Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Keith Drazek: Okay, so the next item on the agenda is our GNSO and Registry Stakeholder Group business. I don't think (Jonathan)'s return. So maybe we can move to stakeholder group business or maybe address some of the items that we have on the additional agenda items.

Chuck Gomes: So Keith?

Keith Drazek: Chuck I think you mentioned the - sorry, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. No, finish saying what you're going to say.

Keith Drazek: I was going to say the GNSO review, the 360 review that was mentioned...

Chuck Gomes: I - we could do that now. I was going to suggest though if (Jonathan) doesn't come back very quickly Bret's. And I'm sure Bret can help us in the GNSO stuff because that's pretty timely stuff that we don't want to put off too long.

Keith Drazek: Okay, let's - let's give (Jonathan) a couple minutes. And if you wouldn't mind touching on the GNSO review...

Ken Stubbs: He's right outside. He'll be back in a few minutes.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks (Ken).

Chuck Gomes: Okay Chuck Gomes speaking. (Dave) and Bret and I are participating in the GNSO Review Working Party. A new term that has been invented -- the Working Party. I'm not sure exactly what it means but we're on it.

And we map was it two days ago at the end of the day. And we've been working on the questions for a 360 review.

And it's in pretty good format although I - the questions are - have been identified although they could still change.

And I sent that around after Dave and I had that - were at that meeting to the list. If you get a chance I mean there's almost 60 questions. Okay, they're not long questions. And the format will be a little bit easier to use once it's in the actual survey.

So if you get a chance look at those questions and see if you have any comments and provide them to Bret or (David) or me so that we can provide that because the target is by mid-July to finish that. And then ultimately that survey would be sent out to the whole - anybody in the community that's willing to participate in it.

Certainly it's going to be important for people within the GNSO and in particular registries to respond to it.

Because the independent reviewer that is being selected right now and is expected to be on board probably by July 1st will use the input from that survey.

Now just and I'll try to keep this will brief as I said I would. Keep in mind this is a really critical for us as contracted parties because there are lots of people that want to change the structure of the GNSO. And maybe that's okay. But we want to do everything we can to make sure that we don't get us in a situation like we had with the original DNSO.

And again, I'll give you a little history on this which for those that aren't aware of it in the original DNSO contracted parties were outnumbered five to two.

Consequently whenever policy was developed and decisions were made on that we virtually had no say. At the same time, we were required to implement consensus policies. I don't think I need to say more than that. It's an important issue (unintelligible).

So anyway, take a look at it if you get a chance. Provide us feedback and let me give the data.

Keith Drazek: One quick comment. And that is if you have any thoughts the particular issue with the way the GNSO currently works and you don't feel like going through all the questions just let Chuck and Bret and me know what the issue is. And we'll make sure that there is a question that reflects that particular concern.

Chuck Gomes: And people aren't going to have to -- Chuck again -- aren't going to have to answer every question. You can answer the ones you want to and when you ultimately do this survey. But right now we're just forming making sure the questions are good.

And the - there's been some questions added at the end that have to do with GNSO structure. They weren't in there at first but there's been a big push for that.

I personally am going to suggest some possible wording changes on those because the way those are worded will be very critical in terms of the data that we give back. So but yes (Ken)?

Ken Stubbs: Yes my biggest concern is though, the way that those questions though are going to be worded. Because what they're really supposed to be doing is identifying issues and deficiencies and how well the process is being managed.

It's not specifically supposed to be identifying the cause for these problems but rather, we've got to arrive at a clear elaboration of what the issues are. Then we can look at the causes and then we can look at the remedies.

I'm of concern that the assumption is that the structure is broken in those questions. So the questions would be more oriented to explain why you feel the structure is effective or something along that line.

And it seems to me like these guys have already arrived at conclusions and are already soliciting solutions when in affect that's what the outside group Westfield or whoever they are is being prepared for.

Chuck Gomes: Well the outside group's not being hired to come up with solutions but rather to do the review...

Ken Stubbs: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...an...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...independent review. Yes.

Ken Stubbs: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And the questions aren't worded too badly right now in my opinion, although I think a few need to be tweaked with regard to the structure thing. They're pretty good the way they're worded.

The staff has just done them so far. And that - now it's time for (unintelligible). So please look at them and see if there any suggested changes in wording that you would have and send it to the three of us.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks Chuck. Thanks (Ken). Thanks (David). Any other comments or questions on this before we move on to the GNSO Council and other business?

So I just want to note that again so I think to reinforce what Chuck said is that this is a very important issue for us as contracted parties moving forward.

And, you know, thank you all for your representation on that group on our behalf.

But I know that, you know, Chuck and (Dave) and Bret would very much appreciate input if you have thoughts. So please take the opportunity to do that.

Okay with that thank you. And I will hand it over to (Jonathan) and, you know, to talk through the GNSO Council motions and any other business that we ought to talk about prior to tomorrow's meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks but not for policies. Ironically I was button hold by someone who wanted to talk to me about the GNSO review. So (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: (Jonathan) excuse me. If you could just make sure you speak under the microphone.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Can you hear me okay?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yes okay. I was talking with someone outside on the GNSO review. So I apologize if I came into the meeting a little late.

I wonder what the best way to structure this is. It's probably best to have a little - a quick walk through the agenda for the council meeting and pick out issues and items.

The first two are as usual we've got the motions up front the first being on the charter for PDP Working Group which is some work in progress. Initially this was drafted by staff.

And it's worth pointing out that the motivation for this that in processing some of our work in order to make the PDP work as efficient as possible we've agreed that the default would be to draft or staff to draft the charter.

And there's really two options after that that the charter is then subsequently modified through discussion and/or pulled out and refer to a draft or charting team.

In this case what the plan is - where it seems to be going is that the charter will receive some tweaks and modifications as it passes through the council and then be voted on.

So I wonder whether had - would anyone else like - has anyone else read the charter, would like to comment on this on the curative rights protection mechanism? I don't know Chuck if you've got anything you'd like to say or if anyone else has got anything they'd like to say (David) on this because it kind of follows from the work of the - work on the protection of IGO and INGO names.

So maybe I should just pause there for a moment and see if there are any comments or issues?

Bret Fausett: Yes, just to clarify the motion is intended to look at a process that would give IGOs the ability to use the UDRP and the URS. So we would be expanding the scope of those two, potentially expanding the scope of those two rights protection mechanisms.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jonathan) and Bret. This is Chuck. Last night at our reception Thomas Rickert and I had a lengthy discussion with Suzanne Radell from the US representing on the GAC.

I - if it's not already in there or maybe could be done any way I strongly encourage us the GNSO to have conversation with her and any other GAC members that would like it.

There is some deep concern at least on the part of Suzanne about where we're going with that.

I'm not saying we shouldn't do the charter. We - that the wheels are in motion there or the Working Group. But we should - and she sounded like really willing to help. Now we shouldn't assume they're going to want to be part of the working group okay? They just don't do that well at all.

So but I think we can get really - well in fact (Jonathan) with what you and (David) and others are doing with the GAC a really good time to get some input from them.

Some very strong feelings were shared. Thomas is aware of them and he's of course on the council as well.

So I don't think it necessarily relates to this motion, although the leaders of whatever the Working Group that's formed and I don't know whether that impacts the charter or not but there's an opportunity here to really put into practice what you and others have been working on with the GAC to get the more cooperative thing.

And I was surprised the strong feelings on this one. So that may be more of a heads up and it relates to the motion. I'm okay with staff drafting a charter and then we can tweak it as we need to.

So as far as a motion is concerned, I think that's okay. If you think it's wise to add something in there about consulting with the GAC right at the beginning that probably would be a really good idea.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes that's helpful Chuck. And actually I'd hope to make it to your reception last night and come and talk with you and Thomas. And it seems like it would have been timely.

That would close the - Thomas we have as some of you may know, we set up a session specifically for this purpose. What the council set up is a 6:00 PM to 7:00 PM session which is - which has no defined attendance. But the principle is there.

It's intended for counselors and or stakeholder group constituency, leadership and/or individuals with specific interests to come and - come together and flush out any of the outlook from the constituencies or stakeholder group data to the extent that they impact the motions such that we can tidy up loose ends or have more challenging conversations that we don't necessarily need to have during the council meeting if we can have the opportunity to talk beforehand. So I'll do that. I'll close the loop with Thomas.

But my sense is that from a stakeholder group point of view at this stage we wouldn't have any difficulty supporting the charter as it exists or as it's likely been modified.

Does anyone got any reservations about that with the knowledge to have the (unintelligible) any concerns or issues with that I mean providing we have the conversations that Chuck's just suggested?

There's some modifications to the charter as it stands suggested by Avri. There are others in process. But I don't sense it's something that we need to - that we shouldn't vote to support unless something changes. I mean any concerns or issues?

It follows directly out of the previous - the output of the May - of the previous PDP.

Okay the next item then I'm going to assume I'm take that as an affirmation that we will vote to support the charter as modified over the next 24 hours if I get concerns on this too or otherwise.

Okay. As far as the motion for - so the next motion is for consideration and evaluation of the new GTLD program and since Bret you put this to the Council I suspect it's probably better you talk to it.

Bret Fausett: Sure. This is a motion intended to start a discussion on what went right with round one, what went wrong with this modification and just understand the status of intentional subsequent application phases as we move forward.

I circulated the draft motion to the list earlier this morning. You'll see the clear as clauses have a very long history of this process starting from the council work in 2005, 2006 up to the recommendations that made it to the board and the approval of those and recounting the fact that baked into the applicant guidebook was a promise to have subsequent rounds of new gTLDs.

And this process is undergoing work at the staff level now. We've asked for in the resolution section you'll see that we've asked for status reports on five different areas of ICANN's review of round one.

We've also asked to create a committee to hopefully pull out all the issues that we might want to put into issue reports that would start a policy development process to the extent that we wanted to make changes for subsequent rounds.

And just to remind everyone of the policy development process it all starts with an issue report.

Issue reports are created by ICANN staff. And so what we're asking for in this section one of the result is for an issue report or for a committee to develop requests for issue reports.

So that's the motion that really is just starting a process. I'm happy to take questions.

I know that on the list for those of you who have been reading while we've been in the meeting (John) and others asked that this be an open working group to create the issue reports rather than a committee of the council. And so I think that's sort of appropriate to hear feedback.

It seems like most of the comments on the list so far has suggested it be an open working group. I always love that working open group but it's all of us. You know, it's just all those other people I worry about.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, going to jump in there. I just wouldn't call it an open working group. I like open committee better because working group automatically brings along all of the structure for a PDP and so forth. And I don't think you intend that here.

Bret Fausett: And that's right. And I want the participants to be clear that, you know, I think the proper outcome of the committee's work would be a series of mutually worded questions that didn't prejudge any particular outcomes for issue reports.

And once we get the issue reports created and once we get the policy development groups created then it will leave the time for staking positions and trying to drive outcomes.

But I see the - this first stage as hopefully something that all constituencies can reach consensus over.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or questions on the motion that same timely? Do we do this? Are you in support of, concerns?

Bret Fausett: So just to wrap up this thread so that people know, I think I will take your suggestion Chuck following on from (John)'s comment on the list that we change it to open committee so that it's clear that anyone can join.

So I'll make that revision before we send that to the council.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so it looks like we will support that motion as well then.

The next item referred to new gTLD program committee letter regarding the INGO ITO identifiers.

I wonder how much detail to go into here. I mean, there is a letter from the new gTLD Program Committee that seeks to - thought was seeks for the council to - we provided effective unanimous recommendations which the board accepted.

Now some of the recommendations were not consistent with the GAC advice. And they essentially asked us to rethink those.

This is pretty unusual that to some people like the form of a front to the GNSO and the policy development process.

Personally, I don't take it as such. I think there's a genuine good faith attempt to navigate a particularly thorny issue here.

And I - it seems to me that there's certainly as far as the one component is concerned which is to potentially put in place a permanent notification system when and if an acronym is registered to notify the IGO concern thus that they are able to decide whether to take any action.

To me this seems I'm jumping ahead a little bit here but that's what's to give you a sense of the scale of the issue that's what's being proposed.

To be honest, little less clear on what's going on with the Red Cross and Red Crescent because here they talk about the GNSO policy recommending that the names protect.

And maybe someone can help me here by entering into the MCH for 90 days claims notification and it seems that there's desire to have a more permanent protection.

Now the bit that is potentially problematic is it depends what you mean by claims notification here. You understand that claims notification means post-registration notification. That's one thing.

If you understand it to mean preregistration notification that's an impact on our industry and the sort of data flows within our industry.

So I'm not 100% clear on this because it uses the word 90 days claims notification. I had understood but I realize that rereading it that it's not 100% clear. So I don't know if anyone else has got a view on that. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Not a view specific. This is Chuck. Not a view specifically on that question.

I think that's one that if it's turned over to the - if the working group is reconvened that needs to be drilled down on.

But let me give you the background on this particular - the Red Cross piece. There are two pieces to this in the board's letter.

One of them is the Red Cross regional names. I think they're about 60 or something like that if I remember correctly.

It actually did come up in a working group but it was brought in late. And we were trying to press ahead and get this thing done. And so we didn't deal with it.

So it's actually a good thing to deal with I think to get - let the working group take a look at that and spend a little more time on it and decide whether there are any undesirable impacts to all the stuff doing the due diligence okay?

So it was brought up by (Stephan) in the Working Group and he's from the international Red Cross. And we have just brought up links so that wasn't dealt with. So that's the history of that piece okay?

The acronym issue is one that the Working Group did not really support protecting IGO acronyms like - because we thought there are - and I think it's a registry position in fact that there are plenty of organizations with the identical acronyms that are actually probably more commonly known to the public than some of the IGOs.

So we didn't support protecting acronyms in any way. What the Board Program Committee has come back and said is that would we consider doing the claims notice for those acronyms and like (Jonathan) said and if that needs more clarity. And they were trying to find an acronym.

Now I'm going to come back now to Thomas' and I's conversation with Suzanne last night. I got the distinct impression that the Board Program Committee may not have been talking with the GAC, may have just been talking with the IGOs.

So in this particular case I recommend that the - somebody from the council, it may be you, it may be you and Thomas -- however you want to do it (Jonathan) -- talk to the GAC and get some clarity before we make a decision on this one.

And I'm assuming probably you can't do an action on this tomorrow anyway. It's got to be the next meeting probably but with enough lead time before whenever you act just consider acting on it.

Again I suggest that you talk to the GAC, I would talk to (Heather) I would also talk to Suzanne because I was surprised. I got the distinct impression that the GAC may not be supportive of - I think they're okay with the Red Cross issue but the other one it's not clear.

We should find out before we go very far on this again an opportunity for you to implement the ideas for better GAC GNSO coordination.

Jonathan Robinson: So I suppose there's a few thoughts here. One is that it - you're right, better GAC GNSO coordination although ideally we do that within a pre-agreed structure rather than but as we've discussed with all of these things their structure in this relationship.

We developed the relationship. We haven't yet fully developed structure for that kind of interaction. Nevertheless I agree with you we have to have the conversation.

My - the reason why I wanted to talk about the impact is for me there's two issues here. The NGPs they'll ask the GNSO to reopen a piece of work. That's a principal point and you may or may not take that in good faith.

I happen to be not unduly concerned about the principle and take it in good faith.

What I do think is dangerous if we're not clear on what the likely impact and or the inspected impact is going to be you're going to go down the road, everyone feels very good about it and then they don't get what they want and this scope or so which is why I want to try and understand it in as much as possible.

And you're right it's putting the cart before the horse a little to do the what you call the due diligence of what might be done in the reopened working group.

But so I suppose we've discussed this sufficiently here. The one point is that strikes home to me Chuck is that I had thought we might be able to take some action here and agreed to go to the next step having previewed it in the council weekend sessions, having discussed it in the Constituency in Stakeholder Group meetings today I thought we might be in a position to decide next steps from the council.

But I guess the next step is going to require a motion so to - that - though you're right maybe there's a bit of caution here to be taken before formalizing what the next steps would be. But I guess we'll just feel our way over the next 24 hours.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jonathan). Chuck again. As you know as at least (Jonathan) knows I think the right step is eventually on this once we get more clarity to reform the Working Group. Because that's a natural - it's a design mechanism we have to vet the issues to ask questions, to do the due diligence.

But I think it is smart to do a little bit more homework in particular communication with the GAC before that step actually happens. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point. So it seems we've probably cover that sufficiently for now unless we see a hand raised.

We - there's I think really the only other substantive item that you should be aware of that's going to come up is further discussion on the cross community working groups develop a transfer process.

No we've got a bit of momentum on this having had the meeting with the ccNSO Council yesterday. We've put out the joint notification from the chairs of the two - of the GNSO and the ccNSO.

We've got support from and participation from ALAC and SSAC putting forward members to join the drafting team.

But for those of you who aren't clear what's going on here this is a plan to convene and form a Working Group to work within the ICANN community on the and potentially involve others on the IANA stewardship transition.

And how this interrelates one of the issues that the Drafting Team is going to have to deal with is how this interrelates with the Coordination Group that ICANN's putting forward. But that's the decision yet to be taken so at the very early phase of pulling together the drafting team.

What this group needs to know about and decide is really I think we've got very short term apart from our input into the content of the drafting team which will come out is who are we going to put onto that drafting team?

So we need a person to put onto that drafting team. And in addition ICANN's called for two people from the registries to go onto the Coordination Group. So as far as a stewardship process is concerned that's what we seem to need.

Now I don't know Keith if we're going to come to this elsewhere in the agenda but that's - but those - that's really is the crux of it at this stage I suppose is pulling together people to fulfill those roles.

And then I guess finally what I - if we could come to a (unintelligible) but let's stick with that for the moment that stewardship transition.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much (Jonathan). This is Keith Drazek. And we can get folks in the queue if anybody wants to jump in.

I did just send around actually coincidently just sent around a few minutes ago to the list an email sort of identifying the fact that we have the opportunity

and the responsibility to identify two members representing gTLD registries to this NTIA transition - I'm sorry the IANA Transition Coordinating Committee.

There's 27 seats on this Coordinating Committee registries get two, the GNSO actually gets three more for non-registered representatives. So we specifically have the opportunity to nominate two. So that's something that we ought to talk about certainly.

And, you know, we could do that on the list, we can do it here. If folks are interested, you know, we're nominating folks then, you know, we can certainly do that. But that is an obligation that we have that we need to address. (Ken) go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes I think it might be a good idea to lay out exactly what the obligations are because this is a critical time. And it's going to require a commitment that may - these teams sometimes have numerous meetings, numerous time zones.

And it's not one of those things where you're going to be able to blow off a meeting because it's going to be at 3 o'clock in the morning your time or either that or we need to make sure we have a balance.

And I would say that this is going to be I won't say contentious but we've got to be in a position to speak up in these meetings. It's really our future.

We're really it's a placeholder for the contracted parties in the future of the ICANN decision-making process as I see it at least.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Ken), completely agree. You know, my view of the Coordinating Committee is that coming out of this process, you know, ICANN submitted this proposal.

We have issues with, you know, the fact that the scoping of, you know, of the charter or the document, you know, was not responsive to the community feedback.

But this Coordinating Committee has been proposed and it is now sort of being handed over to the community to engage.

And it's actually broader than just our typical community in terms of representation. They've got, you know, different groups that are not typically, you know, part of the ICANN group.

But as registries and as contracted parties we really do need to make sure that we engage. And frankly we are direct customers of IANA as registries.

So, you know, (Ken) I completely agree and it is going to be critical.

We need to make sure that in this process that the Coordinating Committee and any other cross community working group that we'd like to suggest if that's the right path forward is truly a bottom-up multi-stakeholder process and not directed by ICANN staff or dictated in a top-down manner.

So I think that's one of the key challenges that we have. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Keith, Chuck speaking. And as somebody heard me say in the joint meeting with the ccNSO late yesterday we don't necessarily have to assume that that Coordinating Committee or Coordinating Group I think is the right term -- I don't know I get it mixed up -- is going to be exact function exactly the way staff has proposed.

My personal opinion is that this Charter Drafting Team is the other action item we have should come forward with recommendations for that. And then the participants, the SOs and ACs that are participating in the Drafting Committee can then weigh in on that proposed charter that they prepare. So that's just a qualifier.

Now back to the two seats that at least staff has proposed that we would have on that we can - I'm going to throw a name into the hat because he has - that he's willing to do this and that's (Pat Kane).

(Pat) is willing to do this. And we have to decide as a group the two people we want. He is willing to commit the time to doing that. So however we decide to make those decisions. I'll put that out there and we can decide how to do that.

One advantage to that although I don't think it's going to come up in this work is (Pat) of course is very familiar with the IANA root zone management function that we've provide him to the extent that he would also be able to clarify that.

Now I don't know if that's really going to be an issue in this thing in terms of scope but that would be an added advantage.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Chuck. Actually Ching and then Sarah.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Keith. And Keith, Chuck and (Ken) perhaps you can help us to understand.

Right now we are talking about for each Constituency or Stakeholder Group to have representatives into this Drafting Team.

We are not talking about where there's no kind of rousing about the geographic diversities and so on and so forth. I just want to capture that tiny element has been incorporated.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Ching. So I think what we're talking about right now is the Coordinating Committee. I think there's a separate question on the Drafting Team with regard to a CCWG charter is that right (Jonathan)? Am I...

Jonathan Robinson: That's - let me try and clarify. There are two on the table at the moment. There is a call for participants in the drafting team that will lead to the charter for the Cross Community Working Group.

In addition there's the ICANN staff led Coordination Group which is made up of representatives from the GNSO and from which the registries have an opportunity to put two people forward.

And then in addition what has not yet been determined is there's likely to be some form of Cross Community Working Group and or Coordination Working Group will have to deal with accountability issues.

Now what's the overlap between the individuals participating in these different (unintelligible) has yet to be determined.

But for me those are the three sort of major work streams stroke activities that need to be determined. So two from registries on ICANN's Coordination Group, one from registries on the Cross Community Working Group and something indeterminate to work on accountability.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks (Jonathan). And Ching to answer your question I don't think there's any there's been any discussion about geographical diversity or representation or geographical diversity in the representation. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Just to add one thing to that. In the preliminary charter that the Charter Drafting Team would deal with it does talk about the geographic division diversity issue.

Obviously the Drafting Team will ultimately take that and do with it what they want. But it has been surfaced in there.

Keith Drazek: Okay anybody else? Oh Sarah?

Sarah Falvey:	So I'm not sure we can coordinate to this level but I think it a lot - because a few of us in this group wear multiple hats I think it would be good to make sure that whoever we put forward to this group is just the representative we just sort of - that company only has one representative on the panel.
	I think I mean we fall into this group. I know VeriSign falls you guys could be in the RSAC. You could, you know, and we fall into this category as well.
	I'd like to see sort of companies that on this panel that we only have sort of one representative from one company even though there are sort of multiple ways companies can - or whomever can get into this.
	Because I think if we have - if people are double dipping -- and I'm not saying that you necessarily are but we should make sure that we're not because I think it'll provide more of a sort of broad perspective on what we want to do. And so I think we should watch out for that.
Keith Drazek:	Thanks Sarah. No. I think that's sort of the reason we're talking about this and raising it is we're basically putting out a call for nominations. And we would certainly, you know, want people to participate and have diversity.
	I think at the end of the day we need to make sure that whoever represents the registries on this particular Coordinating Committee, you know, as to (Ken)'s point, you know, have the time, have the expertise, you know, to - and, you know, and sort of the ability weight in and defend our interests.
	So I think I guess my primary concern is that we have somebody or folks who will be effective in the role. But yes I understand what you're saying. (Ken) go ahead.
Ken Stubbs:	Yes. I can't emphasize enough how strong it - how important it is to have a strong advocacy here. Because even Chuck's point everything we see so far is ICANN's idea of how we should do it.

And really it's ours to do, not theirs to tell us how to do it. So if we don't have a strong advocacy there we need to - we need to be in a position and we need to be strong enough to send a message to ICANN that this in fact is a bottoms up process, this is a mandate that's coming from the community.

They can suggest how quote, the community should be comprised. But at the same point in time I don't want to have a feeling where I constantly have to see us working inside of some predefined box that we had no control of overbuilding. And I really think otherwise we're just kind of being manipulated.

It'll just be another checkmark for ICANN that they can say well this whole process was done in a deliberative bottoms up way by a diverse group of stakeholders. It just happened to be done the way we wanted them to do it.

I don't that's...

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Ken). Anybody else want to weigh in on this? I think we can take sort of a nomination process and further discussion to the list because we have quite a few things on the agenda today.

But this really is important that we need to make sure that we focus on this and make some decisions and time to submit the names so we can, you know, participate.

So (Jonathan) - sorry (Donna) go ahead.

Donna Austin: I guess just a timing question. So I think with the Coordination Group the 2nd of July was the timeframe that staff were asking for.

And then there's also the accountability stream as well. I'm not sure whether there's a call for nominations on that but I don't think it is constituency specific. So maybe we should kind of factor that into the equation as well?

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Donna), agreed. (Jonathan) can I hand it back to you at this point?

Jonathan Robinson: I think we're almost done. But yes I agree with you that we've aired the issues and we probably need to think it through but probably also see what others are doing and just try and recognize as (Donna)'s just highlighted the accountability track that's coming through, not yet clear what number of participants or how exactly that's going to work or whether we as a community will take an initiative and say here is another Cross Community Working Group and that's - so I have a feeling this needs to percolate through the corridors a little bit for another few days while we figure it out but mindful of course that you're right (Donna) there's a deadline coming up at least four what I mean it's - I'm sure is not absolutely hard but there is a provided deadline on the 2nd July for our proposed participants.

Chuck Gomes: Right Chuck again. Your point's well taken. And when we're thinking about who's going to be on the Drafting Team, the Coordination Team and ultimately the accountability effort to whatever format that takes -- and by the way the common period is still open on that -- so we need to keep that in mind.

Because all of these are going to be very busy efforts and you don't want to put the same people on. It's going to have to be different people. So we have to spread out the workload in that regard.

Now the one thing I think that - and (Jonathan) you can answer this it's most timely is for us to get a volunteer to be in the Charter Drafting Committee because we're - the efforts are to try to get that going.

And two groups have already - the SSAC and the ALAC have already provided volunteers to work on that drafting team. So that's a piece that we should probably set as a priority.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I know that Ching's in the queue but thanks for reminding me. We do need someone and we may even try and meet in the next couple of days.

Chuck Gomes: Again I'm a little leery too because of all that's on my plate. But if there's somebody else that would like to do that I would support them.

If nobody does it I'll do it because I've been working on it. But I would be perfectly happy if somebody else did it and I'd be certainly glad to support that person.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Chuck. Keep coming back on this. One thing I might propose is that in the light of what Chuck said in the previous comment is that we almost might want to work with a little table that either illustrates the volunteers were using and/or that we might need to use so we start to build up and we'll populate it as we need to go so we've got a - I mean so we can understand where there's overlap or not. There's four or five people needed here for some pretty sustained work over so that might be something to think about.

But you're right Chuck the first urgent thing is to get a volunteer for the Drafting Team.

Chuck Gomes: Yes Chuck again. And by the way if Cross Community Working Groups are formed and if they're formed like the GNSO likes to do it those would be open to people who wanted to participate. So think of that kind of as different from the rest.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much. Okay so (Jonathan) we've pretty much wrapped on the council business and I guess are there other working group updates we need to address?

Jonathan Robinson: Ching had his hand up. I'm done I think. Thanks. But Ching is next.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Jonathan). Ching go ahead.

Ching Chiao: Think you (Jonathan) and thank you Keith this is Ching Chiao again, just very quick update on the ID and Variant issue. For those of you have been following this part the Variant Project Team they have reached a milestone for the labor generation rules and also several other related items.

But I'd just like to give the registry a heads up is that there's another project is called project number seven. It's about the delegation and how does - it's basically as how do you as an IDN TLD would get your - actually your Variant delegated.

So and that was - that work has been kind of held back because of a sequential issue and some other concerns. But the thinking after the weekend session that we had with the board it seems that the registry groups and also all the relevant I mean affected parties can work together now for the Project Number 7 to develop several maybe we can call it a straw man proposal of how the registry would like to see it happen.

So I would just like to give everyone a heads up. (Pam) you - you were actually in the meetings. So actually another important issue is that this Variant project talks about the very top level. But we're also need some work to be done to update the second level which is the IDN guideline covers the - I mean the second level on registration.

So I just want to give for those of you who's interested in actually following this so there would be works at the board level to initiate on this too.

But I guess my point is that Project Number 7 about the Variant delegation we can start work and also to prepare for that now. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Ching. Comments, thoughts, feedback?

Okay any other Working Group updates? Not. So with that let's just move on with our agenda. So let's move to the Stakeholder Group Charter and an update from the Evolution Working Group and (Philip)?

Philip Shepperd: Thank you very much. So what I had - what this group has distributed to recently is the final report of this Evolution Working Group.

And just as background if you recall the group was set up last September and essentially it's charter was to look at the needs of current and new types of registry that are coming in and to decide if there are some changes to be considered for the charter of the Stakeholder Group in order to accommodate those needs.

I've spoken to you before in terms of the output of the group. And I'll just run through that very quickly now to explain where we have got to.

It's a relatively small group. About 11 people in it together. And we've had something like ten meetings between now in producing this final report.

The first part of the work and that's the first five recommendations in it are simply reflective of charter changes that will be necessary as a function of a likely increase in the size of the Stakeholder Group.

We had developed that work from where we had been earlier and we have now got extensive text changes based on the current charter for you to look at. So it's really to go if you decide indeed that those particular changes are what you need to make.

The last three recommendations of the group which now is fortified by a majority of the group that's - I'll talk about they're dividing in a second but perhaps the more imaginative work we've been doing because we were looking at possibilities for structural change.

And what we did is we contrasted the existing way the group operates which is individual membership and the possibility of interest group formation within that, that's after individual membership and other models such as a constituency model.

And we looked at pros and cons for instance of sort of a model that existed in the Commercial Stakeholder Group with its three constituencies.

And we also looked at a new type of model which is the association model because that is the model that the two groups which is the brands and the .GOs had informed the Working Group that they were particularly interested in.

And in that work we had listed sort of briefly the pros and cons on Page 8 of the report where we'll show you that.

Under the pros of that it recognized distinction and prepared the policy diversity recognizing there may be more diversity and policy on views on policy in the future.

They met the needs of certainly those two groups. I mentioned the brands and the GOs and it's scaled with future growth.

And that by the association model we mean simply that the idea that an association itself could join the Registry Stakeholder Group.

In terms of the comments simply it's unproven sort of not quite where it went. And of course it raised two important questions which came out in the last recommendations.

How do you look at evolving involving the count voting structure of the Stakeholder Group? At the moment although votes are rare when they are done is basically also second level registrations.

And certainly for brands, 1/3 of new registries second level registrations are not relevant. So there's a gap in the basis for which voting is currently done there.

And a link to that really was just a function of how the group itself might evolve to change and meet different needs.

When it came to opinions of the group it was not too surprising in terms of where the group fell out. Brands and GOs in favor of an association membership possibility for the group for this Stakeholder Group the incumbents of the group feeling essentially that those needs could be met by an existing structure and the interest groups.

So where we're actually with our two recommendations is really feeling that within this small group we've probably done as much analysis of needs and modeling work that can be usefully done.

And it - and the large questions around resolved in terms of the group not coming to a consensus upon it. But essentially the large questions remain is this Stakeholder Group interested in doing further work?

And the recommendation is that that further work should be done to look at the big question of whether or not you wish to change to accommodate association membership.

And if that's the case how would you do that and how would you reform the merging structures? So it's two rather large questions that remain open so a good analysis done.

The difficult questions perhaps not too surprisingly not so far answered. But those are the two open questions that remain on the table.

And at that point concludes where we are with that work. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Great. Thanks very much (Philip). And yes to your point those are sort of the big questions and the big issues that as a Stakeholder Group I think we all need to consider.

The Evolution Working Group has, you know, made some recommendations and, you know, sort of come out with some, you know, some output that we all need to consider.

And this is really important for all of us. You know, looking ahead to, you know, the next year, the next several years, the growth of the Registry Stakeholder Group, how we structure ourselves, you know, sort of questions of, you know, voting and representation.

And these are sort of big structural issues that we really do need to focus on. And, you know, I applaud the Evolution Work Group for the work that they've done to date on this.

So I would just want to take the opportunity to see if there are any other members of that group who participated who'd like to weigh in at this point or if others have any views?

Chuck Gomes: Okay this is Chuck. I'm perfectly okay with you going first (Paul). But let me just say I think one decision we'll have to make is do we - there needs to be full Stakeholder Group discussion about the issues for which we didn't reach consensus in the Evolution Group okay?

There are some recommendations for charter changes that are pretty straightforward.

So one general question we need to ask is do we want to just wait and deal the easy ones after we get the tough ones resolved or do we want to proceed?

I guess my own leaning because it takes a while to get the board to approve charter changes and stuff like that that we probably do it all in one package. But that's something for us to think about.

Paul Diaz: It's Paul Diaz for the record. Thanks Chuck. And thank you (Philip) for a great overview of the status of where we are.

To Chuck's last point I mean we are to - we need to make a decision about how to move forward. As the report clearly shows the Recommendations Numbers 6, 7 and 8 of the non-administrative ones will require more thinking.

All members really need to look at this. And were sort of at a crossroads if we are going to continue down a path as I think seven and eight recommend that we do further analysis and thinking and come up with proposals for how the voting structures may change, et cetera.

That implies that the group as a whole wants to go down that path. So we're sort of at a - truly at a crossroads now.

To Chuck's point do we put the first five issues out for a vote and the easy ones move forward on that? Do we put all eight out for a vote to determine where we are?

One important issue is that the charter changes, the process requires that we go ultimately get ICANN board approval of all this and it is a time-consuming process.

But for the easy administrative things like Chuck said if we wait and do one fell swoop it could take some time still before we can work through everything and eventually get it forward. And we may not have charter changes until well into next year as a result again factoring in the board approval time.

Then again we don't want to take charter changes lightly. We shouldn't be punting them forward every couple of months because we have a new tweak.

This is something that's substantial, very important. We should be very deliberative. So I mean it's a question for the group. And our Working Group

and certainly the ExCom alone we can't make the decision. This is something that has to go - come from the bottom up from this group up.

And so I guess my recommendation is that, you know, we've had the report out for quite some time and we've had no feedback on the list about, you know, where people stand, what people would like to do.

But, you know, in the absence of anything I would suggest all right put one proposal out there. We put it out for a vote and see where we can down all eight recommendations out for a vote so we can have some guidance on how to move forward.

And if the vote splits and we can come back. If it's hey let's explore all eight, reconvene the group et cetera, but at least then we have some direction we know where we're going.

But honestly we can't voting has become is so very important of course. It is going to change but we're not doing very well with votes. I mean this something that I'm going to plug again.

Those who haven't voted on the outstanding issues I mean come on folks these are really simple and Survey Monkey it takes, you know, ten seconds to vote express your opinion.

And for these really meaty ones about the future of this group, you know, we need your all everybody's inputs. This is your stakeholder group.

So but I'm just throwing it out there, moved to a vote on the recommendations what do people think? What are we going to do?

Keith Drazek: Thanks Paul. (Ken) then (Jonathan).

Ken Stubbs: Well there's a couple of things. First of all I understand your concern about ambivalence an awful lot of people. Unfortunately sometimes it's timing. You know, people at so much on their minds and they prioritize this stuff.

Unfortunately voting in the constituency is not always a priority. My personal feeling is that there - we don't have enough meat in what we've seen so far.

I would strongly encourage people to start preparing proposals based on assumptions. That will get people started number one.

And number two it may very well be a matter of stratifying this stuff -- and I'll give you a perfect example take our agenda from one of these biweekly meetings and dump it and make the entire agenda about this.

The only way we can really do this is prioritize it and get people totally focused on this. If it's just one of 15 items that needs to be covered in two hours it always seems to fall at the bottom.

It's going to be extremely important in the future. I am certain that Phil, (Philip) and the brands group and the GOS have already thought about structures and proposals.

And maybe they got vetted in the Evolution Working Group but they didn't get vetted with the group here.

And there may be proposals that some of the members disagree with entirely but you have to have a starting point.

I don't see any real value in voting on the five and then sending them up to the board. I'd rather put a sense of urgency on this and say in fact let's get it all done, get it to the board and do it on that basis because if not what will happen is the last two will just get pushed off and pushed off. You can see that coming. That's my opinion, thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Ken). (Jonathan)?

Jonathan Robinson: I think one point - I've spent quite a bit of time just talking informally with various people trying to understand (Philip Martin), chair of the (BLGT Trust) get behind this a little bit. And I do think we've got a perception issue out there of us being intransigent, resistant to change.

And it's kind of interesting because I don't feel that inside the stakeholder group. When I'm outside we're very much seen as a walled garden of incumbents who don't want to welcome people in - or at least that's the way - so I do think the requirement on us to do and be seen to do something, even if that is some incremental changes, I'll be interested to see what (Philip) would say to that if there were...

We're looking at these in two ways. We're saying we could look at the whole package or we could look at some - and I like (Ken)'s point of thrashing out some of the issues and having a focused meeting on it but then of course, what about we look at the whole package? What about we take up some (unintelligible) by chance and make at least some incremental changes?

They may not be substantial enough for what some would want, but they might be seen as at least a willingness to make some movement, because at the moment the danger is we appear to do nothing and that almost is seen as a delay tactic. So maybe (Philip) wants to comment on perceptions.

One thing on perceptions from the other side I would like to address which is the point that (Philip) made which was on voting, he referred specifically to weighted voting and us taking votes now. We take regular votes. We have an issue sometimes with participation. But then make no reference to (SLVs) as far as I can see.

We vote for the most - I'm just not aware of in my recollection any reference being made to (SLDs[PD1]). So we do vote regularly, but we don't vote with reference to (SLDs).

Ken Stubbs: Just want to make one comment. In ten years - or how long has it been - to the best of my knowledge we've used weighted voting one time. One time. It was an incredibly controversial issue and that's where it got used. But on a day in, day out basis that's not how we have run policy management out of this constituency, by muzzling somebody out on weighted votes.

Keith Drazek   Thanks (Jonathan), thanks (Ken). (Philip) did you want to respond or jump in at any point here that would be fine, but we probably need to draw this conversation to a close. And we could certainly take it to the list. And I do think that the recommendation of having a more targeted meeting of the group or a substantial portion of one of our next calls devoted to this issue is probably the right next step. But (Philip) go ahead.

Philip Shepperd: Just two comments - one I think to the perception issue. I think the perception issue in terms of a closed wall is only if there was resistance to change. Now I know the group is open to any new registries joining the group as an individual registry. And that message is clear.

The only difference is that in this sort of new world, we know the majority of BRG members don't want to draw multiple fora, and they want to be a member of the BRG and have the various things that we do as part of that and then invite the BRG to participate in ICANN activities.

And therefore it makes sense for the BRG itself to be part of the constituency. So that's the thinking, that's the difference in terms of perceptions and where those things are.

And I think just on the voting issue, there is a recognition that it's probably not so surprising that in the past there have not been issues of sufficient controversy do you need to go to the complex voting system based on second level registrations because typically we're looking at issues with the same view.

And on the balance of benefit of change versus the cost, the view of that balance we've typically been quite coherent within this group. Now it is possible in the future - it is more likely in the future - that adherence on certain issues will change. And that may be where there is a policy, for instance, that would involve consumer or user protection or fraud, etcetera.

And there you would certainly see the brand, the community of the dot brands may have a different cost benefit feeling to that policy change than would an open registry. So there was a recognition that there may be some important issues in the future where policy coherence, if you like, of the stakeholder group may change. And therefore the voting issue is something that needs to be looked at in advance of that. So just those two comments.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks very much (Philip). (Jordyn) go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: A couple quick thoughts. First is I do - the utility of Second Level Domains (SLD) count as a weighted voting mechanism is probably soon going to see its time be gone. I think not just because I think that it potentially causes imbalance in an unfair way towards dot brands and other new entrants and new types of business models, but in fact the opposite.

It is easy to imagine a dot brand or a dot product like a dot Gmail or something like that being a very, very, very large domain in terms of number of (SLDs) without a recognition of perhaps revenue associated with it or things along those lines.

So I think similarly like a large brand that gave away an (SLD) to every one of its most valuable customers or something like that could easily have as many (SLDs) as dot-coms without necessarily the same amount of commercial activity being associated with a large incumbent TLD.

So I just think we're probably trying to solve a problem through weighted voting that is not going to be solved through the particular mechanism that we

have available. And if that's one thing that helps us address the perception of being resistant to change, that certainly seems like one we're thinking about.

The other question I have for (Philip) though is I do understand why people might only want to join the BRG but I don't understand why that couldn't just be even just an interest group in our existing framework.

NTAG - a lot of people just joined NTAG as their way of participating in ICANN, which they were also were joining the registered stakeholder group in the process. But we didn't need to do anything at all to the by-laws in order to make that happen.

Keith Drazek: Thanks (Jordyn). I have (Michael) and then Ray.

Michael Palage: Just a little history on the weighting. I actually did the weighting formula a number of years back. And I'm just wading back into active participation in the group just now, so I don't know if it's changed (Keith) since I did that weighting formula.

But it actually was two components in the weighting formula - a number of domains under management as well as keys to ICANN. So just to clarify in that example that you gave where you're giving domains away for free, there is a consideration there.

Keith Drazek: At least in the current contract those would be - there's no difference in how much a dot brand pays ICANN per SLD versus any other TLD. So you'd expect those to be essentially linked.

Michael Palage: Right.

Keith Drazek: Ray go ahead.

Ray Fassett: Thank you. Ray Fassett. I agree with (Jordyn)'s comments. I thought they were pretty good. And also just something to think about (Phil) too is not

every brand can join the brand registry group. You have your own qualifications for admittance and those are what they are and certain brands are simply just not able to join. And that's something to think maybe you could take back to your group.

Philip Shepperd: Could you give me an example?

Ray Fassett: (Dot Realtor).

(Philip): Because we had a discussion and you haven't got a trademark. Was that the case?

Ray Fassett: Definitely a brand. I think the issue is they allow individuals to license their trademark.

Philip Shepperd: Right, so second level.

Ray Fassett: Okay, yep, all right.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks everybody. Let's draw a line under that topic, but this is an important issue for us as a stakeholder group. We want to be obviously as inclusive as possible and for having TLD registries, gTLD registries be part of our group. So this is something that we really do need to address.

So we'll carve out some time maybe on our next call to sort of revisit this in more detail and more substance. But in the meantime if you could please read the report that came out from the evolution working group, develop your thinking before the next call, I think this will be a good discussion. Thank you and thanks (Philip). Appreciate the report.

With that I'm going to hand it over to (Don) who's sitting to my left, for the privacy and proxy services update. And then we will break for lunch.

Don Blumenthal: Appreciate it. There's not a lot to say beyond what I said on the last report on the stakeholder group call. But quick summary. We are pretty much on target for releasing the report in early 2015 - a draft report - which is surprisingly enough pretty well - that was our target to begin with and it's held steady.

We are through Topic D of seven letters. So we've covered things such as identification of a proxy registration, proxy privacy registration, contact information, categorization - whether there should be categories of privacy - registrants who can and cannot use privacy proxy services. That's the area where we've had real contention.

There's also been the distinction between or dichotomy between factions that say anybody should be eligible, any registrant should be eligible for privacy proxy registration, and those that suggest that there should be some limits. Traditionally the limits have been commercial versus non-commercial - however you wanted it.

Where we've seen a little bit of a shift is there's substantial agreements on the group I think that we should kind of add a third category, non-commercial. Commercial should have privacy proxy registration rights. Commercial do not do business, do not do transactions using their domains.

An example of that is businesses who are in project developments, want some kind of Internet presence but don't want that product traced to them. And then organizations that really do business, companies that sell on the Internet through click here and pay your credit card.

A lot of these - we'll have to revisit a lot of these. As we go forward we've still got to deal with terminations, privacy proxy, what happens if a business goes under or is de-accredited. That'll be probably a piece of reveal relay, which is our next tough area primarily - well, in two respects.

What are the rules for revealing and relaying and beyond that mechanisms to make sure, for example, that underlying information is not revealed inadvertently when for example a registrant changes registrar.

There we're going to get into some tech issues. We might be in over our heads, just need some guidance. We've had a lot of good guidance all along from the registrar community, but I know they'll continue.

There's been a good amount of attention given to us so far this week. The group's work came up in the law enforcement sessions yesterday morning as one example, you might imagine. I know (James Lytle) and some other people gave a presentation at the GAC meeting.

So even though the expert working group report came out we have not been forgotten. I wish we had been more because I've had Rod Rasmussen take a question at (LBG) and then just point to me and stand back.

We will have our open meeting from 10:00 to 11:30 tomorrow morning. I'm forgetting which room, and I expect it will be entertaining, given some people who haven't been in the process and promised people to show up with questions. That (unintelligible). Good, my voice is disappearing already.

Keith Drazek: Right, thanks very much (Don) and thanks for representing us in that group or those groups. Okay, with that we will break for our working lunch. So let's take 10 or 15 minutes to grab lunch, get settled. Lunches are over there in the back of the room. And we'll come back, let's say in ten minutes, at quarter after the hour to sort of continue our working lunch, which is going to focus on our discussion with the board at 1:00. Thanks everybody.