Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires GNSO Wrap up Session

Thursday 25 June 2015

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

Volker Greimann: Please fasten your seatbelts and put your seats back in an upright position. We're ready to take off.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Volker, thanks everyone. Hi, welcome to the wrap-up session. We've got an hour. So if that's correct, can they confirm that we have an hour; one hour until 12:45.

So we have eight items on the agenda. I don't know if you've seen these on the list but they are here in front of you in any case. Yes, so that's the eight items.

So first on the list is any feedback from the weekend session. If you may want to make any points or comments about areas of improvement now, or alternatively you may wish to participate in filling in this survey. It's not been sent out yet but it will be sent out in due course.

Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So I think as all of you know, we do a short survey to ask for council members as well as stakeholder group and constituency input on the meetings; you know, what went well, what could have gone better, what are the topics you would like to see for the next meeting.

But the thing on last survey we actually got really few responses. So just trying to see if anyone has any suggestions on how we could get more input on that, or does that just mean that people are in general pleased with how we run the meetings and the topics that are being discussed.

Jonathan Robinson: Any comments or points about the weekend session. I mean they were pretty (unintelligible); there was a lot going on.

But if you look at it, is there anything that you would not have had on there or would have seen differently?

Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: This also would be very helpful with the view to the upcoming new meeting schedule as we will not have a weekend session at least for the meeting following (unintelligible) I think it is; the B meeting which is in the summer of next year.

So basically, we will have to look at the weekend session and see what we would have to essentially takeover into the rest of the sessions and what we could move into another slot, maybe an update previous to the meeting.

So please, that would be appreciated. If not today, on the list is fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or points? Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Sorry for jumping in on this, but a question Volker.

It is assumed that there will be no weekend meetings on the summer meeting next year, or is that still an issue being considered?

Volker Greimann: Well we have asked ICANN Meeting Planning Staff and they were pretty adamant in confirming that there will not be any days tacked onto the meeting structure as planned which means that we will have to really try hard to make this work. This of course will lead to difficulties and significant change of our current structure of meetings for that meeting.

And as of this time, still have no idea how this will turn up even though we have some concepts in that already. We'll just have to see and try -- try and see.

Jonathan Robinson: I mean I must say from my point of view, the one thing I have experience in, if you take a big level, you don't just consider the GNSO working session. I mean certainly still some quite significant repetition through the course of the whole meeting.

I mean I've been to some topics or been involved in some topics which have dealt with three or four times in more or less the same way.

So it will be interesting. When we're forced to work in a different way, as a summer meeting will inevitably make us do, how that changes.

But let's keep - there's a number of items to cover. If they're not specific comments or issues about how we ran the weekend session, because as far as Dublin's concerned and Marrakech, it's essentially the next two meetings are essentially similar. So please do give feedback.

And also when those drafts of the schedule do come around, you know, any feedback you can give is always useful.

Right. So the next thing is planning for Dublin and thinking about the various issues. Of course we've flagged in the last day or two that there is going to be that Council Development Session on the Friday. So we'd really appreciate if all councilors were there on Friday, and in particular also communicating with your groups about incoming councilors and making sure that they are aware as early as possible. Because we've had that in the past where people said, "Well I didn't know that was going to be taking place."

So Phil.

Phil Corwin: Is that the Friday before the meeting or the Friday after the meeting?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thank you for that. It's the Friday after it; it's the tomorrow day.

So essentially what the structure of the meeting, for the voidance of doubt is, in Dublin will be GNSO weekend session Saturday/Sunday, regular ICANN meetings Monday through Thursday, Friday at the end of that week, an additional GNSO Council Development Session. This is for councilors only.

I've got Bret and then I've got (Carlos).

Bret Fausett: Thanks. Just planning for Dublin, get my glutton for punishment.

One of the other evenings I listened to the Non-Contracted Party House's interaction with the Board. And I found it very enlightening to hear what other constituencies were raising with at the Board level.

I would have loved to have had both the opportunity to talk to the other councilors about the things that were important to the Registries as well as hear from the other councilors about the things that they were raising to the Board.

I wonder whether we can set aside some time at our Saturday/Sunday sessions to talk to each other about the things that are important to our constituencies. Maybe we always don't know that before Constituency Day. So, you know, we might want to put that later in the week now that I'm thinking about it.

But I found it very helpful to me both, you know, in the work I do for business but also as a councilor just to hear the concerns of others as they voice them to the Board.

So I think maybe that could be a productive use of our time at some point during the week to talk and listen.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. Any - (Carlos), you're next.

(Carlos):   Yes, about the Friday after the meeting, please be clear if it includes dinner or not. Last time in Los Angeles, we lost half of the people Friday afternoon and only half of the group went for a very interesting dinner. So it's good to know if it goes through all Friday or just until Friday afternoon. That's where Volker defined a Multistakeholder Model Friday evening.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point. Okay, so thank you.

I mean it will be challenging because part of it was that it wasn't clear, but part of it is it's at the end of a long meeting and the issue of - so perhaps what we need to do is clarify whether that's something we want or not. Because clearly when we did this the first time in Buenos Aires, and essentially having worked a full day on that Friday, it wasn't really an option to go home, get a flight and so on, and for whatever reason. And it turned out to be a very nice evening, a very sort of way of kind of bonding and wrapping up the thing.

Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So of course the other option is to do the dinner the evening before. But I believe we've never done that because there are already other commitments that typically exist; there's nothing - normally the closing cocktail. I think there's some other meetings that tend to happen there. But if that would work better, that is something else we could consider.

I mean the idea of the dinner is it's a bit of a closing of the day, so from a meeting flow it makes more sense. But if people believe that they're adding really a lot of time because you can fly out in the evening and early the next morning, maybe that's something to consider as an alternative.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so we'll have to work on the planning.

Glen just added me a note which is quite significant in terms of the planning in that it looks like ICANN is going to seek to have all supported travelers confirmed by the 13th of July. Quite how this is going to square with - I suppose do we - we don't support incoming councilors do we though? Do we support incoming councilors?

But that means that technically the elections for incoming councilors need to be resolved by the 13th of July. That doesn't seem realistic. That's not going to happen is it?

Volker Greimann: That's absolutely not possibly for the Registrars at least.

Jonathan Robinson: So we'll have to work at that one. That's going to be - Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Sorry Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, hang on. Hang on just a moment. Before you comment, we've got a little bit of disorganization.

If I could ask you all to log into the Adobe Connect Room, it's a lot easier to manage the queue and it's fairer then. So unless you absolutely can't do that, I'd like you all in there because it's just - otherwise I'm knocking people out of the queue or putting things out of order.

So Glen, did you want to comment on the travel part?

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes, I realize that it is going to - the elections are going to impact this, but I think there are some constituencies, some stakeholder groups that know already who their chosen travelers will be. So as many people as possible, please, you know, send me your names. I'll send out the note.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so for this kind of thing, I think it's very useful to simply make sure we use the mailing list. This is perfect stuff for the mailing list; just sending out a call and letting us know the facts on the mailing list and then the point taken.

Okay, so I do acknowledge James, you had your hand up in the - your down? Heather? You're done? Okay.

I think that covers Item 2 so we'll move onto Item 3. So we need to come up together with the groups. We need to plan for the Council Chair and Co-Chair election.

For those of you who don't know, I'm term limited, so I won't be standing as a Registry Stakeholder Group Councilor; I won't be available to be on the Council from October. So we'll need a new Chair and Co-Chair to be either reelected or new Chair to be/new Co-Chair to be elected.

Marika, can you talk a little bit to the process of that just to give a sense of how things work?

Marika Konings: Yes, I'll maybe just talk about the nominations for that. I think it's all spelled out how the actually election is run in the GNSO Operating Procedures.

But basically each house nominates one candidate for the GNSO Council Chair position. And each house determines themselves how to run that nomination process.

It's important to know that a candidate for GNSO Council Chair doesn't need to be a member of a house, but must be a member of the GNSO Council. So basically anyone running for that position has to be a member of the GNSO Council.

And similarly, there's also the Vice-Chair selection which also happens. Each house nominates a Vice-Chair from their respective. But the Chair of the GNSO may not be a member of the same stakeholder group or either of the Vice-Chairs. So that's also something to be factored in.

I don't know if you want to go any further detail in the process or maybe I'll briefly mention the possible timeline for that. I mean just look that up because Glen basically looked back at previous elections that we've held, and on the base of that she has suggested some dates that the Council may want to consider as their timeline. I think it needs to be formally approved so it would be something on the next Council Agenda then.

But her suggestions are that 25th of September could be the deadline for nominations followed by the 2nd of October, tentative statements. Then the 17th and 18th of October, that's actually at the Dublin meeting. There would be a Q&A with candidates, followed then on the 21st of October, Wednesday meeting the actually election, which is done by the new Council as they are seated.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks Marika. So just to be clear; that's an indicative timetable. We haven't agreed yet that that is the timetable, but that gives you a feel for the way things will work.

Let me go to James and then I'll make some remarks of my own. James?

James Bladel: Thank you and thanks Marika for that timetable. It makes sense working backwards from that to build somewhat of a skeletal timeline.

My question was - and I think that we touched on this yesterday and I missed where we came down was that there was some question of whether or not incoming councilors who may not be known to be us yet are eligible for these positions; Chair and Vice-Chair.

And I think that, if I'm remembering correctly, they are technically eligible but we would require us to name an interim chair or interim vice-chair for sometime being until they were seated and that vote could conclude at the meeting following the Dublin meeting. And that was also - I think some folks who've been through that once before mentioned that that was very disruptive to continuity.

So my question is did we ever settle that question? And if not, does that indicate that the next - the people we are talking about -- let's just beat around the bush here -- the people we are talking about are sitting at the table now; we just don't know who or what, right, because they're not the unknown new councilors that we don't know yet.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's help with that James. Do you want to comment on that Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. So I actually went back to ICANN Legal to get their assistance with interpreting the rules that are currently written. And their read of it is indeed that a candidate has to be a member of the Council. So a candidate or someone coming onto the Council is not a Council member yet,

so that person wouldn't qualify for an election that would be held on that Wednesday in Dublin.

However, should that election fail to find a Chair based on the voting thresholds that need to be met, so basically if there's no agreement on the people that may have been candidates or there is maybe no candidate, the vice-chairs would at that moment step in and a new election would be organized immediately following that. And of course at that moment all the members that are on the Council are eligible to put themselves forward as candidates.

Jonathan Robinson: So at its simplest, the candidates on the sleight or potentially on the sleight, everyone around this table, all existing councilors who are not termed beyond October, at face value.

There are two wrinkles to that. I think I understand it to be two wrinkles. One is should one of the stakeholder groups or constituencies change their candidate ahead of the nomination period, change their representatives on the Council ahead of their nomination period. So in principle, there would be an introduction of a new councilor and chair candidate ahead of that. That's one.

And the second is, as Marika described, which is should we fail to produce a result for whatever reason, for example no one on the sleight or failure to reach the threshold to elect whatever was on the sleight, for whatever reason, would then go into that post new council phase when we call for a second round of nominations in which case the sleight is then comprised those newly added councilors.

I'll stop there and note - I thought I had a hand up from someone else. James, your hand is an old hand. I don't see any other hands. Okay.

So just a couple of comments from my perspective from the Chair if you like. There's really two things I would encourage you to think about and to communicate with your groups on.

The first of all is that, first and foremost, regardless of the house or the stakeholder group or the constituency, what you really should be looking for in thinking about nominations, it's someone who has qualities and qualifications in order to be able to do the job. That's the first thing.

What are their competencies? Are you satisfied that the person you are nominating whether they come from the house that you are not in or one of the other stakeholder groups that you are not in, or they come from your stakeholder group or constituency. What are their capabilities and qualities in terms of previous chairing experience, knowledge of GNSO and GNSO related matters, knowledge domain names and so on and so on. That's one.

And then the second is their ability to commit the requisite time. And, you know, you could argue about what the requisite time is, but I think a reasonable assessment should be that you should assess it as around 50% of a normal working job.

So it's significant, right. This is not a quick 10% that you might be able to do afterhours. This is preparation, you know, follow-up. When you add it up - and I went through this in a mechanical exercise at some point and checked. You know, when you add up all of the weeks and then the meetings and the prep for the meetings and the post analysis and the letter writing and all the rest of it that you add up.

So those would be my two points. Is the candidate qualified and are they able to dedicate the time? That's really the two questions I'd put to anyone who's thinking of talking with their groups about nominating a candidate for the role.

Michele, your hand is up and I'm sorry I missed it earlier.

Michele Neylon: (Don't go beeping) at me Jonathan please. Michele Neylon for the record. I had put my hand up earlier, took it down and put it up again so you didn't actually miss it.

Marika's guidelines on the timing I think is very, very important. It would be great if she could circulate that to us in some kind of simple and easy to digest form.

The timing around the rollover of councilors depending on which stakeholder group or constituency they're from is a little bit confusing. I mean this thing where, you know, you're potentially ending up where you're asked to provide details for people who you don't know about yet. And I felt sorry for James while trying to explain that situation; it was almost a Donald Rumsfeld moment.

You know, the rollover of councilors, I think it's important what you were saying Jonathan is key. This group makes some very important decisions and you need to make sure that the representatives that we put on here across the board are the best people; the ones who can commit to that. I mean it's of no value to anybody if people are just turning up and not committing properly; not engaging effectively. Because we end up with bad decisions with make us all unhappy in the long run.

Now obviously of course if it benefits the Registrars, we're not going to complain. No, but I'm being facetious.

But I just think it's something that people tend to overlook. I mean there has been issues I think in many groups across the entire wide spectrum of the ICANN community in the last six or seven years where some people have used various bodies, various positions, as just being a way to get to go to meetings. And, you know, that has a bad impact on the people that I know come here and work their damn asses off. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Michele. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes.

One of the issues that often comes up in talking about a Chair is the need for neutrality as everybody knows. And to my knowledge, I don't think we've ever had a Chair in the Council that has used that inappropriately. In fact, in my opinion, some of our Chairs have been almost too neutral; they never share a personal opinion. And I think it's okay to share a personal opinion as long as you say what you're doing or if you're representing your constituency.

I found when I was Chair that there were times when our reps either weren't aware of an issue from the stakeholder group or maybe weren't present where I would take off my Chair hat and share that. And I think you need to do that because you want your constituency or stakeholder group to be represented.

So I think it's really important that people that may be considering being a candidate, that you realize that you do have to be neutral, but it doesn't restrict you as long as you're clear what hat you're wearing in terms of representing your constituency.

Now I know Jonathan does a real good job of trying to get the other reps on the Council to take care of the Registry (sic) things. And I think I did the same thing. If they were there, I would rather they did it when I was Chair.

But nobody should think that you can't say anything personal or you can't say anything for your stakeholder group if you need to, as long as you let them know, "Hey, I'm taking my Chair hat off for a moment."

And then the other comment I wanted to make, I have always felt that it doesn't matter which, because you're going to be functioning neutrally, it doesn't matter what house you come from.

If somebody has the right skills, like Jonathan said, and can commit the time, and I totally support your estimate there in terms of the time commitment, I'm sure Avri would too because I know how hard she worked. Then it doesn't matter what house. You know, if somebody ever violated the neutrality role there, you're not going to let them stay Chair, right.

So I hope we don't get too hung up on houses. I think it would be nice if a candidate came from the Non-Contracted Party House because there hasn't been one from there. But in the end what you want is somebody that can do the leadership, will do the preparation and can commit the time. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. And, you know, to your point on the time, it's difficult to estimate and certainly, if you let it, it could take all the time that you add. It's a question of trying to put some kind of realistic perimeters on it.

And if people are measuring whether or not they have the time or able to persuade their employer or funder that they can give the time, I think that's a useful benchmark to call as 50%. But make no mistake; it could take more.

Well that's probably enough said on that unless anyone else wants to add anything. Michele, you've got an old hand I think, but just - all right. Let's move on then and we'll have to work that. That's going to hit us fairly hard figuring all that out over the next few months.

GAC Communiqué; I've had a brief skim over the GAC Communiqué last night. It looks like it's pretty substantial and so there may well be some policy implications of that that we want to respond to. So hopefully this is giving us a chance to do that.

And one of the things that's encouraging about it, in the GAC Communiqué they reference that we intend to do this and they are receptive to it.

So Volker, I don't know if you'd like to make any other comments in that respect?

Volker Greimann: I personally haven't seen it yet but I'm sure that it will make entertaining reading on the flight back, and I think we should get started next week at the earliest convenience to analyze and put it into format that we have developed, and then determine what response, which should be first coming from us, to the Board.

Jonathan Robinson: So let me help you a bit further then with a deadline. It feels to me like the logical thing to do here, to process this, work it out and sign it off at the first Council Meeting post this meeting. I mean that seems to be the logical thing to do because the minute it drags on longer than that, it loses its value.

And so I would like to be - the deadline is it's on the agenda for the next Council Meeting. And hopefully Volker and we can accept that.

Volker Greimann: Well thank you for that deadline; that's certainly appreciated. And I think we have a lot of discussing to do on the list once the first draft is out. I will inform you about the first draft and then hopefully it will get a spirited discussion that allows us to dig in deeper.

Jonathan Robinson: James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Thank you. I read the Communiqué or at least skimmed through it and I didn't see anything.

At least my question is under this process, do we respond to - is the entire Communiqué fair game or is it only those things where it says, "The GAC advises the Board," as GAC Advice. Because that section is fairly light this

time around, and I don't know if that was the intention that we had when we first took up this idea is that we would be responding to GAC Advice that we felt had policy implications.

So if they're just making observations and thanking different working groups and supporting different - I mean can we just Plus One the Communiqué? What's our process here?

Volker Greimann: Yes, I think you raise an interesting point. Originally as it was conceived, it very much only addressed the actual advice given to the Board.

However, we might add these points in as well if, for example, the GAC commends us on certain policy activities or supports certain policies, we may want to thank them for that support. That probably would go a long way with furthering our corporation and duration of our efforts.

James Bladel: And I left my hand up so I could come back to say I volunteer to help.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks James. I mean to put - I must say the one thing I would say is I don't think we have to produce a response. I think what we are committing as a council to do -- not that we can't commit to anyone else -- is to review the Communiqué for policy implications and decide whether or not we want to make a response.

We shouldn't feel obliged to make a sort of soft or fluffy response if we don't feel. It should be really about something effective if we need it.

(Carlos)?

(Carlos): Sorry. I want to volunteer too.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. So you've got, Volker, you've got James and (Carlos) with you.

Any other comments or questions on this item?

David Cake: I'd like to volunteer to help as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, thank you David. Okay, let's move on to Item 5 then.

Michele, your next.

Michele Neylon: Sorry, Michele for the record.

Now just in terms of the interaction between the GAC and the rest of the GNSO, I mean it's interesting to see that they now have the Public Safety Working Group who have been doing the rounds this week here at ICANN 53.

And it seems that they are looking at engaging with the GNSO PDP working groups on a more kind of ongoing consistent basis rather than doing so via the GAC directly.

I was wondering if people here have set reasonable expectations on those interactions because it's very clear from the conversations I've had with them that they won't be able to formally join working groups and get involved on a day-to-day basis, but would be more open to coming in when their specific expertise or advice or input is required. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: David wants to respond to that.

David Cake: Yeah. I definitely advised them to look at the work being done in the GAC GNSO coordination group about how GAC members and government membership can participate in GNSO working group process without fully joining a working group.

Jonathan Robinson: (Mason)?

(Mason):   Yeah. I was unaware that they were taking that much of an act in this role. But if there's an area where I can help out to assist in a liaison role than I'm happy to do that.

Michele Neylon: This is Michele and I'm coming back briefly. Thanks (Mason). The thing, I suppose, from the registrar's perspective is there are several workgroups and the (unintelligible) which impact directly where the Infosec Public Safety Law Enforcement interaction historically was quite looking consensual. Was it particularly helpful or progressive from either parties? The things that moving beyond that but I think also as well they tried to engage in different ways over the years and maybe now they're finally finding the right way to do so.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm sure that's partly true. We've done lots of work to help to try to find their way and to be clear. They're not just finding it all on their own. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry. I couldn't find the mike. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Thank you. I was going to raise it but I'm glad Michele's raised it. Is there any way we could get (Mason) to participate or listen to that advisory committee because it does seem to me a bit odd that that's only in - either understand the government people. But it's only an advisory committee to the GAC. So to the extent that they are beefing up their participation as a formal advisory committee to the GAC, if they're not going to come and liaise with us and make their concerns known, it may actually be more difficult to anticipate what's coming out of and send them in the way of advice from the GAC. If you follow my - and I'm speaking - obviously, one of my key issues is privacy. And there's always some tension with law enforcement about that.

Jonathan Robinson: They spoke with us -- I'm just thinking before going on - they spoke with us for the registry sake and we just talked with them. Maybe someone else can remind me - I remember asking them but I don't remember what I talked

to them about. But let's us go to Avri and then I see that (Ama) got his hand up after Avri.

Avri Doria: This is Avri speaking. I just wanted to point out in another one of their groups that they started in terms of the human rights and international law, they have item - I'm not sure lists yet, but they certainly made their meeting open to us. So perhaps they will take an open view on it and that would be a really good thing to ask in terms of any of their advisory to the advisory committees.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. (Ama), come in?

Man: Thanks Jonathan (unintelligible). I'm not exactly sure if I understand the concern correctly but if I don't please do point me in the right direction. But I think it would be helpful to differentiate between the participation of GAC members in GNSO working group and what GAC advice may be to the board of even GAC input to APDP. For example, the prophecies that we are working on in the GAC GNSO consulting groups. That there has been GAC members on GNSO working groups before but I think they pretty much made it clear that they do not represent the GAC any way but they're joining in their individual capacities. For the GAC to provide formal input into the GNSO prophecy this is what the group comprising of GNSO counselors and GAC members are working on and making some indictments as well. And the fourth GAC advice to the board represents the GAC position. But I think it would be helpful to sort of make the distinction between what those are and what may be perceived as GAC participation in the working group on an on-going basis. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a really good point. Thanks (Ama) for raising that. So a couple of things ready. One, when Stephanie raised her point about how (Mason) might be able to help and you now (unintelligible) to the consultation group. I think we need to be really clear here what our expectations are. First of all, (Mason)'s role is to be a GNSO liaison to the GAC, not the other way around. He can help us with information coming the other way around. And, no doubt,

he will. But the primary purpose is for us to inform the GAC what's going on in the GNSO. So they in a sense can't say we never knew. We were not informed. We had no idea this was going on. And that's one output from the whole work of the consultation group. And the job of that is to make sure that the GAC or the ultimate outcome of that is to make sure the GAC is involved in the policy development process at an earliest possible stage. Now, how they then choose to get involved -- well, as Ama highlighted, there are a number of mechanisms coming out the work of that consultation group. And we probably need to pick up the work of that consultation group again post this meeting. And so I can see that the final point is this concern about these working groups within GAC that are there to inform the GAC. But I think the job we've got to do is try and draw them out of themselves and, again, Ama is correct. I think the chance of us getting the GAC to participate in a working group is very limited. But GAC members to involved themselves and roll up their sleeves I think there's a greater chance and, in addition, as I said a moment ago, we've got these mechanisms we're building for early engagement. So I'm modestly positive but I think it's something we going to have to keep an eye on. But let's not lean entirely on (Mason) to achieve that because there's good reason for me being cautious about that because it's not that I don't think (Mason) could do a job of it but it's based off leaning on that the liaison role. It give them an excuse to remain distant whereas the whole point is to engage the GAC in the policy development process as early possible in whatever way possible and to integrate. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thank you Jonathan. Heather Forrest. I wanted to offer two cents on this. I suppose I've become the poster child for this issue of communicating with the GAC in CWG to call as my co-chair. I supposed one of the challenges that we have - it's not simply having GAC members participate in working groups. It's where we have GAC working groups themselves working in overlapping areas. And let's say GAC members communicating back to us and individually or in the capacity of the GNSO. Understanding the word cooperation or collaboration is very different. In the experience of CWG that has meant that the GAC send one member or indeed one member

participates on their own volition. And nothing comes back from the GAC working group that working on the same area. So I suppose to the extent that we can somehow encourage a more expansive understanding of collaborate bearing in mind that we're dealing with the GAC. That would be very helpful. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Heather. So I think we should formally record if we haven't already on the action that item that Byron and I agreed to do which is to now reach out to - that's part of the work of the compilation group is to insure that there is regular interaction between the chairs of the two groups so this is clearly an agenda right and that we can work with and (Mason) will be part of that group as well to make sure that's all joined up. So that an action on Byron and myself as chairs of the respective CCNSO and the GNSO council, to engage with the GAC chairs and vice chairs on effective interaction. Okay, moving on then.

ICANN meeting membership and working groups. Okay. Well, this is a difficult one. This is both important and motherhood and apple pie at the same time. This one on membership and working groups. We need sufficient participation, representation, and the example here is given that we don't have necessarily members from all groups participating in FCI. So can you confirm which, if any, groups are not participating in the FCI at the moment?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think especially the contracted parties haven't been very active. I don't know if it's a result of the members have been appointed that they are no longer available or lack of interest. But I think if we would've looked over the records from the last meeting the other groups have been participating very well but I the contracted parties have been under represented or not represented in many of the meetings.

Jonathan Robinson: (Jay)?

(Jay):   Thank you Jonathan. Thank you Marika. And my questions was that - I think you kind of teed it up very nicely if do you have the membership handy? And can you tell us who are the contracted party representatives on this SCI? Because when I left the SCI, I think - I'm not sure that someone came and took my place and I was just curious?

Marika Konings: I think that's one of the issues. For example, for the registrars we have (unintelligible) there's a primary member but the ultimate member is a position that still needs to be filled. For the budgetary stake holder group, it's Ken Stubbs and Ray Saxon. And there's some other positions that we know we need to go back or we probably have already gone back to the different groups to fill those slots. All I want is the nominating committee (unintelligible) we still need a primary member for that. I think (unintelligible) is still missing and ultimate and so there is a business contingency. But I know that staff is following up on that with a different group but they're supposed to be helpful if there was some rooms here can also work with us on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. So I think what would be helpful to ask the council is to have a reminder of whose in that group and then we can got back to our respective groups and say, oh, you're still active and are willing to be active. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah. We're getting maybe not to open a different conversation but as we start thinking ahead about the GNSO review and potential implementation and potential roles that the SCI may play in that there's something you may want to think about as well, because I think part of the challenge, for example, that particularly specific with the SCI is that it works with a member and ultimate system. Not an open working group so you don't have a bigger pool of people so that make is also harder. And you only have two people that can potentially show up. One doesn't show up you're already 50% down and if two don't show up you have no representation at all from that group. As the GNSO starts thinking the path I had to put up on the GNSO review and one of the questions to ask there is the SCI the vehicle to work on implementation. Should that be another vehicle or should the SCI may be

reconfigured to deal with the challenges we currently see where it's not enough representation from certain groups in the discussions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. Michele, did you want to speak? I've got (Thomas) after you.

Michele Neylon: Yes, for the record, Michele. Just taking for this week I'm pretending to be a GNSO counselor which is great fun. But the rest of the time I'm still chair of the registrars take holder group. And one of things that we've been discussing in the SOAC leadership calls and the meeting we've had with ICANN staff taking to Chris Gift and Barry Southers is when the management of the different constituencies is take holder group. And the moment, for example, it's impossible for me as chair of the registrars to go to a single place and get a list of every single working group that currently active and to see quickly and easily which ones have registrars representation and who they are. And I'm sure other groups are in a similar position. And I'm not trying to pump massive amounts of work onto Marika and her team but it's a little bit hard for us as well just to see a chance where those gaps are. Now, in the direction that we as a stake holder group who had with the board the other day, one of these things that somebody raised was that within the space is it is awful hard for all of us to try to be involved in absolutely everything. And maybe there is a certain group, certain initiatives where not every single stake holder group needs to be involved. And maybe in some cases we need to be a bit more careful about which ones were engaged on because ultimately when you look around the room it's nearly always the same people. I mean we don't have a massage influx of new blood. And I know that some of these work groups - the work load involved is massive. And you've got regularly scheduled calls. You've got active (unintelligible). You've got, in some cases, huge amounts of material. So just be quite careful about how you frame this because there is an issue there and the workload which we cannot ignore. I'm not saying that we should ignore it. I'm not saying I can fix it either. But just try and get that balance right. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Michele. I just remind everyone that in ten minutes and I'm sure you all want to understand how ICANN is going to appoint next year which is the session which follows immediately after said ten minutes. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is just to Michele's question. For each working group on the Wiki page there is a list where all members are listed including the affiliation as well as links to SOI's. And it also includes there attendance sheets. So we do keep attendance for each working groups so people can see as well. If you have appointed members of people representing you in certain working groups you can also see if they're actually showing up for calls. Which, of course, doesn't mean that's they only way they're participate but it's one of the information that we track for working groups. It's maybe not all in one page but it shouldn't be too difficult to find. And I'm happy to circulate the links to for those if that is helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. All right. So, (Thomas)? Sorry.

(Thomas):   Just very briefly. I think the idea of such an overview is an excellent one because when we said in the SCI it was easy to find out who actually worked primary or alternate for the respective groups. Having said that, I'm currently the alternate (unintelligible) representative on the SCI. My term is over in Dublin. So we might find ourselves without a primary and an alternate. Likewise, I'm going to empty my chair as the CCNSO council liaison in Dublin. And speaking of that I'm just finding out this is my last rep session with the council because we will be kicked out of seats during the public sessions, right. So I think there's some planning...

Jonathan Robinson: ...kicked out. Removed forcibly.

(Thomas):   Gently unglued from the -. So I think there's some succession planning to be - at least of that between today in Dublin.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (Thomas). Following your gentle ungluing you will still be welcome at the sessions, I'm sure. And I can imagine you and I will become back to benches. All right. So I think we've done that point. Meeting strategy, communicate. Next point, six. Meeting strategy, communicate to the board. Consider how scheduling of meetings can be improved. I certainly have some off the record of off the corridor conversation about this issue. Does anyone have anything they'd like to say about this? Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think it's both in looking at how I can move your schedules across the board for all groups. But I also think within the GNSO I think we've seen that the more and more meetings that are being organized by different groups that not necessarily directly linked to GNSO policy development activities. Which, that's not an issue but we've seen that they've start as well being scheduled directly opposite GNSO policy activities. So the question is, is that something where some more coordination should take place at the GNSO level. Kind of a program committee so people see what kind of the meetings are being scheduled and stake all the groups in constituencies. How we can make sure that they don't directly interfere with core responsibilities of the council and the GNSO to focus on policy developments. That's one of the questions we have from staff is there something that we can do to enhance our coordination and avoid at least for the GNSO level direct conflict or competition between meetings that are organized within this community.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll just respond to that because I think there's two points here that need to be done. So if this isn't already captured in action I think it should be and this is what the point about communication of the board. One, we intend to communicate to the board and this is essentially a proposal that I hope you won't disagree with. To say that we are working on our plans for the Meeting B and we would like to interact with the board and understand what their plans are. Because personally, and I've heard other's express this. Some of us find it problematic at least that the board seems to exist in a parallel universe to the policy development process. And it's almost - and it like we've

got the issue with the GAC where we then bump in late in the game. Whereas, actually, it would be more effective if we could interact. So there's a question of the Meeting B where there's that particularly it's an obvious point. I think we could easily append into that letter. Add into that letter just a comment for reference to the board about a concern over scheduling. At least it could get us to their highest level and then they can come back to us. So that's my suggestion that we write dealing with both letting them know what our plans are. How we're doing our plans for Meeting B asking what their plans are for Meeting B and indicating a concern about scheduling and then we can always work with staff separately. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jonathan. Heather (unintelligible). Two points - I'll make them briefly. The first one is on the practicalities. Perhaps not communicating to the board. But in relations to meeting strategy. I was the ways to this issue most (unintelligible) over weekend given the ITC schedule we've identified some 30 odd conflicts. And in the spirit of not just complaining about problems and trying to propose a solution, I have my sort of university exam scheduling hat on. Would it be helpful if each constituency or stake holder group identified in advance, let's say, things that simply cannot clash. So, for example, IPC Meeting cannot clash with this working group, this working group, this working group. Is that helpful for us to staff in terms of putting together the meeting schedule? I'll leave that second point being. In relation to this Meeting B, one thing that plagues me is it seems to be the inherent idea behind Meeting B, is that one would want to spend or need to spend all one's time with their particular SO or AC in Meeting B. And it doesn't at all acknowledge the fact that when we all come here, yes, we attend a GNSO meetings, but we also dash in and out of GAC meeting and ALAC meetings and this sort of thing and that troubles me. To the extent that we try and cram all of our GNSO activities into the few days as Meeting B. When do we have time to go to other SO's and AC's. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So hopefully thinking about Meeting B and the work that we are doing not only in the GNSO but in coordination with other stake holder groups besides

the SO's and AC's will mean that there's some thought given to that. I'm not saying the answer is there. I should say as well that in terms of the clashes - your previous point. I certainly raised it in a one-to-one - I had a brief discussion with Sally (unintelligible) and I think there may well be some other suggestions as to how we deal. I think there's an awareness. I got the sense that this wasn't a surprise. And there was an awareness and they're going to try and do something about issues around clashes and so on. Marika?

Marika Konings: It is Marika. So I think if you update on the meeting that we had with some of the other SOAC's and the informal meeting to talk about scheduling. And I think a lot of the other groups have only just starting thinking about it. But feedback that we've already received, for example, from the CCNSO that there question is basically if there is a B meeting that it's only four days which is quite different from what we usually do. We may not meet at all. So I think that is another consideration to factor in where certain groups may say, well, there is no purpose in coming if it's only four days. We don't think it will be attractive enough. If we can think of what the perspective is - if we cannot run TEC day which is the main attraction for many CCTLD's. You know, we're not going to convince them to come to a location that's likely in South America or Africa which may not be the easiest places to get to. So we're not going to be able to come so we may not have any meetings. And that, of course, puts into question as well the meeting is also focused on cross community engagement and interaction. Thinking of cross community working groups - can you actually then have your meetings if certain parts of the community actually decide not to come at all? So I think it's very important to have - continue that conversation as well with the other groups to really decide what it feasible at those meetings and what we can achieve and is it a need setting up perceiving the purpose that it originally had in the mind.

Jonathan Robinson: Donna, go ahead. And then I don't Paul if you would say anything about the work of that meeting group yesterday? Did you? Okay. I'm sorry. Yeah, of course. Yeah. Okay, Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jonathan. Donna Austin. To the point where making (unintelligible) the idea was that a lot of the conflict and the schedule should be removed. The idea being that they would be more (unintelligible) where everybody was in one room to discuss a policy issue. So you might see that interested. When we put forward the proposal one of the outstanding items was when needed staff to come forward to actually show us how practically that what happened. And I think now that the different constituency groups are starting to think about this. That may help to some extent and try to manage that. But the idea was that we (unintelligible) spend more time with everyone talking about a specific topic or policy issue then you would sitting in your own constituent constituency discussing that topic. So it was supposed to be provide more opportunity for engagement across the community rather than continuing to do business the way we do it now.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks for that insight into the thinking behind it. So that hopefully gives us (unintelligible) respect about things. But that's the end of our time. So I think we should use that to call (unintelligible) because in some ongoing work. Period and iTunes seven there's a number of public comment forms that may be of interest of the GNSO. And there's a couple of highlights the most obvious if you have a review I expect the groups will comment. The question will be for us is whether is there a reply. There is no reply on the comments. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: I have a question about and maybe staff that could help me. What's coming next with the GNSO review. It goes through its public comments identical to the board and then that's it. Craig? Is not coming back to us?

(Mary):   This is (Mary) for the record. So after the public comments are over, than the West Lake team prepares the final report. And that I think it does not go to public comment it goes to the structural improvement committee afterward.

James Bladel: Thank you. And that is just a comment why is there any structural changes. For example, the bylaws and in that process kicks off definitely always this

folded in as a function of this effort? I don't know if that's part of what they are discussing.

Marika Konings: I think the way it works is that in the report will contain a number of recommendations. The board committee would look at that and say, well, this is what we've done. GNSO going to implement it. So that would kick off, I think like last time when GNSO would say well, how we going to do that implementation? What kind of mechanism do we use for that? With that implementation then map out what requires bylaws changes, what would change the operating procedures, what are some programs we may need to develop and implement to meet those requirements. And I think there is already conversations on going, as well, with GNSO working hard to identify what programs are actually that could be part of implementation plan. We can already demonstrate that there are already certain things we're doing to achieve the goals that they set out in that report.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. I am now a lot smarter on this than I was 45 seconds ago. I just want to point out to the council that if it does, in fact, does result in the board and the structural improvements committee sending us a bunch of implementation work. Particularly if it involves reforming our council operating procedures or our own bylaws. That that could come in conjunction with changes that would be associated with the accountability efforts that are tied along. Could be some sort of empowered SOAC or empowered delegate modeling. All of these things could just kind of coincidentally all converge on the same board at six months period sometime in the middle of next year. So it's just something that I think that we should be aware of in terms of when we're discussing work load. And all the things that are on our horizon. All these balls could drop at the same moment.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. And that goes to Marika's earlier point thinking about the future of the SCI and how we manage and handle this sort of implementation. I think it's timely that Marika gets the last word before we call this a wrap.

Marika Konings: Yeah, just very briefly. This is Marika. I don't think you can tie those two things - bylaw changes of the CCWG, they're separate because I think the GNSO review will be on a longer track and I think the CCWG is moving at - but of course, if at any point there needs to be - there's a way to synchronize the implementation of that it can be done. But looking at the previous GNSO review effort I think implementation took quite a bit of time to get that.

James Bladel: Yeah. We just finished and it was time to start the review again. I remember.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. On that happy note I think we'll all thank you all for participation in the meeting. I hope you enjoy the last few sessions of this meeting. And please do be active in between the main meetings. We really need everyone to roll up their sleeves and participate and actively contribute as much as possible. Thanks, everyone. See you later this afternoon and, of course, in person in Dublin.

END