

**Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
Preparation for meetings with the Board and CEO
Saturday 11 October 2014**

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://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#oct>

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

Man: All right, if I could have your attention and we can start the recording for the afternoon sessions.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay, so we have a composite session in a sense this afternoon. Hello? There's a composite session this afternoon so we've got to deal with - we had originally prior to lunch this sort of open and substantial strategic discussion. I had in mind that to talk a little bit perhaps about two topics really. One is any progress on strategic issues for the council we had identified a year ago and the second was to think about - to take a little stock on the ICANN accountability track of work, which for which we've received an update and I wouldn't be surprised if not all of you have managed to see that update that's come out over night, but we also have to be prepared for the meetings with the GAC, the board, the ccNSO, (Tereza) and with (Fody).

So my suggestion to you is that we work through those in the sequence they're going to have to take place in and we should be able to deal with most of that and we'll work our way through and then deal with the motions and if there's some leftover time at the end of all of that then we'll pickup any other

open items. Is that okay? Any questions or comments about how we handle that? I mean I think it's important we go into those different meetings well prepared as possible.

Perhaps we should pick up with on the board meeting first of all or we could warm up on the ccNSO. Have you got slides - can we do either, (Louis)? Have you got slides for the board and for the ccNSO? Have you got - what have you got there?

Man: (Unintelligible)

Man: All right, let's look at the ccNSO meeting. I think that's - we'll warm up on that one quickly and go through those and just make sure. I don't think there's a lot to discuss or figure out which is why it should be relatively easy to deal with.

Just to leave you thinking - the one thing we haven't set up at all really is what the agenda for our meeting with (Fadi). We'll come to that last though. I think that having dealt with what intend to talk with the board about, understanding what the meeting with (Terezer) and the other - and the GDD stuff is about, I think we should be able to figure out what - I'd just like to transmit to (Fadi) what we're hoping or expecting to talk about with him. So we'll come to that last. ccNSO if possible please (Louis).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay, so thanks very much. That's the agenda for our meeting with the ccNSO, which takes place actually on Monday - can someone remind me exactly when that time is? It's Monday late afternoon early evening I think. So what we've got here is a progress report from the CWGs that we're working on, which is the use of the names of countries as TLDs and framework of principles for CWGs. Is, (John), are you likely to report on the framework of principles for CWGs or do we know who's reporting on either of those?

Man: (Unintelligible).

John Berard: Yes, this is John Berard. I suspect that I will - (Becky) I'm told will be here having just had surgery, but I think that we'll both be in the meeting.

Man: Fine, so we can rely on - and that won't ambush you or stuff like that?

John Berard: No, not at all.

Man: Okay, great. That's good. Use of names of countries of TLDs - I think that's - (Heather) is involved, but who are the - are they co-chairs on that CWG?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: So (Gabby) you're - go ahead. What are you - this is going to be a report to the group and an opportunity to discuss some comments that ccNSO so...

(Gabby): Okay, so (unintelligible) too much, but...

Man: No, no, no - we're not reporting here. We just (unintelligible) a walk through of the ccNSO meeting on Monday and I'm expecting that the co-chairs of that group will - or co-chair or co-chairs of that group will report to the joint meetings.

(Gabby): Okay.

Man: So not expecting you to produce a report right now.

(Gabby): Okay.

Man: So who are the co-chairs? Do you know?

(Gabby): I'm not sure. I will check that.

Marika Konings: It is Marika. From our side it's (Heather Forest) and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: And then the other side there's also (Paul Shindler) and someone who has recently been appointed.

Man: Okay.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible), I think.

Man: And so we can expect a report there and there's the NTIS (unintelligible) transition process including the work of the CWG. So I expect that'll be a probably combined input from myself and (Byron) and we would have had a - we're having a meeting on Monday at lunchtime to fall the CWGs. So we should be able to deal with that and then enhancing account - ICANN accountability we'll discuss that a little bit more here. Any other comments or input on this agenda or any - (John), go ahead.

(John): We will need to select a new GNSO council liaison to the ccNSO account.

Man: Good point and I hope you'll train them to do as good a job as you do. So if people can bare that in mind. That's probably one, (Steve), for the wrap up. If we haven't picked it up we've got it already all right? Thank you. Any other comments or questions on ccNSO meeting? (Thomas)/

(Thomas): I'd like to hear from the ccNSO and maybe you have the answer then I don't have to ask it then. You know that some of the (unintelligible) operators have spoken up objecting against how the (unintelligible) transition is being dealt with because they're not organized in the ccNSO and I think that it's important for this whole process to be inclusive and (unintelligible) that also is

being - that the ccTLD registries are also being reached out to and what the role of the ccNSO that would be.

Man: That feels like a question or a comment for that meeting rather than for now.

(Thomas): The question is if you have the answer already or if you - if somebody does then we don't have to table that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: So I've got (Marrol) at the mic and then (John) - or either way around.

(Marrol): I'm happy to - let's not be misinformed by two countries who - one of who has already changed their mind and has joined and no (unintelligible) outreach.

Man: John, go ahead.

John Berard: Yes, this is John Berard. I think it is a legitimate and useful question because the cc-world has many ccTLDs that are not a part of the ccNSO. However, I would urge you (Jonathan) to let (Byron) know that this question is going to come up. So he doesn't feel as if he's been hit (unintelligible because there was - and (Patrick) you can jump in on this too if you'd like - there was considerable discussion about that point with regard to the selection of the cc-reps to the (IANA) transition activity.

Ultimately, they worked their way through it to a point where I think it was everybody can say that they have had a shot at participating and will have a shot at participating. It'd be an interesting question, especially maybe even because India has now joined the ccNSO, but if you're going to do it - if we're going to ask the question just give (Byron) a bit of a headsup.

Man: Have you got a sufficient answer? Would you like (unintelligible) something we discussed in the meeting with the ccNSO as well?

Man: Sorry, I guess it wouldn't do no harm because we only heard of a few speaking up and objecting very loudly, but there are far more ccTLDs that are not covered or potentially not included.

Man: (Patrick)?

(Patrick): Yes, just to sell you again, what (John) was saying. It sort of went through a situation where the regional organizations were acting as sort of a way to get to the non-ccNSO members, but because there was very little time they didn't get that opportunity to - the original organizations and (Byron) extended an invitation to them, but given very short-time period before some deadlines it was a little bit hard for the original organization to come up with some sort of process to find the extra person it requires. So they went with a sort of a poll that the ccNSO had developed up until that point, but, yes, (Byron) can probably talk a little bit more about that.

Man: (Patrick), can I ask you to relay that question as a liaison if you wouldn't mind? If you could relay that to (Byron). I'm going to see him later this afternoon and I'll do my best to remember it - to talk with him about it, but we might get caught up in other issues. So if you could - if I could ask you to cover that (unintelligible) twice cover at least then make sure that's transmitted and if you could copy (Allen), who I think you probably know (Allen) who works with (Byron) at (Sera), (Allen McGiller) - yes. If you could copy (Allen) so he'll make sure it gets to (Byron) one way or another.

All right, I think I'm going to call it a day on that. I think that sounds like we have the right level of preparation. We have a pretty organized agenda. The ccNSO knows this is the agenda and this is areas of common interest. So let's put that away for now and then move on to - perhaps let's look at the issues we've got to deal with with the board next I would think is probably not a bad area to cover. And as you would have seen from the email I sent

around to you that the way in which the meeting for the board is proposed to take place is - covers things in three different areas.

The first is to highlight current GNSO activity and these are five in some ways somewhat arbitrary highlights from our work, but in particular they deal with a couple of things really, which is why I'm letting you know why I proposed these five areas. They deal with areas of cross community work, which I think the board should be interested in and should know about. I think it's their duty to know about it and ours to inform them about it.

And they also deal with - so that's items one, two and three either it's got GNSO, worked together with the ccNSO and then the fact that as cross community working groups become ever more of a tool or a requirement to work with that we make sure the board is familiar that there is the work going on on the framework for cross community working groups and then in an around new GTLDs, which, of course, the board is very interested in as well as they should be. Both from their revenue generation capability and all of the policy and other implications. It strikes me that they should know about the work that's going on there and it kind of touches on the topic we had this morning.

So one thought here is that - let me just take you through the high level and then we'll go back. So let's flip to the next slide. So the theme is highlights of current activity and then we've got some ongoing dialogue with the board in three key areas, I think. One is this PDP or what I think some people think is a prospective PDP, but actually it's a live PDP on GTLD registration services and the inter-relationship with the EDWG on directory services for which there is a proposed board GNSO working group to deal with how these things might inter-relate and work. Is the work going all on the protection of IOC - I wonder if these are - these are a little bit shorter. This is my shorthand appearing on these slides.

So they need to be tightened up please because, you know, I just put them in as shorthand to - as placeholders and they come out as slides. I wouldn't want these to go to the board in this way. And then there's the DWG reports on the nominating committees. So these are just my sort of short hand points that have come from an email. But those are the three topics where we are really actively talking with the board and then finally on the third slide it's a placeholder for other topics of interest we might want to cover. Last, (Mary), there's a third slide. So that's - yes. That's to be discussed. So if we could flip back to the first one of the three - thank you (Louis).

So one of the thoughts here is that there's two ways we could do this. I could either just talk over these and say look - I don't even want to spend hours on this. This is not - this shouldn't dominate the procedures. This feels to me like a 10 minute intro to say this is what's going on. If some discussion comes on it - one thought I had here is there is a prospect here that one person from amongst - from the council could deal with each of these with two or three sentences and just say - and we could just go around topic one, topic two, topic three, topic four, topic five - any questions?

So I think that feels like a nice way of making sure that other voices are heard and participate. So the discussion group on new GLTDs is obviously (Brett) and I would just want working it back in reverse order. I would think that there the opportunity is to say this is what's going on. There's also a staff led program of activity.

I supposed we would have covered policy implementation, (unintelligible) which leaves you the opportunity to say - and actually really what our discussion yesterday or what will be yesterday indicated that these three are related areas. Who could talk to the policy and implementation working group? Or who would like to talk to the working group on policy implantation working group in our meeting with the board? Is there anyone who feels they could - and really here I'm not thinking of - I'm thinking this is the slide and it's two or three sentences highlighting that this work is going on.

It's specifically because it comes out of the new GLT program that through a certain challenges and in particular in and around the boundary and it's setup conflicts between staff and council about policy and the boundaries and so (unintelligible) a valuable piece of work that we should highlight is going on. (Allen)?

(Allen): I'm prepared to do it and I actually did a presentation for the leadership group on it earlier this week, but I need to do a few minutes homework to see what's conflicting with the (ALAC) tomorrow. Is this tomorrow? I'm sorry - when is this?

Man: This is tomorrow at - I'm not exactly - she should - 1 pm.

(Allen): Okay, let me double check and I'll get back to you.

Man: Okay, so we'll pencil (Allen) in for four. That segues nicely into (Brett) for five because you could say in and around (GLTD)s and honestly this is not (Allen) and (Brett) and whoever else ends up volunteering for these things. It's really two or three sentences making sure that the board knows that this work is going on. That's all I want to do is just wave the flag a little bit. Anyone who is really interested can drill into the detail. (Allen)?

(Allen): I've just been pointed out that I do have another meeting. So I can't.

Man: Okay, if necessary I'll do it and if - (Chuck), go ahead.

(Chuck): I'll be happy to do it if you want somebody outside the council to do it as co-chair or I'm sure (Jay Scott) is not here right now, but one of us could do it if you want. How much time do you - have you allowed for that?

Man: (Chuck), honestly my view is this is in general. A sort of ten minute slide and so it's two minutes per point. It's a few remarks about what's going on there

so that they know that it's happening. I don't think we really want to - anyone can go and read about this if they really wanted to know. Come to the meetings, but it's making sure that it's known and understood that we aren't just sitting idly by while a whole lot of stuff is going on with the new GTLD program.

Actually, we've picked it up. We're dealing with policy implementation issues. We're dealing with the discussion group on new GTLDs and we're linking all of that together with the staff work. And so it's really that. It's kind of the advertise (unintelligible) and positioning of this work.

(Chuck): So thank you (Jonathan). So if I heard you correctly just a couple minutes on line four? Okay, good. Thank you.

Man: (Chuck), we'll put you down and that would be great. Working back up the list then - framework for cross community working groups. I guess we know who that's going to be. Or do we not?

John Berard: This is John Berard, yes, I think we do.

Man: Thanks John. CWG work together with the ccNSO. I mean this really highlights - I mean I don't know if this is a well enough frame. Maybe this should say - we should really be highlighting the stewardship transition or what other work is there? We've just done the country names. Anyone willing or able to talk to this? I mean it's - I can make a point on this one. This is - put me down for - oh, (Heather). Hi, great.

(Heather): Hi.

Woman: Excuse me (Jonathan). I'm happy to - I'm the co-chair of the ccNSO-GNSO country and territory names working - so I'm happy to answer any questions that you have. I'm happy to speak to it if need be.

(Jonathan): Thanks, (Heather). So just to be clear - what this is about. This is not really - I mean we will definitely rely on you when we meet with the ccNSO to do this, but as far as the board is concerned, again, the principle here is to highlight the effective cross community working that's going on and to - and so if you're going to be there and someone specifically asks about that then great. It would be great if you were there and on hand too and then we can know we can refer to you - so that would be wonderful.

(Heather): I'm happy to do that (John).

(Jonathan): Thank you, that's great. All right, and then on the GAC-GSO consultation group I guess I'm pretty sleeves rolled up on that. I don't know if there's anyone else (unintelligible), would you like to say? Is there anyone else that would like to say something on that? All right, well this is - as it happens this is our first live so I'm happy to speak to one or two of those first points and then start to partition up afterwards. That will work. That's fine. Any comments, sorry (John), go ahead.

John Berard: So I - this is John Berard - I don't want to discourage, which I guess I just did, your slide, but wouldn't it be better to roll this into a more strategic approach rather than here's what we're doing one, here's what we're doing two, here's what we're doing three? The essential element that connects all of these things is the GNSO council's approach at working beyond the GNSO.

And, you know, for the board I think it's important for them to hear that we are not living in our own small dark basement room and maybe if you - if we come at it from the perspective of, you know, we see what's happening. I mean we're not blind to the external forces that are putting pressure on ICANN. We're not insensitive to the need to work not just across the constituencies, but across the community and here are ways that we're doing it that allows us to get through this quickly and make the point to the board that the GNSO is not, you know, it's not your parent's GNSO council.

(Jonathan): Yes, so John you haven't discouraged the slide at all and on the contrary you've highlighted the purpose of the slide that just isn't adequately expressed on it at the moment. So what we need to do - I think I'm - my understanding last is that we are potentially on, Marika, that we potentially edit these now on live and so what I'm hoping is that we can - I mean really what this needs is, I guess, and (unintelligible) I don't expect the words to be perfect. I'll wordsmith it a bit more as we go, but it's just - it's really - there's a bullet that isn't a bullet. It's above the number one that really covers the strategic positioning of that slide. Yes, that's perfect, thank you.

And so I'm not thinking in the clearest words now, but (Louis) if you could just get a capture - even if it just says strategic - cross - it's without the one. If you can (unintelligible) the one as well please. Okay, so it's cross community work awareness - cross community work/awareness, you know, it's implicit in cross community work, but you're right. Slash awareness of broader context. Anything else missing from the point you were making John where we captured if we've got that sort of essence in there?

Man: Yes, that's certainly the (unintelligible).

John Berard: Yes, this is John Berard. Yes, that's certainly the essence of it. I think I would just want to make sure we lead the board with the point that we are reaching outside of the GNSO because that's the way for us to participate in helping solve some of the problems that present to ICANN.

(Jonathan): So, you see, (Louis), after cross community work outside of GNSO/outside of GNSO or something like that so that I can - we can tidy up the actual wording slash outside of GNSO. Yes, so then John we can say these are highlights of current GNSO activity in a specific area, which wanted to highlight in a specific area of strategic importance that we want to highlight.

John Berard: I think it's great. Yes, I mean we should - the council should feel good about the work that it has done over the last 12-18 months to build the kind of

bridges that make the community - that gives the community a real meaningful role in the decision making.

(Jonathan): I agree with you and here's why I would do it - I want - I have to feel good about it. I want the board to feel good about it. To know what's going on and to feel good about it such that the board can then say we've got a great GNSO in ICANN and we feel we can standup and...

John Berard: What exactly did you have for lunch?

(Jonathan): It was that tiramisu.

John Berard: Yes.

(Jonathan): Anyone else have the tiramisu? (Thomas), go ahead. Tiramisu (Thomas) we'll call you.

(Thomas): Yes, maybe it's something stronger than tiramisu. I don't know, but I mentioned this when we met last with the board or even at - during the last two or three meetings with the board, but I'm still very concerned with the issue of universal acceptance and also I think the IDN issue that we discussed earlier today is quite pressing and I'm not sure whether I'm the only one, but I'm not sure whether the sense of urgency to get these fixed is actually with the board.

(Jonathan): Okay, so I think you're on slide three then and great. Let's put it in there, but we must let them know in advance if that's something you want to - so if we can go to slide - sorry, slide four, (Louis), in this. Oh, you just...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Jonathan): Thank you. So - and I mean the - just to be clear the nature of this conversation is that if you disagree with (Thomas) or you think this is

inappropriate to have it. Please also let us know because this is flushing out a couple of areas for discussion.

Man: Universal acceptance in IDNs.

(Maryland): And?

(Jonathan): And IDNs - (Maryland)?

(Maryland): Sorry, I just wanted to be sure that we were calling universal acceptance and IDN's at the second level, (Thomas), or IDNs overall? I just - and then secondly, I would like to add name collisions there as well for thirdly.

(Thomas): I think that was...

(Jonathan): So (Thomas) respond and I know (Brian) is waiting to.

(Thomas): Yes, I think the discussion that we had surrounding IDNs today - earlier today was whether ICANN is putting enough resources into this to make this happen potentially sooner than anticipated and the universal acceptance topic that would apply to certainly our TLDs, but I think that this is particularly important because we will have this new DTLT program evaluated and if the mandate is to provide for more consumer choice and competition and if the message that goes out to users says, okay you can register this new names and if you're lucky they work, but maybe they don't. Then I think that's not good enough and I think that ICANN is not, as an organization, is not doing enough and putting enough resources into alerting the players that have to update their systems and make sure that new DTLTs are recognized are actually being informed and...

(Jonathan): And (Thomas) are you happy that that's a single point? Universal acceptance and IDNs in one point and not two points?

- (Thomas): I think that, you know, I'm hearing from a lot of players that this is of major concern for them. So I'm more than happy to give this the important that in my view it deserves by making it a point of its own, but I think that's up for discussion.
- (Jonathan): I'm not clearing that. All I'm clearing is that it is a single point, universal acceptance and IDN. I'm happy and you - hopefully you will speak to that point and having raised it and you will be in a position to raise it, which will be great. Okay, great. So that's - so you're happy it's a single point. All right, (Brian)?
- (Brian): I wanted to add to the list potentially Strength confusion objection review mechanism. It's been a long time since the public comment period closed. I think the board is scheduled to talk about it tomorrow morning, but there's usually a long time before we get actual notes or things. I'm wondering if they're able to give us an update.
- (Jonathan): (Louis), have you captured that? Strength Confusion objection mechanism. Is it mechanisms or mechanism?
- Man: (Unintelligible)
- (Brian): Strength confusion review mechanism.
- (Jonathan): Thank you. Tony? Tony Harris, go ahead.
- Tony Harris: Yes, I got to the mic late probably, but I would like to stress and I speak from some degree of knowledge on working on the problem that universal acceptance is not only ISDNs. It includes (unintelligible) strings also and you'll be hearing during this meeting - during this ICANN meeting about specific instances where that is happening today. Thank you.
- (Jonathan): Helpful clarification at least for me, Tony. Thanks.

Man: And I didn't want to have that limited to IDN so I can give complete examples of where (unintelligible) strings have issues as well.

(Jonathan): Okay, (Aubrey).

(Aubrey): Hi, this is may be a quibble, but we keep calling this universal acceptance and that first of all is such an overstatement. I mean, but we're not looking for it to go beyond planet earth, but more than that I wonder whether - I agree with the topic, but I wonder whether it wouldn't be good to frame it in terms of one or two words that actually convey meaning as opposed to, yes I accept them, you know, type of notion and that actually says something.

Just every time I see universal acceptance it just seems to be such a nebulous way of referring to a very concrete topic that requires some activity from ICANN to go out and support the development work that's needed to make sure that these strings are accepted by all software tools. So I just - the universal acceptance always just - maybe it's just me and maybe it's just - but every time I hear it sounds ridiculous.

(Jonathan): So, yes, sure if you'd like to respond.

(Thomas): (Aubrey), I hope that board members do know what the issue is. I'm certainly happy to illustrate this, but it starts from, you know, typing in the domain name and would only resolve if you add http to it. It means that you type in the domain name into a browser window and you could Google search results return rather than the domain name resolving.

(Aubrey): So global resolution of IDNs?

(Thomas): Not only IDNs, but the thing is if you register a name and you want to sign-up to a social media website, for example, it would not accept your email address as in technically correct. It wouldn't allow you...

(Jonathan): I think to (Thomas) I think I've got a point and you can address it. It's really that not everyone will know what universal acceptance means and there's no harm in defining it.

(Thomas): And I think that in terms of what we can request from ICANN is actually reaching out as ICANN to other manufacturers to OS developers to the software community as an awareness campaign.

(Aubrey): Yes, if I could just comment. I think that this is an incredibly optimistic conversation we're having, but one that this conversation will change anything, but the other part is assuming that they know what we're talking about. I think that's a bit of optimism that, yes, one would hope that they would, but I don't think it should be assumed.

(Jonathan): All right, let's - the point is I think is understood. (Thomas), close it and then we've got (unintelligible) in the queue.

(Thomas): Maybe this is too optimistic, but at least from what I understand ICANN is doing virtually nothing. I know register operators that have asked ICANN for help and they've said well you're a much better place to reach out to the respective operator. And I think that's not good enough if ICANN as an organization - if we as a community want to make this program successful, which I think at the moment is at stake.

(Jonathan): Okay, I don't think you are disagreeing. It's a matter of how it's communicated. (Allen) and then (Mary)?

(Allen): Let me put what everything in a different slant. I have no doubt the board members will know what we're talking about when we say universal acceptance. No one else in the world will. I would suggest to the board that they get some of their talented staff to come up with a new name that the rest

of the world will understand if we really want to make any progress in fixing the problem.

(Jonathan): (Mary)?

(Mary): Thank you (Jonathan) and (Allen) that's an interesting that I'm following on after you and this is a comment not so much to follow up on (Thomas) because I think (Thomas) has been involved in some of these initiatives, but maybe more for others who have not been following it as closely that they're afraid universal acceptance, you know, in at (unintelligible) could mean a lot of things, but within the ICANN context because that's also now been a roadmap that ICANN has published for which public comment was thought that - is thought quite become a term of art, but it does refer to certain specific problems. Some of which (Thomas) has described.

I think the only other comment I would add on that is that while the topic that (Thomas) is asking to be discussed is about universal acceptance with the limitations I've mentioned. Innovation to IDNs that in the roadmap that ICANN has published universal acceptance while largely a concern of IDNs also extends beyond IDNs. Including, for example, strings with multiple characters.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Mary). I've got (Tony) and then (David).

(Tony): Well first of all it wouldn't - it would not be fair to say that ICANN is doing nothing about this. Some things are being done. There is a specialist in ICANN who has been working quite a while on this. His name is (Franc Guarious) and there have been reports prior to the launching of new TLDs alerting that things may happen. Things are happening now. And secondly, our constituency, the ISPCP specifically has undertaken two outreach events in the last two weeks at relevant flora where we have highlighted this - let's say potential disrupting threat to the introduction of new GTLDs.

Basically because it's already happening and I would also say that I agree with what (Aubrey) said just now. The problem lies very much in the software development community. I don't see many of them here at ICANN meetings and it would be interesting to see some initiatives addressed towards this community because they probably have no idea that this is an issue and has to be looked at. Thank you.

(Jonathan): I've got (David) and then (Chuck).

(David): Well - so three comments essentially. The first one is universal acceptance is the term that's known and all the board really wants to know is who is going to answer the question. If already some board members recognize what universal acceptance is then those will be the ones that are answering the question and if none of them recognize it then we realize we have a problem, but we don't need to manage much more than that. The board knows what we're going to ask about.

Second, is to say yes. In general, it would be. It is an issue that we do not have, you know, software developers and browser manufacturers.

Here that is probably something we should think about to be bigger. Personally, I would, also, like the opportunity to talk to them about getting (Dane) out there and other technologies.

I think it will be, you know, it's not just this issue that would be great to see software people here - it would be. There are several.

And lastly, I just want to point out to Avri that, yes while we currently - ICANN only the extents to worth. But (Vince)'s been working on Interplaner for Internet for a while. We're just waiting for the users.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Dave) - Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jonathan). First a personal comment. I really strongly encourage ((Thomas)) to give some examples like he did here.

Regardless of how many board members understand the issue, there will be people in the audience - where there's programmers or not. That the examples like you gave - both (ASKI) and IDN would be very much helpful. I think.

Secondly, I want to kind of follow up with what (Tony) Harris said. The registry stakeholder group is very much concerned about this issue - whatever we call it, okay.

It's typically been called universal acceptance. And that's what the GIG working group called in their last - I think it was their last report.

So we will be raising this in some of the session with the board and staff this week and at the L.A. Registry roadshow workshops. We spent quite a bit of time talking about this.

So there are multiple stakeholder groups and constitutes that I think are concerned with this. And it's not that it hasn't been addressed at all. I agree with (Tony).

There's been steps taken but more needs to be done.

Man: Okay, so I think we've covered that topic well - both in terms of introducing it to the board. Can we go up to the next slide - the one prior to this one?

So the purpose here of this slide - and (John) maybe you can run your clear thinking - as a communications person over this one, as well.

But really the idea here was to say - is to flag up a couple of areas where we are. I'm not convinced that all the board understand and know how we're working with them on these different areas.

So my intent with these four - with these three topics was to say, this is just to check if there is any opportunity for discussion on any of these three points.

The first being the PDP on the GTLD registration services and to highlight the fact that there is plan for a board GNSO working group - to try and figure out how to deal with this unique situation. (John) go ahead.

John Berard: This is John Berard. Have we fully staffed that now on our end?

Man: Yes.

John Berard: Okay.

Man: Yes, so we've put forward the group. So I guess what I was thinking here was there was an opportunity to talk to each of these three on the protection of IGO and IMGO identifies.

Talk about how we've been working with elements of the board and trying to resolve this issue.

And then third, the board working group reported the nominating committee. Here my intention was to say, "The reports out. We've seen the report. It's caused significant ripple."

The way in which the GNSO works is that there are - this will be dealt with in the stakeholder group and constituency level. But the counsel may well respond to this, as well.

And our intention is to wait until the reply period to do so. And currently all we're doing is flagging with you that there's some concerns.

Now does anyone think that we should have more substantial conversation on any of these three? Is it worth highlighting these three points and comments or on the structural content of this slide and the discussion? Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Just a very small one. On point number one, we're in new territory here. This is a board request PDP - which the counsel doesn't vote on.

It may well be that based on the final issue report, based on the board PNSO working group. It's PDP's not PDP. So you - just adding in brackets may generate some interesting discussion - adding a SN brackets, rather.

Man: Anyone, any other comments on that? So do we want to put PDP, slash S or PDP, brackets S - John?

John Berard: Yes this is John Berard. I think Alan's point is a good one. And we should put brackets S or however we want to handle that.

But these three points are the - of all the stuff that we've talked about - these are the three primary points of irritation right now - between us and the board.

And I'm not suggesting we label them as primary points of irritation. But if there's any chance - but if there's any chance for a meaningful dialogue, it's going to be on these points, all right.

I mean what on earth were they thinking of when they disenfranchised the GNSO in their nominating committee report? I mean what we're they thinking.

What we're they thinking when they told us to redo our consensus policy. What were they thinking? And now we're waiting for a response to a letter that we've sent off to them asking for a specific language.

And then - and the first one, you know, how can we help, okay. So I mean these I would say are the three things where we are most focused on working - where there's real interaction between the GNSO counsel and the board, yes.

Man: Thanks John - which is exactly why I highlighted them. I happen to disagree with you slightly on point two. I'm much less comfortable - uncomfortable than some are with this process.

I think the whole thing has been a pain. It's been a disproportionate amount of work. But that's my personal opinion.

But nevertheless, we've had to go through with it. And we've had to find - navigate a unique situation in this case - what feels to me like a unique situation.

And therefore, I think we've managed, somehow, navigating a unique situation, holding true to our policy principals and (unintelligible). And notwithstanding Avri's point early point about, you know, whether this will establish precedence.

So we've got to be careful. But you're right. I didn't call them irritation. I called interest. It maybe that's useful that one or more people pick up on these.

I don't know how vigorous we wanted to be on the BWG report on the nominator's committee, Frank. I think we should express - to some extent - their strength of feeling - Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: From my observation - my name is Marilyn Cade. My observation is a - and I'm going to move IGO names aside and focus on what I perceive as a significant gap in understanding - on the part of the board members - about the community itself.

I see that gap in (Fadi) (unintelligible). I see it on the part of the board. I've been around long enough to remember when board members came and sat in meetings and listened.

They sat in ALAC meetings. They sat in constituency meetings. This predates the creation of the SG's. They sat in these meetings. They sat in the GAC meetings and listened.

They came to the bar and socialized with the community. They were in the community not just from the community. And that meant that they had a much deeper understanding.

And I think right now they're caught in an ivory tower of committee meetings. All interesting but it denies them a real understanding. And they sit in a room on Tuesday.

And we all go to them like supplicants and debate two or three topics. And then we leave. And they go on to the next group.

So what I'm presenting to you is - not that it's an irritant or it's a frustration. But the gap that allowed that report to be established in the way it was, that gap is what I would prefer the counsel to focus on - if you could.

In sort of how did we get so far apart from understanding each other and mistrusting each other? Because to me, when I read that report, it is mistrust, mistrust, mistrust, mistrust, mistrust.

Man: Marilyn thanks - two thoughts on that; one, in a sense, elements of what you've just said or implicit in this slide, right. They just aren't expressed in that way.

And in a way, my purpose in having these three points is to tease out some of these issues. And we can rehearse - which is in a sense what we're doing now.

But the question is, will anyone, you know, this has - this slide has the prospect of falling very flat. And if we just, you know, all - being a point of substantive - substantial discussion.

Now the challenge is to have a substantial discussion without it - well the challenge is to have a substantial discussion.

So the question is how do we have a constructive substantial discussion. Marika your hand was up? So let's make sure we...

Woman: It doesn't (unintelligible) is go back to the earlier point on adding the S. I think (Connie) and the PDP. We're not in PDP's. And even if, you know, we decide to slice up the work at the moment it would still be in a current PDP.

If you wanted to initiate more PDP's we can do so.

Man: We can fix that. I think there's two key points to make here. One is that I'm not sure - at this stage - that the board even knows that there is a PDP on GTLE registration services underway.

That it's a unique PDP and that its board commissioned. So a part of my purpose is to say that's what's going on. So to your point, then let's put - remove the slash S and put it at the back of the sentences.

And brackets off the services last. We're going to have two sets of brackets. But we can fix that - after services - after the services where it says, "PDP on GTLE registration services."

Put in brackets immediately after that, please - may become PDP's. So then that very clearly highlights that there is one. And it may become more - Marika.

Marika Konings: But just to note, as well, for everyone's understanding here. Of course, more PDP's means issue reports - - final issue reports.

You start again because, as well, the other thing that has been considered is breaking this up, for example, in work tracks. Within one PDP you actually have different slices of work.

So then (unintelligible) your pre-assuming here for that potential outcome. But I think there're different ways of potentially looking at it - but aside.

Man: Yes, good point. And part of the purpose of the board - - GNSO working group is to figure it out - Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes. Just a quick response Marika - whether it's one huge issue report or several components of that, I think the work efforts about the same, yes.

Man: All right, so is anyone prepared to introduce and talk to any one of these three topics.

Have I got anyone who's prepared to put up a hand? I mean (Thomas) you'd be the obvious hand for two.

I don't know if anyone else is willing to either put up their hand for two or any other of these to make the point as to how we are currently working with the board and start to tease out a discussion on that.

Anyone prepared to talk to three? Surely someone from the CSG might have a view on this.

Man: I'm willing (unintelligible) on any part.

Man: Well maybe you might start without the gasoline and just see how it goes. Seriously, though that's - I mean, John would you like to...

John Berard: This is John Berard. I think I already have a speaking part.

Man: Yes.

John Berard: So.

Man: (Unintelligible) is there anyone else who would like to step in on this - (Tony). Okay great. So (Tony)'s - we've got (Tony) on three. (Thomas) I've semi volunteered you for two or you willing.

I know you already have a speaking part on the final slide. But that's because you introduced that point. Are you happy to talk through?

Tony Harris: I would keep this area very brief. Because I think we pretty much want to follow up on the correspondence that took place in (RATIC) so far and the - yes.

Man: Are they - let me say. I mean is the purpose of these points could be to either - is to critique, in a sense, how we work with a board.

Now that critique could be a positive critique, right. I mean we all - I mean the point here say, "We are midway through a process where we are navigating a particularly tricky issue.

And we've had some good collaborative discussions with the members of the NGPC. That hasn't yet worked out. But we thought we'd flag with because it's an interesting area.

And see if anyone's got any comments or thoughts they'd like to add to it.

Man: And maybe they even have news for us.

Man: Exactly, so that's my point. It's not necessarily...

Man: Is that too optimistic?

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) go ahead.

Woman: I am just - I'm cautious on three because I don't think we have a universal perspective on number three. I, you know, I don't think NCSG has discussed it in any sort of thing.

I know personally, when I read it I don't see problems with it. So and I know that other's do see problems with it.

So I want to be careful that we're not saying that there's a GNSO or even a more limited GNSO counsel position on that.

I think some of us may think that the redistribution is something whose time has come. So I just want us to be careful and not group it in the same category as the other two.

In the other two there was a policy. There's policy work going on. And as a council we have a view on it.

On the third one, it's one of those broader cases. It has to do with the structure of the organization.

And yes, as parts of that organization we have varying opinions on it. But it's not like the other two issues.

Man: Okay, so I agree with you. And if we go off the rails - in that sense - you should feel free to say so.

But let me just say what I think I would've said. And I don't want to constrain you (Tony). But my purpose - in putting that out in this way - was I would've said, "We're aware of this board working group report."

It seems to have caused significant ripples. You know, there's definitely been some reactions and responses and some concerns. That's going through the GNSL process.

Now let me tell you about the GNSL process board. What happens is it goes out into the constituencies and stakeholder groups. They're processing that and working with it.

And once they respond on the common period, the council may or may not take a position in the reply period. But we stand ready to do that. So that's kind of where I was at.

And then I was expecting that maybe one or more of the board members might say, "But we're surprised. We really thought we were doing you a favor."

You know, there may be some discussion. So I don't know (Tony) if that's (unintelligible) preempted to you.

But that's to just answer your point Avri. I wasn't going to go in there and say, this is - I mean I happen to have, you know, on my stakeholder group that I represent. I'm sure has concerns about it.

But we haven't even digested that or fully formulated our common concern.

Man: I'm quite happy to raise that. But I do respect what Avri said on this. It isn't the same as one and two.

And there're certainly quite a few opportunities around I think for whoever interested in this - to put some impute back to them during this meeting, so.

But question the fact that it isn't an exact fit with the other two points because there are real policy issues. So I'm happy to direct if it's the will. But I think there is an issue here.

Man: So I suppose my feeling was to meet with the board and not flag that there's been a significant report come out of the board. That impacts parts of the way in which the GSO interacts with the organization.

It felt to me like we had to say something. Even if it was just to say, "Look we're dealing with this. And this is how we're dealing with it."

And in your case (Tony) you could - if it was the case, you could say, "And by the way, I'm a CSG counsel on the board. And the CSG is significantly impacted by this. And we do have concern."

But, you know, as long as it was clear that it's the CSG in that case not the - that's my take on it.

Man: That's exactly where I was heading with this to start with. But I got the impression that Avri was somewhat unhappy with that approach.

Man: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes that's just it. And then I would respond that, you know, for example we've been trying to get one of our constituents who is represented for a while. And we didn't succeed it.

And we're happy to see that there's finally going to be some parody. You know, so, you know, do we really want to get into that discussion there then. I mean.

Man: So the option is, is the motivation to remove the point from this slide? Or is it to handle it in the right way? Because we could have either approach - I mean any proposals.

I mean there's two ways of doing it. We either handle it in the way that seems acceptable to the group. And just indicates that is an issue in the GNSO. We are dealing with it. And we will be coming back to you on it - or - (Tony).

Tony Harris: Well if the - if the thought is that they should be some constraints put on how we handle it.

I don't see what we're telling them because surely that's exactly what they would expect with us - of us as the GNSO anyway. So it's no big news for them.

Man: You know, I get a feel of the room as to whether people want to remove this off the agenda. I mean or not. Or is it something we should be raising. I've got Maria and then probably Marilyn.

Maria Farrell: Yes, Maria speaking - just trying to be helpful here. I mean is there a certain concern around of what sources of information the boards, you know, how much consultation or thinking or how deeply or broadly looking.

They did at this issue before the report came up with the recommendation. I mean is that something we can agree on. You know, that while some of us are, you know, more or less happy about the results was.

Maybe the process or the amount of information or consideration the board gave to it was insufficient. I'm not sure. I'm just suggesting (unintelligible) that's a possibility.

Man: I mean I would guess that the board would just respond to that. And say, "Well we were responding to a previous report. We were obliged to do something. And we've done it.

We've put it up for public comment. We haven't presumed anything. We've tried to respond. So what's the problem?" Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade speaking. I guess I'm of the view that you need to flag it as an area of particular focus and discussion going on still within each of the SG's, et cetera, et cetera.

Public comment period is still open. Different people may have different views about the outcome of the recommendation. But you do want to call it to their attention that there's - I do think there's a - regardless of whether you like one part of a recommendation or not in that report.

I do think from everyone I've spoken to there's concern about kind of the process of getting the recommendation out there. And what some of the underlining implications are.

But since you're not in agreement necessarily about the substance - but I think it's fair to give the board a heads up that it is a topic of significant discussion at the SG constituency level.

Man: All right, well I'm going to go to (Brian) next. But perhaps the way to fix this is I put it on the agenda. Maybe because it's - maybe if we wanted to represent it more neutrally, maybe it's something that comes from me as chair then.

And say look, you know, this is something that's on our agenda in the GNSO. It's being worked on and it's of particular focus as you say Marilyn - (Brian).

(Brian): (Brian), (unintelligible) for IPC. I agree with Marilyn and I guess I agree with you as well (Jonathan) for putting it on the agenda in the first place. I think this is something that's important.

I think there's significant discussion like Marilyn's indicated. I am certainly among the IPC and some of the other GSG groups that we talked about that we do have some concerns about the process.

And we did talk about it on the last council call. And we got a little bit of feedback. But it seems like they - or maybe processing some of our comments.

So maybe they have more to say and it is actually a broader group because we really just had the one representative on the last call.

(Jonathan): So what we've come to is I think a suggestion. And I just checked that anyone - if anyone's unhappy with that. That we retain it on the agenda, but I represent it in a relatively natural way.

But indicate that there's an issue of substance for the GNSO and we'll be coming back to them. Okay, any concerns or - all right, so let's settle that then if everyone's okay with that.

I think we've got some nominated speakers from (unintelligible) at each topic. Just before we close, can we look at slide three and just make sure there's nothing else that's been missed off.

Anything else - any other areas that are of substance - go ahead Maria.

(Maria Staking): It's (Maria Staking). (Jonathan), I don't know if this is an area of substance or not, but the general concern about the scope and process of our methodology of the GNSO review.

It seem to find it, you know, that concern seem to find some support with other people. I don't mind whether people, you know, but I just wonder is it something people want to bring to the board.

In that I think it will be news to the board that there is this clash - the GIN. So cancel level about the review scoping. And, but you know, I guess I raise this as an open question.

Should it be something we bring up with them or not because it's been festering away for six or nine months now.

(Jonathan): I guess it's potentially a similar issue in that there may not be universal. Let's say you could argue, therefore it should be on there if the other point is on there or not.

I don't know. Any other comments as to whether it's premature or appropriate or relevant to put any comment. And if so, does the council have particular view?

Sounds like a subject for one to one's with the board members. And making sure it's transmitted to them in that way. Unless someone else is - okay, I'm going to draw a line under that.

We have quarter past three and we've got to get onto a couple of other topics still - a couple other areas. Let's look at the points with the - where's Mason? Is Mason still with us?

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) Mason left (unintelligible).

(Jonathan): Yes. Potentially he should (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) he have the session for him.

Man: All right. Just for update, Mason went over to the (unintelligible) - to (unintelligible) over there.

(Jonathan): So we've got a structure for the GAC meeting with the GAC. Let me tell you what that structure is and then talk about what we might do. Are there any - is there an agenda slide for the GAC meeting at this stage - not yet I don't think.

Okay, so I will describe the agenda for a moment. The agenda comprises - a substantial update from the GAC GNSO consultation group. An introduction to Mason - and it's a shame that he had to leave.

Because it would have been quite good to just talk about that a little bit has GNSO liaison. And as the first product - I'll be frank with you. I think the big issue with Mason in his capacity as liaison to the GAC is - and Mason agrees with this.

And I think thinks the same thing, that it is about - and anyone who's in the consultation group, boys if you please come in on this as well. But it's about managing expectations.

And Mason is a GNSO liaison to the GAC. The objective is to have someone who can talk with the GAC about the work and mechanics - policy work and mechanics of that policy work in the GNSO on hand when they need to talk about it.

Of course at times he'll be responsible for bringing some information back to us. And we'll naturally do that. But primarily, he is a liaison from the GNSO to the GAC.

He's the mechanism by which information is transferred at a personal level - to avoid the kind of perceived spam and deluge of information.

And that they can then use that as another mechanisms - another method by which they can then begin to process and organize and understand which bits of policy they want to work with.

He is not the solution by which the GAC will interface with the PDP or with multiple PDP's. That work is still going on with a consultation group. So if all walk out of that meeting tomorrow having educated the GAC on the work of the GNSO GAC consultation group.

And sent a moderate expectation of what the GNSO liaison to the GAC can do, I think we will have succeeded. And that to me is what we're trying to achieve there.

And then the GAC's (unintelligible) to have a couple other items on the agenda. And this becomes in part at least slightly more challenging. And I'm genuine a little unsure how to handle this one.

Because they've asked to talk about the work of the - on the IGO - INGO RCRC PDP's and what's going on there. They've asked for some sort of update or discussion so that.

Man: Don't you mean the existing PDP that we - they ultimately new IGO INGO (unintelligible) mechanism PDP.

(Jonathan): It's a good question. I don't know. I think it's - I think probably it's an update in general on the work relating to that subject matter. I don't think it's kind of as focused as that.

Marika, have you got - can you help there at all? Because there was that - there was an email from Olaf, talking about potential - the GAC would like to talk about - does it ring a bell?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think they just wanted an update on where things stand in regard possible reconsideration in the process and possible also where things stand under (unintelligible) rights.

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): Yes. So I would think that those are the two points. We have - and I think if we can focus it in on that. Say we can give you an update. So that's the opportunity to provide that update there.

I'm looking at you again (Thomas). How do you feel?

(Thomas): I just get the - get information that the OECD in the GAC meeting has urged for notifications plus non. You know, because we were just thinking about the post registration notification.

So if they're discussing this now, I think it's not unlikely that the GAC will ask maybe more specific questions as to what we're about to do. And I think that we should try to avoid this in depth discussions.

So I think if we're asked about the status of this, I think we should maybe make reference to the call that we had. Which I think is not a secret that we had informal call with Susan and the NGPC - to inform each other about the latest state - status of this.

And then maybe offer more communication on this. But I think at the moment this is more a board GNSO council or GNSO thing - rather than a GNSO council versus GAC topic, right.

(Jonathan): If it happens, it comes nicely after the work we talk about the consultation group and the liaison. And I think what we can say is - I'll come to you in a moment Peter.

That we got into this position prior to having our existing mechanisms. And we are working hard to try and find our way through this. And in addition, we got the work on the curative right PDP.

So I think that a brief focused update on what is actually happening. And what seems to me the right way to do it. And you're right, questions might come.

But that seems to me the way we should handle it. Peter had is hand up and then David.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes, just when we talk about these topics, a reminder of what I said this morning.

That if we can get - probably active participants from GAC and - in the working group for this (unintelligible) solutions - and also to reach out if they have better possibilities to reach out to your ideas.

So we can get the inputs on - what they think about this issue.

(Jonathan): I think we have to - if we do that, we have to do it diametrically. Because there is - I mean this is part of the problem we've got. Is that the GAC says, why are you asking us this of us again?

We've told you, we don't work - we don't go into working groups in the same way as you do. It's not the way in which we work. That's the whole purpose of the consultation group.

So if we're not careful, we'll undermine the work of the consultation group. But we need to be careful - go ahead Peter.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Just wonder if - I mean okay, I cannot maybe understand but I hear what you're saying. I have seen it before. That they - does not what to officially participate in working groups.

But is there a way to have a continuous input from them still? I mean it's - so we're not finalize our work and put out the report. And then we got the input from GAC because that's too late.

(Jonathan): So just wishing that - so just too sort of address that the - Peter's point there, which is we are - that is what - a lot of what we're doing on the GAC GNSO working group.

Is to try and work out how to do that. And why the GAC may not participate directly in working groups, it's very clear that they will - can for example, provide comment to an issue report and things like that.

And we are trying very hard to encourage the GAC to do that. So that they give us useful input early and during the process. Rather than sort of reacting to into it at the end.

Or giving us - or running a parallel process. So we are trying to find ways to work around - the GAC may not be able to directly participate in a working group.

But we think that we have found enough ways for them to give useful input to a working group. That we are not working across purposes. But the another thing I just wanted to say - so one of the things that may come up if they ask us about this - will be the London GAC advice.

It had some specific advice concerning policy to do with the RCRC. And some of their policy concerns - now I want to sort of put this delicately. Because I know - and I know that many in the council shared my reaction, which was extremely negative.

I believe I think how that exactly affects the GNSO will not really be known until we have the board GAC meeting on Tuesday - where the board will discuss their reaction to the advice.

And I think if the GNSO asked about our reaction to that GAC advice, our - the diplomatic position is probably to say that it is advice to the board, not the GNSO.

And we will wait and see how the board reacts - that makes sense to everybody.

Man: Okay, I'm a little mindful of time here. And we've got to keep this moving. So there was a second item for the GAC. And that was an update on the cross community working group.

I think was - Marika, is that right? Does that ring a bell to you? Update of the work of the stewardship cross community (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) confidence, yes.

Man: So, I think that's it as far as our agenda is concerned. I would like to draw a line under that part of things. I know this is a bit of a long session, but we've got to cover off a couple of things.

We don't have at this point an agenda or a set of topics to deal with (unintelligible) - got (unintelligible) coming to see us for 45 minutes. It's going to be followed by - following an interaction with the GDD.

That's (Cyrus Ackrum) and (Kristine). And there we will be talking to them about an update and work that's going on - any work that's going on implementation of GNSO policies.

Set an updates on the new GTLD's and so on. And then we go onto a meeting with (Teresa). Who will talk with us I suspect about - we'll ask her to cover off a couple of the keys areas she's involved with.

Which is obviously the stewardship transition; accountability and then we go onto our meeting with (Forty). Has anyone got any inspiration as to what they would like to hear from or what we could reasonably ask (Forty) to cover or discuss - Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade speaking. I guess I'm a little struck by observing the meeting last time. Where (Teresa) came and met with you and then (Forty) came - or (Teresa) came and met with us perhaps.

And then (unintelligible) came and met with us. And I kind of felt like we were just having the same meeting redox with clarifications and corrections. So if those are really two different meetings - that would be - I really have a question about that.

Secondly, it may too late but I think there's a lot going on in global stakeholder. Activities et cetera that would be useful to hear reported on in some way.

And then finally probably it would be good to ask (Forty) for an update on the (Net Moon DeLong) initiative.

Man: So I speak (unintelligible) clear, there are two points. One is global stakeholder initiatives - what do we mean by that? Just so I understand.

Marilyn Cade: Gee look at the budget and you realize that they're big, really big. I assume we mean the regional strategy, the global stakeholder outreach that is going on. Um, ICANN has an I2U plenty pot strategy I understand that Mundial initiative.

(Jonathan): Okay. Any other comments or input on that (Klaus)?

(Klaus): I would like to back up on Marilyn's last point. I really would like to know what the hell has written Fadi when he basically handed over the Net Mundial to the economic forum?

And I don't even know what authorization or whatever is behind that. And I think that's a lot of the big, big irritation. And also it affects all areas of policymaking.

That's why I think as a GNSO I should ask a straightforward question it and say what the hell why?

(Jonathan): That's good. I mean I'm happy that these are areas that we haven't covered off elsewhere so it may be that this is the best thing to cover with Fadi.

My slight worry about it is that one of the concerns I have is how balanced the agenda is of focus on operational issues, GNSO, policy effective operation of ICANN's operational functions versus these global and Internet governance initiatives.

So in a sense by focusing on these ourselves we perhaps reinforce their position on the agenda. So that's my only question about those. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. And thanks for reminding me. Actually I should have open my comments by saying personally I feel that the CEO of ICANN needs to devote the majority of his time and energy to operational excellence and performance of the organization.

External threats are real and need to be dealt with. And I put many of the Internet governance activities into that space.

But I think right now I see the single greatest threat to ICANN a failure of operational excellence and performance and even understanding.

And so I don't mean to present this negatively but the fact that there is significant concern about fraud in - and phishing and some of the new gTLDs there's return of concern about what we used to call kiting of the names.

The operational performance and excellence in performance is our greatest defense. And so I do think making sure that we are conveying a message that particularly because we're in the GNSO where gTLDs are addressed where are - what's the message we're sending out about operational performance and focus, focus on the operation of the organization?

(Jonathan): So I slightly restructured that the point now and it says that the draft email I would have to Fadi says would like to understand, you know, the focus is - essentially says focus on operational excellence and performance of the organization percentage of time, priority is the question.

So there's an opportunity to talk to that for some time about that. And I'm sure - and then there's an update on global stakeholder initiatives and does that include Net Mundial or do we put Net Mundial as a separate point?

And I can say including an update on that or maybe you want it separate. (Klaus) and then (Thomas)?

(Klaus): I don't think we need to get an update. We know what the situation is. I would like to know how we get that.

(Jonathan): An explanation on Net Mundial and hand over to WEF? (Thomas)?

(Thomas): And direct response to what (Klaus) said to me is not obviously what's happening. So I'm missing understanding of ICANN's or Fadi's I should better say global strategy that includes Net Mundial but that also includes Fadi meeting with individual governments.

And I'm not sure whether there is - this is board mandated activity or whether he's doing that on his own. I have no insight in what the agenda of these meetings is, what alliances might be set up without community's involvement.

And I would hate to have a situation similar to the Net Mundial thing where suddenly there is a board resolution authorizing all this where nobody knows when exactly I shouldn't enter into a conspiracy theory.

So I think I would like to hear from Fadi what his global strategy is. And that would include Net Mundial as well as liaising with individual government.

(Jonathan): Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I had the benefit of hearing from WEF at the World Congress on IT a little bit of an update.

I do not pretend to be providing an update but I like the way (Thomas) has identified this. And that is what is the global strategy, how do certain things fit into it?

The Net Mundial initiative as far as I know from what I learned at WEF so, you know, it's secondhand or third hand, now is - does include a reemergence of a relationship with a CGI.br. And it has two I'm going to call it legs to it, one a platform for action and the other a multi-stakeholder dialogue.

Hearing about that very quickly what WEF's role is, what Fadi envisioned his role is, my understanding is - and again this is secondhand -- that he intends to participate actively in the World Economic Forum.

But I'm not sure that I would say that the Net Mundial, Net Mundial has been handed over to the world economic forum.

I think it's a little better to characterize it as what is the strategy and what is ICANN's role? What is ICANN's community role?

I just will remind everybody that we created a Cross Community Working Group on Internet governance. And we ended doing a town hall and issuing a sort of a strong recommendation to body, board, et cetera, before Net Mundial. And that Working Group is meeting again this week.

(Jonathan): So let me tell you how I've gotten the topic structured at the moment. They're essentially in two major bullets. The first is operational excellence and performance of the organization and then there's three sub bullets under there which question the focus, the percentage of time and the priority.

So it's putting that ahead and up front. The second is an update on global stakeholder initiatives. And that breaks down into four sub bullet points at the moment -- global strategy, question mark, ICANN and ICANN community roles, question mark, explanation of/discussion of Net Mundial in brackets were WEF. Future of Net Mundial do we mean?

Man: Well I think what - there's...

Marilyn Cade: Sorry the correct term is now Net Mundial initiative.

Man: Yes. So that's going to - that's pretty much what I was going to say. The Net Mundial and the Net Mundial initiative appear to be two things that not the same but share part of a name.

So I would then - in fact perhaps it's better to - and also the WEF may have moved away from that terminology I've been told. So perhaps just talk about as (Thomas) said global strategy and the role of engagement with the WEF or something like that might be less confusing.

(Jonathan): Okay. Let me just trying capture this before we go to Greg.

So do we want to specifically highlight - I mean I've now deleted the Net Mundial from this and I've got the engagement with WEF?

Man: Yes, no.

(Jonathan): All right so my bullet's - before we go to you Greg I'm just going to highlight my bullets now say global strategy question mark, ICANN and an ICANN community roles, question mark. It's all about under global stakeholder initiatives, engagement with WEF, liaison with individual governments. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan, IPC. Two quick points, first I wouldn't drop entirely the Net Mundial initiative reference since it is a live thing. And having spent a good part of my life as a trademark lawyer I think there's a likelihood of confusion between what Net Mundial was and what the Net Mundail initiative is.

I'm not sure they're the same thing and that is a concern as to kind of where this - where they've let the Net Mundial concept go to.

On an entirely separate point keeping an eye on what's going on in the GAC circus tent behind the hotel - or sorry GAC tent behind the hotel there's a lot of discussion going on about the IGO, Red Cross protection.

I think this is a lot - seems to be a lot more of a concern to that group than to this. And I wouldn't want the GNSO council to be underprepared on that point.

They're talking about putting together a, apparently a delegation to explain to the GNSO how important this is and what their position on it is. And it's going to be taken over to the ITU (plant a pod). And the OECD is putting their hair on fire on this.

So I think there is the approach of, you know, writing a letter back and, you know, kind of putting this off and off for a while until something develops or doesn't I think is perhaps not being well received and, you know, as if there should be preparation for discussion of that with the GAC.

At some point it may not be in this exact context but I think that's a space we're going to have to watch because it seems to be getting misaligned amounts of attention between the two sides. Thanks.

(Jonathan): Thanks Greg. It's kind of disappointing but probably not surprising to hear that because I think we've worked really hard to try and, you know, respect

the channels of communication and manage this as best we can and try not to go off without understanding what the desired outcome might be.

And it seems to be we're on a highway to nothing here. But anyway and perhaps we were always were doomed to be because I know there are elements within the GAC that think we shouldn't be doing this work at all. So in a way that's why it is not surprising.

All right I mean as far as the set up with Fadi is concerned I've got a reasonable perspective that I think we could set off.

Phil Corwin: (Jonathan)?

(Jonathan): Phil go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes thank you, Phil Corwin for the transcript. I'll try to be brief.

I hope not to be repetitive but from just following-up on the discussion we've had from my perspective we've got an organization which has substantial challenges, the new TLD program still rolling out, the IANA transition and accompanying accountability and a significant expansion of both physical offices and staff over - since the new CEO came on.

So to me this is about allocation of resources, and financial resources, of executive resources. And in that context it becomes important for the community to know how is the CEO and his top people allocating their time?

How much time and financial resources we're allocated to this Net Mundial initiative in conjunction with the old economic forum?

Where - and the August event in Geneva was - wasn't a train wreck but it wasn't exactly a huge lift off. And where is it going?

How much more of the CEO's time and staff resources will be devoted to that between now and the Davos meeting in January?

And also what - how does this all relate to the budget where budget projections may have been based on new TLD registrations which may not be meeting the expectations they were built on?

We do know that none of the applicants from the new TLD program are getting any refunds of their application fees. So that money seems to all have been either expended or locked in and dedicated to functions.

So I think that, you know, what - how did we get here and where are we going and what kind of resources be - being directed to things that are not within ICANN's primary remit which I would say that the project with world economic forum while important and it may be a good thing to have the global corporate sector involved in Internet governance issues even if it's not the natural follow-up to the Net Mundial conference in Brazil.

We still need an understanding what is going on and is the primary focus on this organization or is there too much distraction of personnel and financial resources to things not in the direct remit so I hope those thoughts are helpful. Thank you.

(Jonathan): Thanks Phil and I apologize for that. And I'll come back to you now (Brett).

(Brett): Thanks (Jonathan). I was struck when you're going through the draft agenda the disconnect between focus - telling Fadi that we want to focus on operational excellence and then and the work at home and then immediately going to the Internet government stuff.

And so I wonder in our conversation with Fadi if we can structure it so that the bulk of our conversation with him is on the first large bullet point and then we treat the Internet governance stuff with maybe a less than 1/3 of our time?

I have this abiding belief that if ICANN does its job well the Internet governance stuff will take care of itself. So I'd rather have the focus of our conversation and the bulk of our time spent on item number one.

(Jonathan): I must say I'm personally - speaking personally I'm - that's a belief I have as well is that, you know, if we stick to the knitting and do the core job well much of the other problems might be less problematic.

So I've got, you know, having had Phil Corwin put the allocation of resources and I kind of put in brackets senior staff resources and then so I've got an allocation of resources in particular outside of ICANN's primary remit.

So I just wonder how we structure this, how we give Fadi a reasonable notice of what we would like him to talk to us about?

At the moment I'll come to James. And at the moment just to reiterate where we're at I've got a first bullet which is about operational excellence and performance of the organization, how much focus is on that, how much percentage of time, what's the priority of that?

Then - then the now having had Phil Corwin's point and some extent (Brett)'s what allocation of resources is going outside of ICANN's primary remit and then finally an update on the global stakeholder initiatives including global strategy.

So it's in that context. We've already said operational excellence, allocation of resources and then an update so that's how it's currently structured. James?

John Berard: Thanks (Jonathan). So one point that Phil touched on I think perhaps deserves a little bit more examination when we talk to Fadi is the budget that was adopted despite I think some public comments the pointed out that revenue assumptions were based on 33 million new gTLD registrations in

fiscal year 2015. We're currently tracking at about 2.6 billion about a quarter in.

So my concern our question is for Fadi is that, you know, is there some mechanism to review or revisit those midyear and make adjustments if necessary? Because I think we pointed this out, various commenters pointed this out in the comment period and that revenue assumption was not changed in the final budget.

So I feel like we're on a, you know, we're on a train and we're going as fast as we can but the tracks end not too far down the line here.

Now how do we squeeze that into the list that you just put together? I'm not clear?

(Jonathan): Well I think I can maybe manage that James by saying you - budgets financial issues and then it's really what's the allocation of - the trouble is if we're not careful it will feel like a question for a finance director rather than a CEO.

So it's just being a little bit outside of, you know, because I've got now budget stroke financial issues. What's the allocation of resources outside of ICANN's primary remit?

John Berard: I mean perhaps the way to link the two is to ask the question about resource allocation particularly given that some of those resources may not materialize through the course of the fiscal year.

(Jonathan): In a way I've put that - I just need to frame it properly because I put it as maybe it's financial issues or business issues we could call it. Then it's not directly finance. It's business management issues.

So if I (unintelligible) that business it's a discussion of the allocation of resources outside ICANN's primary remit and then 2016 budget assumptions relating to aggressive assumptions of new gTLD update.

All right I'm mindful of time. It's quarter to 4:00 and we still got to talk about motions which I think we can deal with. I mean the motions aren't highly controversial or difficult.

And I think the one thing we haven't touched on really is the new - I'm conscious we haven't discussed what's coming down the pike on the new accountability mechanism stuff.

But I think that is possible. I mean clearly (Teresa)'s going to introduce that tomorrow. And I think we will - we can find time then to decide how we take that up.

But we will need to. I mean essentially what's happened was there was a staff initiative. There was a big push back from the community and now there's a proposal that a Cross Community Working group is formed to deal with ICANN accountability issues.

That's going to be another whole lot of work. It's going to require us taking it up. I don't know if before we go - I'm conscious if we open this up it'll take the rest of the hour.

But I don't know if anyone wants to make any remarks about that or any comments or if we roll it over to once we spoken with (Teresa) tomorrow?

I'm open. I don't know if anybody had any chance to digest that from overnight? (Keith) you probably got the preview like me last night so you may want to say something.

(Keith): Yes thank you Jonathan. Yes so just to recap very briefly or as briefly as possible. I think as we all know going back to the Singapore meeting there was an announcement that there would be the IANA transition process and an ICANN accountability process.

Through numerous public comment periods the community repeatedly called for a Cross Community Working Group. This goes back several months, many months if you will.

And on I guess it was August 14 ICANN posted a proposed process plan that was completely not a Cross Community Working Group in the traditional sense.

And it raised a lot of concerns and a lot of questions among the community, among the SO, ACSGNC leaders about, you know, what's the motivation behind this? Why were we not allowed to move forward on a Cross Community Working Group?

And I think the perception and the serious concern was that ICANN in a sense was trying to stack the deck and create a process that it could control both the inputs and the outputs on its own future accountability mechanisms.

So through numerous engagements from the SO AC SGNC leaders with the board sending letters basically going on record very clearly and saying, "No we are not aligned with this staff proposal." "We are not supportive." "We do not buy into which you proposed." "We have many questions." "We still call for a CCWG."

This engagement and back and forth has been going on for the last several months.

Yesterday we were told by Fadi and (Teresa) in the SO ACSG and CE leaders meeting and then dinner with Fadi and some ICANN senior staff that

they have now heard the community and that they are prepared and have decided to pull back their proposed staff plan and to in fact acknowledge that a CCWG is the community's call and that they're going to honor that and support that with staff resources.

So in a sense they have now announced - it's on the ICANN Web site -- they announced it last night that they have posted a new plan which is in a sense to respond to the communities' calls for a CCWG.

So I think that's very positive. I think we should actually be very pleased with that result. There's still some questions and some I think detail that needs to be addressed.

But what this means is that ICANN has pulled back from its original proposal, has said yes we know recognize that the community has been calling for a CCWG.

We're going to work with you to make that happen. But that means we now need to initiate yet another CCWG with the others in the community.

So we're going to need to I think from the GNSO and the gTLD side take some initiative here and to sort of work with some of the other SOs and ACs to initiate yet another CCWG.

So we're going to need to form a drafting team that can start working on a charter. And I think fortunately there's been a lot of great work already done on the CWG for the IANA transition.

So I hope and think that some of the structural work is already done. But there's going to be some of the detail that we need to focus on. So thanks (Jonathan). And let me know if I can answer any questions.

(Jonathan): Yes that sets the scene. And by all means Avri come in with a question that I'm just conscious we'll have to deal with emotions unintelligible.

Avri Doria: A quick question is how long do you think it'll take us to pull together another Cross Community Working Group and to figure out how many chairs and vice chairs and other sort of creatures and structures we have to have before we actually have something that can start dealing with the issue? Just an estimate?

(Keith): I would actually defer to those who have much more experience in charter drafting that I do.

Avri Doria: Four months?

(Keith): No it really should not take four months. In fact I - if we use the model of the IANA transition CWG I really don't think this ought to take more than a few weeks frankly if we put our minds to it so...

(Jonathan): Marilyn and then Marika.

Marilyn Cade: Very quickly, Marilyn Cade speaking. Very quickly one of the things to remember about the accountability mechanisms is there is work already done in the ATRT.

One report in the ATRT2 report there have been - there actually are already ideas about strengthening or improving.

I think the point that Avri was making was a different which is about how to get the Cross Community Working Group together quickly?

And I think we've learned some lessons from setting up the transition CCWG. And even while we're here we ought to be trying to come together with a straw proposal for the makeup of that group and err on the side of

inclusiveness instead of exclusiveness so instead of arguing among ourselves whether there can be five GAC representatives.

If the GAC wants five representatives then give five representatives -- one per region. Let's move ahead with getting the group together so we can go to work.

(Jonathan): As a reminder as to what we did with the CWG on the stewardship transition, I mean we pulled together a drafting team pretty quickly.

I think we had two per SO and AC if I remember. And that produced the draft charter and then the charter that was adopted by the charting organizations.

And then that went on to solicit members which were between two and five to suit the different organizations and with unlimited participants to join in. So that's the - a very brief sketch of how it was done there. Chuck?

My apologies.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. I was actually going to mention as well the things that you mentioned the way it worked. But I think we basically did the work.

I think in the - we got together I think for the first time in London and basically had the draft that went to all the SOs and ACs ready by the 15th of August.

And I think it was done as well quite consciously where we knew as well we were on a short timeline. And we basically looked at what will be the deadline, you know, to get it on the agenda for, you know, the next round of considerations by the different groups.

And that I think users, you know, was used as a bit of an incentive as well to divide the work up and say okay how much do we need to get done to meet that target date?

And a lot of people put a lot of work and effort in getting that done and meant that indeed we, you know, if we basically got there in a month and a half and then in two weeks more for all the groups to consider it so that was a time we were on for that group.

(Jonathan): A quick response from Avri and then Chuck.

Avri Doria: Just a quick clarifying. When I said four months I wasn't really being disparaging. But the group hasn't actually started working, hasn't really started doing anything yet. We're hoping we start this week.

And so I'm looking at the elapsed time of starting in London. And here we are at the next meeting not having actually gotten started yet and saying yes we did a really good job, we worked really hard at it took four months.

(Jonathan): Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Jonathan), Chuck Gomes. I also think it can be done a lot quicker than four months. But Avri said something that's a fact. We have to get going.

And so (Jonathan) it's going to fall on you again I think. I'm glad you're willing to serve another term as chair. A lot of responsibilities come with that. And I thank you for that.

But I think the chairs of the SOs and ACs need to meet this week and get a drafting team formed.

Now I really believe that the some - a lot of the structural and process issues can be used from the Cross Community Working Group charter that has been approved.

The scope is obviously different and so there's got to be work done on that. But, you know, let's not talk about whether we can do it in four months or three months or let's get going. And that's what's really critical.

Now one other point just like with the IANA transition we need to - and I'm talking to the GNSO now because we don't control what the ccNSO does and I know they're doing things in this regard already and the ACs as well.

But we need to open up our individual processes in our different groups for people that are not part of the processes to participate.

That's going to be a critical factor in both of these efforts IANA transition and accountability that we open up our processes.

I know within the registries we're looking at how to do that for those that aren't observers or members right now but are applicants or are registries already.

And if each of us as constituencies and stakeholder groups will do the same thing it'll go a long ways and including the ALAC, you know -- and I know you guys will do that -- then that will also lend a lot more credibility to this effort and demonstrate not only to the community which is important but also to the ICANN board and ICANN leadership that we really are opening this up to anyone who wants to participate.

But if we don't individually as stakeholder groups constituencies, ACs, SOs take specific steps to allow those kind of people to participate fairly in our processes we're going to lose some credibility in this.

So I really exhort all of us to take that task at hand not next week or the week after but this week.

(Jonathan): Thanks. Jay Scott.

((Crosstalk))

Jay Scott Evans: Jay Scott Evans from Adobe and the Business Constituency.

I think, you know, we just went through a whole session where everyone wanted to talk to Fadi about operational excellence.

Well this is our turn to show that we can step up to the plate and we can have operational excellence right? It's our time to do it to take it and make it work, stop the bickering and get the work done. And that's what we need to do.

We can't sit a man down and say that we expect that from him when we don't even demonstrate it and expect it from ourselves.

And so I would say to all of us here, you know, the issues I think (Jonathan) you made the point well I think that if we get it right the Internet governance issues will take care of themselves.

Well this is our opportunity to get it right and it's our opportunity to demonstrate that to the critics.

(Jonathan): All right it sounds like were clear of that and that's taking us up to just before 4:00. So what I suggest we do it is rather than break for coffee now is deal with the motions and tackle those in the next 15 minutes or so and that'll still leave us with 20 minutes on the - for coffee break.

END