

GNSO Public Council Meeting.

ICANN 53-Buenos Aires.

25 June 2015.

**Attendees:** NCA – Non Voting – Carlos Raúl Gutierrez

**Contracted Parties House**

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Volker Greimann, James Bladel, Yoav Keren - absent  
apologies, temporary alternate Michele Neylon and proxy to James Bladel gTLD  
Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Donna Austin, Bret Fausett

**Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA):** Thomas Rickert

**Non-Contracted Parties House**

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Phil Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi, Osvaldo Novoa, Tony  
Holmes, Heather Forrest, Brian Winterfeldt

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Marilia Maciel, Edward Morris, Stephanie  
Perrin, Avri Doria, David Cake, Amr Elsadr – remote participation, if connectivity issues,  
proxy to Avri Doria

**Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA):** Daniel Reed **GNSO**

**Council Liaisons/Observers:**

Olivier Crépin-Leblond– ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer

Mason Cole – GNSO liaison to the GAC

**ICANN Staff**

David Olive - VP Policy Development

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director

Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director

Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director

Julie Hedlund – Senior Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director

Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst

Berry Cobb- Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. It's 1:00 already. So, if we could start to settle down at the table and have everyone ready to commence the meeting as soon as possible.

Okay. We'll start the meeting in one minute. Just so you know, we'll start the meeting in one minute. Feels like the volume is a bit high on this mic.

Can I encourage all councillors to log into the Adobe Connect room, and we'll use that. Make sure you're all logged in. Glen did send you an email earlier with those links. For the avoidance of doubt, the link you should be logging into is the -- let me just check.

It is the bottom of the two links. It says, "Council Adobe Connect room."

Okay. It's five minutes past the hour, if we could start the recording, please. All right. Hello, everyone. And welcome to this afternoon's GNSO Council meeting here in Buenos Aires. This is a public council meeting. In other words, it's held, obviously, in public. And we would -- we have an open mic up at the front. So, if anyone would like to contribute to a substantial item or make any points, please join us at the microphone, and there will be an open mic session at the end, time permitting, which we'll do our best to accommodate.

So we have an agenda in front of us. And you'll see that up on the screen up above there.

If I could draw your attention to that. The first item is to deal with the administrative matters. And that starts off with a roll call.

So, Glen, if you could lead us through that, that would be great.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Jonathan. If everybody would just acknowledge their name as it is called, please, for the record.

Bret Fausett.

BRET FAUSETT: Here.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Donna Austin.

Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: James Bladel.

JAMES BLADEL: Here.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Yoav Keren is absent. He has Michele Neylon as his temporary alternate. And, in case that Michele has to leave the meeting early, a proxy is given to James Bladel.

Volker Greimann.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thomas Rickert. Not here yet.

MICHELE NEYLON: Glen, just for the record, Michele Neylon is in the room. Hi.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Michele. Susan Kawaguchi. Susan?  
Brian Winterfeldt.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Here.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Heather Forrest.

HEATHER FORREST: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Tony Holmes.

TONY HOLMES: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Marilia Maciel.

MARILIA MACIEL: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Amr Elsadr is absent. He's going to participate remotely, hopefully. But, in case there's any connectivity issue, he has given his proxy to Avri Doria.

Avri, is that all right?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, it is. Thank you.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: David Cake.

DAVID CAKE: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Edward Morris.

EDWARD MORRIS: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA: I'm here.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Daniel Reed.

DANIEL REED: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Carlos Raul Gutierrez.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Olivier Crepin-Leblond is our ALAC liaison.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Patrick Myles, our ccNSO liaison.

PATRICK MYLES: Present.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: And Mason Cole, the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

Thank you very much. Thank you, David. And over to you.

Oh, Phil Corwin?

PHILIP CORWIN: I'm in the room.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you.

Have I missed off anybody? Or has anybody come in in the meantime?

Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks again. Welcome again to everyone. And welcome to everyone who is joining us here today, both councillors and members of the broader community.

So the next item we simply call for an update to the statements of interest, which we all have previously recorded. Are there any updates? Seeing none, we'll record that there are no updates.

And I now draw your attention to the agenda. The first item you see on the screen in front of you and you should have all had circulated to you previously. Any comments or issues relating to the agenda?

Thank you.

We note that the minutes of the previous council meetings, which had gotten a little bit behind, will now be posted and approved as of 28th of June, 2015. So that should bring us up to date.

If we can move to item 2, which is a review of the action items. These have been updated to reflect some of the weekend discussions and issues. I'm only going to highlight those which are open. I won't highlight anything that is either on hold or completed. We've done a good job of ticking off quite a few items. And, in addition, I won't highlight items that are coming up on the main agenda in any case.

One item we will need to deal with since -- is the GAC communique and our plans to process that and deal with that. For those of you who were at the GAC meeting with the GNSO on the weekend, it seemed to be a well-received and accepted that we would make an attempt to enhance the communication and working on policy matters with the GAC via this processing of the communique. Volker, your name is next to this item. Are you in a position to help out with processing the GAC communique after this meeting in Buenos Aires?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. I think we need to move ahead with this. As soon as the GAC communique is released, we should get cracking on that. So yes.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Great. Thank you. Just to note that there, of course, may not be any items on which we want to respond. But it's a matter of going through it systematically and taking the opportunity to highlight where, if any, there are matters of policy that the GNSO would like to comment on.

And I'll take this opportunity of welcoming Thomas Rickert to the meeting, Glen. If you could record that Thomas is now present, and having come from a previous meeting that had overrun.

The next item that has an open agenda item that's worth updating on the action list is in relation to the CWG on the use of country and territory name TLDs. You'll recall from yesterday that in discussion of this matter in our joint meeting with ccNSO, that the chairs of the ccNSO council and the GNSO Council agreed to open up dialogue with GAC chairs in order to see how best, if at all, we can improve our working in this area.

So, if that could be recorded as an update on the action item list, that would be great.

There are a number of items completed, which as I said, I won't highlight on each individual case.

There are some open items at the end of the list which deal with the preliminary issue report on gTLD registration data services, which is something we expect to come in in July. There's also a need to communicate. And all councillors, if you could please take a note of this now - well, certainly anyone who is expecting to remain on the council from the annual meeting in Dublin, we will hold, as we have done for the last couple of years, an induction and development session on the Friday of the meeting in Dublin. You might call that the second Friday, anyway. It's the last day of the week following the Thursday on which the public forum takes place. So, please, could you note that in your diaries that there will be -- I won't say as firmly as a requirement. But it would be very useful if everyone could be there. And communicate that your groups as well so that anyone who's coming on to the council is prepared for that session.

We also have a note open item to determine the linkage on any new gTLD work with the SSAC. And that's something currently in the hands of staff. So we'll receive an update on that in due course.

All right. That deals with preliminary items on the agenda.

We have nothing -- no items on the consent agenda today.

And so that leaves us with the opportunity of going straight in to the substantive items on the agenda covered by a series of council votes on motions.

The first motion is item 4 and is an opportunity to deal with the extension of term or, really, probably more correct to say an additional year of the GNSO liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee to the GAC.

And this is a motion brought to the council by Volker Greimann. So, Volker, if I could ask you to reproduce the "resolved" clauses on this motion that so we're clear on the resolved clauses that we're voting on.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, of course. Thank you, Jonathan.

"Resolved, number 1, the GNSO Council hereby extends the term of Mason Cole to the role of GNSO liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee until 30th of June 2016.

"Second: The GNSO leadership team will coordinate with Mason Cole as well as the GACGNSO Consultation Group on the continued implementation of this role."

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. Thank you, Volker. Of course, like all of these motions, we have discussed them previously on the weekend. But, if anyone would like to make any other points now, feel free to do so. And anyone else who is in the room, if you have a point on any of the motions or issues, please feel free to come up to the mic in front of us. And we'll do our best to accommodate your input.

David, go ahead. Just to remind you, if anyone, if you'd like to talk, just please your hand up in the Adobe Connect room so we can manage a queue. I've got David first followed by Philip Corwin.

DAVID CAKE: Just the only thing to notice since on our work on the weekend we did discuss this in our meeting with GAC and they seemed quite happy about this as well. Everyone's happy with the -- the still somewhat experimental yet role of the liaison to the GAC so far. And everyone's happy for Mason to remain in the role. So this is -- you know, this has been run by the GAC and they're also fairly happy with the state of affairs.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, David. That's an important point. Just, for the record, when you say "run by," you mean we've discussed it with them and confirmed with them rather than that they're in control should anyone have any doubt about that. Okay. Philip Corwin, go ahead.

PHILIP CORWIN: Thank you, Phil Corwin for the BC. The BC supports this motion. I just wanted to say, on a personal note, that I'm currently the co-chair of the working group on curative rights protection for international intergovernmental organizations. And Mason has been of considerable assistance to our working group in facilitating positive communications with the GAC. And we certainly wouldn't want to lose his services at this point in time. So I wanted to get that on the record. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Phil. That's an important point to both acknowledge the work that's been done over the past year by Mason on behalf of the GNSO and to both recognize and thank you for that, Mason, and also acknowledge the willingness to stand for a second term. So thank you on both counts.

Any other comments or issues? James, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks Jonathan. James speaking, for the record. I wanted to reinforce I think that Mason has done an excellent job and it's an important role. We'll be voting to support this resolution. I did want to, perhaps, put a marker down for next year that, since we're kind of feeling this out, we may need to give a little bit of thought to whether or not there's any limitation to the number of terms that we could put consecutively, whether that's 4 one-year terms. Or, if Mason can provide some feedback, maybe a two-year term is more appropriate and that we'd have a two-year cycle or something like that. I think we're looking to you for some guidance on fleshing this out and making it more of a formal project. Because it seems to be working as a pilot program. And I think we want it to continue. I think that we maybe just need to understand that better. But I'm all in favor and think that we should go forward. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, James. David.

DAVID CAKE: Yeah. I think that's a good point that this is a pilot program. I think it's appropriate to just kind of, you know, leave it to run for another year and see how it goes. But at some point we should review the terms -- you know, how long a term goes, how is it renewed. And the -- you know, I think the process that we use to select the liaison this time around is -- which was run between the -- you know, the chairs, was, you know, a pretty good choice for this time, but we may need to review that and see whether the council would rather have that be more of a whole council thing or whatever. It's a pilot program. We will review the rules and we should.

But for this one, we should carry on and see -- go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. So thanks. So that feels to me like an action item too diarize a date to review this function in good time. And really, there will be a couple of key dates in that.

One will be the budget cycle in which we have to apply for future funding for the next year's funding. So, if I could just make a note that we need to set a date by which we will have reviewed the function, it's probably at or around the point at which we need to reapply for further funding. So we'll -- rather than just simply deciding whether to apply for another year's funding, we can make a slightly more comprehensive review of the function and the details around it.

All right. If there's no more discussion on this, I'm just reminding you, if you do want to raise a point, please do it in the Adobe Connect. It's just easier to manage from a point of view of managing the queue. But let's put this motion to a vote.

Lars, do you have -- Amr, I'm sorry. Your hand is up in the chat. Go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I apologize for the late hand.

I just figured I'd also chime in and point out that both the GNSO Council and the GAC have adopted the -- or have decided to adopt a pilot phase regarding the issue scoping of early engagement of the GAC and the GNSO PDP.

This pilot project has -- there is a role for the GNSO liaison to the GAC in this project. And Mason has been very helpful in developing the recommendations and sort of the process by which the GAC will engage in this pilot project. And I also just wanted to add that. Thank Mason very much for that. And I'm very much in favor of his continuing in this role. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Amr.

I'll second that.

So it seems to me that this isn't a -- a PDP vote, nor does it sound to be particularly contentious.

So I think we can call for a voice vote on this. Can I ask if anyone objects to having a voice vote?

So, if I could have a show of hands from anyone who would like to vote against the motion.

Can I show hands of anyone who would like to abstain on this motion?

So, Glen, we've got no one voting against and no abstentions.

Could I call for a show of hands for everyone who would like to vote in favor of the motion? All those in favor, please raise your hands.

Thank you. Glen, if you could record that there were no abstentions and no one voting against the motion. Thank you.

So, just an administrative point -- and thank you, Amr. I note your vote in the Adobe Connect room in favor of the motion.

If I could just draw your attention to an email sent earlier with a link to the correct Adobe Connect room, I'm not sure everyone is in the correct room.

So Glen sent that note around a little earlier. So you should have -- I mean, it's timed in my inbox 20 past 12:00. So an hour ago. And it says -- there's a second link provided in there that says, "Council Adobe Connect room." And you should have that available. I would post that in the Adobe Connect room, but I don't think that will help those of you who aren't in the room.

Okay.

So the next motion we have before us is a motion to adopt the final report and recommendations of the policy and implementation working group. This group -- this is a working group that has produced a comprehensive piece of work, but drawing your attention to the fact that it is a non-PDP working group. It will not result in consensus policy, therefore.

And that means that the outcomes are not binding on the contracted parties as such. But that doesn't diminish the value of the output as making a significant potential contribution to the way in which we do our policy and related work within the GNSO.

So, Amr, if I could ask you as presenter of the motion to present the "resolved" clauses to the council, please.

AMR ELSADR: Sure. Thank you, Jonathan. This is Amr.

"Resolved, 1. The GNSO Council adopts the GNSO input process as outlined in Annex C of the final recommendations report and instructs ICANN staff to post a new version of the GNSO operating procedures effective immediately upon adoption.

"2. The GNSO Council recommends that the ICANN board of directors adopt the new GNSO processes as reflected in the Annexes D and E of the GNSO guidance process and Annex F and G for the GNSO expedited policy development process as outlined in the policy and implementation final recommendations report." And then there's a link.

"3. The GNSO Council recommends that the GNSO guidance process and GNSO expedited policy development process shall be available for use by the GNSO Council following adoption of any necessary changes to the ICANN bylaws by the ICANN board.

for use upon adoption by the GNSO Council. The GNSO input process, which does not require any bylaw changes, will be available for use upon adoption by the GNSO Council.

"4. The GNSO Council adopts the recommendation to add a provision to the GNSO operating procedures that clarifies that parallel efforts on similar/identical topics should be avoided as outlined in recommendation number 3 of the final recommendations report. The GNSO Council instructs ICANN staff to post the new version of the GNSO operating procedures immediately upon adoption by the ICANN board of the GNSO guidance process and GNSO expedited policy development process per resolved clause 3.

"5. The GNSO Council adopts the policy and implementation principles/requirements as outlined in section 4 of the final recommendations report and recommends that the ICANN board of directors also (a) adopts these principles/requirements and (b) instructs ICANN staff to follow these accordingly to help guide any future GNSO policy and implementation related work. "Resolved clause 6. The GNSO Council adopts recommendation number 4 of the final recommendations report to modify the PDP manual to require the creation of an implementation review team following the adopts of the PDP recommendations by the ICANN board and instructs ICANN staff to post the new version of the GNSO operating procedures immediately upon adoption.



"7. The GNSO Council adopts the implementation review team principles and guidelines as outlined in Annex L of the final recommendations report and recommends that (a) the ICANN board of directors also adopts these principles and guidelines and (b) instructs ICANN staff to follow these accordingly to guide GNSO policy-related implementation efforts.

"Resolved clause 8. The GNSO Council thanks the policy and implementation working group for its efforts and recommends that the working group is formally closed upon adoption by the ICANN board of these recommendations while still allowing the working group to provide input to the GNSO Council and implementation staff should any questions or issues arise before or after that time.

"Resolved clause 9. The GNSO Council recommends that a review of these recommendations is carried out at the latest five years following their implementation to assess whether the recommendations have achieved what they set out to do and/or whether any further enhancements or changes are needed.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Amr. Any questions, comments, or issues arising from this work? And that, just to be clear, that if anyone in the room, in addition to the councillors, would like to speak, there's a microphone at the front of the room if anyone would like to make any comment or provide any input.

Amr, to your point in the Adobe Connect room, you were satisfactorily clear. Thank you.

DAVID CAKE: I'd just like to echo what -- in particular the part of this motion that thanks the working team for not just a lot of hard work but, I think, absolutely this is really good work that will really improve -- has a lot of potential to improve the way the Council and ICANN generally operates in the future and absolutely thank them for a -- you know, we've got a lot of our real veterans of the process working very constructively to do some great work in this, and I'm very pleased to see it move forward.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, David. And yes, it's useful to record that formal vote of thanks. That's great. We have had the opportunity to discuss that and hear from the cochairs over the weekend session and acknowledge the value of the work. Now, it seems to me that we can probably do a show of hands on this motion as well. Let's go ahead, Lars. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and I wanted to second what David Cake has said. The ALAC has looked at this work with much interest and the work of the working group has been tremendous, so we really appreciate it and thank you on behalf of the ALAC.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Olivia. Okay. So any objections to a show of hands on this one? All right. Can I ask anyone who is not in favor of the motion to show their hand. Anyone who would like to abstain from the motion, for voting on the motion? And all those in favor, please raise your hands. And Glen, if you could record that Michele Neylon has left the room, and so if we could take the vote for his proxy from James and we'll record that is also in favor of the motion. So there were no votes against and no abstentions.

Thank you. So next agenda item, agenda item 6, is another motion, and this is a motion on the adoption of the GNSO translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group, final report and recommendations. This motion was also made by Amr Elsadr and seconded by David Cake and Volker Greimann. Since we just heard from Amr, David, would you like to present the resolved clauses to the group?

DAVID CAKE: Okay. So this is the motion on the adoption of the GNSO translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group final report and recommendations. And I -- I'd like to note that this has slightly changed from when it was first put on the agenda to -- as per discussions on the weekend and discussions on Council lists. So just to present the motion, whereas --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just do the resolved.

DAVID CAKE: Sorry? Just the resolved? Sorry. So let it be resolved -- sorry, I'm having trouble with my -- I'm just having trouble with my -- I can't read it. Let Volker read it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Volker, have you got the resolved clauses in front of you? Volker Greimann will read the resolved clauses.

VOLKER GREIMANN: This is the amended version. Resolved number 1, the GNSO Council recommends to the ICANN Board of Directors the adoption of the recommendations 1-7 as detailed in the translation and transliteration of contact information final report. Second, on June 21, the translation and transliteration PDP working group working group notified the council of a clerical error in the text of the recommendation 4 of the final report, which has been edited as follows: "The working group recommends that, regardless of the languages, scripts, used, it is assured that the data fields are consistent to the standards in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, RAA, relevant consensus policy, additional WHOIS information policy, AWIP, and any other applicable policies. Entered contact information data are, struck verified now, validated in accordance with the aforementioned policies and agreements and the language/script used must be easily identifiable."

The recommendation with the corrected text has reached full consensus in the working group because the correction is needed to reflect the substance of working group's deliberations documented in the final report. The corrected final report has been posted to the GNSO Council and posted to the GNSO Web site, link is in the motion.

3, the GNSO Council shall convene a translation and transliteration of contact information implementation review team to assist ICANN staff in developing the implementation details for the new policy should it be approved by the ICANN Board. The implementation review team will be tasked with evaluating the proposed implementation of the policy recommendations as approved by the Board and is expected to work with ICANN staff to ensure that the resultant implementation fulfills the intentions of the approved policies. If the translation and transliteration of contact information review team identifies any potential modifications to the policy or new policy recommendations, the translation and transliteration of contact information implementation review team shall refer these to the GNSO Council for its consideration and follow-ups, as appropriate. Following adoption by the GNSO -- by the ICANN Board, excuse me, of the recommendations, the GNSO secretariat is authorized to issue a call for volunteers for a translation and transliteration of contact information implementation review team to the members of the translation and transliteration of contact information PDP working group. Quite a mouthful.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Volker. Are there any comments, questions, discussion, in relation to the motion? Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Brian Winterfeldt, IPC. The IPC has consistently supported mandatory transformation of gTLD contact information. As such we support the minority view that was expressed in the final report on behalf of the IPC. And I wanted to just reiterate that here quickly. The IPC recommends mandatory translation and/or transliteration, transformation of contact information in all generic top level domains.

Although the IPC agrees that there are situations where the contact information in the local language of the registrant is the primary version such as to identify the registrant in preparation for a local legal action, there are a number of situations where a global WHOIS search, providing access to data in as uniform a fashion as possible is necessary for the data registration service to achieve its goal of providing transparency and accountability in the DNS. That said, the IPC supports recommendations 2-7, as these recommendations are suitable and important independently of an situation where transformation of content information is mandatory or not. So nonetheless, we do recognize community support for the majority view on this recommendation and support the rationale behind it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Brian, and the IPC. Any other comments, questions, or issues in relation to the motion? Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: The B.C. also filed comments in which we supported the transformation or translation of the WHOIS information, but we will not oppose this motion.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Susan, and the B.C. for that. Any other comments or issues or points before we move to vote? Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, I would just like to reiterate my support for this motion and my admiration for the work that has been performed by this group. This has been a hard piece of work, and I especially would like to thank the members of the working group to reconvene at such an expedious -- in such an expedious manner to correct the clerical mistake that has been discovered at last Sunday GNSO meeting and change the policy recommendations in such an expedient way to ensure that the meaning remains clear and no new obligations are laid upon the contracted parties that were not urgently intended. Thank you for that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Volker. So if there are no other interventions or points, I think we should recognize the work of the chairs of the working group in particular, especially Chris Dillon who is a newcomer to the GNSO, one of the co-chairs, but in general also obviously the work of the group itself and the chairs in leading the work of that group. So thank you. Formal note of thanks to the co-chairs and the group before we move to vote.

AMR ELSADR: Jonathan, this is Amr. I have a question, if I may.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Go ahead, Amr.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks. First, I'd like to thank Volker for -- for catching the little error when he did and allowing the working group to reconvene so quickly and then respond to it. Also, to Susan's point, thank you very much for the B.C. comments and those, of course, have been included in the public comment review tool that is part of the final report.

My question though, and I'm kind of just curious about this, is there's a certain voting threshold on the GNSO Council regarding making changes to contractual obligations of contracted parties. So voting thresholds for consensus policies. I'm wondering, in this case, the -- the PDP working group is actually recommending that a new policy not be adopted. Does that change the voting thresholds in any way? I'm just curious about this personally and would like to hear what others have to think. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: It's an interesting question, Amr. I mean, to the best of my knowledge, this is a vote on the final report and recommendations of a PDP working group and that determines, therefore, the thresholds rather than necessarily whether or not those -- those recommendations then go on to have an impact. The voting thresholds, to the best of my knowledge, apply to the final report, as opposed to the impact of that final report. Does anyone from -- anyone else have any comment on that, or clarification? Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: So this is Marika from ICANN staff. Ultimately the voting threshold that is achieved does have an impact on whether certain recommendations can be required upon contracted parties. So I think as you said the vote to pass on to the board, if it meets a super majority vote, it puts the requirements on the ICANN board to consider those or if they wouldn't agree with them. Similarly, if the GNSO Council would adopt it with a simple majority vote it would still be passed on to the Board but indeed the implication is that it could not -- or at least in my read of how the language is written, it -- it does not meet the requirements as set out in the contracts that ICANN has with contracted parties, so this recommendation could be passed on but are not necessarily able to be imposed on contracted parties as consensus policies. So I think that's the -- the distinguishing factor.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Marika. And thanks, Amr, for an interesting point and question. All right. Let's move to the vote. I suggest we record this vote formally and do a roll call because it is a PDP vote and has the potential at least, even if it may not in this particular case, to have a binding impact on the contracted parties. Glen, if you could take the roll call of the vote, please.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Volker Greimann.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Bret Fausett. Philip Corwin.

PHILIP CORWIN: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Edward Morris.

EDWARD MORRIS: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Tony Holmes.

TONY HOLMES: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Amr Elsadr.

AMR ELSADR: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Brian Winterfeldt.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: David Cake.

DAVID CAKE: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Donna Austin. James Bladel, for you.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Daniel Reed.

DANIEL REED: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Susan Kawaguchi.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Heather Forrest.

HEATHER FORREST: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Stephanie Perrin.

Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Jonathan Robinson.

Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Marilia Maciel.

Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: I do believe we have 100% of the contracted party house and 100% of the non-contracted party house, so the motion carries. The motion is passed.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Glen. Next item, another motion to request a preliminary issue report on new gTLDs subsequent rounds. Motion presented to the Council by Bret Fausett and seconded by Avri Doria. So Bret, if you could present the motion in the form of the resolved clauses, please.

BRET FAUSETT: Thank you. Before I present it, I would just like to tell you that we finished the working group -- the discussion group work today. We had our last formal meeting, 1112, and I would like to thank, before we present this motion, the staff members, the GNSO staff, Steve, Lars, Marika, who worked so hard to get us to this point.

So with that said, let me move to the resolves. Resolved 1, the GNSO Council requests a single issue report that will analyze subjects that may lead to changes or adjustments for subsequent new gTLD procedures. The preliminary issue report should at a minimum consider, bullet one, the subjects that the new gTLD subsequent procedures discussion group identified in its deliverables, and there's an attached issues matrix and draft charter, bullet two, global domains division staff input to the deliberations of the discussion group, and bullet three, the ICANN Board resolution Annex A regarding additional input on areas for possible policy work.

Resolved 2, in addition to covering the required elements of an issue report, ICANN staff is also requested to provide options on how the subjects may be organized and worked through in a potential future PDP. And that's the end of the motion.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Bret. Any comments, questions, or issues arising? Go ahead. I've got -- sorry, I've got Olivia ahead of you. Apologies. I've got Olivia ahead of you in the queue in the Adobe Connect room. Please raise your hands in the Adobe Connect room if at all possible, and for the record Philip did do that. So Olivier, first to you, and then we'll go to Phillip.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And we understand that there was a motion -- or an amendment, a friendly

amendment or some kind of amendment that was going to be perhaps presented by the B.C. The matter was actually discussed on the ALAC on Sunday. We've looked at this motion. We do deplore that there is absolutely no reference in that motion to any kind of reviews as mandated by the (indiscernible) on the first round of the new gTLDs. So there's a concern there that the PDP would start its work and indeed even end its work before the results of the first round of new gTLD reviews were completed.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Olivier. Philip.

PHILIP CORWIN: Thank you very much. Phil Corwin for the B.C. First generally, the B.C. -- and I will concede at the outset the B.C. has not been substantially involved in the work of the discussion group because the B.C. has been rather overwhelmed with matters relating to the transition and enhanced accountability as well as dealing with consequences of the first round of new TLDs.

Second, we have no desire to delay the beginning of the process for this issues report. But we do have substantial concerns, and the substantial concerns are related to item 2 in the resolved clause of the motion. This is the one that requests ICANN staff to provide options on how the subjects may be organized and work through in a potential future PDP. So there's two important things in item 2. One, it refers to a potential future PDP and its -- while it's not automatic that there will be a PDP, I think it's everyone's expectation that there will be a PDP following the completion of this issues report. It would be very unusual, particularly on this subject, for that not to occur.

Second, the reference to on how the subjects, the natural reading of that is referring to the -- the term "the subjects" as it appears in item 1, which is the subjects that the new gTLD subsequent procedures discussion group identified as deliverables. Now, it's true that above that it says the preliminary issues report should at a minimum consider and then it references the three bullet points below. But it's unclear on how to read those two provisions in conjunction, whether the request to ICANN staff refers only to the subjects identified by the discussion group or whether it might refer to additional subjects that come up in the course of the issues report.

And finally, we share the ALAC's concern that there's no reference to the Affirmation of Commitment. So we have prepared what we hoped would be a friendly amendment and which we discussed at length and shared with Bret Fausett, and he worked in absolute good faith and actually came back to us with a modification that clarified and improved upon our motion and that we were perfectly willing to accept. And as of late yesterday afternoon we believed we had an agreement and understanding to have the friendly amendment accepted, and then we were notified later in the day that the registry constituency had decided to oppose the intention -- the amendment that was intended to be friendly because it spoke about what should be considered before a PDP was completed, which we found -- while we accept that rationale, we found it a bit odd in that item 2 is the item that refers to a potential future PDP and brings up the subject in the first place. The friendly amendment, as it stood, when -- at the point that there was mutual acceptance before we got notification that there was a change of -- of decision by the full registry stakeholder group, had two pieces. The first part was an additional item 12, would have added an item 12 to the whereas clause which would have simply acknowledged that there were a number of concurrent efforts to review different aspects of the 2012 new gTLD round and related projects and would have specifically referenced the Affirmation of Commitments requirement review to examine the impact of the new TLDs on the promotion of competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice as well as the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process and the safeguards that were put in place to mitigate issues arising in the expansion. And then it

would have changed the language of item 2 to read -- and I'm going to read this so people know exactly what was intended here --

It would have had item 2 read, "In addition to covering the required elements of an issue report, ICANN staff has also requested to provide options on how the subjects may be organized and worked through in a potential future PDP considering the impact that concurrent reviews and related efforts may have on a possible future PDP." Period.

"This should include providing guidance on circumstances where external work serves as a dependency in a possible future PDP concluding its work in certain areas such as in the case with the Affirmations of Commitment of the 2012 new gTLD round."

Now, to boil that all down, what the effect would have been to say that the PDP could not be completed until the Affirmation of Commitments review was completed and there at least had been some consideration of the results of that review.

Where we stand now it would not be a friendly amendment, if offered. We wanted to await any further discussion of this subject after I finished to decide whether we're going to offer it, knowing that it's not acceptable to the registry stakeholder group. And the last thing I'll say there would be no need for any consideration of any amendment to this if the presenters would agree to remove item 2 from the "resolved" clause. Because that's the part that triggered our concern. So I'll stop there and so that any other members of the council can speak to the situation. Thank you.

BRET FAUSETT: May I ask for a point of order here?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Sure, Bret. Go ahead.

BRET FAUSETT: Could I have the language that Phil just offered placed into a chat here so I can actually see it? And do I understand correctly that the friendly amendment that has been offered is in the alternative? Either this language or delete 2?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Just to be clear, I don't think Phil has yet offered -- there was an amendment offered. My understanding, Phil, if you could just clarify this, is that there's not yet a new amendment offered but an alternative, I understood as Bret did, that there was an alternative, which is the withdrawal of "resolved" clause 2. So could you clarify exactly what is on the table right now before proceeding, please.

PHILIP CORWIN: We have not yet offered the amendment. Bret, the amendment, if we do offer it, is identical to the language that you sent to Steve DeBianco of the business constituency yesterday that the BC had indicated was acceptable after you had spoken with ICANN staff.

I provided the language to Glen so that Jonathan and other council members could have it. And I haven't offered it as an either/or, if we do offer it. But there would be no need to have this discussion if item 2 was deleted from the motion.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So, in effect, there is an alternative friendly amendment proposed, which is the deletion of item 2?

PHILIP CORWIN: Yes.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you. So we have currently what was a friendly amendment. And indications have been that it would be considered not friendly. And, for the purposes of anyone to understand this, "not friendly" simply means it's not accepted by the initial proposer of the motion. So we have -- we had a potential friendly amendment.

Indications are that it will not be accepted as friendly. And, in addition, we have an alternative friendly amendment proposed, which is the withdrawal of "resolved" clause 2.

Brian, you're next in the queue. Brian Winterfeldt.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Brian Winterfeldt, IPC. The IPC supports the BC's previously friendly amendment that has been defriended. And we also -- and we also would support the alternative solution of removing the particular clause that would take care of the concern that the previously friendly amendment was meant to address.

The IPC does also have concerns about timing of the review efforts and, specifically, in view of the continued rollout of the current round and impending reviews regarding the current round and, of course, the important RPMs for the IPC.

We want to express our hope that the policy development process does not get ahead of these upcoming opportunities to review and reflect the current round. And, specifically, we support the idea that any policy development process develop recommendations for subsequent round not conclude prior to the conclusion of the new gTLD program for the current round, review of the RPMs, review of competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust and any other pertinent reviews.

So, with that being said, we do recognize the process of producing an issues report is important. Getting a charter fully drafted and approved, populating a working group and all the time that it's going to take to actually go through the working group's work itself, which we all know takes at least a year if not two.

So, given this, we support moving forward with the motion while underlining the importance of considering the outcomes of the reviews and developments that take place.

Again, we do support the BC's amendment or the alternative to it. And we look forward to hearing what other councillors have to say about that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Brian. I have Bret next in the queue.

BRET FAUSETT: Thank you both for those contributions. I had not appreciated that the changes that you were making were because you were concerned with clause 2. So I -- I am taking quite seriously the option of deleting that entirely. Because I -- I think trying to make it longer may require additional wordsmithing that maybe we're not prepared to do here. But let the discussion go on. But I will -- I would like you to -- let's talk about whether I can invite that friendly amendment in a couple of minutes after I confer with some of my colleagues.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thanks, Bret. While you consider that, let's go to Olivier who is next in the queue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Olivier CrepinLeblond speaking on behalf of the ALAC.

Now that the amendment is on the table or at least is being discussed, I can say that the ALAC has discussed this and would be supportive of this amendment.

I would urge the GNSO to consider the due process in being able to consider all sources of information and of lessons learned from the first round if one was to engage into a second round.

So I would hope that this amendment would be seen as friendly.



The alternative of deleting part number 2 is, unfortunately, something which the ALAC has not had a chance to discuss. So, unfortunately, I wouldn't be able to weigh in on this or express the ALAC's views on this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Olivier. If I can ask you and Brian to remove your hands now from the queue. Amr, go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I just had a couple questions. And maybe Phil and Brian can help clarify this for me.

My understanding is that, when the GNSO requests an issues report, then that in itself suggests a potential future PDP. So I'm not exactly certain how clause -- "resolved" clause number 2 is problematic.

Regarding the additional language suggested, isn't this exactly the sort of input that a preliminary issues report speaks during the public comment period on that report? And wouldn't that be the appropriate time to suggest this sort of input be considered in the final issues report?

My point is that I really don't see what the conflict is regarding the second "resolved" clause being the way it is. It could very well lead to all the considerations that the BC, the IPC, and perhaps the ALAC are taking into consideration and perhaps being included in the charter of a future PDP. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks for those thoughtful points, Amr. I see Bret is next in the queue.

BRET FAUSETT: Thank you. Amr makes a very good point. This will not be the last time we discuss this either as a community or at the council level.

In fact, this is going to come right back to us in a couple of months after the issue report comes out. And we have to consider whether to create a PDP.

So we'll have a fulsome conversation around what the inputs should be into the policy development process again probably in Dublin.

And then just a quick question for whomever is our parliamentarian. I am open to the amendment that has been suggested by Phil Corwin from the BC that we delete clause 2. Is that an amendment for him to make, or am I free to withdraw clause 2? How should we handle that procedurally?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So Philip Corwin from the BC proposes that as a friendly amendment. Providing you see that as friendly, it becomes withdrawn. We should, as a matter of course, also check that with the seconder of the motion. But, providing both of you accept that as friendly, it simply goes ahead as a change. And then we proceed to vote on the motion with the clause 2 withdrawn. So I understand that you accept that as a friendly amendment. And so I turn then to the seconder of the motion. I don't see that recorded here, if someone could help me who seconded the motion.

It happens to be Avri who has her hand up in the queue just next, as coincidence has it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri speaking. How fortuitous. I wasn't actually sure it was offered as a friendly amendment or possibly offered as a friendly amendment. And I'm not sure I could tell the difference between those two.

I would not be inclined to accept it. Because I don't understand what an issues report is that doesn't include the options for a way to do a possible PDP.

So for -- to me, it seems like taking out clause 2 turns this into a not issues report but something else, which I also don't know what it would be called.

So I'm inclined to not accept it as a friendly amendment. Not because I disagree, in principle, with, you know, needing to -- in fact, I was quite happy with the previous friendly amendment.

I had no problem with an end-to-end dependency between reviews and the work. But I do have problems with an issues report that doesn't explore how we do a PDP and doesn't make recommendations related to a PDP. I just don't understand that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I guess I would expect that -- we have another open mic. I would expect that -- I'm not sure how this would impact whether or not staff would conduct an issues report. I think it's pretty well scoped how staff would conduct an issues report in any event.

So let's hear from -- so I must say I -- in terms of the materiality of the point and your point, Avri, I'm not sure how much it would impact it.

Let's go to Heather who is next in the queue.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you, Jonathan. Heather Forrest.

Brian has spoken quite carefully on behalf of the IPC as to our concerns to timing. And I would like to offer just a bit of clarification in relation to our other concern, which is that potentially limiting interpretation of the motion as it's currently drafted and, hence, that was the reason for our support of the initially proposed now unfriended friendly motion, friendly amendment.

But I did want to say on the record, have it be noted, we very much appreciate the open dialogue that we've had with Bret who has made the motion and for, let's say, the opportunity to hear our concerns about the interpretation of the precise language as perhaps limiting the scope of a future potential PDP.

We also appreciate the input that has been provided by staff as to the opportunity to raise issues for consideration in an issue report after that issue report has already gotten underway.

With that clarification, we have a certain degree of our concerns allayed. We would prefer that our concerns were documented in the motion. We understand the difference, let's say, between theory and practice. And, nevertheless, it would be helpful to have our concerns expressed, captured in the motion rather than simply here in the minutes of this meeting. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Heather.

I'm just wondering if, in the event that no amendments take place, if there's any other way -- but I guess they are captured in the minutes in any event. So that's the case. Philip Corwin, you're next.

PHILIP CORWIN: Thank you. The reason we have concerns and we're -- and are still considering offering an amendment, if there's no deletion of item 2. And I don't know if that's possible now that the seconder has objected to a friendly amendment to that effect -- is that

item 2 seems extraneous to us. We all know the procedures that what happens after an issues report. The next step is to consider a PDP.

That's the natural course of the policy making process here.

So we don't need item 2 to move on to the PDP at the completion of the issues report. And, again, it's the concern created here that there's no need to have item 2 to request along the way in the issues report that staff do this or that. But it's the specific -- the specificity of the request in item 2 that staff provide options on how the subjects may be organized and worked through in a potential future PDP.

And so you say what are the subjects? And the subjects -- that relates back to the first bullet point in item one, which is the subjects that the new gTLD subsequent procedures discussion group identified as deliverables. And then you can get into debate about whether that's modified by the -- at a minimum, language that precedes it.

But there's no need for all that confusion. It can simply be clarified through an amendment that clarifies that the subjects to be organized are not limited to what the discussion group has suggested in its spreadsheet so far. Or we can delete item 2.

But the BC finds the current situation unsatisfactory and would like to see a resolution one way or the other. And I should add, if we can't work something out on this, particularly after our experience meeting with the Board on constituency day and being told that we weren't clear enough on the first round at expressing concerns. If we can't get this resolved, the BC at least will vote no on the unchanged motion, not out of any desire or expectation that the issues report would be delayed, but simply to create a record so that, in the future, no one on the Board or staff can say, well, you should have spoken up at the time that you had concerns. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Philip. I'm going to close the queue. I think we've heard more or less enough on this already. And I'll close the queue after Avri. And we'll resolve it as necessary thereafter. So, Bret, you're next.

Heather, if you could drop your hand, please.

BRET FAUSETT: Thank you. I wanted to make two points, first to Heather about the different inputs that we've had into the process and the other reviews that are under way.

We first heard that concern at the Los Angeles meeting last year in our discussion group. And we went back to our drafts and made sure that there were references to the AoC review.

We understood as a discussion group that that was going to be an input into whatever policy processes would go down the road.

So we tried to put that into the things that the PDP may wish to consider.

Avri, to your point, I would hope that you would withdraw your objection and allow me to remove 2. And I'll tell you that, in my view, an issue report is a defined thing. And we will not expand the scope of the issue report or contract the scope of the issue report by whatever we put in 2.

I fully expect staff to give us some options on timelines, to tell us about the other reviews that are underway. I think that's part of the creation of the issue report, whether we say it or not. So I don't see 2 as materially shaping it, which is why I'm -- I'm very happy to withdraw it. I think it's language that may cause confusion when it's meant to be helpful.

So I would simply ask the staff to prepare the issue report as they always prepare the issue report based on the template that they always use. And, you know, we'll actually get a chance to shape that issue report when we see it in draft comment later in the summer. So, to the extent we don't think it covered what we need it to cover from either side of the GNSO house, that's open to public comment. And we'll be able to shape it at that time.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Bret. I did call to end the cue with Avri. So, Thomas, I see your hand has come up since. So let's hear from Avri and Thomas. You haven't spoken at all in this meeting, so let's permit you to speak should you retain the requirement to do so.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I appreciate your request, but I'm still going to not go along with it. Because, first of all, I don't see the point of dropping it. And, therefore, I'm just very uncomfortable about dropping it. Because there's absolutely no reason it should be dropped.

It actually talks about providing options on how all of these subjects may be organized and worked through.

Now, one of these subjects has indeed been the reviews. And so, basically, what we want to take out of this motion at the moment is something that says we want to accommodate all of the options and all of the subjects and deal with that.

And I think that that makes the most sense to make that request explicitly. And I guess, because I truly don't understand what is achieved by dropping it, whereas, it seems quite a reasonable thing and it isn't normal in a PDP for us to ask for please take the complexity of this massive subject that we've said we wanted in one PDP and to ask the staff to actually go through that and give us options for how to deal with all these subjects, including this last one.

So, to me, it makes no sense to drop it. And I would really prefer that we didn't. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Avri. So we'll hear from Thomas last, and I'll call the question on the amendment.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Jonathan. And I have to confess I thought I had understood what the issue is. Now I think I'm confused.

To my knowledge, there is no rule preventing an issue report from containing information contained in this clause number 2, i.e., to make suggestions.

So, if that is the case, if we then drop clause number 2, we can still have an issues report, including all the components that are referred to in number 2. The same time, if we delete it, there is no -- yeah, so there's no request merely from the process that we're undergoing here that the deletion leads to this to be forbidden territory for the issues report.

At the same time, if my first statement is correct, then the inclusion of clause number 2 would be a merely declaratory and not any -- add any additional rights to it.

Is this maybe a communications issue or is there a hidden agenda that we should reveal to find out why this language is suggested? Maybe somebody can help out.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks for the question, Thomas. Avri, do you feel any differently having heard from Thomas?

AVRI DORIA: No. Basically, in fact, I'm further convinced. And I will be able to go on for a while, but basically, at the moment, yes, it's voluntary. The staff can look at the content there and arrange it any way they want. They could say -- they could opt not to go through giving

us options on ways to deal with all the information and all the issues that are there. And yes, we could ask in the draft issues report, please, you know, give us options because we didn't ask you before.

Here, what we're saying is, if you've looked at that complexity of issues and we had a whole lot of discussion, is there one PDP, is this many PDPs? It's the same issue that we've gotten into with some other PDPs of how do we organize this incredible mass of PDP? How do we do it so that enough bandwidth is available for everybody to work? How do we make this possible?

This PDP is not just a regular single line, let's get it done PDP, but it's a very, very complicated one. So I see specific value in asking for options on how could we best do this? That is not a normal part of the PDP. A normal part of the PDP is, is this in scope? Is this not in scope? And what are the issues? And here's a charter for you to think about. It is not a, look at this complexity of items and spend some time thinking about how best to organize the work of the PDP. That sentence there asks that. And that's why I think it's important. And I think taking it out actually loses from the motion and puts things in some sort of a confusion as to what do we really want from them.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thanks, Avri. I think we've had enough on this now. I mean, this is a sizable amount of discussion. I think the points have generally been aired. Volker, is there some other point that you'd like to make before we put this to a vote?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, just one question of procedure. When laws are drafted or motions are made in certain organizations taking something out means something. For example, when you look at interpreting a law or interpreting a motion at certain levels, you look at the materials, what were the reasons for making that motion that way, drafting that law that way. If we now explicitly take something out that has a certain recommendation to it, does that mean we want the opposite? We do not support it to be done this way? Or does it have no implication whatsoever on the interpretation of the motion?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Well, I mean, I think there are opinions on this, right? And so I'm not going to pronounce -- and we've already heard that there are opinions in both directions. So I think what we have to do now is come back to Philip and the B.C. and understand whether or not there are any amendments they would like to see in the motion as it stands. We'll vote on those amendments. And subsequent to voting on those amendments, we'll vote only then, amended or retained motion. So go ahead, Philip. Please propose any amendment you'd like to see, and we'll either then formally accept that as --

PHILIP CORWIN: The first motion we would like to propose is to strike item 2 in its entirety from the resolved clause. Is there a second? I don't want to --

JONATHAN ROBINSON: We don't need a second for that. We simply have that as a proposed amendment, and we know, from the responses of the motion maker and the second, that they're not in agreement that this is a friendly amendment. So we'll put it to the vote of the council. So we vote on -- here we vote on the withdrawal of resolved clause 2. So Glen, if you could call -- if you could take the vote, please. And let's be clear on what the thresholds will be here. This will be a simple majority of both houses required to pass or fail the amendment. So both houses, each -- both houses need to vote in the majority in order for it to pass or the alternative.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Sorry. Dan Reed.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Let me make it crystal clear what we're voting on. We're voting to withdraw resolved clause 2. So if you support the withdrawal vote yes. If you do not support the withdrawal, vote no.

GLEN de SAINT GÉRY: Dan Reed.

DANIEL REED: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Edward Morris.

EDWARD MORRIS: No.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: No.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Sorry. Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Bret Fausett.

BRET FAUSETT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Amr Elsadr, can you hear us?

AMR ELSADR: I abstain.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Brian Winterfeldt.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: James Bladel.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: David Cake.

DAVID CAKE: No.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Yoav Keren. So we ask James to vote for Yoav, please.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Tony Holmes.

TONY HOLMES: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Donna Austin.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Susan Kawaguchi.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Philip Corwin.

PHILIP CORWIN: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Volker Greimann.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I abstain.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Heather Forrest.

HEATHER FORREST: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Marilia Maciel.

MARILIA MACIEL: No.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: No. Sorry. Yes? Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA: No.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: I do believe I have come -- in the contracted party house we have five yes votes, we have one no and one abstention. And in the non-contracted party house we have seven yes votes, five no votes, and one abstention. So we have, in the contracted party house, 71.4%, and in the non-contracted party house, 53.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. So by a simple majority in both cases, the amendment is passed. The motion is now modified to have the second resolved clause removed. And we now give an opportunity for Amr and Volker, who both abstained, to provide a reason for the abstention, should they wish to do so. So if you could go first, Amr, and please indicate you do not wish to provide a statement on the abstention or simply give the reason.

AMR ELSADR: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I'll give a reason. I somehow see that whether clause 2 is included or not in the motion doesn't really change anything. We're discussing the issue scoping phase of a potential PDP. There is a public comment period following the preliminary issues report where anyone can suggest what should or should not be included in the scoping of this PDP. So whether we include this in a clause now or provide that in -- during the public comment period, the result is the same. So I'm really honestly not really sure what this is all about. So I preferred not to go either way yes or no. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I fully appreciate that, Amr. Just for the record, for anyone else's benefit, you may not be aware of that and just to be crystal clear, that is understood and recorded. But a no vote -- an abstention is recorded, for the purposes of counting the vote, as a no vote. So just so that everyone is aware of that for this -- well, I guess it's by now for future purposes. Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, I abstained because of the concerns I voiced just before the vote -- the discussion was closed. I agree with the content of the second resolved clause. I think sorting and ordering by staff will be helpful for the PDP, and I do not wish to create an impression that the council now wishes to -- wishes the opposite by removing this clause. Therefore, I abstained. But I still support the motion.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. So let's proceed now to vote on the amended motion that is without resolved clause 2. We previously read the motion. I don't think we need to reread the resolved clauses. We know that we've now struck clause 2 off. So Glen, if you could proceed to take the vote on the motion itself as amended.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Edward Morris.

EDWARD MORRIS: Abstained.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Sorry. Donna Austin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Abstain.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Yoav Keren. James, would you please vote for Yoav.

JAMES BLADEL: For Yoav, yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Susan Kawaguchi.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Tony Holmes.

TONY HOLMES: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Brian Winterfeldt.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA: Abstain.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: David Cake.

DAVID CAKE: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Heather Forrest.

HEATHER FORREST: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: James Bladel for yourself.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Bret Fausett.

BRET FAUSETT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Volker Greimann.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Marilia Maciel.

MARILIA MACIEL: Yes.



GLEN de SAINT GERY: Daniel Reed.

DANIEL REED: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Amr Elsadr.

AMR ELSADR: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Philip Corwin.

PHILIP CORWIN: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Have I left anybody off? No. It doesn't seem -- in the contracted party house, 100% yes. In the non-contracted party house we have nine yes votes and three abstentions. Yes, I'm just looking at that. That we recorded everybody. Sorry. Ten in the non-contracted party house yes votes and three no -- abstentions.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So Glen, your percentages, please.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Percentages in the contracted party house, 100% and in the noncontracted party house, 76.9%.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: And the thresholds to pass the motion are -- it's an issues report so the thresholds are --

GLEN de SAINT GERY: So it is a -- it's two thirds -- no. Sorry. It's a quarter, isn't it, Mary? A quarter of each house.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: It's an issues report, it's a very low threshold. It's 25% in each house, so it's well covered. So the motion passes and the issues report can commence.

Thanks, everyone. A brief remark from the Chair. We should do better on that, and I think it's -- it's unfortunate that the amendment got -- I don't think it was any bad faith. It was just an accident that the amendment didn't get tidied up in time. So yeah, apologies. I understand where you're coming from right at the moment, Avri. So it's just something which I think for all of us just a note, we spent a lot of time on process again here which takes us back a few steps. More work to be done on all of our part to try and undo that and make sure we work effectively together, which generally I think we all intend to do so but somehow we got a little bit lost in the process here. Avri, I assume you're going to talk to me about reasons for abstentions, which I passed over. So anyone who has abstained from the motion, please make -- please form a queue, an orderly queue, and let's hear the motivation for the abstention. Starting with Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. I will attempt to be orderly about it, and I guess before I start I'm somewhat hesitant about the fact that questioning friendly amendments and causing a friendly amendment to end up being voted on is somehow considered a disorderly process or a non-efficient process. Having said that, basically my issue is that I believe we have made this motion a little less clear by removing this. We have introduced ambiguities into it, and I really wanted a chance to say, I really think it's quite important that the options for the manner in which this PDP is presented to us please be included in the -- in the issues report. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Avri. You'll know that just in brief response, not to your reasons but to the process point, it's not really that dealing with friendly or unfriendly amendments, it shouldn't be done properly. It's more that I think we could have dealt with this informally had we not chipped ourselves up in -- over the prior 24 hours rather than in the meeting itself. So it's just a reminder to me and everyone else that we need to resolve these things at -- as effectively as possible in advance.

Does anyone else want to make a statement in relation to their abstention? Please let yourselves be known. Edward and then Stephanie.

EDWARD MORRIS: Thank you, Jonathan. I simply was not happy with the way this procedurally was conducted. A last-minute amendment. Sorry, that's not how we're supposed to be doing things in council now.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. Edward. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin, for the record. Yes. I'd just like to say that as a relatively novice counselor clarity is really important. I'm very concerned about the complexity of this particular issues report and PDP that will come out of it. So I felt that 2 was helpful and I would echo Thomas' statement. I became confused at the thought of removing it. If it doesn't do any harm, why not leave it in. And as Avri has eloquently said, it would be helpful to have staff outline the issues and check on the -- on the parallel track processes that are going through at the same time. So that is why, had we had more time, possibly my comfort level would have been higher. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Stephanie. And for the record, I have in the comment portion of the Adobe Connect room that Amr agrees with Edward in terms of his motivation for abstaining, if I understand him correctly. Phil.

PHILIP CORWIN: I just wanted to say two things, as we wrap up this item. One, I understand the concern Edward expressed. The B.C. made every effort and thought that we had resolved this until very late yesterday, and what we thought was an agreed-upon resolution kind of fell apart.

Second, I -- while we haven't discussed within B.C., it would be difficult for me to imagine that we would oppose staff suggesting ways or other people suggesting ways to order the way the PDP should be handled. We just want to ensure that the items considered were not limited to those in the discussion group Excel spreadsheet but would include things like the Affirmation of Commitments review. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Philip. I think we should move on now. We've covered things. Marilia.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Jonathan. This is Marilia speaking. Just for clarification, I had understood the informal meeting that the council has on the night before we are here, it is exactly for these things to show up. So if they don't show up until the informal council meeting either we should not hold them at all because they're not working or we should make sure that anything that happens after that won't be accepted because it is not good practice. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks for that view. I think we -- as I say, I think we could do -- we could do better and I don't think -- I think we have to be very careful here. My impression is no one acted in bad faith. It just got a little clumsy.

And so I think this is unlikely to repeat itself, but that's my opinion. Let's make sure that it doesn't. I really am very keen to move on. I can see we've taken a long time over this. We've got a couple other items.

Amr and James, if you could both be brief, I'm closing the queue there. So, Amr, go ahead followed by James.

AMR ELSADR: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Amr. I will be brief. On a somewhat related item, the SCI has requested to look into the standardizing the procedures to a second motions and how to submit friendly amendments. I strongly recommend that we do, as the chartering organization of that committee, that we do ask the SCI to take this up. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Amr. Noted. We can check that. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, just quickly. I agree with the sentiment that these sorts of things should be shaken out in the sessions last night. But I would caution against making that a formal deadline for submission of friendly or unfriendly amendments or motions. I think it works best if it's just kept informal. And we didn't catch everything this time. And that's not necessarily an indictment of the purpose of those meetings. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, James. I'll make no further comment. Let's keep things moving.

So our next item is the final motion for today. It's clearly on a substantial item, which is this - the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on the IANA stewardship transition with regard to naming rights functions. It's item 8. It's a motion that was prepared and presented by myself with help from others.

And so I will proceed to go straight to the "resolved" clauses, which you will note have been modified over the last -- since the motion was submitted. You should all have seen them. None of them have been, to the best of my recollection, haven't been modified in the last 24 hours or so. But there were some amendments along the way.

So "It is hereby resolved that the GNSO Council approves the stewardship final proposal and its submission to the IANA stewardship transition coordination group.

The GNSO Council approval is provided on the basis that the stewardship final proposal is conditional on the ICANN accountability level mechanisms -- accountability mechanisms, workstream 1 being developed by the CCWG-accountability and, moreover, that such mechanisms will need to be approved by the GNSO Council and, B, such mechanisms will need approved by the ICANN board and, C, all required bylaws, amendments will need to be adopted before the transition and, D, all other required implementation will need to be completed before the transition or, if not implemented beforehand, that there will be irrevocable commitments of such implementation to be complete within a reasonable time period after the transition, not to exceed one year."

Following the submission --

"Resolved clause 3. Following the submission of the final report of the CCWG-accountability on workstream 1 and subsequent GNSO Council consideration, the GNSO Council will communicate the results of its deliberations on the CCWG-accountability final proposal on workstream 1; including to the ICG, ICANN board, and NTIA, as necessary, and thereby confirm whether or not the conditionality requirements as set out in the CWG-stewardship final proposal have been met from a GNSO perspective.

"Resolved clause 4: In the event that the CCWG-accountability mechanisms fail to meet the conditions in the CWG stewardship final report, the GNSO Council must formally consider -- formally reconsider any material revisions to the CWG stewardship final proposal that may be made as a result of such failure by the CCWG-accountability to meet the stated conditionality.

"Resolved clause 5. The GNSO Council thanks the CWG stewardship for its hard work and recommends that the CWG stewardship is only formally closed upon submission by the ICANN board of the final transition proposal to the NTIA, thus allowing the CWG stewardship to provide input to the ICG and/or GNSO Council should any questions or issues arise before that time."

And that completes the "resolved" clauses. I'll call for discussion or -- on the motion. This may be a subject we've heard enough on over the last few days.

Any comments, questions or issues arising as a result of the motion? Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah. I'd just like to go on record thanking the CWG for their remarkable work. They've been under a lot of pressure. They had excellent leadership with Lise and John supported by great staff. I know this because we are liaising very closely with them as a CCWG. And I just would like to make sure this is adequately put on the record. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Thomas. Noted.

All right. Let's put the motion to the vote then. Glen, if you could call -- make the roll call for the vote, please.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'm sorry. I have a hand up from Amr. Amr, go ahead.

AMR ELSADR: Thank you, Jonathan. And apologies again for the late hand. This is Amish. And I just wanted to note I do plan on voting in favor of this motion. However, I'd like to put on the record that my understanding is that there is still an unresolved issue in front of the CWG regarding the trademark issue of IANA. And I just wanted to note that and -- with the hope that the CWG will resolve this in due time. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Amr. Noted.

Glen, if you could call for the vote.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thank you, Jonathan.

Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA: While I'm voting yes, I will want to make a statement attached to the yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Jonathan Robinson.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Tony Holmes?

TONY HOLMES: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, with a statement. Thank you.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Brian Winterfeldt.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Susan Kawaguchi.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: James Bladel.

JAMES BLADEL: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Daniel Reed.

DANIEL REED: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Heather Forrest.

HEATHER FORREST: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Edward Morris.

EDWARD MORRIS: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Marilia Maciel.

MARILIA MACIEL: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Philip Corwin.

PHIL CORWIN: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Volker Greimann.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: Yoav Keren and James Bladel, please.

JAMES BLADEL: For Yoav, yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: David Cake.

DAVID CAKE: Yes.

GLEN de SAINT GERY: And Amr Elsadr.

AMR ELSADR: Yes.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Glen.

While you tally the votes and prepare the outcome, I'll just call for statements. I note that there was a prospective statement from Avri and Stephanie. Did I get everyone?

So, Avri, if you could go ahead and make the statement if you'd like to orally now.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. This is Avri Doria. As the NCSG assigned member to the CWG stewardship transition group, I've been instructed by my stakeholder group to indicate that they want to insert that the bracketed language on trademark indicates that there is no position by the CWG on the trademark issues.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Avri. I'll note that in the report itself it is recorded as place holder language. Thank you. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Just a very simple statement that it would be good if we had greater clarity on those issues as they are moved along. Namely, the trademark issue. And I recognize that there is -- it's a place holder. But I would echo Amr's comment before that we don't just hope this will be resolved. It really must be resolved in a manner that is consistent with the work on accountability. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

Glen, could you give us the outcome of the --

GLEN de SAINT GERY: The outcome is 100% for the contracted party house and 100% for the non-contracted party house. That is 7 votes in the contracted party house, 13 votes in favor in the non-contracted party house.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So we record that the motion is passed unanimously. Thank you.

Chuck, did you want to make a point at the microphone?

CHUCK GOMES: Thank you, Jonathan.

I want to give some compliments -- and I won't take the time to compliment everybody. I, first of all, want to compliment Jonathan. I don't know how he did it chairing the council and co-chairing the CWG. And it's not done yet.

But you've done a great job. And I really commend you for that.

I think another person that should be singled out -- and, by the way, the whole working group needs to be commended. But, you know, there was a turning point when we went to a -- what we first called the hybrid solution and what is now the PTI solution and so forth.

And it was a GNSO councilor who spearheaded that. So I want to compliment Avri. In a critical moment in the working group. So single out those two. There's lots of others. Donna led the design team C, which was a critical one for the Customer Standing Committee. Greg was not on the council. But from the IPC -- incredible amount of time in terms of helping with the legal advice and so forth. And, you know, I could single out others. I'll stop there. But thanks to all of you because it was really a very successful effort.

And, you know, we look back to December. Remember how we were viewed? We were kind of -- we were the unsuccessful ones. And, yet, in my own belief, that exercise we went to to get to that first solution, some people think it was a waste. I think it was needed for us to move forward. And so it's all part of this bottom-up multistakeholder process that we give a lot of lip service to. But it worked. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Chuck.

[ Applause ]

I'll join you in acknowledging all the hard work that's gone on from everyone in the group, councillors around this table, and others in this group. And that includes yourself, Chuck. So thanks very much to everyone involved. It's been a mammoth piece of work. And, for me, one of the most gratifying things is it's demonstrated the effectiveness of and the usefulness in the right circumstances of the Cross-Community Working Groups. So this is a nascent process for which, as we know, there's a group working on developing the procedures for that, further developing the procedures for that kind of work.

So it doesn't take the place of the work that goes on in the GNSO, in the working groups, and PDP working groups. But it's a valuable addition. And that is also an important part of the development we've seen.

Speaking of which, item 9 deals with -- Oh, I have a hand up from Olivier before we move from this point. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. First on behalf of the ALAC, I'd like to thank the GNSO Council for voting this. The ALAC is going to be ratifying this, absent any last-minute rebellion tomorrow morning. And we might have a couple of points or a few notes that will be attached to the vote. But I would like to echo the points made by Chuck in that I was absolutely extremely impressed with the work of this group. And it's an incredible example of a multistakeholder model at work. That has to deal with incredibly difficult and incredibly significant things.

So a great showcase. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Olivier. All right. In the interest of time and making sure we hit -- we complete our agenda by the top of the hour, we'll move on to item 9, which deals with the Cross-Community Working Group on enhancing ICANN accountability, again, the subject of which we've heard much about the last few days. So, Thomas, this feels like the opportunity to bring up salient and current recent points resulting from the work of this group. Go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Jonathan. The good news in terms of time is that we don't have a motion on the table for this agenda item. Hopefully, we will when we meet next time, if everything goes smoothly.

This accountability topic has been discussed with the council during the weekend session. There has been a Town Hall meeting on Monday with almost 300 people in the room.

We have done a little tour to see various groups that have asked to see us and ask questions. So we've presented to the GNSO, the ccNSO, the BC, IPC, ALAC, SSAC, RSSAC, and the GAC. So we have done what we could. We've offered everyone to come and speak to them. And we've collected more input beyond what we had last Friday when our group last convened.

And I think there are maybe two or three points worth highlighting since council has been updated during the weekend. And that is that SSAC and RSSAC have both confirmed that they will maintain their advisory role, that they will not participate in a voting scheme. And they provided the rationale for that, which I think is interesting and worthwhile knowing for the councillors. But as far as the GNSO as such, they said that they had a limited mandate. They want to make sure that what they do within their mandate has impact. They don't see it as their role to take part in decisions that do not touch or are not related to this mandate. So, while they appreciate an invitation to join the communities' discussions on the community powers, to be able to chime in and add to the discussion, they would not like to see the

neutrality and the strength of their advice being jeopardized or diluted by them taking a stance on other matters.

At the same time, they recognize that our plan is to put security and stability into the bylaws and give that a special role in the bylaws. And so they see that, even though their role is merely advisory, should the Board wish to ignore security and stability, that could constitute a violation of the bylaws and could potentially give aggrieved parties standing to invoke an IRP. So, even though they're not willing to vote, they don't see their role diminished, they also made very clear that their position does not result from perceived or actual complexity of the model that we're proposing, nor are they challenging it as such but they just want to stick to what they have at the moment. That might change at some point in the future, but this is sort of what we heard from them.

The GAC has asked a lot of questions with respect to the IRP and jurisdictional questions. So that is all well-noted. And we will further discuss this very important topic.

So I think it's good that the community stays engaged. Please do take the opportunity to maybe sit in or actively participate in the two more CCWG meetings that are going to be held, one immediately after this meeting at 3:30 and we have another one tomorrow morning. And watch out for the next public comment period to be opened. And please do chime in. We need to make this work, and then we're going to have a resolution ready for them then. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Thomas. Any questions or comments arising from that point at the moment? We've all spent enough energy on this for the recent few days, but that work will continue.

So moving on then, we have an item 10, which is a brief update on the work of the council drafting team on the new ICANN meeting strategy. Is there anything there you'd like to say there, Volker?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes. Volker Greimann speaking, for the record.

We had a small meeting this morning at 7:45, which was regretfully not as well attended as it could have been.

There were conflicting sessions, and it was very early in the morning. So it was to be expected.

However, with those members that were there, we were able to identify some issues. However, the largest problem remains that we have not heard back from all SOs and ACs on how they see the plans for, especially the meeting B, which is a short four-day meeting. Without this input, we -- as the GNSO, and especially the GNSO Council, are very -- almost unable to complete our work without provoking conflicts down the road.

So I would urge all councillors to go back to their constituencies and stakeholder groups to just respond to the letter we sent out a month ago and provide us input on how they see their time and requirements for the short meeting so we may begin to finalize our planning.

We have already a draft that Marika provided. And, Marika, if you could send that around to the list to inform the councillors of the current thinking, basically, filling the time.

Just as an update, under the current thinking, the four-day meeting would not have a weekend session, as we know it today. It would have a short meeting at the beginning and then a short meeting at the end with working group sessions in between.



The current role of the weekend session would be taken over by a policy update. You're free to comment on that. This is just very rough planning at this stage.

We're looking for input from all sides. Please do not hesitate to provide it. The time is running short.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Volker. One idea I have -- and I'll float this with you now. And I guess we'll put it on the action item list, if no one objects -- is to write to the Board and let them know what we're doing, that we're taking this seriously and we're working within the GNSO to think about how we will handle our work on the weekend sessions and asking them how the Board -- sorry, not -- on the meeting B -- in meeting B and asking the Board how it intends to deal with that. Because it would be very interesting to know if the Board intends to, perhaps, participate more in the policy process or at least listen in and engage with what's going on. So I thought of writing something along those lines. So, if anyone has got any thoughts on that, either now or on lists, you can let me know whether you think that's a good idea, bad idea, or how we might shape that.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Just one update, maybe. One interesting thought that we heard from the -- the Board wasn't present, but indications from the Board was that the Board meetings with the different constituencies would not happen at the short meeting. And the Board members would instead be able to move about. And -- move about and join all the different sessions and working groups and activities that would be going on on this four-day meeting; i.e, there would be no official board sessions. The Board members would be free to participate in all the meetings, which is, in my view, a very attractive thought.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Great. Maybe that will be formalized by that correspondence I was suggesting.

I'm mindful of time. So let's go to AOB quickly, any other business, if there's anything else. And then, thereafter, we can go to see if there's any other contributions from anywhere in the room.

If anyone would like to make a contribution, please come up to the microphone now. And I'll be sure to accommodate you.

Mason, your hand is up. Go ahead.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much. Mason Cole speaking. I just wanted to say thank you to the council for the affirmative vote on my role in continuing in the liaison position to the GAC. I appreciate the Council's confidence in not only the role, but in me personally. And I wasn't able to get that sentiment across when we took the vote, so I wanted to add that before the end of the meeting. So thank you, and I look forward to another year of serving the council.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Mason. Likewise. And, behalf of the council, I'll say that we look forward to working with you and having you as part of our work.

Any other comments or suggestions or points that anyone would like to make in particular who are not on the council? Anyone who would like to come up to the microphone and make any points in relation to GNSO policy, council business, or other matters?

Seeing and hearing none, I'll take this opportunity to thank you all for participating in the meeting both councillors and anyone else who has come to join us today. Much appreciated. In addition to the staff support that we received to run an effective meeting.

With that, we draw the meeting to a close and stop the recording. Thank you.

[ Applause ]