

**ICANN**  
**Transcription ICANN Johannesburg**  
**GNSO - Informal Council Session**  
**Tuesday, 27 June 2017 at 18:30 SAST**

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

- Man 1: It is Tuesday, June 27, at 6:30 p.m. This is the GNSO informal Council session in ballroom to it ICANN 59.
- James Bladel: On my watch it shows 6:30. I think everybody is still over in Geo Names. That's where the action is this time, so. Good evening. I know we're still waiting for Geo Names to end. Has that let out yet? (Tony), (Erika)? Has Geo Names let out yet?
- James Bladel: It's just ending. Said Geo – geographic names – the geographic names – this is a very hot mic. So we'll just get some refreshments and make our way to the table. Okay, good evening. We're going on 20 minutes behind now, but I understand that Geo Names ran a little late and that was fantabulous session, thank you (Aubrey) and (Jeff). I really do like the moderators – mediators – facilitators, I thought they did a fantastic job of managing the discussion. So welcome, this is our informal prep session/cocktail hour that we have at each ICANN meeting where we go over our agenda for the next day's public meeting. I'm hopeful that we don't have a lot to go over in any depth of detail, but you know, I always say that and I'm always wrong.

But I would note that Nathalie has mentioned that this meeting is scheduled to end at 7:30 and then our dinner begins downstairs and across the street at 7:45. And people might want to run up to the hotel rooms and drop off the briefcases and computers and what not, so if we can just kind of keep this on topic and on focus, we can get out of here and that will give us a few minutes in between this. And then if we have more things that we need to hash out, we can certainly do that over dinner.

So just a reminder that this meeting is for counselors and for leaders of SG's and C's within the GNSO. It is extensively closed. It is not open, but it is recorded. And then we are publishing those recordings after the fact. And that was (Aubrey's) doing. Thank you, (Aubrey). So watch what you say because you're on the mic now. So that's what we're up to.

So here's our agenda for tomorrow. And I note that I think a couple of folks – I think perhaps Ed and maybe one of the person has some AOB so we want to leave a little space if we can. Can I ask the staff folks if they can dial this microphone down just a smidge? I feel like I'm shouting and I'm basically doing my NPR whisper over here and it's like, oh perfect, thank you.

Okay, so administrative matters, roll calls, SOI's – I don't know that – and I can even defer to Graeme here, if the little mini drama of my eligibility to remain a counselor even warrants an SOI. I think the, you know, where the XCOM is maybe landing in the registrars is none of that ever happened. It was about all a bad dream because it was identified and fixed so quickly that it was kind of a nice little diversion in the run-up to Johannesburg. But I note that some other folks have indicated perhaps some changes to their SOI's. So just keep that in mind for tomorrow. If we could scroll to the next page please? Okie-doke. We have an agenda amendment. And I think the one item of note is that the motion made by (Paul) -- as you heard in the working session yesterday -- was withdrawn and he would like to consider resubmitting that as a discussion point for our meeting in July, whether that occurs on the 13th of the 20th.

(Paul): False.

James Bladel That will make that note, then when we come up. The review projects in action list and open items -- I would just maybe -- there you are. You were over there and you moved. I would like to kind of maybe if we can move through that as quickly as possible. Just a — is there anything necessary that we have to flag in that, or can we just maybe give an overview of those two documents and would that be sufficient for most counselors on the action items and project list? Because sometimes it got to get tripped up and bogged down in the single line item.

Woman 1: We're good as you want to handle it. We have them ready. I think they're actually with – I'm looking at Natalie I think the project list is probably with the chair, so I don't think it's come to the counsel yet, has it? Oh, it has.

James Bladel Yes.

Woman 1: So it's already on – are there any specific questions. The action item list is updated. The link is in there, so.

James Bladel Okay. The action item and project list is in your inbox. Please take a look and if there's something that you want to discuss in a little more detail tomorrow, bring it up then. But otherwise we're not going to put each item under a microscope. Yes.

Woman 1: Barry just pointed out one thing to probably point out is one thing we updated in the project list that actually at the end of the document under other – we started capturing some recommendations of PDP working groups that are kind of future items. For example there's an item from a RTP party that basically said once all IRTP recommendations have been implemented, there should be a review. Similar, I think, for post expiration domain name

recovery. I mean, those are kind of longer-term items, but we realized we currently don't have a place to keep track...

James Bladel To keep track.

Woman 1: ...just to actually have them somewhere. So we decided to create a category there. And I think there's one potential question – one where we've made an assumption. There was as well one on the (unintelligible). Also transfer related. Where there was a specific, or separate review. We're seen but we're assuming that that will just get incorporated in the overall review that's foreseen by IRT Part D at some point in time.

James Bladel Okay. Yes, it's good that we put those somewhere, that they're on the clock and visible and that we're tracking them. Just that when you said IRTP the three registrar reps kind of threw open their mouths a little bit, so. But anyway, okay. That's good and thank you Barry, and I will point that out tomorrow as well and just kind of flag that. So thanks for raising that.

The consent agenda is Item 3-1 and it is the adopted charter for the SSC and the confirming the leadership of the SFC. Okay. Piece of cake, and that's Susan, Yoav and Maxim. Okay. Did that charter -- just because it might come up -- did that charter include, like, term length – term limits reelection, re-selection, or is it just gonna tied to your membership as counselors, because Maxim is not a counselor. So how does that work? Yes, there's a review also baked in I think after the APR T-3 selection. Then it kicks to review. Is that correct?

Woman 2: I think we were supposed review after the RDF RT, but we decided to push it out to (unintelligible). We didn't have enough experience for that.

James Bladel Yes, good point. That will make the review at least more meaningful.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel      Okay.

Woman 2:            Can I get back to you on that?

James Bladel      Yes. It's just a question because I noted that, you know, everything else would naturally be tied to counselors term, presumably. But I guess I shouldn't assume that. So, check on it, hi, Marika.

Marika:             Yes, this is Marika. So the chart itself just says the SSC is expected to select the chairs from its membership. It doesn't actually talk about term limits, but I think it's a good point to note for review of the charter because probably there should be something in there either on reconfirmation or indeed if someone leaves the SSC then there is a new selection process.

James Bladel      Yes. Good call that will make it future proof. And then we moved to Item 4, which is a vote on the SSC's recommendation on how we select our representatives to the ECA. And that is Yoav and Susan. If I can just throw out here, you know, as somebody who is looking at the calendar and noting that I was going to be out the door here sooner, you know, then you think. But I do think this is really sensible. I know.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:    If you want to us to get rid of you James, we can. All you have to do is just say.

James Bladel      Graeme did his best, you know, last month, okay. I'm bulletproof, man.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:    Leave the little Canadian alone.

James Bladel      But I think this is – just personally I think this is a really sensible what you guys have chosen, because it's not always going to be a chair or it could be a vice chair, it could be, you know leaving that to, you know, between the three of us, Donna and (Heather) and I have usually covered everything pretty well.

And I hope that that just reinforces the teamwork approach. And I think that's really good. And it takes a lot of open questions off the table about travel funding and vacation all kinds of stuff. So it's – the word I was looking for is it's an elegant solution. Just you know, from the old comps I days, it's accomplished a lot with very minimal amount of work. And I think it's a very elegant solution, so.

Man 5: Yes, I just wanted to add that there was a point that we are discussing it (unintelligible), it looks like something we thought was going to be simple, suddenly got very, very complex and very uh oh. It was down.

James Bladel So, and maybe I'll save this for tomorrow, but I think congratulations to the SSC are in order. Yes, Marika, go ahead.

Marika: it is regarding maybe for reason is the question you raise in the lesson. Actually wanted to point out that that was a specific question in relation to why the process refers to the consent agenda after the leadership has decided who that person is. And the decision, if you want to talk to it, I'm always happy to speak to it.

James Bladel There were two questions on the list. Wolf-Ulrich records the question about the consent agenda. And then my question was, is there any kind of a deadline between an election of a new chair and new vice chairs between the time that happens in the time they have to inform the Council on the selection of the – and we want to put a hard stop on that? Those are the two questions that we put on the list. So I don't know if that lends itself to friendly amendments or.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. But just to clarify why I put this question in. From my understanding, I understand that the final decision is to be taken by the Council, that means the question is then how the council is going to take this decision. And your proposal is it should be put on the consent agenda, which is a different process. It would be on the normal agenda.

So is the question now what was the rationale because I understand – if it's on the content agenda in means it passes in any case unless one council member is raising a question or with regard to that. So that's different from the process if it comes to the usual agenda if it's asked for a vote or what else for that. So my question is here because I think items put on the constant agenda are not of that importance or have been already dealt with in the past and [unintelligible] on the agenda of the Council. And this item to nominate somebody for this administration is of more importance to my understanding. So that is why I put up this question, ask this question. Is that really the case that you said it, okay, the process should be facilitated – should be more easy to do that. Or is there any other rationale behind that? So that's my question.

In case, you know, if there's a difference between the importance of these kind of tough decisions, I would like to ask for a small and friendly amendment mean just putting that not on the content agenda other than to the regular agenda that's.

(Gil): Yes, I mean, the logic behind that was really it is a question of – the way we saw it is that the counsel trusts it with committee to make the selection. And it's only if somebody has an issue with the but then it gets discussed. Instead of going through the whole process -- in a sense again in the Council -- it's already gone through committee. So we also, none of us feel very strongly about that one, so were flexible about that.

James Bladel Thank you, (Gil). Just a reminder, too, we are recording even those not remote. So we have to say our names and make sure we get the microphones. Marika. This is James by the way.

Marika: Yes, this is Marika. Just a note, just because something is on the consent agenda doesn't mean it cannot be taken off. The whole purpose of the consent agenda as that anyone can just ask for that to be moved to the main agenda and to be discussed. But (Anita), as you have explained the

assumption was the responsibility for who's identifying from the leadership team will service as the rep there wouldn't be a need then for further discussion or questioning of that. But it is not prevented by having it on the consent agenda because any member of the Council can request for that to be on the normal agenda and for the discussed.

James Bladel But just a question and then I'll go with Wolf-Ulrich. This is James. If something – if we just strike that, the consent agenda and just says it goes on the agenda, then when that meeting comes up a counselor could recommend that it moved to the consent agenda. There is nothing preventing that. Is that correct? That would be in order. Okay, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: All right. Normally I understand that much of the agenda and the Council leadership is – much of each meeting agenda. So that's what I understood it was for the vice chair as well. So it's up to the leadership to decide, okay, we put this part to the content agenda or not. It's a suggestion. But anyway during the meeting maybe the agenda comes up and then there's a question around are you satisfied with the agenda are not satisfied with the agenda?

James Bladel (Yoev)?

(Yoev): Yes, this is (Yoev). I think we would be happy with that (unintelligible). We can definitely make that amendment.

James Bladel Thank you. And good feedback. Very constructive, Wolf-Ulrich. And to my question, which I don't know if this is also equally constructive or productive, but is there any benefit to setting some sort of limit -- not in terms of time but in terms of number of meetings -- between an election occurring for chairs and vice chairs and the time that the new incoming leadership team must inform counsel that they've made a selection? I was thinking like within two meetings, for example. I haven't worked on the language, I haven't thought this through, but at least it puts a hard stop on how often -- and this has been



-- and I said this before this is been my discomfort with participating in the ECA.

I've always been very careful to remind folks that I'm an interim appointment and, I think, just shortening that window that we have an interim appointment and making sure that we have a confirmed appointment is going to make the, give the (unintelligible) some more credibility, I think, is the decisional participant. So are you – or is it compatible with SFC's deliberations to put a hard stop there? Or was the reason that they wanted to leave that open-ended? Am I missing it?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, let's let Marika...

James Bladel Marika.

Marika: This is Marika. It basically says as soon as possible upon confirmation. So there's the assumption that it's in the interest of the leadership team to confirm that as soon as possible so indeed that may be dependent upon certain things. But I think the SSC perspective it's as soon as the leadership is able to meet and make that decision.

Susan Kawaguchi: The decision within the first meeting or something. That was what was in the back of my mind on that. As soon as possible gives a little more, you know, bandwidth for, you know, if you couldn't get to it. If the leadership team couldn't get to it then maybe you – by the way this is Susan Kawaguchi. To two meetings or something, but I would – I don't think anybody on the selection committee would be opposed to saying giving an actual, you know, requirement.

James Bladel Okay, let's leave it as soon as possible and let's not solve the problem until we have one. You know, I know that the leadership team as it exists today, we're like BFFS, but future leadership teams might not, you know, might struggle with these questions little bit longer than one meeting. And if that

problem comes up I guess we're trusting future councils to take action on that. Okay, Heather, and then Marika.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Just a follow-up on your comment, which I think is been (unintelligible). I think we might be in fact a good team to test this out because if we can't make it work, I'm thinking nobody's gonna make it work. You know, we work extraordinarily well together. So let's give it a road test and see how we go. And I think we all should say we thank you for – well it's kind of congratulation condolences on this one, right? But we all thank you for the faith that you put in us.

Susan Kawaguchi: And we did have you in mind when we were deciding this, so.

James Bladel Marika, you wanted to add?

Marika: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to ask whether following this conversation may be (Yoev) and then Susan can respond to both emails suggesting that change so we actually have a formally on the record. And make that change before we go into the meeting tomorrow.

James Bladel Okay.

Marika: So what that were moving off the word consent.

James Bladel Yes. And I will drop my – I will drop my question because I know it's I can tradition to solve problems before they pop up, but that's very pragmatic of us. So okay, but otherwise I mean, fantastic work with SC – SSC on this one.

Okay, then moving on to Item 5. And as was discussed, (Paul) yesterday withdrew this item and reserves the right to reintroduce it in our July meeting – 13th or 20th or both -- and we'll save it and we'll put a bookmark in there for future discussion. As a discussion of the rather than a motion, okay, fair enough. Okay, that covers – oh I'm sorry, Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. I would be interested to get a sense of the other counselors about whether they think this is something that's a priority discussion or not. The feedback to – that we received from the registry stakeholder group is – I thought we had better things to do. Is this really a priority that we need to even discuss now? So I would just be interested to get a sense of whether others have had that conversation because knowing that we do have pretty full agendas for most of our meetings – if this really isn't a priority, do we need to bring it back so quickly? No offense, (Paul).

James Bladel (Michele).

(Michele Neylon): Thanks, James. (Michele Neylon) for the record. We did have a bit of discussion within the registrars and essentially this it's the same kind of discussion of the registries.

James Bladel There was one dissenting opinion.

Michele Neylon: Okay. With the exception of our glorious chair -- who is diplomacy personified -- most of us felt that it wasn't something that really needed our attention at the moment. Now obviously if somebody can make a very, very strong case for opening that up, then fine. But I think in some of the discussions that I've had even here this week – looking at the ways for example (unintelligible) prioritizes which things they work on whereas here where (unintelligible) it's far too easy in some cases to kick off some kind of PDP or review or some other kind of work which requires volunteers, and time and everything else. So thank you, that's where we stand.

James Bladel Thank you. I think all of this is fodder for a discussion that we can have on counsel if and when this it appears that our agenda as a discussion. Paul?

Paul McGrady, Jr.: It's Paul McGrady for the records. So as not to belabor it, I will defend my honor during that discussion. But thank you for that feedback. This is the

feedback that we were hearing and one of the reasons why the motion was withdrawn. And again when it comes back up from discussion I will lay a little bit more background as to why you think it's worthy of a chat. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: As we're talking about Paul's honor, I do reserve the right to throw down the gauntlet. Thanks.

James Bladel We'll have none of that, (Michele). I know this is South Africa, but pistols at dawn, I think, win out...

Michele Neylon: Who said anything about pistols?

James Bladel Swords. Okay, but just enough for our purposes that this is not – will strike this tomorrow when we discuss our agenda bashing.

And then moving on to Item 6, the CC WG on Internet governance. This is, again, this is a discussion item that we do have a motion on this topic. We've had some discussions with the CCN SO, and the board working group on Internet governance. This, well, I would say this week – yesterday. So that's – I think that was helpful. And I think the two takeaways that I took away from those conversations was that this is – it is valuable for the board working group on Internet governance to have some mechanism in the community to consult and or engage with on these issues. And I think we heard the same from the GSC. And then on the other side of the coin is – but they don't really have a strong view on with that format or structure looks like -- but there's a CCGW or something else -- so I think that's just fodder for our discussion tomorrow so, you know, be prepared to, I'm sure, spend a little bit of time on that. It looks like we've allocated about 20 minutes.

Okay, Item 7 – and we should note that whatever the result or outcome of our discussion – I think we should be moving this topic. It's now appeared on three separate sequential agendas. We should probably be moving this to some kind of a motion, or get rid of it. Because it's kind of been a discussion

topic, I think, coming out of Copenhagen and now April, May and now here. Soon let's try to set a stretch goal that in the July meeting we have some kind of a decision point on CCW GIG.

Item 7 is another discussion point on the fundamental bylaw changes. Were folks able to attend the ECA meeting this morning? I know Ed was there, and a couple folks were there. I hope that was helpful in illustrating what is at stake here -- answer, not a whole lot -- it is a fairly minor, or even administrative change to that. But because it is contained within a fundamental bylaw, you know, we do have to run this through the new process of the ECA.

And it gives ECA a chance to kind of go out in a shakedown cruise and figure out what, you know, how that's all going to work. I think that we heard from -- is Steve -- we heard from Steve DelBianco that the BC has submitted comments on the record that it supports this change and has also offered some guidance on what the Council -- and what the charter of the new working group would look like. That's great. I think that one other group -- NCUC under receipt -- has also submitted supportive indicated its support for this.

I guess then that falls to everybody else to engage with their stakeholder groups and constituencies to make sure that they understand what's at stake and get some explicit buy-in on this change -- either support or oppose -- because -- spoiler alert -- this is probably going to come up as a motion for us to decide. You know, if not -- I think our deadline is the 21st. So if it's not on the 13th, then definitely on the 20th. And it's not the kind of thing where I, you know, I as a chair have any discretion or wiggle room to grant referrals or extensions or anything like that. We're going to have to vote on this one way or another, up or down. So just kind of laying the groundwork now that while we've got a few days -- actually exactly 3 weeks to think about this -- not the time to be pulling your stakeholder groups and constituencies to make sure you're very clear on what they stand.

And we can talk about that tomorrow, too. Item 8 is the CC WG on use of country and territory names. Heather, do you want to give us a flavor on that one?

Heather Forrest: Sure, thanks James. Heather Forrest. So I know I'm not the only one in the room the Geo'd out today, but this isn't so much about Geo's, believe it or not. The way that this thing broke down – this is a cross community working group that is chartered by the CCSO and GNSO, and we had recommendations that are sitting in this report -- preliminary recommendations on which there is not agreements -- dealing with two letter codes, three letter codes and names. And as you might guess, you came from the previous session, the discussion broke down at three letter codes, which is interesting because GNSO made a pretty big concession and compromise on two letter codes. And then it ended there. This is really about our – the role of the PDP, which of course is a pretty serious line of questions that came up in the previous session with the external facilitator. It's a question about the definition of geographic name. It's a question about Sub Pro and what Sub Pro do. And it's a question about CCWG's and what they can do.

And so here is where we are. We've, you know, at the end of – and I should say this is the end of, you know, what a space of like three years of work. And in fact was predated by two and half year running CCNSO study group. This is a huge chunk of time that we've invested. And the reason we are where we are is no surprise given the previous session. So I would encourage you to look at this through the lens of not just geographic names. We've had, you know, kind of sporadic report of engagements or involvement and engagement from the contracted parties. And so, for you folks I would say you probably want to consider this. I'm more than happy, you know informally -- if you want to ask me more in the substance -- but we can speak more about it tomorrow. Thanks.

James Bladel Thanks, Heather. And not just thanks for the update, I mean thanks for all of your work on this. It's been a tough row to hoe, so thanks for taking care of that for us. So any other thoughts from the counsel on this one? I know the report came kind of really close to our deadline, so folks may not have had a chance to fully digest it. If it's possible she can take a look at that. Yes.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Heather. Just a process point, but I should have said it. So it's on our agenda this time around as a discussion item, but we as a chartering organization are expected to reflect on the final report and do something with it – whether he endorses or otherwise – and likewise the CCNSO was going to do the same. I would expect that it's not on their timetable for voting at this meeting, but it would be in the very near future. So consider this may be our dip the toe in. I'm happy to follow up, you know, afterwards if we did somebody get across things. Though I think that the background in Sub Pro today captures very neatly, you know, where this is, so put a marker down for this one for if not July, because we already have things percolating for July, then it'll be August. Thanks.

James Bladel Okay. Good advice. Thank you. And it would be I think late August. So I have no excuse for not having read by then. Take it to the beach. Okay.

Then let's take a look then at Item 9, which is an update on our section 16 process for reconvening the PDP on Red Cross. I will just gonna provide a brief update, but basically – and I think is Thomas, Thomas is going to be available for this section of the meeting. So they've had an initial call to kick that off. And it was an extensive discussion on the question of membership – whether the original PD – the membership would be participation would be limited to the original PDP or if it was wide open like any new PDP where anyone could join.

And that's a tricky question because if you think that the way section 16 is intended, it's really meant to happen like a few weeks, maybe a month after PDP. Not years. So, you know, finding adequate substitutes might be

reasonable, but throwing the doors open to anyone and everyone who wants to reboot that process is probably not in the best interest of the work. So it's been an interesting conversation and I think in the end everyone agrees that we will allow Thomas some discretion if he believes that there is something absent or some viewpoint organization that is missing from the reconvened work, then he can use – exercise some judgment there. But otherwise I don't think they have a lot to report except there organized and they are setting up to review this. And I think that their next step is to produce some sort of a work plan for our review. So look for that one tomorrow.

And then the last item, AOB, we had a couple of points here. We had a note – I don't know, Susan, if you're able to – or (Erica) or Stephanie, if anyone of you is welcome to give us an update on the RDS review team if there's anything to update. But I think that we note that the three of you plus (Volker) were selected.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel By the way pulling that rabbit out of the hat – getting us for lots – nothing? Okay. Actually, a lot easier that I thought. Those guys were pushovers.

Stephanie: Actually, seriously to that point – I'd recused myself, but I watched email threads on the flexion committee. Really appreciate that that worked out that well. I was – it was a little bit of a nail-biter for me. Because I did actually been participating in would've been like, no we can't, don't plan on that.

James Bladel Yes, I think there was a presumption that we would just debt four -- even though we were allowed three -- but we did. So fantastic. And I don't know if there's anything meaningful to report, but we'll leave a slot for you just kind of give us an update. If anyone of you – maybe the four of you want to – or maybe just - (Volker's) not here, make him do it.



Stephanie: Yeah, I mean, it's been – this is Stephanie for the record – it's been a little chaotic because of course it was a last-minute plan to get people here for the meeting. Plenty of people were totally booked, myself included. We had an outreach event so I would've had to cancel that. You know, is difficult. So we wound up having a couple of informal meetings. And I think I missed one today. I have that horrible feeling. Was there one today? Yes, unfortunately I don't know about you guys – I'm either triple booked or I am going for a walk, you know. It seems very bizarre this year. So I'm not sure – this is all just get to know yourself, or yourselves. And getting to know oneself. We mustn't wax philosophical at this...

James Bladel Let us know what you find.

Stephanie: Yes.

Michele Neylon: So Stephanie, was this a journey of self-discovery?

Stephanie: You just wait. This is going to be longer than RDS (Michele).

Michele Neylon: I know, I'm just wondering if, you know, if you've had any revelations or found your inner chi or whatever it is?

Stephanie: I have a revelation. I'm with Susan, I want this thing to be short, tightly circumscribed. We have so many processes going on right now. And the conclusions that people reach in the new committee that has been struck -- which we don't even know who's on it yet, they will – that will alter a lot of things. So I don't think we should waste our time. But – so it should be like a gallop.

James Bladel Thank you, Stephanie. That was Stephanie. We also heard from (Michele), (Erika) and Susan. Thank you. But okay, will leave a little bit of a note here in case there's anything meaningful to report. We also have a – just a note here

that the SSR2 – RT has been meeting since March. They have an update and who will be providing that? Marika?

Marika: This is Marika. No, definitely not me. We've actually been speaking to (Denise), who is the chair of that review team. We hope that she will be there, but in the meantime she has actually forwarded an updated and [unintelligible] was supposed to have been circulated earlier, but we're actually not sure where that got stopped. But we'll push on out to the Council so you can have a look at that before the meeting. And hopefully she will be able to meet there as well to answer any questions you may have.

James Bladel Thank you. I haven't seen it but I'm hoping she hasn't sent it, and it's waiting on me. Okay, great. Okay and then that brings us to the end of our posted agenda. But we have at least one AOB from Ed. Any others? And (Michele) and Donna. Okay, so I would just note that we are trying to finish early. We have four minutes. So very quickly please, Ed, (Michele) and then Donna.

Ed: Thanks, James. I'm trying to make a proposal that we set up some sort of a small group, committee, something that works year-round on the budget, operating plan, strategic plan. Now that we have the powers under the empowered community I take a look at what the other groups are doing. The CCNSO also has a standing committee. (unintelligible) has a standing committee.

And talking to (Javier), they work with him throughout the process, throughout the year. What we do here in the GNSO -- at least at this level -- is we see a deadline, we work with staff -- and last year was me, James, you did it this year. You just have one or two volunteers quickly write something up and send it in. And I'm not sure that's effective. I mean, we have a vote coming up, don't we? That we have to make in the budget?

James Bladel We don't have a vote necessarily, we have a window to file objections. If none arise we have to vote projections that come from other communities.

Ed: So we do have new authority, things we have to do. And I talked to (Xavier), I talked to some staff as well who sort of take it on the chin. When they put in a request and then our groups come in and say, we want X, Y, and Z. And the finance comes back to them and says that, you know, why didn't you know what you people wanted? I think we need to have a better way of coordinating and communicating both on a GNSO level and linking staff to our constituencies and trying to work together more holistically to try to meet to our new responsibilities.

James Bladel Thanks, Ed. We will put that up for discussion tomorrow under AOB and hopefully that will prompt some good conversation. I just want to note that Barry is probably the guy who follows it throughout the whole year. But we do need to get him some help from volunteers from counsel and be so deadline oriented. And so, that's a good point and we'll work through that. And there are good ideas happening in other communities. We can shamelessly steal those. (Michele), go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. This is completely any other business off topic out there – Just if anybody is interested, the Global Equal Multi Stakeholder Round will be appearing this evening at the Hard Rock Cafe on Mandela Square from 8:00 pm till midnight.

James Bladel What was the name of the band?

Michele Neylon: Global Equal Multi-Stakeholder bands.

James Bladel I thought it was generic. It's global.

Michele Neylon: I think you need to raise that with other people but yes. I thought as I read that I realized – God, I'm feeding my little troll over here in the corner.

James Bladel I think — Thank you, (Michele). And for those of you that I think will be a dinner for at least part of that. But at least maybe can catch the end of that.

Donna I think has a more -- I don't want to dismiss that -- but I would say more pressing matter she'd like to raise for AOB. Donna?

Donna Austin: So most of you would know that Chuck Gomes has - will retire at the end of this meeting, even though he's staying on for – to finish off phase 1 of the PDP working group on ideas. But we would like to do a recognition of Chuck Gomes. In any other business we'll be getting together the vast range of information that relates to Chuck over the last 20 years. But we'll do something. And hopefully you'll see you before the meeting tomorrow, but no guarantees.

James Bladel Thanks, Donna. Hopefully that everyone can agree on. Although, when he actually leaves in December do we say goodbye again?

Woman 3: Yes.

James Bladel Going to have to keep...

Michele Neylon: He officially leaves VeriSign on Friday. It's his last day.

James Bladel Yes.

Michele Neylon: On Friday, Friday afternoon he gets back to DC, goes to the VeriSign offices, hands over everything, and then gets a flight home Friday evening.

James Bladel As a private citizen.

Michele Neylon: As a private – still a private – what are you saying that VeriSign is the government?

Donna Austin: I mean, it is a good point. You know, is now the time to do it or do we wait to the end of the (unintelligible)?

(Unintelligible]

James Bladel Yes. I think if we do we should just recognize – formally recognize – and then do that once. And then when Phase 1 is what is completed maybe it's more of an informal goodbye. Like the..

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is he just leaving ICANN or is he just leaving VeriSign?

James Bladel ...Yes thanks, Wolf-Ulrich, he's leaving VeriSign I believe on the 30th at the end of this meeting. And then he's going to work in a, kind of a private consultant capacity through the end of Phase 1. And so, I think that we were discussing is probably this is the opportune moment to recognize him. So...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Was he chair of the (unintelligible) previously or not?

James Bladel Twice.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That gives some context.

James Bladel Yes.

Marika: Aren't you welcoming him in the perpetuity of doing this even when it's not your job anymore?

James Bladel As – yes.

Marika: I mean, he's just entering the new perpetual age of being a volunteer, no?

James Bladel Nobody escapes. You can change jobs, you can run away, but nobody gets...

(Unintelligible).

James Bladel Yes. It is no joke, I love it. He would love that. And hopefully you guys signed his card, the big (unintelligible) card. Okay, so that was our AOB. And we said we'd finished early. We are two minutes over time. That counts, I think for GNSO time. Okay, so dinner is – and Nathalie, do you want to come to the microphone — dinner is at a restaurant that is downstairs and across the street. You know that Street that is all dug up with all the construction that you can see from the windows, It's over in that.

Nathalie: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel No, it's supposed be quite nice. I think though that (Carlos) has mentioned bring cash, small bills. And I think it's right around...

Michele Neylon: No rupees.

James Bladel No rupees. Well, that's the wrong country.

Michele Neylon: Unmarked, small bills.

James Bladel And I think Nathalie did the math for us and if you're having both the dinner and the wine tasting comets around 400 – 439, and I don't think that includes a gratuity. So they call it like 475 rand. Okay, Nathalie, do you have anything to add for that? What's the name of the place again?

Nathalie: It's called Parc Ferme It just go down to the ground floor of the convention center and out the main entrance there. And across to it it's exactly opposite.

James Bladel Parc Ferme. She's doing her French thing, Which is much nicer. But for the English speakers it's P-A-R-C, and then F-E-R-M-E. Is that correct? Parc Ferme. (Unintelligible). It's supposedly downstairs, ground-floor, walk across the street. 15 minutes. So hopefully that gives everyone at least a chance to

get upstairs, maybe throw their bags in the room and come down and join us. And for those of you who aren't able to join us, you'll be missed, but we'll see you at tomorrow's meeting. Okay. We'll adjourn and see you at dinner. Thank you.

END