful about this one or da da da da?"

I mean, we just do it, you know, and maybe there has to be more earlier communication, early warning, et cetera about where we are, et cetera for the people who aren't participating and who are fully informed, et cetera, et cetera.

So that's all - that's one point. The other point I wanted to make was on the general conduct of the Council meetings, I've argued this before and I'll argue it again I know on the real one.

I really wish we could somehow pace our workflow in such a way that when we come to public meetings of the Council, we weren't doing sort of detailed written instructions of long motions or a lot of process stuff, but we're rather focusing on some bigger ticket items that would be more likely to engage the community, because I just - every, you know, in the - I've only been here for 2-1/2 years but in the time that I've been around, it seems to me like the level of public participation in our Council meetings is just going down, down, down, down, down, down.

And when I talk to people and I listen, "Oh God, that was painful." You know, I mean, the way people talk about our open meetings is really not flattering, and I think that's a function of how we run them.

We run them as like this is just a regular Council meeting in the normal three week flow, and whatever is coming up at that time is what we're going to do, rather than sort of saying, "Can we structure the workflow in such a way that when we come to that point, some things have already been resolved that are kind of more procedural or micro level and we can do something a little bit more engaging." And so I just - I would like to keep that discussion open because I think it's important.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks. I think our Council meetings are painful for us now is - they're getting painful for us as well. I had - I won't name them but I had three Councilors come up to me at the start of the meeting yesterday and ask if we could not make it last till 6:30.

So, you know, when you go into the meeting that has taken a lot of preparation work to do and you have your own Councilors saying that they don't want to - they cannot face four hours of this discussion, and for good reason to be honest because towards the end I was ready to shoot myself.

I agree. I'm just not sure. We've discussed this before and I - honestly I don't know how to make it more interesting. I mean, we could make advances, you know, or something - but male and female obviously, but I just don't know how it could be done.

Can I just ask - Chuck you're next because Zahid has to go to - he has another engagement. Do you mind if he goes before you? Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you. Thanks a lot Chuck. Thanks a lot. First of all I think Tim's comment was actually very good. I think it does help. That does help us sort of get early warnings on ways to go back to our stakeholders/constituencies.

But I think the issue that I wanted to raise was this is more structural. We have a system that's not working in my mind at least. We're struggling because we don't have the manpower to man this wonderful, idealistic system that has Working Groups, which is imposed upon us by the Board.

So, you know, the ideal system would be there would be a Working Group, everything is seen by the constituency and by the time it comes to the Council we're all ready.

Everybody knows what this is all about, everyone's aware because they had their representation within those Working Teams or Working Groups. So I

think that we - I know this is not helpful but it really raises an issue of structure.

Does this structure work? Is it actually working for our constituencies and stakeholder groups? And I think that's something that needs to be sort of raised and we need to think about it, and maybe when this comes up for, you know, discussion again about the GNSO structure, maybe there's something that can be addressed. Thank you. Thanks for the...

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you Zahid. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephane. You know, we actually have a really - we, the GNSO, have a really good place to deal with the problem we're talking about right now, because we're in the stages of reviewing the PDP recommendations.

And I think that that's a really good place to deal with this issue of the final report, the motion, et cetera. One of the things that some of you heard me comment on in the PDP session on the weekend was - is that the way the document's worded right now, final reports have to be at least eight days before a Council meeting.

What could any of us do in eight days with the final report unless it's a one pager, and even that would probably be a problem? So what - all I'm suggesting is I think we have a situation right now where as we work with the Working Team that - to finalize the PDP revisions, that this all can be done in there and probably with not a lot of work, but we can put in some steps there leading up to a Council motion and a Council vote that would make this all more realistic.

I think we're always going to have a situation where there will be groups that just didn't find time to review, but you can only do so much. But I think that's a natural place to work on this problem, and I don't see it as a huge amount of time.

And I know Jeff doesn't want to hear more work on the working team, but it's an ideal time.

Second point is very minor, Stephane. That is in the motions itself, we have - historically we have not - we've used links and motions as well, just in that particular motion, all of that (checks) in there. Now for - that needs to be a part of the motion as far as the revised language, could've been linked.

And it - at least wouldn't look so intimidating. One last point is that with regard to consensus policy, especially you know, we're all going to have to be diligent because it's really important that if we're going to improve consensus policy that it's impacting contracted parties that we've done our due diligence. Thanks.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you very much Chuck. I have Alan next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Some of you may remember that in the report that came out a while ago on - I think it was communications and something related to that. The ALAC suggested that and to engage the community it may require one-on-one personalized outreach and not just sending things to email list.

But that doesn't help if people don't respond. You know, at that point they no longer have deniability that they didn't know about it but that still doesn't really change the response. And I found it interesting or disquieting - I'm not sure which - that in the discussion of new DRP, one of the issues raised was the working group model may not be sufficient to address such a complex subject.

And to be candid, I'm not sure the working group model is able to discuss almost any of our subjects because of the problems in participation and getting people to focus on the issues early on.

So I know we're stuck with it right now. We don't have anything else but we really have to start looking at is as how do we make working groups work? Because I don't believe they are right now and it's a significant problem.

And the last very quick comment, and I speak from personal scars this week, when workgroups formulate recommendations, they should formulate them using words recognizing they're going to have to be put into a motion. And I know PEDNR particularly put a - had at least one recommendation says the working group recommends and that implicitly means we have to reword it when the council recommends it.

And just a little thought at that time may save us some problems and (unintelligible) later on.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank Alan. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes, a couple recommendations. Would you like to say something? First of all, I think there was a more (Tim) said in terms of the job of the liaison and the liaison making sure that the council's constantly aware of what's going on in the working group, who - the fact that there's not proper representation in the working group, the fact that issues are being discussed without everyone being there.

And basically I think you have a place on most of your agendas where, on most of the working groups, the liaison or the chair, if it happens to be, you know, the same as the liaison, is basically asked by the council to report on it.

So I think that part of making working groups work is having that liaison role be a seriously taken job not just sort of somebody that's standing by there in case something goes wrong but really making sure that the working group is getting what it needs and sometimes that means that various constituencies aren't going.

In terms of the meetings - and this goes partly to the subjects - in either the good old days or the bad old days before the council had to start spending a lot of its time talking about reorganization, there actually used to be substantive reports of ongoing reports, not only done in the smaller meetings held on the weekends, but on issues that more community out- input was needed on and such.

Those discussions were actually held, you know, in the Wednesday meeting and there was discussion. So having a couple substantive topics actually discussed, and it's not that the council is now a legislative body bringing in legislation about the substance but rather, it's just making sure that the discussion of all the substance has gone beyond - be- has gone before the whole community so that in those meetings people actually get something that they can talk about, that they can actually think about.

So on the lot of these working groups where perhaps there isn't sufficient participation and there're really substantive issues that long before a final report, they actually come to the council and in the council meeting actually give some substantive time to it.

I think - I believe that working groups can work. I think we've seen various times when they have been working. I think it's way too early to give up on them and I really do believe that that liaison role is critical to making them work.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you Avri. So I have Jeff, Mary, Marika, (Margie), Wendy, (John), Christina and I'll put myself in the queue and Adrian. Anyone else? (Bill), Jonathan. This is good. This is good. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Well that's actually part of the problem is we spend a lot of time on the process and we never get to the substance. So we're going to spend this whole wrap up session talking about the problems but we have a whole

bunch of substantive issues we need to actually decide on what to do to go forward.

But I just - I want to address, you know, this kind of notion of, you know, the motion only gets there and we have such a short time. Most of the reports that have come to the council for a vote have not only had an initial report, but they have a proposed file report.

And then the council actually puts that out for comment. And then, only then after the comments are received and tweaks are - like small tweaks are made, that's when it comes up as a final, final report. And that's when it's voted.

So shame on me for the - my comment on the pick who is. I understand that. But I think this is not a structural issue. I don't believe that for a second. I believe this is our issue. I think this is our issue. It's on our stakeholder groups and our constituencies.

I think - I know the registries, at least, we have a full day meeting on constituency day and we delve into these issues in these reports in a lot of detail.

I've seen some other constituencies and stakeholder groups and they spend a lot of time talking about things that may need to be talked about but they're kind of high in the sky issues. You know, let's talk about AOC, let's talk about consumer trust, let's talk about, you know, lots of things of but they don't nail down as much as they used to in the past on the actual reports that go out for council.

I don't know if that means that stakeholder groups need longer meetings or meetings on two separate days to actually talk about the stuff that's before the council. I don't know the answer to that. I don't, again, don't believe it's a

structural issue at all. I believe it's our issue towards our stakeholder groups and constituencies and we need to find the time to talk about the substance.

We need to show up at our meetings. I know that, you know, I'm afraid right now because I know that our PDP final report's going to come to the council hopefully - knock on wood - you know, on the 21st of July. And I'm hoping not to see too many comments that we haven't seen before and we haven't addressed because that's been over two years worth of work.

Most of the stuff in that report is not new. And there're are going to be, I don't know, 50-something recommendations, something like that, that comes to the council and, you know, another point is that we got criticized in the past for just saying we approve a report without looking at the recommendations and nobody knew what that meant.

So when we sent our report to the board, the question by the board was, well, does that mean that the council supports all the recommendations? So we kind of went through this process now of voting on all the recommendations so we made it very clear to the board which of the recommendations we all supported that they needed to make a decision on.

So I think maybe the pendulum has swung back all the way the other way to including every word of the recommendation and the resolution but let's remember how we, you know, kind of how we go there in the first place. And then I'm trying to remember what my last point was and...

Man: Get to the substance Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Get to the substance, right. That's it I guess for now.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. Mary.

Mary Wong: Following from Jeff's point, Jeff I'm - I have no idea how every stakeholder group or constituency works. I know that in ours in the NCSG, we do very regular policy calls shortly before every council meeting where one regular item on the agenda is - discussion things before the council.

I say that not just for informational purposes but actually to kind of highlight a problem that - and this, (said) I guess agree somewhat with your characterization because the truth of the matter is that even with an initial report and public comment and summary and I don't know if there's a public comment and then a final report...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mary Wong: For both finalist one and then a final- yes. I have to say that, and maybe it's just me, it's hard to remember what happened. So even if I read everything that we're doing, when it comes time to it and certainly in our group there are some folks that are interesting in certain issues and when they participate on the calls, it is the responsibilities of counselors to follow and follow through.

And we kind of have to go back and study again just so we can get that update and then give a recommendation on how we think the position should be. And I just wanted to say it has to be done but it's hard. And I think that even if we don't call it a structural problem, it is a problem.

And it - Chuck's and (Tim)'s earlier suggestions are things that we want to follow to at least try to alleviate that problem. I think certainly for me, the discipline of having to prepare for a council discussion before the actual motion is formally proposed will force me to do my homework and I'll at least try and I'll at least try to bring that back to the group probably better than I have before.

So I'd like to suggest that we take up those suggestions and the suggestion of the liaison and see what happens. On a more general note, this picks up

on (Bill)'s point earlier, and I had a discussion with Chuck and others a couple of days ago, I hate to reopen issues but what is the purpose of an open council meeting at an ICANN meeting?

I know that sounds kind of weird but - and I'm not asking it sort of rhetorically or joking. I'd understand - I understand what the - I understand the process is - you know, we do want to involve the community and get participation and be informative and have a two-way channel and allow for the face-to-face feedback. I fully support that.

But if we want to take that seriously then there're a couple of things I think we need to do. First, between our weekend working sessions and the Wednesday meeting, that maybe we need to do a better job of telling people, like what happened at ROTP, that that has been happening behind the scenes.

We don't have to go through a blow by blow of how many edits were changed but speaking beyond the Mikey issue, there might just be people sitting on going, "What the heck's going on? I popped in on Saturday and I don't really know what's going on."

I think we do need to have something very specific that says this is continuing. And secondly, then going to the point of how we conduct the meetings, we might want to think about seriously running them as a different kind of meeting and the particular motions or issues are not (taxing) then those do not get discussed at a face-to-face meeting but be put off until the next call.

Stephane van Gelder: Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Following on from some of the earlier comments, I mean, (John) noted that now is the right time to come on the PDP working report but I would've thought that the right time would've been the initial report and the

proposed final report and as Jeff said, you know, if we have to go back again, I'm sure we'll lose even more volunteers on that work team.

And that's one where we actually went back several times to the council saying we don't have sufficient participation. We are with a small group of people. There are several stakeholder groups or constituencies that are absent so - and that didn't result in any changes.

Also to point out I think working groups face the same problem with getting a constituency and stakeholder group statements. That's one of the initial steps in any working group and on many of the recent working groups, there are only some constituencies or stakeholder groups that actually provided input.

So I think for working groups it's very hard to get a sense of, especially those that don't have representatives of a group, what certain stakeholder groups might care about or which issues they consider crucial or important.

Building on the liaison idea, and I would actually say - suggest to different constituency and stakeholder groups, even if you don't have an interest in the issue, you might want to consider appointing maybe you don't call it a liaison but maybe you call them the observer, someone within your stakeholder group or constituency that just is on the mailing list.

So indeed, if there is discussion on items which you might not have expected in the context of a certain initiative, there is someone that rings the bell and tells your constituency, hey, this group suddenly has started talked about this issue. Should we do something about it or do we want to talk about it?

And coming to Jeff's point as well on, you know, substantive discussion here at ICANN and at stakeholder groups, their constituency day, you know, policy staff is available. You know, we went to the registrars to talk to them about, you know, what's up with I think EDRP, the IRTP and post-expiration, to give them an insight on what's going on.

I know - you know, I think the registries appoint the people or that serve on the working groups to give those kinds of updates. But we don't receive any requests from other groups. I don't know - that doesn't necessarily mean that they don't discuss it but I just want to know that, you know, we are available and if there indeed is a need or also outside of ICANN meetings, you know, to have someone - of us on the call to just give a quick update on where a certain working group stands, which kind of recommendations they're considering.

You know, we're more than happy to do that. You know, anything we can do to make sure that an issue or a recommendation is socialized before the council has to decide on it, you know, before the final report is issued. I think we're there to assist in the process.

Stephane van Gelder: (Margie).

(Margie): I think a lot of people said what I was going to say. On the topic of - so I'll switch topics - on the topic of making the council meeting more interesting in the open session, perhaps we do the open mike right away because if you remember by - when we did that yesterday, it was very late in the day.

There was hardly anyone left in the room and, you know, and we basically got very little public, you know, comment at all so it was just a suggestion that maybe, you know, start off with the discussion then.

Stephane van Gelder: That's very good actually. Thanks for that. Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Yes, just too quick points. One is on efficiency, wouldn't it be great if we could deem things read when they were circulated among the list rather than have them read out again in the council meeting or read through in Power Point version?

Stephane van Gelder: Can I just address that. That's something that we've heard. We've been back and forth on that topic. The reason we read out the motions and stuff is so that people that are listening in on the audio or listening in after the meeting can actually get the text that's been talked about, if that's what you meant?

Wendy Seltzer: That isn't what I meant.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay, sorry.

Wendy Seltzer: I meant the reports - the Power Points explaining the reports. We need higher level abstraction. These are the three critical issues rather than this is the 15 issues discussed. And I - we need to trust that the council members can read the documents and if we can't read all the documents, then we need some other way of doing our work.

The other point on the calendaring of the various public comment periods, I wonder if there is a way we can work with staff to get a calendar or maybe it exists and I don't know about it, calendar of what - of perspective comment periods of various forms.

I know there's the ICANN issues out for public comment. Is there a place where we can also include the working groups seeking public comment, seeking constituency input so that on our monthly constituency calls we can say, "These are the five issues that are going - that are out for comment. Let's make sure that we've put in comments on the ones that re important to us."

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks. Adrian wanted to come back to - just on one point that you made, Wendy, or that I made. I don't know. But you had a specific come back? I've got you in the queue for later so if you just want to come back on that point and then.

Adrian Kinderis: Well, while I'm at it, I'll just in on Wendy's. I think it would be great to see a visual consolidated timeline of comment periods somewhere. Does that exist Marika, I see...?

Marika Konings: I think that's something that staff is working on as part of the AOC - or the AETRT recommendations and don't remember what the (amount) that they were going to publish that sometime next month. The list of public comment period's coming up.

Man: By the...

Marika Konings: But that isn't a (worry about) the conference at all. But, of course, sometimes it's hard to predict, you know, timing so it's - I think the issue's at least from what I've added to that, it's like, well this comes at some point. That does give an indication.

Adrian Kinderis: Sure.

Marika Konings: So that should be coming.

Adrian Kinderis: Stephane, just with respect to your comment on the reading out of motions, I don't find that - where is that coming from? Is someone going to be reviewing it later once they have the motion there? Because I assume you mean by reviewing it later they're going to be on the Inter Web machine? And if they are, the motions are available on the aforementioned machine. So why would they need to have it orally if they could have it visually?

Stephane van Gelder: What's the Inter Web machine?

Adrian Kinderis: I'll explain it - I'll draw you a picture later.

Stephane van Gelder: Okay. No, the idea is that if people are listening in - and it's for people listening into the MP3 later but also, which in that case they may have that - the ability to go online and read the motion at the same time.

But also for people listening in live. Don't forget that that is now possible, has been possible for a year. I know that in that case it's extremely useful to have the context because if we just say, "We're voting on Motion 1. Go to the Wiki and look at the motion. You're listening in," then it would...

Adrian Kinderis: Well I - that's great in principle. I'd like to challenge that because I do not believe that that's a reasonable understanding. Now we got there because of that but is that still the way it is? If we stopped it tomorrow would we get an influx of people that say, "This is absolutely inappropriate. I cannot do it."

And then if we did, then great. We could turn around and go back again but from my point of view, you know, I'd like to see part of these open sessions - and the reason I wrote some of those thoughts up there were that the public meetings are also a little bit of a sales pitch, right?

So what the council does and everything (in line), tries to get involved and it tries to get people going. The more boring we make it, the harder it's going to be for us to get any public participation. Is there any way we can truncate some of that - some of the unnecessary, you know, non-vital wording or whatever, phraseology but go on? Then that'd be - you know, I think then official.

And then we can - and I'll save my other spot in the line for talking about some other proactive ways we could use that time, but that's just the way my marketing brain works, so.

Stephane van Gelder: The - I mean, the point you make, just to address that, to- yesterday's meeting - I know I've said that already - but yesterday's meeting was very specific in terms of timeline. We were going into that me- I mean, it was a

long open council meeting. They are important but we just had a meeting two weeks ago.

It was a horrible timeline to work to. It was a hell of a job putting an agenda together for that meeting and actually that's one of the points that I wanted to make when I was - when I had myself down in the queue was that when I - when the council leader team - leadership team puts out an agenda, please look at it and comment.

We put it out to you so that you can come back. I mean, it's not only three people doing these things or it shouldn't be and sometimes I can tell you that we do feel slightly isolated working on the preparation for these meetings. It's a hell of a job. It's our job to do it.

We're happy to do it but at times, you know, yesterday's meeting was hell to put together as an agenda. And I actually went to (Tim) and asked him if he'd lead the motions and I'll be honest with you, I was hoping he'd say yes because I needed some time filling because that agenda was difficult to put together.

We just had a meeting two weeks before. So we're trying to address some of these things. You've seen us trying to address the prioritization issue, trying to present the issues that we're dealing with in a regular agenda item, trying to - I'm also trying to apply my other normal day job experience to this and trying to highlight for example the stuff that we've done on the pending projects list so that that's clear for people but your help, all of you, to us in doing this is invaluable.

Adrian Kinderis: And can I just respond? Yes, I just wanted to - absolutely just yes, exactly what I was about to say. I absolutely want you to under- he said he didn't like you and never did.

But - no, he said we're not personally attacking you guys and I just wanted to make sure that that was absolutely not part of what I was saying here. I understand you worked your butt off to get the agenda together and it's not necessarily that the agenda - although, you know, I'd certainly volunteer, Stephane, to work with you on, you know, jazzing up the public meeting if that's - especially the next one's going to be my last.

So maybe that can be my legacy. I'll put a bit of my Adrian (je ne sais pe qua). I don't know what that means but I will put that to it. So I'm happy to do that, work with you between and then and I've got some ideas about how we can visually portray some information, what we've been working on, what's coming up, and really try to, you know, promote the fact that the council is working, we can do public participation and support, yada, yada, yada, so I'll shut up now but thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: Thank you very much Adrian. (John) next.

(John): Thank you. An unintended direct segue. I totally agree with Adrian's points on the need to redesign the meeting. And in fact, my point is that I'm not - I'm neither a lawyer nor a technologist which in some respects makes me an outlier on this council.

But I do focus my work on communications and how to effectively advocate for ideas, issues to organizations and I think perhaps I might be of some help in this regard.

And so I will offer to work with the staff on the design of our meetings. Not the substance of it but the design of it, right.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(John): I mean as...

Stephane van Gelder: (Unintelligible) with us, (John), no.

(John): What's that?

Stephane van Gelder: The staff have so much things to do (around here).

((Crosstalk))

(John): Well, whoever is responsible for deciding that we should maintain the 1950s, you know, Moscow type approach and pace. But as I look at it, we offer progress reports. We vote on actions that have reached - that are ripe. And then we seek public participation.

And there are ways, I think, that we can design our meetings so as to increase the level of energy in all three but particularly public participation. And so I would be willing to do that.

From a substantive perspective, I realize that something can always be improved but I don't want the perfect to be the enemy of the good. In terms of the working groups, the working group guidelines do offer a lot more control over some of these difficulties.

I reviewed them again yesterday when the subject - when Mikey came up. It's really kind of striking. The first time I met Mikey I thought how can a guy called Mikey have such an essential role in the organization? But he does.

And I hope that he chooses not to leave. I mean, you know, really. But, you know, the working group guidelines provide significant responsibility and authority to the chair.

The liaison is a - is not mandatory. And in fact, if we made it mandatory, I think it would - I don't know that it would be any more effective. But there are aspects of the working group guidelines that perhaps we can accentuate. We

don't have to create anything new. We just have to perhaps ask that they be followed more sinuously.

But if you accept my invitation to participate in the design of the meetings, then cool.

Stephane van Gelder: We welcome it. So I have Christina, taking myself out, Adrian, taking you out of the queue unless you had some other points you wanted to make.

Adrian Kinderis: It's just - can - I'm...

Stephane van Gelder: No, no. I'm not - don't speak now. I'm just asking, do you want to stay in the queue?

Adrian Kinderis: Well I won't have to if I can respond to (John) and then I'm out. So here it is. Ready? Why don't we just do a working group, right, and we'll - like an informal little thing. John and I - I'm happy with - me, (John) and Stephane, the three of us come together on this, anyone else who wants to join and take care of it. That's all. (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay good. (It's yours).

Stephane van Gelder: So Christina, (Bill), Jonathan, Jeff, Zahid, Alan. Anyone else, did I miss? And Wolf and then we'll try and cut the queue up there to try and talk about other stuff in the remaining five minutes. Christina.

Christina Rodriguez: Sure, first I guess one of the things I'm struggling with, with this working group, is we've really created kind of - and very inherent but important tension I think, because on the one hand we're saying that anyone who wants to can participate and they don't.

They are not participating as a representative of their stakeholder group or constituency and what they say is not the position of the stakeholder group and constituency. But on the other hand, we're really waiting until the end of the process where they've done all their work to say, okay constituencies and stakeholder groups, now is the time for you to input.

And I'll tell you that, you know, the IPC leadership is going to be taking a very long hard look at how it deals with working groups because, you know, we were all totally blindsided by some of - not the recommendations - but some of the points of agreement within the working group.

We then went back to some of the people who had identified themselves as IPC, one of which we'd never heard of, and said did you guys really agree to this and they were like well no.

So I think we really are going, you know - personally as a constituency, we're going to have to look at that. And I think we really need to get this problem right, because what I don't want to have us do is end up in a situation where we're saying okay, we can only do six working groups at a time and only two of them can be policy and four of them can be implementation, because that is us vulnerable (unintelligible).

But I can see us heading in that direction unless we can kind of figure out how to end up at a situation that when we get the report and when we've considered it and discussed it - and I think Tim's idea is great. That we're in a position to actually say, okay thumbs up we're all good.

Two other things really quickly. I love the idea of open mic first. Bar public meetings, I think we need to stop trying to - we should never have something on the agenda because we're trying to fill the time and personally, I would much rather that we start trying to aim for a shorter public meeting because I am firmly of the view that once this whole new GTLD thing happens and you

have new registry operators, this whole ten day let's travel to somewhere that takes a day and a half to get to is going to end.

And I think that having to be much more efficient and the soon we can start about it, I think the better off we're going to be. That's it.

Man: It's going to end?

Christina Rodriguez: I just think maybe it'll be four days in a, you know, airline hub or somewhere like that.

Man: Okay. I was just going to tell John that if, you know, you feel like, you know, you're an (unintelligible), I think I must be off charts. (Unintelligible) diversity here in terms of backgrounds.

And that actually goes to part of the problem with how I view both the question of the relationship between the council and the working groups breed and how we do the public meetings, but (unintelligible).

Mary said, you know, what is the purpose? And I really - and again I know I'm probably completely a minority on this, but I'll say it anyway. I view the public meeting - well, what I wish the public meeting was, was an opportunity to outreach to the community, to give them a three times a year update and kind of macro level assessment of what the council and the GNSO community have been doing.

We tend to treat these meetings as just another meeting in the workflow and we cover the same kinds of things that we do on teleconferences and that's just not very scintillating to people and we - and it's not just a question of people get bored and walk away. We're missing a fundamental opportunity to engage people in the community and inform them about what we're doing, people who are not down deep in the trenches of GNSO work and I think that's really problematic.

And I know, particularly from - again (unintelligible) the lens of NC, but I mean, you know, there's just so much going on that people can't process and I wish, for example - take a concrete example. Yesterday, we had lots of discussions referring to the jazz, you know, but probably there are people who have not had time to actually track what's going on in the jazz.

I bet you a lot of our members don't really understand what the whole jazz thing was about. I wish instead of sort of simply referring to it, we had had some - had used the time to sort of say, this is fundamentally what this is about and this is the key issues that the council has been struggling with in a kind of more coherent way.

Mary said, can't we hold - maybe we could hold nonessential motions to the next meeting. I mean, I would think why not. Why - you know, just because it's percolated to a certain point, do we have to necessarily use that session to pick up whatever the last bit - the last part of the train - I think that's been going on for a while, rather than saying let's repurpose this meeting as something of a kind of broader education of the community in an effort to try and promote engagements.

So I would really like to revision personally the way that that whole thing is done.

And as far as the working group issue, again I just think that while everybody feels that, you know - we went through this whole improvements process and we sorted this out and we've come to a new model. It just seems obvious to me that not everybody's completely on the same page as to their understanding how that model works.

And I know that from my standpoint, you know, it would certainly help if the council were to take up reports, you know, more fully in advance, etc., etc., but there's more to the matter. I mean, people just have to get engaged and

work more. It's not going to - you know, for contracted parties, this is your business okay. You can allocate the people or whatever, but we're never going to be in a position to do it the same way that you do. We're just not.

I think users are just not in that position so we have to calibrate this flow in a way that deal with that and recognize that when it comes to the council that's the time the stakeholder group (unintelligible) surfaced and they're now able to really focus on it (unintelligible) and that - the way that works is going to have to be understood better between the working groups and the council.

Man: Thanks. Jonathan, (unintelligible) we have, I think, talked about this subject for a sufficient amount of time. Please make it very short because there are some others subjects that some people want to talk about and we've got 15 minutes.

Man: I'll try to be as brief and distinct as possible Stefan. Personally, I could carry on a little longer, but I realize others may have scheduling issues.

TWG is a company I'd love to touch on before we close this meeting. I think, everything I hear about this public meeting seems to be driven towards making tasks more (unintelligible) so hopefully it can get there. I personally, I spoke to - I raised it with one or more people last night.

I mean, I think the purpose and style of this public meeting, I really like what I'm hearing. I almost think one could do a throw it out and start again, say what's the purpose and work through it, but I like what I'm hearing. The fact that there's a real willingness to try and do something.

I personally experienced quite a lot of repetition over the last four or five days something that I realize this is not a commercial environment, there are some reasons for doing some repetition, but nevertheless by the time I've been through the weekend sessions, the stakeholder group sessions and the public meeting session, I've seen the same topic discussion in more or less

the same way three times. It indulges us in a way that we wouldn't in our commercial organization. So we do have to try and fix that a little.

I just on the whole issue around working groups, I heard a lot of effort put into trying to make sure that working group, the integrity of the working group, recommendations were carried through to the council. So I think, I just want to go on record as saying, we tried to respect that (unintelligible) as a council. I think we've done a pretty good job of trying to do that.

And I've heard very practical suggestions through this discussion from Tim on time, I think from every liaison which was backed up a little by Marika and developed and from Wendy on her summary of critical points, which links into the whole style of the meeting. So thanks for giving me the chance to make some input in (unintelligible).

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Jonathan. Zahid generously offered up his slot. So Zahid did you want to come back in? And then Alan and Wolf.

Man: After Chris Disspain's little presentation on the farewell for Peter Dengate Thrush, I'm really concerned about what the (unintelligible) are going to come up as jazzing it up in the ICANN meeting, but I'll be joining you in that (unintelligible) thank you.

Yes I think it's a good idea having some of (unintelligible) to what we're actually doing in the public meeting. It would be a fantastic idea. It gives people who are there for the first time an idea of what do we mean by the IRTP. Each and every resolution that is being passed, what does it practically mean to a user or registrant. That may be very useful.

So maybe it's an idea on Wednesday to actually have sort of a public (unintelligible) and maybe do the work on Saturday and Sunday and I think that's Alan - Alan made that point as well.

But I also think the point that Stefan made that a lot goes on during the reading of the resolutions and I think we're all organizing ourselves. I know that I am and many other people who are on the council do that as well.

Speaking to the thread on working group and council, I like the idea that Christina mentioned, which is there's only so bandwidth that any constituency around the global has in putting people into working groups. We need to sort of say, okay if this is the (unintelligible) policy, how many working groups do we have working at the same time. We cannot have unlimited numbers because we don't have unlimited bodies to fill those and that would be something I think we should all look at. Thanks.

Man: Thanks and if you look at what Adrian's doing now, I don't think you have anything to worry about.

Stephane van Gelder: He's new still. We'll see what happens when he gets to a PowerPoint presentation with music maybe. (Alec)?

(Alec): Three quick points. Christina correctly pointed out that in general people aren't not on working groups representing their constituencies or stakeholder groups, but that doesn't prevent them from actually going back and getting confirmation and being able to on any given point represent - to present some consolidated views and some people do that on some regular basis.

And if people would do that at a critical time, it might help speed things up.

On a positive note, with the exception of I think with the exception of cross-working groups, we are almost finished process. We may actually be able to go back and focus more stakeholder and constituency time on policy and in fact meeting time on policy and maybe that will make life a little bit easier.

And lastly, I'll remind people that we used to have council meeting in the morning. It was an (unintelligible) time to start at 8:00 in the morning, but in

terms of participation, there was no one there when we started and by the end we had a good turnout. Now we do it in the afternoon, people are there after lunch and by 4:00 and 5:00 and 6:00 they just drift off.

And so, you know, to some extent we put it upon ourselves by switching from the morning to the afternoon but, you know, we've got to pick one or the other.

Man: Yes.

Man: I'm just more comfortable with starting at 2:00 p.m. and not having anyone in the room, but that's my personal view. To get me to get up at 8:00 in the morning and I'll probably not be very effective.

Man: But the result is by 6:30 there's no one there, which probably...

Man: Christina's point of the meetings just been too long maybe. I mean, for us concentrating for four and a half hours - for me anyway. Yesterday honestly I was - I know that my ability to concentrate for a long time isn't very good, but that was just...

Man: After five heavy days and several heavy nights, yes.

Man: Yes, yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible). Thank you. (Unintelligible) with regards to making the conference more attractive and (unintelligible) discussed here to take more out on that so I only just would like to refer this point to all of this group. We have a (unintelligible) group here (unintelligible) outreach efforts and they should come back really.

So I don't expect if you just (unintelligible), improve and don't take measures about it that somebody's going to - that something's going to happen. (Unintelligible) and we are also discussing in our constituency, how to joint this group here that this could be done in an effective way. Thank you.

Stephane van Gelder: (Unintelligible) you had one more point that you wanted to make and then Jeff.

Man: Why do we have a specific timeframe for public meeting?

Man: You mean why do we have four and a half hours set aside for it? Because there's - I mean, we're not the only ones to have a lot of planning work to do. Going up to these meetings takes a lot of planning for the planning meeting staff and the slots have to be identified ahead of time, usually 15 days before the meeting, although we tend to, you know, blow into that deadline.

So it's just everything. We're not the only ones that are having to get organized.

Man: Okay but if we wanted to shorten to three hours...

Man: Oh yes we can ask that ahead of time. I mean, all the input that we've had today is very helpful. We've possibly got a small time that's going to come together and look at these things and that's great. And if we think that it should be three hours instead - if your question is, did we ask for four and half hours for this one, no we didn't.

The slot we were given was four and a half hours and to be honest, with all the preparation work that was going on, I just didn't have time to react to that and maybe I should have done it, but I just didn't.

Stephane van Gelder: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes in the couple of minutes we have left, there's a bunch of things that we have on our plate that I'm a little bit worried about. We have a July meeting on the 21st and then we don't have any in August and I don't think we pick up until September, mid-September.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Well at some point in September, maybe it's early, maybe it's mid, but the Board has given us a couple of things that we need to do. One is we need to wrap up the jazz working group, have a final report on everything to staff in time for them to do an implementation plan all for the Board's approval and (unintelligible).

That's no time, right. So we need to kind of figure out a way and (unintelligible) to work backwards to figure out when everything needs - a final report needs to be to us that we consider, get feedback on, vote on and then get that to the staff, which means the jazz working group needs to get us that stuff within a certain period of time. It's a very, very, very quick amount of time.

And that kind of worries me with the Board's resolution as to how little time we actually have for that.

The other thing that's within the Board's resolution was to discuss whether to revisit the reserve names for new CLDs with the possible addition of the Red Cross marks and the Olympic marks to block as a second level.

We can take that up. We don't have to take that up. It's a choice, but if we do it's got to be pretty soon and so we need to know from the council as to whether this is something that councils want to actually take up or not.

And then there's a whole bunch of work that's come out of the transfers resolution that we just passed, including one - at least there's a one issue

report and a bunch of things that staff needs to come back on. So there's a lot going on.

Yes so we have a September 8 meeting and then an October 6 meeting and then (unintelligible) so there's not much time to do all of this stuff. And I would think that - and I would like - and I will ask you all. I know we don't have a scheduled August meeting.

I don't want to do a council meeting, but if it's perhaps a possibility to maybe do (unintelligible) - if it's possible to do sometime - I know August everybody's off and I'm sorry, but if it's possible to do a special jazz working group GNSO call either in July or August just to give us more of an update and help us get through our processes so that we're not a roadblock for you all, I think that's what I'd make a recommendation for.

Stephane van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay just to clarify to understand that. You want a GNSO council and jazz working group call in July or August?

Jeff Neuman: I think we need to figure out a time on working backwards when we need to deliver to staff the final, you know, the final report so they can write an implementation plan to present to the Board to vote on in De Carr. So we need to kind of do a milestone, working backwards.

I just don't know where in the process that would be...

Man: Jeff, isn't that the group's job?

Jeff Neuman: What's that?

Man: Isn't that the jazz working group's job...

Jeff Neuman: No, we have to let the jazz working group know when we need a report back so that we can, as a group, discuss it. So it's our job to tell the jazz group you're our community, you get us back the final report by this date.

Man: Okay so we can have - I need to ask working group members what's a good date and time for us.

Man: For a call?

Man: Hang on...

Man: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I may be wrong, but my understanding was that the Board said the jazz working group has to have a report for consideration in De Carr and the implementation would follow prior - and the implementation has to be complete prior to the start of applications, I believe.

Jeff Neuman: Look at the document Alan and I copied word-for-word what was in the resolution, so it's the staff needs an implantation plan to present to the Board in De Carr so that they can approve it and launch the program. Because remember, January's when applications for renewed GTLDs are going to be accepted.

The only way - you've got to give some notice in advance. So I just read through the actual resolution.

Stephane van Gelder: If you look at the document I sent, I did a copy and paste. Anyone else on this, the jazz? Okay Jonathan you wanted to talk about community working groups. We have ten minutes lefts.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Stefan. I just thought I would put out, there's been quite a lot of discussion over the past few days and I thought it might be helpful to

essentially put out to you the way forward - how we'll develop this going forward over the next while.

I thought it was an excellent and thorough discussion yesterday and I did try to capture a lot of it in writing while we were talking.

It seems to me and I'm looking for your feedback and guidance on this because we're going to have to try and make some progress on it. It seems to me what we've got is a GNSO discussion group that's working. We should perhaps consider that being open and I think that's what I think I've been hearing to some form of liaison or participation from others around other SOs and ACs.

I propose to seek assistance from staff with some of the admin organization and drafting around this document and I guess we'll set up a series - it is likely we'll go into a series of calls to start to make some progress on these conference calls.

The first thing for me really is to make sure we've got our objectives and scope of what we try to achieve set up clearly and then importantly, output we hope to get from this drafting group and ideally some key (unintelligible) timing.

So that's the way I see it in a nutshell going forward and I'd welcome any comment, not really about structured progress, how we make progress rather than reopening the discussion of yesterday because I think we've got time to talk about that. So that's where I'm looking for comment for feedback.

Man: Any comment or feedback? Margie?

Margie Milam: Yes, I just wanted to let you know I'll help you with that effort so if you need staff support let me know.

Man: (Jaime)?

(Jaime): I think it's critical to decide if we will proceed opening or inviting other SOs and ACs or if it will be - if we will be proceeding as a GNSO only working group.

Man: I just responded. It is my intention to invite external participation and that's what I'm looking for you to say yes or no on in effect.

Stephane van Gelder: Adrian?

Adrian Kinderis: Off topic. Just to let you know that this was my last (unintelligible) position ever.

Woman: And mine.

Man: And Christina's. So in my official capacity...

Man: But it's not finished yet so...

Man: (Unintelligible) for me. I'm leaving.

Man: Stay and we'll have drum rolls and...

Man: There will be others providing ice cream and water. Now that I've set this precedent (unintelligible) I'm looking at you.

Stephane van Gelder: Well Adrian if you have to leave and considering it's two minutes past the hour, perhaps this is a good time to just thank both of you. I may be missing - is anyone else (unintelligible) any other (unintelligible) councilors I may have missed. Zahid?

Thank you.

Man: You don't know what's going to happen (unintelligible).

Stephane van Gelder: Okay well. Those four seem certain.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Stephane van Gelder: Okay no I'm doing (unintelligible). I just want to at least get that in, but just to say thanks to you all and on a personal note, Adrian and Tim, it has been an honor and an pleasure to be schooled by both of you.

Who was it? Christina, sorry.

Christina Rodriguez: I hate to even say it, but I'm going to say it because it was driving me crazy yesterday. I am not even sure if we've actually decided that we need a new process for cross-commuting working groups and that we want to do them.

And it just seems like this whole thing is taking on a life of its own. We kind of had the (unintelligible) thing, but (unintelligible) has been clear that they're not going to be participating so we're really only talking about the (A Wax), the ccNSO and the (Asac). (Asac) I think is unlikely to happen.

And it just seems to me that if we say, okay we're going to open up this whole drafting team, the people from other SOs and ACs, then effectively have made the decision that yes we think we need to have new processes for these and the like and I'm just not entirely comfortable with doing that.

Man: Okay maybe (unintelligible) which just shows how tired I am.

Man: I don't mind. Anyway, so I think it's interesting what Christina brought up and what (Jaime) brought up. I think getting some input from the different SO and AC if we are talking about this is definitely important.

But I guess two things. One, I do think in the future, you know, you made your point about that now the (unintelligible) thing is done, less people might be coming and less issues, but I don't - I think in the future we're still going to have these working groups and it's probably good to have a set of principles that the GNSO can sort of somewhat hold to and those who are participating in those working groups from the GNSO can sort of conduct themselves with, you know, a set of principles.

And on that I think in terms of what we are working on probably we should focus on what the GNSO or the GNSO - those who are representing the GNSO side of things in these working groups, we should probably have a set of principles of how, you know, of how things are - you know, how we want them to conduct and how things should be conducted and what messages we would bring there.

And the other thing is that from I guess from experience with participating in some of these working groups is that the perception - you know, I guess the perspective of how processes work, you know, and what constitutes policy, what constitutes implementation - - (unintelligible) we are also have a problem with that.

But it's very different between the GNSO's view and the ccNSO's view and the (Alax) view and obviously the GAC's view. And I think we need to be sensitive to those, but we have to, you know, - we need our own guidelines, you know, going in.

And we might not be able to enforce those same guidelines to all those, you know, other groups that are participating in these cross-working groups. So we might - what I'm really saying is that we might need a set of principles or guidelines for GNSO representatives and if we are eventually going to these cross-working groups consistently, we might have to have some process that's, you know, a (unintelligible) process as well.

But regardless, the GNSO side of things principle I think would be a useful, you know, useful piece of work.

Man: Thanks (unintelligible) we have to end the meeting. Thanks.

Tim Ruiz: I think Christina makes a very good point and I may or may not have it completely correct, but I think we've just started proceeding with community working groups. I mean, there's nothing in the bylaws, it's never been established. You know, we just started using them, but the council itself has never really formally said whether or not, we're going to continue with that work.

I mean, we just assumed that we're going to by starting the work that we did with the - with Jonathan. But, you know, I think it's a good question and maybe that's something that we should consider as a council. You know, is that something we want to formalize I some fashion.

Man: Thanks Tim. So Liz you just had a staff announcement.

Liz Gasster: Just a very short announcement. I'd like to welcome a new policy director to the policy team. It's (Brian Peck) who was previously with the registrar liaison team.

For those of you who don't know (Brian), he's here in the room today so I hope you'll all welcome him and offer him your support. Thank you.

Oh and I should note also that we only have about 25% of his time initial and we'll be - he'll be migrating his old responsibilities and picking up new responsibilities on a gradual basis so we won't inundate him right away.

Thanks.

That's right, that's right, 250.

Man: Thanks Liz. Thanks to everybody for your hard work this week. It's been once again a pleasure to work with you all. Thanks for your participation, effort, patience and just generally good humor. And just to end on a good note, Mary is kicking me underneath the table because she's been expecting money from some people so you just work that out with her and safe travel home everybody and see you next time. Thanks.

Woman: I'll hang out here for a few minutes and I'll also be in the public forum for as long as that lasts and if you don't find me here, you can find me there. Thank you.

Man: And a lot of thanks to you Stefan and the vice-chairs as well. Thank you very much. And thanks to Mary.

END