

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting  
GNSO Wrap Up session  
Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2013**

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/#nov>

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

Attendance:

Chuck Gomes

Ching Chiao

Jonathan Robinson

James Bladel

Thomas Rickert

Volker Greimann

Gabriela Szlak

John Berard

Brain Winterfelt

Petter Rindworth

Oswaldo Novoa

Patrick Myles

Miket O'Connor

Maria Farrell

Amr Elsadr

David Cake

Magaly Pazello

Klaus Stoll

Avro Doria

Jennifer Wolfe

Staff:

David Olive, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund, Rob Hoggarth, Mary Wong, Berry Cobb, Glen de St Gery, Steve Sheng

Man: Thank you. This is, once again, for the purposes of the transcript, this is Thursday, November 21 at 10:30 am. And for the transcript this is the GNSO Wrap-Up meeting in Retiro B. That's - Retiro B, GNSO Wrap-Up meeting, Thursday, November 21. And they should be getting started probably in about two or three minutes would be my guess.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, everyone. Welcome. We'll start in about one minute. Good morning, everyone. Welcome to what is normally our last session - our last formal session of the meeting. Have we got the recording running? Thank you.

So welcome to the GNSO Council Wrap-Up meeting Thursday morning, 10:35. Pulled together a little agenda here. And I think what I'm going to do is give you a walk through it first so you can see what it looks like, see if we're missing anything and get a flavor for what we're going to try and cover and then just make sure if you think we've missed anything substantial on here it'd be great if you could flag that.

Like I say, normally this would be our last session of the meeting but of course we've got the special session tomorrow so we'll be running that during the course of the day tomorrow and tomorrow evening.

So I'm going to just take a quick whistle stop tour through what this agenda looks like. I've got two slides with key topics on them, another one with action items that came out of the weekend and other sessions and then a final one with some administrative topics on.

So what I was thinking we might talk about is any feedback on the meeting format and organization. And I've put two of the new items but we could cover any issues under that to do with meeting format and organization here at the meeting.

I think we're still due to give input to a couple of groups potentially, ATRT2 and EWG so it may be that we want to highlight one or more individuals to lead that and pick up on those two.

There's this prospect of cross community working group. It actually should say slash groups really because it wasn't clear out of this whole Internet governance area, there was the Brazil meeting, the Internet Governance Panel and I think it was 1net were the three topics that we looked at yesterday morning. And the question is what sort of GNSO participation or coordination should be taking place.

And then separately - sorry, Lars, just stick with that one, is the Multistakeholder Innovation Strategy Panel. And that deals with policymaking, policy development and various areas so there's the question of what, if any, our involvement the Council or GNSO involvement should be in that.

Okay next slide. I think we could talk a little briefly on the GNSO Review Working Group, on the GAC working group. These are mostly a reasonable way down the road but it would serve to be useful, I think, just to capture where we're at.

Then I've called this, a little bit tongue in cheek, Marketing and PR but really this is about continuing the work to promote the success of work within the GNSO including the prospect of PDP case studies or similar. And I've talked with Thomas a little bit about the IGO INGO and we may want to think about if there's anything else we want to highlight. Next slide please.

There's a bunch of action items that we've picked up over the weekend and mostly we should be able to just tick these off and say okay, who's doing it, what are we doing on each of those items.

Next slide please. And finally there's a bunch of administrative items to just talk through at the end. So we'll come back to that. That should just take us sort of 10 minutes at the end. So I'm thinking around an hour and a half on the first two slides, something like that, and then on these key topics, depending on how we go.

Have I missed anything? Does something jump out that someone thinks that there's - that we've picked up over the last few days that we should have thought about or should be on these lists? Make sure - can staff post to the Council list? Can staff post to the Council list? Yeah, so I think it'd be a good idea to send these slides out anyway to the Council list. Yeah.

Yes, Glen.

Glen de Saint G ry: (Unintelligible). Sorry, Jonathan. I'll put them on the URL for you and send them that way rather than attach them.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. So, Lars, if you could just make sure Glen gets them and she'll make sure they're posted in a way that's logical and resource-efficient.

Okay so should we take a bit of feedback on the meeting format and organization? I mean, I can put out a starter. I certainly felt that it was pretty full on the weekend but, Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. I'm going to raise one thing and probably it's been covered before just among the chairs and the vice chair in the preparation for the meeting for the Council public meeting is that this time it seems that this is the AGM but for the Council public meeting seems that we remove the

constituency - I mean, the reporting part because I understand that it's very tight schedule; we only have two hours.

But I will suggest, just my own perspective, is that because since this is AGM maybe this is the time that where the constituency delivers some highlights of what they have been doing, you know, maybe - I mean, the previous meetings with this meeting or the - even a kind of annual wrap-up for each constituency. I think that it would be a good chance for each constituency to actually to provide some update but just my two cents on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so thanks, Ching. Two quick comments on that and I'll come to Marika. One, you should be aware that there was quite a tussle in the background about what we were allocated in terms of room and time. I must say - I'll make my comment and I'd very much like some more comments and discussion around this GNSO Public Meeting.

I thought we did moderately well in terms of our audience. We were better, we were in a nice high profile slot and we weren't conflicted. Could have more; be nice to have had the Board. The Board had a conflicted session.

I invited them. There were other ways in which - and I think we should keep pushing on this - but we got - it was certainly better than Durban. I mean, Durban was, from my point of view, I won't use too strong a term but it wasn't great at all. I mean, it was pretty empty. It was conflicted. It was late.

Now one of the things that came out of our wrap up in Durban is we said we wouldn't have the stakeholder group and constituency inputs. So we - okay so let's open the queue. Marika, I don't know if I've covered what you want to say but go ahead and then Petter.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I just want to remind everyone that I sent around a link to a meeting survey that we put together. And I think we already got some really great input so I would like to encourage people, you know, in principle we

focus on the weekend session but of course people should feel free, as well, to put in suggestions or feedback on the Wednesday session.

And all the feedback we'll just gather together and then with the Council leadership look at that and see how for the next meeting we can make some changes or improvements based on the feedback received.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. And just another little insight so what we normally do - what we have made our custom - John, I've got you - in the past is at the end of this wrap up session we typically go off - the vice chairs and the chair - and have a lunch with the policy staff and say, right, let's start planning for the next meeting. Let's take whatever the learnings were and roll it in.

Now Marika has put that survey out and so anything else that you can put either in this session or the survey - and I think we're going to do that in the breakfast on Saturday morning now instead of the usual lunch - but either way we'll try and pull these learnings together and quickly turn them around into actions.

So I've got Petter and then John.

Petter Rindforth: So just about the ccNSO GNSO meeting. You know, that I see that meeting as an opportunity to actually do some practical work together in the large meeting. And I must say that we have gone from - the first meeting I went to where we were sitting there and the whole general information to the audience on what ccNSO and GNSO was doing. And it was a nice meeting for the audience but nothing practical at all.

And this meeting was much better. Actually it's going in the right way. So I look forward to the next one to see how even better we can get on that when it comes to the practical issues.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Petter. That was my sense as well; in the right direction quite - not all the way there yet but going the right direction. John.

John Berard: The - with regard to the ccNSO Council/GNSO Council meeting there was a substantial benefit of having subject matter that was of high interest to both. So the ccNSO has taken a lead on working the strategic plan, budget with ICANN. And that has become - so their interest coincides with our interest which I think gave that subject a little bit more energy than we might have otherwise.

And I would encourage us to keep looking for those things. The - I will say, having spend the last year participating to the extent that I can in the ccNSO Council meeting is that there is a general belief on the part of the members of the ccNSO Council that there are very few areas in which the gTLD and the ccTLD space actually overlap.

And so the ICANN budget and operations and strategic plan is one and likely it will be another opportunity for us to touch on that when we get together in Singapore.

With regard to the public meeting, I suspect, from the Business Constituency, because I've gotten pushback before, that I would get pushback again if we reinstated the constituency reports. You can appreciate or at least - and to our new colleagues - you will come to appreciate that that our view is that the Council is a creature of the GNSO overall and that the reporting of one to the other seems somehow out of whack so.

Jonathan Robinson: One quick comment and a question before we go on - just one point of information. In case anyone is not aware, John is the GNSO Council liaison to the ccNSO Council.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. In which direction though? I mean...

John Berard: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: I'll try and put it in plain English. It has the appearance of a hierarchy so it appears that there is reporting up to the Council rather than - I mean, we could, as you say, we could take it offline but that's what I think you meant, right? Yeah. I've got Chuck and then Thomas.

Chuck Gomes: Okay since - Chuck Gomes. And since John brought up the strategic plan budget, he's absolutely right that the ccNSO really does a very good job of being involved and providing constructive input into that process. And so I was in the finance session that started off the day yesterday and this topic came up.

One of the things that was really good to see yesterday was that there were lots of - the stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO were quite well-represented in that finance session which is, I think in my history, that's the first time I've seen such good representation.

Now I think that - I just wanted to point out though that the ccNSO is quite different on this area than we are in the sense but I think it's much easier for them as a ccNSO to deal with budget issues than it is for the GNSO Council, not the GNSO. So I think it actually works better and easier for them to do it collectively whereas in our case it's probably easier for each of the stakeholder groups and constituencies to be involved in that process.

That said, though, it's an ongoing area that I think we do have in common with the ccNSO and we should, you know, continue that. And that will be quite a involved process in the Singapore meeting. So it's kind of advance notice that that will be a very good topic at that meeting for us because of the process that's mapped out.



Thomas Rickert: Let me open up with a provocative statement that the CCs, at least many of them, are interested in not paying too much money to ICANN and not to get involved with G-business to preserve their independence. And therefore I think that talking about budget is something where, especially (unintelligible) is very active and that's all good.

But as Chuck alluded to, there are those that claim that the GNSO Council doesn't have any say in budget questions. So I guess that what is needed is actually an open and honest discussion with the ccNSO as to where they actually are willing to discuss matters that are of interest for the G-space.

And I've seen some movement in that in recent meetings talking to representatives of ccTLD operators, particularly those that are also engaged in providing registry backend services for new gTLDs or that even run their own gTLDs so the lines are blurring, right.

And on top of that I think it's required that we sort of find areas where there should be strategic alliances. Talking about the RAA, for example, the data retentions requirements as well as the user data authentication requirements are areas where ccTLD operators should have a vital interest in certain requirements not to be put in place because it will be quite natural thing for national governments, as well as other local stakeholders to impose those requirements on the ccTLD operators as well.

Nonetheless they don't want to be seen to be engaged in such discussions because then the fear is that others will say, okay, you've been at the table when this was discussed so sort of you've agreed to that in the first place.

So this is a long preface to basically stating that I think we need to reconsider where there is movement inside the ccNSO to find areas of common interests to be discussed with the GNSO and if that were not the case then maybe really spelling out that our discussions should be limited to strategic planning

and budget questions. And then certainly we need to decide to what extent the Council has a say in that.

Jonathan Robinson: I think I'm hearing something, you know, we've got a queue building and so I need to be mindful of that. But I think I'm hearing different things from you because one is - and from others - when we talk with the ccNSO there are areas of commonality.

I think what you're saying is there are options to open up perhaps through a slightly contentious area or could we get a great scope of topics to talk about. And then third is this issue of how we deal with the budget. But...

Thomas Rickert: Yeah, if I may I would like to clarify. My impression is that that's just as an observer that while there has been a very firm view by the ccNSO that they want to preserve their independence to the largest extent that only recently we see some movement in that and that may be there are divergent views inside the ccNSO as to what to talk about and what not.

And I'm not sure whether this is something for a public debate but I think that we need to open up a communications channel with the ccNSO as to what they're prepared to discuss with us and what not. You know, I guess that everybody's very busy during this week and we should be honest enough with each other and just declare that we shouldn't touch certain areas.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Let me be mindful of the queue which contains, John, Avri,  
Jonathan Robinson:.. John.

John Berard: Yes. With regard to conflicts when you said that the public meeting was conflict-free, a good spot in the agenda, I had wanted to go to the launch of the Domain Name Association but I couldn't because it was at the same time as our public meeting and then follow-on.

And so it isn't just meetings on the ICANN calendar that can serve to be a conflict for participation but also meetings that would be otherwise attractive to members of the GNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Understood and appreciated. And personally I would have liked to have gone to the Domain Name Association but there's a limit to how much we can - I mean...

John Berard: How do we manage when these events occur to try and coordinate a little bit better? I mean, one cannot dictate to the other but - and I don't know, maybe this was just a one-time thing and it'll never happen again but it strikes me that there's - that as the industry, the domain name industry grows, that there will be more and more extra ICANN meetings at ICANN meetings.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I want to make a comment on each of them. I think if there are a list of prescribed topics that the ccNSO doesn't want to speak with us about I think it'd be good to have a list of those somewhere, you know, on the wiki and elsewhere so that it was a truly transparent list of things that they would prefer not to talk about just so that we don't have to sort of, you know, skate on thin ice.

In terms of the reporting of the constituencies I wanted to make two points. One of one is that I don't think we should necessarily accept a certain theory of the relationship of constituencies and stakeholder groups and Council within the Council. I think there's a real diversity of views in that. And there is no prescribed that the Council is not a Council of the GNSO versus over the GNSO, etcetera.

So there really isn't - and some of us have very different views on that. I think, though, in terms of the specific issue of reporting I think the idea of at least once a year the constituencies standing up and making a public reporting to

the GNSO as the Council reports to the GNSO you can avoid the controversial hierarchical topic by merely saying we will start off the meeting with reports by the constituencies to the supporting organization.

You know, and it's not reporting to the Council, it's reporting to the - and I think the idea of doing it yearly at least, you know, I think the every meeting gets a little bit, you know, much but that the annual general meeting to actually have the constituencies come up and tell the supporting organizations this is what we're about, this is what we've been doing this year, this is where we're going next year is a good thing and I definitely support it.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got Mikey O'Connor, Petter and then Brian.

Mikey O'Connor: It's Mikey O'Connor. I want to head back to Thomas's thing about the ccNSO and just share an experience and maybe an avenue to open some more dialogue with them. We had a pretty lively conversation in the DSSA between the ccNSO and the GNSO and it was very collaborative.

So certainly one of the topics to put on the opportunities to collaborate list, I think is the SSR topic. You know, there was a lot of mutual interest in security, stability and resiliency kinds of things.

And then to add on to that SSR theme in the SSAC meeting I button-holed a bunch of the SSAC leaders after that meeting and said how can we improve the flow of communication between the SSAC and the GNSO? Because sometimes I think the SSAC is putting out recommendations to the Board, because they're an advisory committee to the Board, and other times they're putting out recommendations to the community.

And those ones to the community often sort of go off and never land anywhere. And so I encouraged the people I was talking to to give us a nudge, either formally or informally, when they think they've got

recommendations that are of interest to the GNSO so that we don't drift along not paying attention to them and got a pretty positive reception on that.

So I think SSR is one of those cross-cutting topics that there's plenty of opportunity to do a little more collaboration.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, you want to respond directly to Jonathan Robinson:?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think it's something we mentioned over the weekend as well but something the GNSO may want to explore is the concept of a liaison. It may not be possible for them to send a liaison to us for certain reasons but I know, for example, I think the ALAC has a liaison at the SSAC and that might form that function.

Although there are certain limitations because you need to be an SSAC member. There's a certain procedure so we need to tread that carefully. It's not that we say that this person is now our SSAC liaison but it may be a topic of conversation to start and see how we could make that work possibly.

Jonathan Robinson: And so I read the GNSO - I'm trying to think which document it was. I guess bylaws, but there is a very clear paragraph creating the opportunity for observers from other ACs and SOs for - to the GNSO Council. And it's very, very clear.

And if you remember when we met with the Board I slightly shot from the hip and said, "But what about the SSAC?" You know, why the SSAC taking advantage of that? I've subsequently spoken with a couple of members of the SSAC, including the chair and vice chair and they seem very receptive to sending someone over as a - I mean, we call it a liaison but in the bylaws I think it refers to it as an observer. But nevertheless, the function would be more or less the same.

As Marika says, the reverse is perhaps slightly more tricky because of the qualifications. But frankly it's opening up the communication I think is the important point. So I think we're three-quarters of the way there and I suspect we may well find someone available to do that and we can pursue that.

Mikey, you just want to respond then?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, just a little tiny follow up and that is that this sort of topic-based tendrils that we're extending to the SSAC, just to tie back to Thomas's point about tendrils that we can extend with the ccNSO I think there's another one of those there in that we might want to just bear that in mind that at least in the DSSA there was a very strong shared interest in a lot of the security issues that we were exploring and the tools that we develop.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I've had Petter and Brian both being quite patient so Petter first and then Brian.

Petter Rindforth: Just pertaining to that the ccNSO has a new chair. You have any feelings or (unintelligible) the chair, positive or negative, on what you can expect from that point connecting to your cooperation? Because he didn't say much on our meeting together so.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, the question directed to me is that how do I...

Petter Rindforth: Yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so I mean, I've got a couple of feelings. And I think going back to Thomas's point, I mean, I think it's very clear that the ccNSO has been very diligent about the ICANN budgeting and all of that and - that feed into the strat plan.

Notwithstanding their motivations that you referred to, Thomas, or their concerns about their relationship with the budget, the general holding

ICANN's feet to the fire to be diligent about their budgeting, I think we've got a common interest in anyway.

But to your question specifically, I've now taken - I've taken essentially an action out of this meeting that I think would probably be quite helpful to have an informal discussion with Byron, first of all. I mean, I know him and I'm comfortable with him but I haven't talked with him specifically about this sort of scope of how we might interact.

And I think that's probably the right diplomatic way to handle it rather than us putting, you know, I take Avri's point on transparency and putting a list of what might or might not be but I think we might go in slightly softer first, have the discussion, get a feeling and then start to work that up into a more, you know, public understanding of - that's my sense of how we might handle this.

So, yeah, so that's a response to your question where I think we might...

((Crosstalk))

Petter Rindforth: Sounds like a good start.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Petter. Brian.

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt. I just want to agree with Avri. I think having the reports, at least annually, from the constituencies would be very helpful. I think it's very difficult to keep track of what all the different constituencies are doing. And so I think at least the annual report would be very helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm not sure which order those hands came up in but we'll go Ching, John, Thomas.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. I certainly believe, actually, every, you know, I just realized we have two past years of GNSO sitting at the Council right now so I think we have really a very powerful group here.

I'm not trying to, I mean, going back to that the Council public meeting I think it's kind of obvious there seems to be a interest there to get some report. I would like to simply point out and - this is from the dialogue that I have with several ccNSO - ccTLD, I mean, operators.

It seems that it's fundamentally the ccNSO meetings and the GNSO meetings are very different. CcNSO from my past, we've all been in the meetings, pretty much ICANN comes in and other constituency comes in to talk to them about updates. And then the members they all have different updates, I mean, in the meeting.

One major ccTLD in Asia-Pac, when we had a chat yesterday, actually they really don't have, you know, much understanding of how we work. And the first question he asked me is that what is GNSO? Can we provide an update about their ccTLD in our meeting? Because the purpose of - for them to come to the ccNSO meeting is to provide the development in their own perspective ccTLD and maybe to listen from what's happening in ICANN.

So I'm just sharing the facts here and maybe this help us to do some more additional thinking.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. I've got obviously John and Thomas in the queue and then I think we'll draw a line in this topic and I'll try and wrap it up a little.

John Berard: Obviously. I realize it seems like a small thing but I believe if we turn the microphone around at the annual meeting that we will be on firm ground to have the constituencies comfortably report to the rest of the GNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Very practical suggestion. Seems fine to me. Thomas.



Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Jonathan. What I'd like to hear at these briefings is not only what the current topics are discussed in the various groups but also maybe something on development of membership. You know, is it increasing? Is there - are outreach activities successful so that we can measure how the groups react to the incoming new gTLDs and what impact that has on the landscape.

And I think that, you know, so far we had a lot of talk about, you know, basically replicas of the main agenda, which have been discussed in the various groups which I think has been too, you know, there was not too much substance in that. But I think that learning more about how the groups work and how they develop would be interesting.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Mikey O'Connor

Mikey O'Connor: I think I'm going to take up the job of amplifying and agreeing with Thomas. That seems like a good thing. I think outreach is a cross-cutting issue that's extremely important right now. It's very much tied into the issue that I raised yesterday with the ATRT2.

And if there was a way to sort of elevate that in our view. I'd be very keen to do that. It's way too big a topic to talk anymore about than that. But I see lots and lots of opportunities to do better at that across all the stakeholder groups and constituencies and I think that the benefits across a whole bunch of spectrum issues would be huge.

So I just want to plus one violently on the notion of let's take outreach as a topic and make it higher visibility than it's been.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I'm not sure how easy it is to - sorry, Amr, just. Go ahead, you haven't had an option to talk. Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, I just wanted to also add to Mikey O'Connor and say we should probably add in-reach if we're going to be talking about outreach. I think in-reach is also something we should be looking at. There's a lot of members at various GNSO constituencies who are not active in working groups. And I believe Alan raised this point as well yesterday and I am in support of both outreach and in-reach.

Jonathan Robinson: That's an interesting point. That's got kind of a good business analogy because quite often, you know, we start talking about the sales and marketing and people say, well, sell to your own customers first. And in a way, in that sense, that in-reach sense, these are already our existing customers, they're - so that's a very helpful point.

So I think there's general support for - for the ccNSO/GNSO new structure. There's support for some softer engagement first with - between the new chair and myself trying to talk some about what the scope of our interaction might be and how we develop and continue to build on that.

Certainly we've heard these recent points about outreach and in-reach. I'll go through the - I'm not sure if - Lars, if you've picked up any other actions out of that? I'll go through the transcript and have a look and make sure we pick up some of the other points that have come out of this.

Very briefly this additional Tuesday meeting - I mean, to me it seems like a no-brainer but I just want to check that with anyone else. I mean, I think what my takeaway was that we don't need a formal meeting to record. It's an opportunity for people to come together, talk across the different GNSO groups and constituencies. We should just make sure it's known that that's what we're doing.

I think we can have it relatively open. I don't think we need to contain it to simply councilors. I think anyone from the GNSO who - the topic is really

about the motions or the forthcoming GNSO meeting. So any comments or questions support or otherwise for that Tuesday meeting?

We're generally in support, right? I mean, everyone's aware of what I'm talking about, the late Tuesday meeting after the stakeholder group and constituencies. Avri.

Avri Doria: I knew you had one. Is that a permanent entity?

Jonathan Robinson: This was the first time we had it but what I'm suggesting is that it's - that it's essentially scheduled on a regular basis, that we create - and forgive me but this came out of the Durban meeting.

And the idea was that we had all the weekend discussions, we went off into our stakeholder groups and constituencies and we could potentially benefit substantially from coming together again after having discussed things in stakeholder groups and constituencies and iron out any wrinkles that existed between positions on motions and matters before the Council on the Wednesday.

So the idea was to try and ensure we don't go into a sort of car-crash type situation on the Wednesday which could have been readily avoided by getting in a huddle on Tuesday later afternoon. Really the two options are only Tuesday late afternoon, early evening, or Wednesday morning.

And I think on balance we felt that Tuesday with a further night to sleep on it and so on and - was a better option so that's what we settled on and that's where it came from. And I think the only sort of area, if you like, we're kind of confused about whether to publicize it because then it seemed like a formal meeting.

Somehow we need to get the slot out there, create the opportunity for interaction without making it too formal, you know, sort of recorded,

structured. The idea was to have an unstructured interaction that was not in any way secret. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think it's a great idea. But I think doing it without the formality of recording and whatever is probably not something that I would be terribly supportive of. Maybe it's the badge of wearing ATRT sign that thinks that if there's a meeting it should be - if people were talking at the bar then that's fine; if it's a social event that's fine. But if it's a meeting it seems like it should follow the protocols of a meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: I understand and I'd love some feedback on this because it is not intended to be a meeting; it's an opportunity to come together and talk informally. So to that extent I would argue it's not a meeting. But I understand the optics. So, Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: I would back up for (this). We have to be transparent to the point of obsessiveness. And I know it looks silly that we will record these things but we should do it because there should be absolutely no question whatsoever to anybody about our transparency. And that's why I would opt - even I think it's silly but I think we have to do it.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments on the - Mikey O'Connor.

Mikey O'Connor: I'd line up with that notion too. I've spent my whole time here in working groups, everything's recorded, it's all transcribed. For me it's just the soup I swim in. It's never felt, in any way, constraining. So - and I agree with Klaus, you know, we go out on the international stage and we say we're transparent, we're multistakeholder, we're consensus-based. I think we have to live, you know, walk the talk.

Jonathan Robinson: John.

John Berard: I'll agree it should be recorded. It easily can be, we're just, you know, adding some time into a meeting room already set up. But I will say that in three years serving as a councilor it was the first time I'd had a meeting in a room with windows. And I enjoyed that quite a bit.

Jonathan Robinson: Right, so I'm hearing windows, wine and recording. Maybe I just added in the wine. But all right so there we have it. That's pretty clear. That's good guidance. And we're on the road.

So let's move on then and, Petter.

Petter Rindforth: Just short, sorry I think the opposite. We have our dinner where we can also speak together. And what - as far as I know there's no recording there but maybe there is in some way. You never know today.

But I thought this was a good start on some kind of meeting where we met in time for - to discuss informally and not having to sit down with the dinner and just talk about wine and meat.

So I don't know if it can be done in another way to be even more informal but personally I think it was a good opportunity to actually - to discuss it open without being - stick with specific decisions.

I mean, we have our formal meetings and if we can't have a meeting like this in some way we will have to continue to meet two, three, four persons in a bar which I appreciate as well. But, I mean, it was good to have a possibility to meet the full group and discuss it in a more social way.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, I mean, you can sense from where I'm at I'm in - personally, if I take my personal view I'm of two minds because I appreciate the opportunity to have a relaxed and relatively informal interaction but I hear there's some fairly strong concerns about, you know, the perception that that might create.

So let's - I think on balance I'm hearing a desire to ensure that we are over-cautious about ensuring things are recorded so I'm happy to have it on mic. We may be able to sort of mix the format a bit where we chat for half an hour before and then come and sit at the table. I think we can work creatively to accommodate both. Mikey O'Connor.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, this is Mikey O'Connor again. There are certain working group calls that are very informal, sometimes to the point of ludicrousness, sometimes when we've worked really hard on something and we're just sort of blowing off some energy and telling jokes and so on and so forth. I don't think we have to be terribly grown up on the recordings all the time.

But it is helpful - it's partly it's helpful from a transparency standpoint but it's also helpful from capturing a transcript so that we can go back and refresh. So I don't have real strong views on this if there's a reason not to but I do agree, it's easy to structure meetings in a more informal way and not arrive at formal conclusions but still record them it seems to me.

Jonathan Robinson: David.

David Cake: Just from a straight practical point of view we may be in the - if people are going - if people who aren't physically present or for whatever reason at that meeting can review it. It may be helpful. We certainly - I mean, we had a councilor participating remotely. It may be very useful, just look at that recording and go okay so that motion will be that.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah so I think I've got - I mean, it's something we're going to have to work out. This was an experiment this time around. We'll keep trying it. Like I say my feeling is that we can probably accommodate both; find some kind of hybrid where we have either before or after half an hour where we relax with one another and simply talk and then we can have things, you know, when we discuss it collectively we record it. I think we can probably work our way through that. So I feel reasonably confident in that.

So let's draw a line under that one and move on to our opportunity to provide input into a couple of key groups. Now we had a good meeting with the ATRT2. I think they really took away some constructive input. What I'd like to get out of this now is two things really, I suppose, on these ones.

Who's going to lead our input, if we are going to put it in? And what areas are we going to try and cover if there's any formal input? Now I've got a vague memory yesterday that - with ATRT2 we did commit to putting something to them in writing already or at least got quite close to that.

Any reminders? And I think - in her absence I think Maria is our point person on this. I'm not sure where she is this morning. But what, if anything, are we going to put to the ATRT2 from the GNSO Council in writing?

Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: After the meeting yesterday Chuck came to me and said that I was very silent, which was true. But sort of I felt like I would sound like a broken record because I had made my points with respect to PDP improvements and stuff like that numerous times. So I would suggest that maybe we allow a time window of maybe two or three weeks and have a living document that everybody would add to and then sort of put in writing the points that we want to make and pass it on to the ATRT.

Jonathan Robinson: You just need to be very clear what you're talking about because we have already a tabulated document. Are you suggesting we send that existing tabulated document or some new document? What is it specifically you're suggesting, Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: I guess I - we can build on what we have but I think that, you know, rather than exchanging thoughts in formats such as this where we don't know whether it's going to be documented and actually passed on we should put all

our thoughts and recommendations into one place and then, you know, apply some finishing touches to it and send it on.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Just to let you know that three of us, as individuals from the Registry Stakeholder Group, just submitted comments to the ATRT2. Now, as you know, since you're part of the Registry Stakeholder Group, those will shortly be submitted to the whole group to see if the whole group in the Registry Stakeholder Group endorses them and then during the reply period would comment.

I'm not suggesting that everybody should support the comments that we submitted because that may not be the case. But certainly I'm calling you attention to those that if you want to refer to those I think they are pretty much in the GNSO interest but that's my bias.

So I just want to let you know those probably will be out there in the next few minutes and will be available. I can also give you a copy of those so okay?

Jonathan Robinson: Can I make a specific request then? Thanks, Chuck. What I would like to ask Thomas is that you track that - the suggestion that Chuck's made and liaise with Maria and try and make sure that our response is coordinated in that respect.

Because Maria's done a good job of summarizing it. Then there's Marika's table that she's worked on our prospective improvements and now Chuck's talking about it but some submissions and that would be good to try and pull that together. I'm not sure which would become our core document for submission to ATRT2 but I'm - if you're willing that would be great.

Thomas Rickert: That's now that you've volun-told me I think is the new term to be used, I'm more than happy to do that.



Jonathan Robinson: Much appreciated. Can we close that topic? Is there any more comment on this? And I think we've got a little plan here. And it seems sensible.

Expert Working Group, what if anything, are we in a position to say to them and do we have a sort of topic lead on this? Yes, Avri.

Avri Doria: I have a question on the Expert Working Group. That that interim report, or whatever it is that came out, that was announced but I don't quite understand why it's not having a comment period. And I'm wondering if anybody explained that to you all. Because it seems like it should. It's a second report; it's different than the first.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika to respond and then I've got Ching in the queue.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. As I understand it, I think they considered it a status update. These are not recommendations; this is just a status update of where they're at. I think they have provided an email address so I think they are encouraging everyone to actually - if they have specific input to provide input on the email address. But I think the idea is that they have the next formal public comment forum when they actually have their concrete recommendations out there. That's at least what I understood, I think, from the updates they provided.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, that's helpful both for the question and the answer. So really what we're talking about is what do we put into that email? What, if anything, do we put into that email? Ching.

Ching Chiao: I think just a point of clarification because we're seeing the second EWG emerging over the weekend on the IRD part. So this one is the - like the RDS, the Registration Data Services, that is - that has the draft final report. I mean, do we see another EWG which is being set up and led by Jim Galvin. So I guess we have to make a distinction on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. That's a fair point. I mean, in putting this on the agenda I was thinking of the call for input at this stage into the RDS, yeah. Maybe we're going to have to just put this up on an action item. I don't have a specific view of what we - is there anything - does anyone - can anyone remind me of any comment we - that came up in our meeting with the more specific input we would like to make as a Council? I mean, not aware of anything specifically. So, Ching.

Ching Chiao: Very quick point. I did recall that actually in the Registry interaction with the Board on Tuesday - actually it's Don Blumenthal. He specifically pointed out that this seems that there is a feeling or kind of a sense that there is strategic panel, there is also this EWG all consists of actually special groups...

((Crosstalk))

Ching Chiao: Right. So...

Jonathan Robinson: You do remind me. The one thing that we did talk about was - there was some talk about a form of integration of - some document to actually request of staff so, Lars, if you could capture this as an action I think we're going to request of staff some kind of description of - or an attempt to reconcile the universe of work - the current universe of work on Whois and Whois data.

And I think that that was really - that's my recollection of where we came to. It was - just to ensure that we could - and then which, if any of that, is our responsibility to do anything further with. That's where we got to. That's - okay good. Unlucky for staff. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I will need to have a look to see if the new Whois Website may be of help there because I think part of that effort is looking at, indeed, how could we make sure that all the information is one place. And I know that they also talk about all the policy activities that are ongoing.

But I'll talk to Margie to see, indeed, if there's a way, as well, that maybe on there we can actually integrate all those activities and have one place where people can go and look at all the activities and as well link through and find more information. So I'll follow up on that and check back in with you.

Jonathan Robinson: I think I have - John, I'll come to you now then. I have in mind an image of - my image is of a mind map or something like that that actually seeks to integrate the overall picture of activity. Because I think sometimes we see the stuff coming along in bits and pieces, we follow a due process in one increment of it but we don't necessarily know how it joins up. John.

John Berard: Just my recollection is that the Expert Working Group on Directory Services was constructed to operate independently looking at the question without being influenced by history. And so if we're going to now shmush it together are we undermining the effort as it was initially launched?

Jonathan Robinson: Good question. And for the record I never used the word "shmush"...

John Berard: But you could define it as you did "whack" so...

Jonathan Robinson: Shmush and whack are not in my vocabulary but I think I get both of them. My understanding, and my intention, was that these are - that we understand how they interrelate, not necessarily that they become shmushed together.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Yeah and I thought that the intellectual exercise was to operate it separately so as to come up with a totally new regime with regard to registry data services.

Jonathan Robinson: Never mind. So then on the mind map we could have a bunch of bubbles that were interlinked and one that was floating out on its own. So I think after probably almost two years of working with John I'm beginning to get him.

John Berard: Perhaps you could brief my wife.

Mikey O'Connor: Maybe I'm going to come back on that recording idea.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...we're to allowed to go informal here, Mikey O'Connor. All right moving on then so next topic, Internet Governance Cross-Community Working Group/Working Groups. Where do we go with this? What's our role and responsibility either as a Council or can we offer anything to the GNSO as a whole? Any comments, input? Yes, Mary.

Mary Wong: I think this item was placed on the agenda due to some confusion John and I had had. I think for those folks who were at the Wednesday session - the last-minute Wednesday session at 7:00 am we heard about some of these cross community working groups that Fadi was proposing.

At the same time, because we have been doing this work within the GNSO, on the principles for cross community working group it's very clear that we're not going to have as much progress as quickly on those principles as this other initiative of having cross-community working groups.

So it's not that is a suggestion but that is the context. And it may well be that the GNSO, you know, figures there's no real connection that can be made but we thought this was something that the Council should at least discuss.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so two points. Marika, did you want to say something first?

Marika Konings: I just want to add to that because I think one of the reasons here as well because I think in that meeting Fadi, at the end - or towards the end basically said, you know, SO and AC leaders go away and, you know, think about forming these groups.

I think part of this question is as well is that something, you know, the GNSO even wants to consider leading or should there be further discussions with other SO ACs how this should happen? Or do we just assume that others will take the lead and individual members will join as needed? I think that's a bit the conversation to see where the GNSO stands on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so let - Chuck, I'll come to you. So I want to make sure that, for the benefit of - can I just get a show of hands who was at that 7:00 am session the other morning? I mean, it was pretty well attended but certainly not everyone in this room.

So let's just be clear what was put up on - there was a slide put up that talked about - and remind me if I'm wrong here - the Internet Governance Framework, Brazil, and - well there was 1net, Brazil, what was the third topic? And the panel, the panel that sits outside of ICANN, the International Internet Governance Panel.

So there were three topics. And at the bottom of that slide it said, you know, there is an opportunity to form cross-community working groups to discuss these. At the end of the meeting Fadi said, well I'll leave this up to the SO and AC leaders to pick up and decide what they want to do with this.

And certainly in the little huddle that I was in there was a question of is it appropriate to have a cross community working group for each of those topics or for all of those topics? So I guess that's the question.

One other point of information, there is a monthly-scheduled call that very seldom takes place but it's a kind of placeholder in the diary for so-called SO

and AC leaders to talk together. So that's one option I could pick up if you wanted to raise that.

And basically if there's no agenda items around the call doesn't happen; if there are agenda items then it happens. More often than not, in my last year of experience, there are no agenda items; nobody puts an agenda item on. But of course this could be one. So did you have a hand up - okay. John.

John Berard: So the holdover councilors are aware that at our last meeting we passed a motion to move forward on the reconstituted drafting team to establish guidelines for cross community working groups that I was named as the co chair from the GNSO Council, that you, Jonathan, sent letters to other leaders to ask if - especially the ccNSO - to ask if they were willing to - to offer up a co chair as well.

I think that we should proceed along that path energized by the top down call for cross community working groups as evidence that we need to get this sorted out because the demand for them will increase as the complexity of the issues we confront cut across the entire community. So the next call you might suggest have the agenda - the specific agenda item, of establishing the drafting team for cross community working groups.

Jonathan Robinson: Should we capture that as an action? So the action is that at the next SO and AC leadership call I put on the agenda, cross community working groups. And I think, I mean, I think I heard slightly different. Come to now the agenda. I think I heard slightly different from Mary which I do want to make sure we capture.

And I think what Mary was saying, perhaps, we go so far as to say well we have a draft framework, shall we use this - because there's an (urgent) cross-community working group. I think the politics and optics of that might be quite challenging. So just want to be sure - there's two different things.

John, you're saying that the fact that this exists creates a added impetus and momentum to the cross community work on cross-community working groups. The question is how do we proceed as well on this specific topic?  
James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. And you touched on it right there at the end which is, you know, I don't know that the time scale of this particular need is going to line up and permit us to revisit those guidelines and then have those finalized. You know, I think we're looking at April for one issue and then November for the second.

And it seems like this is an expedited need and I'm wondering if the Cross-Committee Working Group under that formal umbrella is the right mechanism to approach this.

Jonathan Robinson: Perhaps the only way forward is to have the conversation at this meeting as discussed but I'm not sure how or to write and say, "Look to separate it out into the two topics what if anything is the response to this call for Cross Community Working Group's activity on the meeting on 7:00 am the other morning," and second the rallying call for involvement in the Cross Community Working Group's working group.

Man: So Jonathan if I may, you're absolutely right. (James), you're absolutely right that to complete the two at the pace in which one is moving and the other is not is not prudent so - but I do believe that this is not a - the executive call for Cross Community Working Groups.

It's not a one-time thing. It's going to be a persistent thing and ultimately it would be great if there could be some rules of the road that the constituencies could have established and so that's what I would be proposing.

Yes these, you know, we should pursue these wild hairs, great, but we should also make sure that ultimately there is a solid base from which to build those in the future. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Mikey here as well - I've been having a little sidebar. I think one of the things that we need to be pretty careful about while we do this is not to confuse the roles of the Council and the constituencies in that chartering of the fast-moving process.

So we as the Council need to make sure that the process works right but the actual work on the whatever CCWG has chartered should flow from the constituency so I really like -- we -- really like the idea of driving the well what do we do right now conversation to that standing ACSO leadership call and then retain the well what do we do about this in general conversation under our wing.

Jonathan Robinson: Just on that second point I think it's already - we've already gone beyond being under our wing. We originally did under our wing. We then made a call, got the CCs involved -- and some of these involved -- and now - so they both by now Cross Community initiatives or activities.

But I think we're pretty clear on this. These are completely separate although it does beg the question under what rules of engagement does any Cross Community Working Group on this - on these urgent matters take place?

I guess we could in some way it'll be implicit but it's involved -- that we have these draft terms -- but if anyone else wants to volunteer and say, "Well ha! We've got these draft terms. Why don't we at least try and work with these?" But that's I think for us to push that into the mix is, you know, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm sort of leaning on Chuck here. I'm going to talk a little bit to sort of allow him to, you know, recover. Sorry about that Chuck but I'm thinking that the circumstances that we're in right now with (Foddy) requests are not terribly



different than the circumstances that surrounded the chartering of the DSSA. That was also a very fast-moving Cross Community chartering effort.

And I'm just wondering, Chuck, can you - I came into the DSSA a little bit late. How long did that chartering effort take? Was that a whole meeting cycle's worth or was it faster than that? And could we use some of that experience as a guide for this fast-breaking one that (Bonnie)'s launched?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I don't remember the exact timing or how long it took for the chartering itself but there is one key difference between the two areas and that is in the case of the DSSA Working Group. And for those that are new, it related to the SURP issue that was raised. And our former CEO (Rod) had initiated some things kind of unilaterally in that area with good intentions and so forth but there was no involvement of the Community.

So it's similar in that regard but here's where I think there's a - may be a difference. We probably don't know for sure yet but in that case there was very uniform agreement across the SOs and ACs. I happened to be Chair at that time and we had regular meetings with the -- I did -- with the Chair of the CC and SO and with the ASO) in particular. And we were all on the same page for sure.

I don't think we know for sure whether we're quite as uniform on this as we do on that but there was - it was real clear. We didn't even -- in our calls -- you know, we didn't even have to discuss it. We weren't concerned there. In this case I think there's probably more divergence.

Jonathan Robinson: So Mikey are we going to go over this? I mean my sense is that I'm going to. We've got two topics and we're going to pick those both up in the (SOIC) regular scheduled call. Is there anything else I've missed? Is there anything I - Mary?

Mary Wong: And I'm not obviously saying that we should push the draft prints.

So going back to what you said Jonathan - but it might also be worth you having a quick conversation with Byron. Because to the extent that there are certain things in those draft prints both that may be useful and some of the CC and SO feedback probably would not apply to this particular set of Cross Community Working Groups in terms of creating a charter and having it adopted by all the organizations.

Given the timeframe, etcetera, those things are not going to be pertinent to these groups. So while they remain separate assets it may be worth talking to Byron just to gauge the temperature on the CC and SO should the possibility arise of using these draft prints because if someone says, "What's the framework under which we're going to operate?"

Jonathan Robinson: And so as per the previous topic, we had already agreed that I would reach out to them anyway to talk with them about mechanisms of working. So we've got really the two actions and last one is that the reaching out and making sort of informal contract with Byron -- which would include the work on (CDW)s anyway. So that's meat enough and then the joint (SOIC) leadership call, good?

What about this Multistake called Strategy Panel and GNSO involvement in that? That's just the one that's happened. This is the one that's happening -- one of the Strategy Panels that's happening within ICANN.

Now just to be clear on this, I've already -- in other words it's not the one that - the governance one that's happening normally outside of ICANN. This is one of the four Strategy Panels that's happening within.

I've already reached out to Theresa Swinehart, spoken with her and said to her, "I'd like to give her my personal perspective of a GNSO." You know, make sure she's fully clued into what work is going on in the GNSO at the

moment. And I'm not sure how else we might do this. Any other thoughts or suggestions about how we might engage? Yes Jennifer?

Jennifer Wolfe: This is Jennifer Wolfe. I don't know. Was anybody else in the Strategy Meeting or listening to it? I know I was listening to it. You might want to go back and read the transcript because it's definitely something that I found very concerning.

She's very clearly a smart and innovative thinker but in my opinion she clearly does not have a deep understanding of how the GNSO works and quite frankly didn't show very much deference to it at all.

And what she's talking about doing is what the GNSO does so I think it's really important that we pay attention to this Panel. I think even above and beyond just you, we need to be watching it. We need to be participating in the public comment and I just think this is really important that we don't just sit on the sidelines on this one.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jen. That's spot on and actually I mean I think there you're referring to Beth Noveck, right, the Chair of the Panel. I mentioned Theresa a moment ago but Theresa's the sort of coordinator from within ICANN on the Strategy Panels and then Beth is the Chair of that Panel.

And in fact I have spoken with others to talk to make sure that people do talk. But I agree with you. I think we need to - I heard two things -- just to be - just to add to that point. One was I heard Vin Cerf in fact talking beforehand and making analogies between IETF policymaking and how much potentially a better or more desirable model that was.

But then went in -- I think in the GNSO is what I thought I heard him -- and then went onto Beth talking. And that's what you respond to.

Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Yes I think Beth's got some -- what I hope was -- lame feedback from some of the participants at that meeting on some of the issues that Jennifer was just talking about. And maybe we should think about whether we want to liaise with her and see what she's doing with her Panel and whether we want to encourage her and whoever's engaged with her on her side to work with us in the GNSO more and just take a closer look at us.

And that was one of the comments that were -- even though that she didn't really respond to in the session -- but if she's going to be making suggestions on how the GNSO works and how working groups work and how policy is developed, then maybe she should have a more insightful understanding of how it's going on right now. And so we might want to engage with her and invite her to come take a closer look one way or another.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes and I should say - I should add further I mean I cornered her after the meeting and went and spoke with her briefly and she assured me that she would make a reasonable effort. In fact I gave my business card to one of her assistants as well on her encouragement and she assured me she would pay close attention to what goes on in the GNSO.

And I guess I had a concern both from, you know, it's very rare you hear me but I came - am thinking about it from a contracted party's point of view as well and because I have a very real sensitivity to the direct impact that our policymaking has on contracted parties.

But I am not sure that that's always understood when people talk on a very kind of umbrella level about policymaking and Internet governance. And I think they're too quite different things.

One is sort of - I mean there's a different layer at which this whole thing operates and so I wanted her, you know, that clear - was clearly one of the things in my mind.

So I guess what I'm saying is I've made the contact. I made the contact with her -- with her assistant -- and I have two hats I would wear in that context.

One is an awareness of the impact of GNSO policymaking on the contracts of the contracted parties.

And two is as an evangelist for the GNSO and - but I'm not saying I should be the sole guardian of that contact. I'm just flagging that that's the contact I would likely have. Mike?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I agree that it would probably be good to have several people in that conversation and I'm glad that, you know, Amr and others - you -- are engaged in that.

At the same time, I'm so frustrated with these Strategy Panels that I consciously do not want to be engaged in them because all I'll do is start chewing on people's ankles as I'm known to do.

So what I would like to see is a cadre of folks from the Council who are pretty deeply engaged in what's going on that can kind of keep the rest of us up to speed and then give us a signal as to when you want ankle biters to show up and, you know, or whatever else you need so that we can make a very strong case when it's appropriate without insulting them.

Because my reaction to all of these Panels is that there is a vast disconnect between their understanding and what really need to happen and...

Jonathan Robinson: Marika's ready to comment but I just want to see - (Ross), can you make sure we've got an action item here that is GNSO Interaction -- GNSO Council Interaction -- with the Multistakeholder Strategy Panel?

And I think really let's just be clear. I think what we're talking about here is the Council and the counselors it sort of manages but also the guardians of the GNSO policymaking processes. And in that capacity I think we have an obligation to interact with Beth Noveck's Panel. Quite exactly how we'll do that I'm not 100% sure but anyone who does can keep the Council informed and so we'll at least have that as an action. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. My suggestion is actually to try and see if we can connect with Theresa as she and her staff are responsible for our supporting the Panel to discuss what will be the best way to engage whether that's kind of a, you know, maybe a monthly update either through the staff or Beth Noveck or however they work.

You need to ensure that there is this dialogue from both sides so we understand what they are working on or what they're trying to do as well and then to understand how we work and what our current best practices are. So I think we can to try to set it up in that way and see from there what would be the most appropriate approach.

Is it forming a group? Is it through you? Is it with the whole Council or with the whole GNSO? So that may be a starting point.

Jonathan Robinson: Good suggestion Marika thanks. Now as I said that the answer - I already did reach out to Marika and she -- to Theresa -- and she did offer a meeting, which hasn't yet been scheduled but (Lasa) you can put that action on me to reach out to Theresa on behalf of the Council with respect to GNSO policymaking and its relationship with the work of the Multistakeholder Innovation -- the Panel -- Strategy Panel?

Any more comments on that topic or are we done? Did I leave some out?

(Dan): I don't think our objector has to be as even as aspirational as you mentioned.

You know, our responsibility for managing the policy process means that it not get muddied or murky in ways that make it hard to understand the process in itself. And if we're creating parallel tracks then we are potentially looking at a - making it a murky and muddy kind of approach and we don't want that to happen.

It's interesting. This meeting occurred at the same time as the ICANN Board and GAC Interaction and so I'm beginning to think now that I need to begin looking at the agenda for these meetings differently, you know?

Historically it's the GAC Board Interaction -- is one of the meetings that you don't want to miss. Well maybe the sessions need to be weighted differently now.

Jonathan Robinson: But just to be clear, which session clashed with the GAC Board Interaction?

(Dan): Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I think (Dan) amplifies the point that I was trying to make that, you know, we need a cadre of folks who are really paying attention to this and, you know, so that we make sure that we've got really solid participation and representation at some of these meetings.

But then I think the other thing is that we need to build, you know, this sounds like something we need to build a record on in the legal sense so that when they come out with something completely ludicrous -- which they may do -- we can say, "Look we are on record here and here and here and here. I mean here are our representatives that you've either ignored or," you know, I'm starting to go into ankle biter mode already and so I'm not a good representative.

But, you know, this is clearly something that we have to take very seriously.

Jonathan Robinson: David?

David Cake: Not to come in and make some comments but in this particular case please allow me to one, encourage your involvement in all these activities in terms of the Multistakeholder Improvement Strategy Panel. Definitely there are some online inputs to do that.

We gave a liaison to Beth Noveck's staff. As an ICANN Fellow linked to the Policy Department - so we have an avenue there and obviously through Theresa Swinehart who heads those programs.

So please make sure that you do follow that. We will keep you informed in that. I will just add that this particular Strategy Panel is not like an ATRT Review. It is not looking at the processes and procedures of the GNSO per se -- to look at positive or negative aspects. It's really looking at other tools for best practices in similar organizations -- if there are similar ones to ICANN that may be helpful and useful as suggestions.

So it would not be a review or a judgment on one particular practice or procedure or one particular council but more of how one could elaborate or have extra tools that might be at our disposal. So please think of it in those terms. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks David. I appreciate that information input. Amr?

Amr Elsadr: I would just like a clarification on the liaison to Beth Noveck's staff -- what was meant by that.

Man: The person is learning from Policy Development Staff on how things work. The person is actually working for the Multistakeholder Panel but is linked to



us in terms of information we include on our briefings or we use to come to us for sources of information on various councils and procedures. And so we are providing that as mentor.

David Cake: Yes that's correct. It's staffing that Panel.

Jonathan Robinson: Jen?

Jennifer Wolfe: Could I ask a question David? I guess what happens if her recommendations are in conflict with the way things currently work or I guess...

David Cake: That's not...

Jennifer Wolfe: ...what concerned me is...

David Cake: ...I would...

Jennifer Wolfe: ...she's talking...

David Cake: ...I would - it's not recommendations. They would be suggestions or best practices or that type of thing. It wouldn't be recommendations in that sense.

And two, that is to be either further incorporated in any Strategic Planning Session or implementation of any AT link and the ATRT Reviews.

So in that sense it's really more other ideas for which there has be further consideration, public comment and anything before action would be taken internally to change processes or structures of ICANN.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan, Chuck Gomes. With regard to this issue -- and by the way I'm totally supportive of where you're going with this Jennifer -- but one of my concerns in terms of some of the presentations on the Strategic Panels this week has been okay, what happens once they deliver their reports?

And I was able to get a pretty clear answer after I probably was a little bit irritating to Theresa in that after the reports are delivered -- because one of the problems yesterday in the slide that was put up in the session late morning was that it said in April Board Action.

Well I just the previous day raised this same point. I said, "Okay what happens after these Panels produce their output?" Because I was very concerned that -- and probably some of you have heard me say this sometime this week -- is that, "Okay the Strategic Panels do their thing. They come back with some information and it's put out for public comment," which it will be.

And then staff on the Board decide what they're going to take from those -- both the results of their work and the public comment -- and take off. I was assured very clearly that's not going to happen but what will happen will be the regular Strategic Plan Process Development where staff will develop a draft Strategic Plan after the public comments on this and then the Community will respond to that.

And it's an iterative process and keep in mind too that it will happen. This is assuming that they follow through on what they committed to when I asked these questions -- and I think they will. It's for the fiscal - the Strategic Plan really won't have any impact on the Budget and Operating Plan until fiscal - for fiscal year '16 -- another good thing to hear -- because it's way too late for fiscal year '15 -- which the Operating Plan we should see first of next year.

So I think that the process is going to be normal process for Strategic Plan and like David said, "These aren't supposed to be recommendations." That's

kind of semantics I think. I mean bottom line is they will be things that will be considered for changes to the Strategic Plan whether they're called that or not. And I'm not being critical there.

As long as the process afterwards is the full Community process for developing the Strategic Plan, I personally am much more comfortable with it. So my concern -- and again some of you have heard me say this -- is less about the Panels themselves and what they produce and much more so in terms of how that is handled after they produce their reports.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: That's great news Chuck. This is Mikey.

I think that one of the things that -- now this is an opportunity staring us in the face if we can figure out how to take advantage of it -- which is I think the worst headline to write would be, "Strategic Planning and a Panel at great expense and much time produces silly results that are completely irrelevant to the true processes that need to exist."

Because of this unusual relationship between contracts and consensus policy and they must missed the boat entirely and we started to say, "Well great job but a swing and a miss." That's a bad headline. And so if there's some way that we can steer them or help them or something to a result that's more of a positive contribution to what we do, that would be helpful.

As a miniature case study, I'll give you the ICANN labs initiative, which has been breathlessly rediscovering things like Facebook and LinkedIn. It's like it's a tragedy. It's a huge amount of resource going into something that is silly. It's getting all kinds of well this is silly kind of reaction out in the Twittersverse and if there's some way to head us - head these other ones off from that kind of thing, it would really be helpful I think.

Jonathan Robinson: And Chuck I think we've got to draw a line after this.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again, and Mikey I'm with you all the way and that's why I think it's really incumbent upon us -- staying on top of this and participating in the Webinars that they're going to hold. That's going to be our earliest opportunity to impact what - where they're going, okay? And obviously we'll have opportunity at the ends too but just - I'm with you but let's cover that by being involved and participating.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so to try and turn this into something and I'm certainly - Jen I'll come to you and make sure that we don't leave you off. I'm certainly committed to personally engaging with Theresa Swinehart with -- to the extent that it's reasonable and possible -- with Beth directly and I can do that in my capacity as Council Chair.

I think it would be good if we had at least one other counselor who said that they were (unintelligible) in the way Chuck has talked about the midst to being on every Webinar, follow every (unintelligible) that our kind of point person liaison -- whatever we want to call it.

Have I got a volunteer for that by any chance? Yes? So Jennifer I'm seeing your hand up and so that would be great and then that's - and if Jen - we're sorry Jen. I didn't realize that's what I thought you wanted to...

Man: So I'm also volunteering and I would like to be in the queue.

Man: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Great so that's so - what I think we - my feeling is we'll have lots of other work to do even if - anyone's of course welcome. These are open processes but it's really one or two people who take a responsibility from the point of view of the Council so I think we have two volunteers.

(Jeff), you wanted you speak?

(Jeff): Just to, you know, pile on a little bit what Mikey was saying, you know, whatever comes out of these groups, I believe we'll have a huge degree of inertia into being incorporated probably almost unaltered into the Strategic Plan. And I think that we need to be as engaged as possible throughout the whole process and steer it and inform it wherever we can.

Man: So I would John...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: I know how we hate to draw conclusions on single anecdotes but I heard one this morning that I think I'd just like to pass along. So as the new.icann.org was being unveiled and (unintelligible) A and B this morning, one of the first people to the microphone was (Patrick Folstrom), Chair of the (ESEC) and he said that ICANN has - essentially that the (ESEC) Team doesn't - no longer chooses to use the ICANN tools. The Web site's too confusing. The tools change too often and they're not useful.

I don't, you know, you could look at the transcript. That's what I heard and I thought, "Well okay this meeting's over."

So I went to the next one but I just thought it was interesting that someone with that pedigree would -- in that form -- choose to make that particular kind of statement.

Jonathan Robinson: David?

David Cake: I just want to say I am also planning to track this particular Panel very closely anyway so whether I do that or not (unintelligible) in this capacity and I (unintelligible) I mean is from a GNSO point of view is we would never sort of - we have never been asked what we wanted from this slide.

There are actually things where it really lacks, you know, it would be really valuable for people to go out and find - try different tools for things that we do that would be really useful -- tools for, you know, things like collaborative, you know, that would help us collaboratively put together a document and things like that.

We'd actually be really valuable but instead yes I'm - because we haven't been asked. We're just as likely to be told we should all go and, you know, do things using tools we've already tried or already found failing or that we're not - were not really working.

So this does seem to be part of the problem is that they sort of came out of nowhere and didn't ask. They never asked what we wanted out of this.

There's actually plenty that I would like out of the new processes -- the working group, you know, there's things we can see in ICANN that clearly have been around for a long time, are really kind of old and stale and it would be great to see something else, you know, the - I mean the public comment process, for example. It's sort of this ancient crusty code from wherever so there's a lot to be gained here.

But yes engagement is what is so far lacking and...

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks David. That's a nice segue into our next topic but before we do that I've Avri and Chuck who I should defer to for our last one.

Avri Doria: I didn't think anything I had to say was that momentous but I tend to have a negative view of these Panels as well and I usually express it in words that shouldn't go on the transcript. But I do think that we do have an opportunity to input into them and I - and we should. And I want to add that I'm planning to track the - ICANN's role in the ecosystem one fairly closely so...

Jonathan Robinson: Just to make it absolutely clear which panel that is that you're talking about.

Avri Doria: There's...

Jonathan Robinson: Is that the one that's sort of outside of ICANN?

Avri Doria: It's one with many, many people and it's the one looking at how - what ICANN's role is within the Internet governance ecosystem.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's record that as well Lars. I mean, and actually if we feel strongly enough, and we don't have to decide that now, we might want an alternative because I think we had Jen and James as volunteers on the MSI Strategy panel.

That's great that they - that we can rely on them to track - I'm sure others will like David said he would and so on, but I think we have to partition up our resources quite carefully because we have a tendency to go for a hot topic and a lot of us volunteer for that or get involved.

And so I'm quite keen that we make sure we - there's a huge amount going on; too much for any of us. Avri respond and then...

Avri Doria: I just wanted to say that if I don't track it for the Council I'll track it for my own purposes.

Jonathan Robinson: So Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. Just one caution. We need to keep in mind that these are strategic panels, so we should be careful about getting too tactical. Your suggestions for example are great suggestions but it's probably not at the strategic level, so just a caution.

I think everybody understands that but it's real easy to get into the tactical, and that probably detracts from really getting some strategic things that are looking as much as five years down the road.

Jonathan Robinson: And I suppose you hit the nail on the head there Chuck. Some of it is a trust that these are genuinely strategic panels rather than - and I guess the fear that I'm perceiving is that they are tactical and how you press through the recommendations that come out in four months' time and they say, "Why didn't you do that in the GNSO?"

And so - but I think that our fears are all on the table and you - but you make wise comments there. Right. Let's move on then to the next slide please Lars.

And the reason I said that David's point was a good Segway because here we talk about the GNSO Review Working Group. Now this is another one where a bunch of us put our hands and said, "Great.

We'd like to be on that." Just let me capture where we're at right now. We heard extensively from Ray in our meeting with him in the Board. He's working at the Structure Improvements Committee level at a framework type level for all future Board initiated reviews.

In addition, as I understand it the sequence of reviews that are going to come out of that are first the GNSO and next the ALAC. We've told him we're available and our point person leading our little group on this is Jennifer Wolfe, and we can engage with them on three levels.

But first of all is - and I think you should - might want to hear directly from Jennifer on her own background and why she's particularly relevant to this. But on the first level on anything as and when - as they evolve their thinking there's already a paper out that they've shared with us, a - an initial draft paper and that will be valid.



The second level is any - the areas of responsibility of the Council and what we can do immediately to start to dovetail our own self-review work of the policy development process, and link that into the kind of review work that they might like to do.

And the third is to act as a kind of conduit, an informer to the GNSO as a whole as to how the process of the review might work. So it's not the Council assuming that we deal with the review of the GNSO, but just making sure that to the extent that we can help we make sure that the GNSO is informed.

And so I think those are the three roles of that group. And whilst I - and it's clear that Ray would like us to engage with him but not have - he doesn't want to meet with ten people.

So if we could rethink who's on that group and I don't know how to do that. But Jen, maybe you want to just say very briefly about your sort of background and experience and why - how that qualifies you in this position.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure. So just very briefly for those of you who don't know me, I've spent the last 15, 20 years of my career building a law firm and a consulting firm. And most of what I've done in my career is around strategic planning and process improvement.

I have a Black Belt in the Lean Six Sigma methodology of process improvement. And if you look at the document that Ray circulated and the methodology and approach that he's looking at, it is very, very data driven.

It's a very typical audit is the term that he's using but it's very much focused on tracking things that can be tracked in metrics. And so I think that what I can bring to the Council is to really help understand how we're going to be measured, and then ensure that we all like the way we're going to be measured and have responses if we think that it should be measured in a different way.

And then I think also as we look at this process, we have a really good opportunity to conduct our own self-review in parallel with the same metrics so that if their review has different outcomes from ours, we've at least used the same methodology so it can be compared appropriately.

Jonathan Robinson: Very succinct and clear to me. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi. This is Mikey. My eyebrows just went up. We've got a coordination thing that we need to pay - you and I need to pay attention to. In the - I'm on the Drafting Team that's working on the Metrics and Reporting non-PDP Working Group.

And we need to somehow figure out how to keep that lashed together in a way that we're not laying out yet another metrics structure so...

Jonathan Robinson: So Lars if you can capture that Mikey and Jen need to - as part of that GNSO Review Working Group work Mikey needs to feed in the work of the Metrics and Reporting Working Group.

All right. So one of - the thing I've suggested there, and we can take this offline on the list, is just to revisit who's on the membership of that group and just make sure that group is manageable for the moment and it could potentially be - have a smaller size for the short-term objectives and maybe Jen you can even lay those out.

And then as the work of the group develops it might be that more join in. So Lars if you can just capture that we'll - and just capture the three main objectives of that Working Group and ensure that the membership is reviewed and current.

Right. Oh it was the GAC. I think we all - just moving on to the next topic then, which is our work with the GAC and our attempt, I mean, I'm slightly

worried about this to be absolutely candid with you because we've done all this nice, lovely, you know, touchy feely stuff with the GAC.

And yesterday we approved the outcome of a PDP, which contradicts or at least doesn't entirely accord with their advice so quite where these two are going to go I'm not sure.

But, you know, so far we've had a very good interaction with them at the prospects of their improved engagement with the GNSO and the PDP process. Yes Avri comment.

Avri Doria: Yes. Does having a good touchy feely with them mean we can't disagree with them? Are those two contradictory somehow?

Jonathan Robinson: I shouldn't have been maybe so lazy with my language but, you know, I think you get the sense of what I'm saying. We have been working well with them in terms of our plans to engage with them.

I accept that I think there's, I mean, one of my worries is I think there's some bumps down the road even on the early engagement stuff. And make no mistake, I mean, there's a series - the big issue is we all feel great about early engagement.

We all feel great about a reverse liaison but the devil is in the detail as it always is. And so that's where I think it - the plan at the moment is now to dig into that detail, which we're now in Singapore in some intercessional work with that - with three of us to engage properly with them and try and dig out that detail, so that's the plan. Comments/input?

Avri Doria: Yes. I mean, I think it's really good to maintain a good working relationship with them. But I don't think that that good working relationship should by any means include 100% agreement which goes under other names or that - so I

think a good working relationship means at the end somewhere in the middle, you know, we've agreed to some stuff that's a stretch.

They've agreed to some stuff that's a stretch. But, you know, I - so I don't see that as a problem. I see that as part of the process that you've got ahead of you.

Jonathan Robinson: I think it's a welcome reminder and I hope you'll keep us in check on that so we don't get steamrolled by the GAC.

David: I think a little bit of some forensic examination of things that - where we clearly are in disagreement to work at how we could've managed that process to make it work better will be something that will be now.

But acknowledging they'll get to things where we significantly disagree and the policy we passed yesterday will clearly be part of that and, you know, give - each give our perspectives of how we think that could've been better done will be part of the discussion I think.

Jonathan Robinson: But just to confirm Volker and David, you're happy with participating in that intercessional Working Group to engage with the GAC and move on with this early engagement, the policy development...

David: Yes I'm happy to.

Volker Greimann: Of course, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. So Lars you can commit that to the action list as well that that's the team that's going to work on that. To close that item and move on to the next one, which is...

Chuck Gomes: Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes sorry Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Just a - thanks. This is Chuck. Just a real quick follow up there with regard to your concern about we didn't give them everything they wanted. I think -and my own assessment is is that one of the reasons some people on the team weren't totally satisfied with the results of the PDP is because some of the rest of us bent over backwards to try and give the GAC some of what they wanted.

So it's important to keep that in context when we're doing this. Yes we didn't give them everything we wanted, but we thoroughly evaluated it and gave them more than some people really wanted to give them.

So keep that in context when we're thinking about this and that and we may have to provide some of that to the GAC. I don't know.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point Chuck. So that's both in the Working Group and of course it was very much noted that at the Council level yesterday that we sort of - I don't know what the right expression is but we favored good process, good collegiate work and an overall desirable outcome over some individual positions.

And, I mean, I think that cannot go unnoticed through the community and in fact I bumped into both Cherine and - of the new gTLD Program Committee and Steve this morning - Crocker.

And I spoke with both of them about that and indicated the unanimity with which we got behind that, so they are in no doubts about that. I saw Mikey and John's hands. John first then Mikey I think.

John: I don't mind disagreeing with the GAC especially when we do it in such detail and with such grounding, right. Perhaps we gave the Board reason to not give the GAC what the GAC is asking for.

I don't know but I am curious about the - what the colloquy at that GAC Board session was between Denmark and the new gTLD Program Committee on this sidebar discussion with regard to protections for IGOs and INGOs.

I mean, that is in the transcript. They heard it loud and clear. And I don't know if it was real or not but it - it's there and my concern of course would be that if there is some side discussion, some sidebar that has gone on that it would - well I'd be - I'd feel bad for the members of the Working Group that put so much time and effort.

But I'd also feel that we as a Council and the GNSO in general have been misdealt by the Board, a point that I have made a few times before.

Jonathan Robinson: What if anything do you want us to do about it now John?

John: Just be aware of it and, you know, I will have kerosene-drenched torches at the ready for the session.

Jonathan Robinson: Does that steal your thunder Mikey or you still want to make a point?

Mikey O'Connor: Well it's sort of a Segway into the next section and that's why I wanted John to go first, and that is that what happened yesterday is there was a sound byte that started running around right away that said that, you know, it was a really short headline.

"GNSO unanimously adopts resolution that conflicts with GAC," and that just went like wildfire through the room. I think the backfire or the, you know, I think we need to get better at the message.

And I think in this case the words are words like rigor and consensus and due care and, you know, compromise as Chuck was saying so that these sound

bytes don't get, you know, out in the Twitterverse and then become true, you know, and it does head into the PR thing.

This language is really important and it's important I think to get those messages formulated quickly and out quickly.

Jonathan Robinson: It's a good point and I think that's exactly why I put this up. I didn't expect us to take a long time on this, but I did want to highlight that I'm acutely aware of the marketing and PR of the GNSO and the work - the good policy work of the GNSO.

And I think it's part of the Council's responsibility and I think we've set up a Twitter account for GNSO Council Chair or what are we set up at the moment for? Just to check with Staff?

Man: Just the GNSO in general.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so we have - and I think we can move on this. And, you know, you saw the videos and the - on the Web site talk about - with me talking about some dirt and talk about policy stuff and so - Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I guess since this PDP that I was tasked with Chairing got so much attention, I think we should slice and dice it, you know, not putting too much work into it but I guess that it's worthwhile dealing with the criticism that came up afterwards.

And Mikey has brought up some points. So we had the question, "To what extent strong support but significant opposition recommendations should go to the Council, and whether that would transfer - transform the Council to a policymaking body or legislative body?"

So that's one question that I should - that I think we should look into. Another said that we should have worked in greater detail on potential outcome of our recommendations, and I think that's worthwhile looking at.

And also with respect to the GAC and our discussion or our joint meeting with the GAC, you will remember Jonathan that we - when we talked about or you talked about early engagement, the GAC responded that they will make up their mind as to at what point in time the GAC should make recommendations or provide advice to the Working Groups or to the GNSO?

So we might have another route for the GAC to try influence and that is very welcome policymaking, but will that be the creation of GAC advice to Working Groups or GAC advice to the Council, which we currently only have directed at the Board?

So I think there are various implications of this and I would, you know, be more than happy to discuss this with whoever is interested in it as long as my memory is fresh on what we did and why we did things.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes and I think those are the detailed questions - come up and that's what this group's got to work in, because the minute you say what's envisaged you start then, "Well what does that mean?"

What are the implications? What are the responses?" And I think that's where all the detailed questions have to be worked through, brought back to the Council and so on.

That's certainly the discussion that has to take place. Conscious of time here - so that's just - for me that was more of a placeholder. I mean, I've talked with Thomas privately last night about trying to turn the work of the IGO/INGO into some sort of a case study, and that's what a business would do if it was trying to market itself.



And to some extent I think the GNSO - that's what we need to do about our policy. To respond to Mikey's point we need - we have the right messages, the right messaging coming out so that's really as I said partly tongue in cheek but partly quite serious that I think we need to promote and share our success stories.

Can we go on to the next slide? So the next slide just summarizes the action items that came out of various bits and pieces over the weekend and over our sessions.

That point about Visa procedures you'll remember. There's a link between the Metrics and Reporting Drafting Team and there was a question. I'm not - I don't exactly remember this.

We need to go back and check exactly what the - what - why we were asking to consider the Council views in that. Certainly there was a proposal that Steve DelBianco talked about and others about, you know, making - having annual reports which links into the marketing and PR side on the GNSO's policy work in plain English.

In fact Maria talked about something similar where she talked about any policy work having a kind of more plain English straightforward discussion of context, so that's a related point.

Talked about having dashboard and metrics for the project list in the same time. We've touched on the SO/AC observers issue, which is the SSAC observer to Council.

And then Sebastian asked for input onto the Meeting Strategy Working Group, which ties in John to the kind of points you're talking about about this parallel stuff and Mikey you talked about.

So I don't know. Maybe this is an opportunity for you guys. I mean, the two of you - I don't know if you would be volunteers to provide that link or that input.

I mean, I don't want to volunteer you but is that - are you willing to - yes someone's got to engage with the Meeting Strategy Working Group. I think that was the request from Sebastian that we provide some - but can anyone remind me of what exactly Sebastian was looking for?

I mean, he chaired the so-called Meeting Strategy Working Group that looks at critical issues. Any volunteers to engage with them and help them to understand - yes Gabriela?

Great. So I think if Lars you could record that we - I think ideally in all of these things it's good to have two so that both can participate, can check and could potentially if there's a real problem one can attend.

So it's no - if there's any other volunteer to go along with Gabriela on that, I think providing that input, providing the liaison to and from the Council and just making sure that our concerns - so for example a key point of view from the Council might be, "We want our main Council session to be as unconflicted as possible."

Ideally the Board should not have scheduled meetings. For example I've just - we just got a straw man to put out but those are the kind of points we were able to make on behalf of the Council.

How do we feel about those things on, you know, there was talk - I think I heard talk of maybe Sunday being used for something else. How do we as the Council feel about that, losing our Sunday sessions, you know, that kind of pre-meeting preparation thing, cross community stuff?

So those are the kind of things that I think we might well do - engage with and work with the Meeting Strategy Working Group on. Is there a second

volunteer to go with Gabriela? Mikey were you willing or is that - am I pushing you too hard on that?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm certainly willing to take on anything you ask but this isn't one of my core issues.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so let's leave it aside for the moment. We'll have Gabriela and anyone else can join with Gabriela if you feel it would be of interest and appropriate. Final slide please Lars. Sorry. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thanks Jonathan. Just before you move on to the last slide - so on the plain English, the reporting of the GNSO policy and that links as you mentioned to the marketing and PR, actually I was approached by the VP of Stakeholder Group, I mean, sorry, the VP of Asia from ICANN.

They're putting together in the thinking still in this process a kind of a mini ICANN during next year's - there's a usual meeting. What we have been intended to is called APIOT, the Asian-Pacific Internet Operation Technology, this type of meeting and it's actually in conjunction, I mean, kind of the - always with the A-P NIC.

They're asking some of us in Asia-Pac to help him to put together a - as I mentioned a mini ICANN to try to engage with local businesses as well as a Non-Commercial groups.

So I just wish to give everybody a heads up here and there's - there are effort being made there. And this actually work in plain English and later to be translated into Chinese would be helpful for the world.

I mean, I'll be asked to do this and actually willing to help. It's simply the person who's in charge in Asia and I'm just assuming that others' regional head is that they know probably the kind of the cosmetics expression of ICANN, but probably down to those policy level they need our help.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so thanks Ching. Keep us informed on that then and then what - okay so I've got Mikey and Avri.

Mikey O'Connor: this one's just really quick. Azumi, do you and Jen know each other and can you coordinate on this? Okay. And then as long as I've got the mic open I'm apologizing. I have to scoot.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri and Amr.

Avri Doria: Quick question on the Visa procedures. Just wanted to mention that one of the things that we got ATRT feedback was various Visa issues. I don't know if that's what - your issue.

But what we're looking for and I should've mentioned it earlier is if any Council, Working Group or whatever volunteers you know of who were denied or couldn't get to meetings because of Visas in 2012 or 2013, we would like the data because what we're trying to do is make a recommendation based upon that difficulty, but being fact-based we need the facts.

So if there's any of your Working Groups or any of that, you know, it's what - we're making it on the volunteers that couldn't make it in 2012 and '13, so please.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. Amr if you could make your point and then I'm going to briefly work through the action items on the last slide.

Amr Elsadr: Yes very quickly and I don't want to take up time during the meeting, but I'm just a bit oblivious as to what marketing and PR topic is and why we're discussing marketing and PR at a Council meeting.

Would it be okay to circulate something on the list just to get some background on this?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes let me just have a quick chat. It'll be two minutes aside but it's - as I said it's slightly tongue in cheek, the use of the term, but I'll discuss with you what I mean by that and see if you feel - still feel it needs further clarification.

Could we go on to the next slide? And so we need to appoint a liaison to the SCI. We will produce - we - it is an obligation on the Council leadership to produce Council meeting schedule for 2014 within 30 days of the annual meeting.

We'll do that. I just wanted to remind all of you that - and I feel very positive about this. This seems like a fantastically well-qualified and engaged Council, so it's great news and I just want to remind you that's what we - we're signed up for.

We all need to be engaged, participate and involved, I mean, to absolutely rely on myself and that the Chair - the Vice Chairs will rely on all of your engagement and involvement and participation.

So I'm very, very excited about the quality of the - of this 2014 Council. It's fantastic and so just a reminder of that. The - typically the responsibility of the Vice Chairs is to organize the meeting schedules.

And David I've spoken with in - on - in private about doing a Singapore meeting and Volker in London so that's the likely way in which we'll work. And then reminding you all of the Council induction and development session tomorrow.

It's taking place on the 24th Floor and it's a beautiful room with lovely, lovely views. It's a fantastic place in which to work so thanks for that being organized.

It commences at - here we go - guys just the schedule here so everyone's clear. At 9:00 am there is breakfast available. The primary purpose of a 9:00 am to 10:00 am is to offer the incoming Councilors an opportunity to meet and to meet with the Vice Chairs and the policy staff and to just get up to speed.

Feel free to answer - open to ask any questions like, "What the hell do you mean by marketing and PR?" or anything else and that's the opportunity. However it is not closed.

Do you want a free breakfast and you want to come up at 9:00 am, come along. It's fine. But the primary purpose is to just give a little bit of free space to the early Councilors, in fact to the newly joining Councilors and frankly to give the rest of you an opportunity to possibly have a lion.

But by all means come at 9:00. You're very welcome. At 10 o'clock we are joined by the Chairs and - Chairs of the Stakeholder Groups and constituencies or a nominated representative.

And the objective of that is to give a perspective to the Council of the work of the GNSO, some of the mechanics of how it all works and to come in and do that.

So Glen needs to know from all of you please who will be there tomorrow, and very importantly who will be there tomorrow night. Please let Glen know.

So just give a quick raise of hands. Who's going to be there tomorrow night at the dinner? So it looks like we got a lovely dinner organized for tomorrow night and function, so if you could make sure that Glen knows who you are. Glen do you want it on email or...?

Mikey O'Connor: Could I just...?

Glen de Saint Gery: Sorry. I'd like to actually know if anybody who has replied to me, because I know you have practically all replied to me, is not coming for some or other reason because that has happened too. That's all. Okay thanks. That's exactly what I want (Gene). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Glen send a mail to the list and ask for people to confirm that again to just double check.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes please.

Jonathan Robinson: So Ching is not coming. Any - so it's - yes. So there's an all day session that ends - Marika please help me. Marika what time does the session end please? Concentrate. Brian.

Marika Konings: I believe it's 4:00 or 4:30 but we'll send the agenda out after this meeting with the detailed timing.

Woman: A question - dinner in Argentinian time? Argentinian time for dinner or what time? For me it will...

Glen de Saint Gery: Sorry. The pickup will be from the hotel from the Sheraton at quarter of 5:00 to 8:00 in the lobby.

Avri Doria: Is this free food or how does it cost?

Glen de Saint Gery: It's part of the package. It's a free dinner and it's a tango show and it's at the (Roja). For people here in Argentina you probably know it.

Jonathan Robinson: So send reminders of the agenda and the details to the list. Please let us know if you can't come. That's the most important...

Glen de Saint Gery: If you can't come because we have to pay up in advance. That's the problem.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks everyone. Look forward to seeing you at 9:00 or 10:00 tomorrow morning. Don't be late for the 10 o'clock session please. Please be prompt for 10:00.

Twenty-fourth floor of the main hotel. Not the tower - the main hotel - 24th of the main hotel.

((Crosstalk))

END