

**Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
GNSO Wrap Up
Thursday 16 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

Jonathan Robinson: Welcome to the final GNSO meeting of the LA - of ICANN 51. Just for those of you who haven't participated in this meeting before or been aware of it, the purpose is simply to try and scoop up and wrap up topics that have come up over the meetings from Saturday through Sunday and the Wednesday meeting. So it's really an opportunity to pick up any loose ends and make sure that we direct our efforts going forward properly.

So if there is - this is a list that has been compiled with the assistance of staff as we've gone through. Normally what I do is I typically read through this in the morning and try to structure it in certain ways. I think it's - I've had a quick skim read of it, I think it's relatively well structured anyway so thanks to staff for pulling it together.

I think I'm just going to work through it in order but if you think there's an item that you need to see covered please bring it up at the right time or at the end if there's an appropriate time as we go through it.

So first item we've got is an update from the Board GNSO informal group on the purpose of gTLD registration data PDP. I don't see anyone around here

other than Marika who was there. I know Avri was there. Was anyone else there? You fancy giving it go, Marika, giving an update on that? Caught you on the - I mean, I could do something I guess and I'll...

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So this was, you know, first informal meeting. And I think, you know, one of the things coming out of it that future meetings, you know, will be recorded and transcribed so others have a chance to follow conversations as well as, you know, for this meeting it wasn't possible as it was set up relatively last minute and there were no AV facilities in the room we had.

So I think what we did at the first meeting was really just to try to get to a common understanding of where we are at at the process. And I'm actually seeing Susan was there as well.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: The common understanding of where we're at in the current process and as well trying to see what may well potential next steps be. I think one of the suggestions that have been made is that we may need to look at the EWG report to determine what the policy issues are that are within that report and see are those - if those are the ones that should actually be moved into a new issues report recognizing that, you know, the previous one may not be up to date anymore or not easily adjustable to I think what we're trying to do now.

Which would also allow us then to provide a draft charter as part of that preliminary issue report for public comment and then basically move forward from there. So I think the next conversation probably will go around, you know, is that something indeed that everyone feels is the appropriate next steps? I believe the other thing staff has committed to try and come up with that list of policy items from the EWG report.

I think there were already some general principles that were shared that probably formed the basis of that. And I think that's where the group is moving towards. And I think we said a next call in two or three weeks if I'm not mistaken. And if I missed anything please feel free to add.

Susan Kawaguchi: This is Susan. So I think the fundamental question that this group is going to have to answer and then take it to the GNSO is do we want to remain with the old system or do we want to move forward to something else, some version of EWG. So I think that will be a sort of crucial question that we ask and discuss in this group so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks both. I think the other thing that I remember, Marika, is that there was going to be some sort of output from that first meeting, there's going to be some kind of minutes or communiqué at least so we can expect to see something.

So I guess from the Council point of view the next step is that when that communiqué comes out we should share it with the Council and just - because this is - this is a pretty fundamental question here that's being grappled with rightly by - under Steve's initiative is to try and understand how this unique setup of a Board-initiated PDP, together with a Board commissioned EWG, how these things are handled in the policy process.

So I think from the Council point of view it's up to us to keep a close eye on the mechanics of it and be satisfied that the representatives working on it, and/or the Council is okay with where it's going and if not that we feed that back from a sort of policy process point of view. Any other comments or questions on that? Lars .

Lars Hoffman: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Fine. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, Lars. This is Amr. I just wanted to put in a little comment on what Susan just said and why I'm hoping this group will do is not determine whether we want to do something about Whois, something that is slightly consistent with what the EWG report has recommended but what this group should do is try to work on the process on how a PDP working group will decide whether we want to do something about Whois or not.

That's the one comment I wanted to make. And I also wanted to ask if it would be possible if these meetings between the GNSO and the Board, the informal group, that those meetings could possibly be live streamed as well similar to the GNSO Council calls as opposed to just recording and transcribing them. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well we can certainly -on the latter point we can certainly take that to the group. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. I have a question about a lot of these documents related to the Whois. And I raised in that all things Whois. We don't really need a map as much as we need a documented change record of where the decisions are actually coming from. So I for one don't understand the 16-agreed purposes that the EWG came up with.

If I were looking at all of this as a policy document I'd have a footnote as to when we agreed that these were acceptable purposes with a cross link to the new cross community working group that's coming up with acceptable purposes. Do you see what I mean? And I'm looking at Marika and I'm sure she's thinking oh dear, that sounds like a mountain of work.

But honestly, I don't see how one can decipher what's being decided unless we actually know the decision tree, the legislative record, if you will, of when all these changes came through and who agreed to what.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Marika, you want to say something?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm not exactly sure I think the point you're making but, you know, this group between the Board and the GNSO is no decision making body whatsoever, it's purely looking at what should the next steps be moving in to the policy development process where then those decisions are going to be made. So I may be misunderstanding what you're specifically asking for.

And if I can just make one point as well on live streaming, I think we're currently foreseeing, you know, the standard or we're doing for any working group is having a recording and transcriptions. I think live streaming as a whole, I mentioned to it, and again this is a real procedural discussion, this is no decisions, no substance.

It's really trying to outline what the path is and any of that will come back to the Council obviously for, you know, feedback and input purely to move the discussion forward. And I have that dialogue with the Board as they were the ones who initially requested - the PDP.

Jonathan Robinson: And, Stephanie, if I may just to com back on that before I sense you may wan to make a response. But just to talk with you because I think your name might have come up as a prospective member. And you are indeed now a member of that group.

But the whole - so the way the Council approaches this - and you may have been listening in on that particular Council meeting anyway. But the Council took a view that primarily this was less about subject matter expertise per se and more about kind of process and knowledge expertise so that we kind of sought to integrate the work of the EWG consistent with GNSO processes.

Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, I understand that. And process is not my forte and certainly not ICANN process I can assure you. No, my intervention here is really about how do you throw pieces of the EWG report, just as an example, to a working group and have them refine things and have them clearly understand that this bit comes from the 2013 RAA agreed specs in the contract, and no, you can't change it.

This bit here is an idea coming from the EWG. This bit was agreed in a - because the document itself is not footnoted with that kind of detail. And it's quite hard to follow.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Marika, you're going to come back on that?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to respond I think some of that will be in the issue report because basically there we'll try to bring all those pieces together that help inform the conversations. But part of it will come as well in the PDP working group itself where, you know, people will need to say well this bit, you know, is - I want to bring it into the conversation coming from here.

So I think it's part of the process because, you know, the PDP itself - there will need to be documentation of where things are derived from, how it was considered, you know, why it was maybe discarded. So I think there should be that trail normally.

Stephanie Perrin: Back to the open meeting. I think we did agree that it would be - anyone could observe through Adobe to the next phone call and there would be an email archive.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. The challenge with that is how you set it up because if people are in Adobe on audio they can also talk so how do you then - for the Council we do separate streaming which needs, you know, IT support and - so, I mean, we can take that offline, I mean, there are different ways but, yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's consider that the Council to been updated about where that's going now unless there's any other points anyone would like to make. But that feels like we've got a pretty clear idea of what's going on there.

Next point says - seeks to do two things really; remind you, one, that there will be a survey that comes out of the work we did on the weekend to check how it worked for you and understand how it went, what could or couldn't be done differently.

But I guess there's an opportunity quickly to comment now in, you know, either to affirm elements of the structure or - I'm not even sure it needs to be confined to the weekend sessions, Marika. I mean, for example we could deal with the Tuesday or anything else, ccNSO.

So a quick update if anyone's go t- if anyone's particularly strongly supportive or not supportive of any element of the scheduling at this meeting or, you know, the way in which it's been managed. (Unintelligible).

Carlos Gutierrez: It was wonderful. Great. Great introduction. Just in terms of the process, and I love the flexibility you had over the weekend to adapt the agenda. When we have the list of PDPs and cross community working groups that is growing we're jumping from one to the other and so - and you mentioned yesterday about these way to report on all the processes and going in.

This is just a very small suggestion, if we get - have a list of numbers of the ongoing PDPs and then a list of numbers of the cross community working groups maybe divided into colors and we keep track of all the meetings we have with this number like when we have a PowerPoint it would be very helpful. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I think, Carlos, there is that - I mean, I think that's the schedule we publish on a spreadsheet immediately prior to the meeting. You may not

have got that being an incoming councilor but I think that's - I think if I understand what you're referring to - maybe, Glen, or you could send to Carlos what we had for this meeting. Is that what you're referring to, Carlos?

Carlos Gutierrez: No, it's wonderful it's just we have different sequences of talking about the same issues, one PDP was discussed on Saturday early and the other one on Wednesday late. And these are the same but the titles are so long. I would miss to have just a number this PDP is number one...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I see what you're saying just...

Carlos Gutierrez: So we keep track of...

Jonathan Robinson: PDP 1, PDP 2, PDP 3...

((Crosstalk))

Carlos Gutierrez: Exactly. Just a simple numbering...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Carlos Gutierrez: And maybe a difference between PDPs and cross community working groups would make it easier to track down the list. Right now we have 12...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Carlos Gutierrez: .discussion lines and it's getting a little bit crowded I would say. People like Avri they dominate that of course and they have no problem. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: So certainly I feel like we've settled on a decent schedule for Sunday morning with that meeting with the GDD, with Theresa, with Fadi and the Board. And I felt our Sunday - and I must say to you guys, I don't know if

anyone said it to you but certainly a number of people came up to me after the Board meeting and said that was great, we had a substantive discussion with a civilized tone and we really feel like we - that was one of the best meetings we've had with the Board.

So I feel like we're getting into a rhythm. That doesn't mean we should be complacent but does feel like we're getting into a mechanism of dealing with the issues we need to with - Sunday felt good. Saturday was also okay I think. It wasn't - my only thing is just reminding you of the purpose of Tuesday, that Tuesday session which is really if there are any contentious or other issues.

As we said in the meeting yesterday there's an opportunity to come together Tuesday after Constituency and Stakeholder Group Day to deal with those issues. David.

David Cake: Yeah, yeah, I just want - from having been involved - been in the meeting planning this year we really, really do want to hear from councilors about how you feel that - particularly that Sunday morning session. We do invite senior staff, we really do, you know, what do you think the balance of which senior staff we invite and who else we might want to talk to.

But if you don't tell us anything we'll probably just do the same. So if you are satisfied and would like to see anyone else or please just let us know and we really are very open to who we have in that session.

Yeah, and I just wanted to reiterate what Jonathan said about that, the reason we have that Tuesday night is not just to give us another opportunity to grab some free drinks, it really is so that we can have any last minute sort of things crop up.

So if you are going to - I don't want to single out Brian but if you are going to give us an amendment please we'd love to - even that few hours extra would

- even if it's just an informal heads up rather than a, you know, properly worded amendment would be great.

Jonathan Robinson: Brian, was that a hand?

Brian Winterfeldt: Yes it was. Yes. Brian Winterfeldt for the transcript. I just want to point out that there were very similar last minute negotiations on a motion in London but there was no similar grilling or pointing out and finger-pointing but that's okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Really my purpose is to make it clear to incoming councilors what, you know, because I think there's a whole structure and function and there's often a presumed knowledge about what the purpose of each of these things is. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes just from my recollection, I might be wrong, but I think in London there was an announcement that there would be something forthcoming although the nature of the amendment wasn't clear yet.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well let's not get into too much of a rat hole on that. I mean, what else - any other issues about scheduling and organization or content of the meetings? Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Regarding the Sunday morning, maybe I'm the only one but - and if so please let me know, but I think that the presentations that we get are the presentations that the speakers make in lots of places during the week. And so I'm not sure whether we could maybe make more out of the face time with these senior people that we invite to come to us rather than hearing something that we - we hear like four or five times during the week if we want to.

So maybe there is a possibility for us to get some heads up on what they're up to in advance so that we maybe can prepare better and have a more in depth discussion without getting the presentation part of it. You get my point?

Jonathan Robinson: Well I think I get your point but I'm not sure I agree with you in this instance though only in the sense that I don't recall - we didn't have any slides from the GDD people, we had a handful of slides from Theresa, Fadi didn't produce any slides. So...

Thomas Rickert: I'm not only referring to this last weekend but, you know, the - if we talk about Monday morning - Sunday mornings I guess that's more general notion of what's happened in the past. I think this one was particularly good.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: ...but we had a lot of meetings over the last couple of years where I thought that I'd, you know, I'm moving to this time machine where I'm presented the same things over and over again during the week.

Jonathan Robinson: So my challenge to you is that those were previous problems that were perhaps addressed by this time - we met this time. So I think that perhaps the point is to affirm the value of the way we did it this time. Is that right? I mean, was it done relatively well this time?

Thomas Rickert: And for planning of future meetings to make sure that we don't move back to the old type of format. And I think that goes to the vice chairs who are responsible for organizing the meetings during the preparation at this point might be made.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or issues about the scheduling or organizations of the meetings? All right well we'll thank Bret for organizing Saturday's dinner, it was a great evening. Thank you very much.

Avri Doria: I think it was the best food we ever had at one of those dinners.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, well next time we're having rainbow trout and glazed carrots I'll have you know. It's a good point actually. I just thought I'd take - while we're talking and structure and organization of meetings as part of the - of tomorrow's session as you've now seen there's a session that really runs kind of 9:00 to 5:00, 9:00 to 6:00 where we work through systematically orientation of the Council and the GNSO, how things are going currently, how they might be done better, making sure that everyone's - and then it goes on to an informal or semi social function in the evening.

And there were a number of things considered and we settled on this kind of cooking school thing. But it turns out that there's actually a relatively small turnout, there's only about 10 people who are interested in going to that. So the question really is should we cancel it? Is it - does it make sense still to carry on with that? I mean, there'll be a cost associated with it, sure we won't bear the cost, I think ICANN is bearing the cost for us.

But nevertheless the question is with the low number is it still of value to do that? How do people feel whether you're attending or not? Because I wouldn't mind guidance, I mean, because in the end, I mean, we don't have to solve next year's one completely now. But at the very least we should decide shortly whether - yeah, go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I actually think that for that sort of thing it's actually good to check with people first and if there was a set of possible activities. Now if it's an integrated part of some sort of training, bond-making, whatever there is the possibility. But if it is something that's optional and I truly appreciate that this one was optional, I can't stand the notion of being guilty of making glazed carrots, I think then you might want to check beforehand to see whether it's a reasonable thing to do and whether the people are indeed interested in it.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so I mean, that's more the feedback about the general principle of how to organize something like that. I mean, which is not bad although we

should - we must pick up on that at some point. But really in some ways I'm after the question is do people think we should still carry on with tomorrow?
Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: The leadership group had this same experience the week before so it is a bonding experience and it's part of the training. But having subscribed to the meeting I have a very early flight on Saturday so I won't mind going earlier to bed just to give you my vote because I'm one of the 10 people who are ready to participate. It was a wonderful experience but I really have to wake up very early.

Jonathan Robinson: Quick show of hands, who's currently - of the people here who's currently going? So we've got most of the 10 who are going. And how do you feel about - I mean, any of you - do you feel - I just want to get a sort of strawman of how would you feel if we canceled it?

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: I haven't hung up my heart on it so it would be nice but if there is only 10 people attending I think the purpose of the entire exercise is a bit defeated.

Jonathan Robinson: So I think - Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We're just looking into as well and whether we're going to incur any costs or whether, you know, we can even cancel. So maybe we can confirm - because, I mean, if we're going to pay anyway then those that want to come, you know, can still come noting that it's optional. But if we indeed can cancel without any costs we'll go ahead and...

Jonathan Robinson: Fine, I think we've got the steer, that's - sorry, Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jonathan. I just wanted to say - I've said this offline but I apologize, I'm not able to be there and it's only because I was only elected to

Council on Monday and I have a flight that's been booked for some time so forgive me. But I would like to second Carlos's comments having experienced last week, in any event, I just wanted to make that clear that this isn't - not blowing anything off on my first day at Council.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. And I think for more general conversation we do need then to have that conversation because we basically followed the format the we did in Buenos Aires with everyone, I think really seemed to enjoy and appreciate. So we followed on on that concept and that's why we organized it and have made arrangements.

So, you know, ideally of course we should have had this conversation maybe earlier but it's for if we want to go ahead with the meeting in the same concept for the next fiscal year we should probably get clarity on that, is that something we should foresee and plan for or whether indeed it's too much. Because, I mean, I understand that everyone has been here for a very long time already.

Jonathan Robinson: So those would be my three takeaways. If we committed to it we'll let you know and whoever is - has committed should go. If we can cancel it I'm getting a steer that actually people haven't hung their heart on it, as Volker said, so we're all right to cancel it. And next time around we'll think a little bit more about how we handle it in terms of getting commitment.

All I'd say to you is just - and this is not to be defensive but just to let you know these kind of things are - they're always a challenge to organize. I mean, we struggled with venue, options, there's a whole lot of, you know, peddling under the water that one doesn't necessarily realize that's gone on. And in the end you sort of get together with some kind of compromise that feels right.

And ideally it would be shared with and commented on but it's not always possible for a whole number of reasons. So it was a good faith effort to find something that worked. But - and just to put my personal perspective on it, I'm not going even though I was going, I've been called back to duty and so I have to leave a day early. So I was - I had planned to go.

I've had to pay more to change my flight and it's rather sad for me because I'm an enthusiastic chef so. All right so all of that had no influence on the choice of the activity I might say, it wasn't - at one point it was going to be a murder mystery party or something. All right - I know, in true life they die.

All right. The supply skill sets for two GNSO Council positions to Nominating Committee. I don't think we need to go into this here now. It's - this should really be on the action list, not on the - but we can pull something off. Unless - I'm not sure this is an open topic.

Anyone want to - I mean, I've been asked by the existing chair, the current - the incoming chair of the Nominating Committee just to give an indication of a skill set or, you know, desirable skills of NomComm appointees. So if anyone has any suggestions I think we can just pull together a thread on list and I'll then do some kind of edit and write it back to them. So, Marika, that's on the action list. Yeah, okay.

Schedule of meetings for next year. What's to discuss here? I mean, typically we have to publish them - I think we've got a deadline to publish them within a month of the annual general meeting or - so I guess what we will do - the way we would normally do this is plan out a series of meetings.

They'll be at approximately three or four week intervals, probably four week intervals with a break over August and we'll give you an opportunity to feedback. And if everyone says they can't make it - inevitably one or two won't be able to make one or two meetings. But if there's a strong problem with one particular meeting we'll shift it and modify it.

Yes, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And maybe just to flag that there may be a need for January to schedule a couple of additional meetings just to have them on the calendar to anticipate possible proposal for the IANA transition. So we may just slot that in so we have it and then - yeah, exactly.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point. There may - because of the particular and unique nature of the overlying week there's probably need for a couple of placeholders so that can be sorted out in January. Yes, Osvaldo.

Osvaldo Novoa: Just to make a note that January for the southern hemisphere is very similar to August for the northern hemisphere, it's our holiday season and month and usually we - we are - or most offices are closed in January.

Jonathan Robinson: It's a very valid point and if - I'll take it. I'm just not quite sure how to respond to it. I'm totally sympathetic and appreciative especially since I'll be in the southern hemisphere in early January.

All right so we have to appoint new liaisons for the following working groups. Again, I would suggest we just bang out a set of emails with each of these and look for volunteers on a per working group basis. If there's any in there that particularly strike you or that you're already working on perhaps - and you may be willing to act as liaison to the Council - Marika, would you mind saying - or anyone else if they feel so willing to describe the function of a liaison just to make it clear what people are volunteering for?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think the liaison serves a two-way purpose. On the one hand the liaison is supposed to be the intermediary between the working group and the Council should the working group have any questions concerning the scope or if they have any - identified any issues that they, you

know, don't exactly know how to deal with and that need Council consideration.

And I think on the other hand as well the liaison serves a purpose to keep the Council informed as needed if they see any particular issues and, you know, if there's specific questions from the Council to be able to provide that input, for example, during Council meetings.

You know, from the practice so far I don't think there has been - there have been many occasions where liaisons had to actively, you know, get involved one way the other so it's a relatively passive role and hopefully shouldn't take too much time.

I think the expectation is that a liaison does stay up to date with what the working group is looking at and its activities but does not necessarily have to be on every single call and put in a lot of time in doing the actual work of the working group.

But it's really to have someone that is able to be that intermediary whether it's from the working group to the Council or from the Council to the working group.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So I think - I can't see if Glen's there beyond Lars. She's gone.

Okay so I think we'll ask Glen to put a series of emails out calling for - Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes I think for the liaisons that's fine but maybe we can talk about the chairs that were looking for, as well as I think the GNSO Council liaison to the ccNSO who maybe have more active and formal roles. That's I think the last three and as well four just maybe to mention the geographic regions working group that is actually I think a process that's trying to conclude for quite some time and I almost dare to say that's probably the longest running working group ever.

And there I think Ching was serving as the Council rep. The challenge there is that, you know, they basically have I think concluded their work and just trying to submit the final report. So it doesn't necessarily need someone to, you know, reopen it but it probably does need someone. And I see Cheryl's hand is up.

Jonathan Robinson: Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've been asked to serve as the chair of that now to put it to bed so perhaps I could wear a couple of hats and just deal with it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Any objections? Thank you Cheryl, that's great. That takes one off the list. Council - we've got a GNSO Council co chair for the CWG Principles. That's quite an interesting area and it's obviously very topical. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. For that specific one although in the project list we do identify this as GNSO Council co chair I've spoken to John Berard and he's, you know, willing, if the Council agrees, to continue in that role as that group is already as well like halfway through their process. So, you know, unless there are I think significant objections or someone else wanting to take on that role maybe you can consider keeping John Berard in that capacity.

Jonathan Robinson: Any questions, reservations? Okay so that sounds like that's a done deal there. CWG to develop a framework for use of country and territory names as TLDs. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jonathan. The cross constituency working group met this morning. I'm pleased to report that it was a fruitful discussion. I think one very unique aspect of the discussion is the involvement of a member or indeed the author of the GAC proposal on geographic names.

One thing that, let's say, there's two things to say. Number one, I'm not sure what Council's processes are here. I was a GNSO representative on the - on the working group. Ching's departure meant we lost a second GNSO co chair. And we had discussions to the extent that it would be helpful if this was a Council member so that reporting could happen more easily. At the time I of course did not anticipate that we would naturally have a Council member who was a GNSO representative or co chair.

I would strongly encourage that we have a second co chair from the GNSO. It's - we're quite a geographically disparate group and I think it would facilitate the work to have two - and of course the GNSO is a big group. I think it would be very useful to have another co chair from the GNSO. And I fully support that.

Am I able at this point, Jonathan, as well to ask a few questions in relation to the working group?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I'd just like to - I'd like to clarify something. You are a co chair of that working group and you are proposing that we have an additional GNSO co chair.

Heather Forrest: We had - yes, Jonathan. We had each the ccNSO and the GNSO two co chairs. Ching and I were co chairs. And with Ching's departure and indeed there's been shifting within the ccNSO as well, in fact we're calling for new co chairs from both ccNSO and GNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Cheryl, I know you've got your hand up. And perhaps I - let me just - I mean, for me it seems - I mean, my intuition is that four co chairs is clumsy. The only reason we had two co chairs was because both you and Ching volunteered and were both similarly enthusiastic.

I just pose the question why we don't just drop it down to a co chair, one each from ccNSO and GNSO. But that's - Cheryl, did you have something different?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Only just to declare that I serve on that working group. If there's any particular use of just noting that that means you've got another person in the game then please feel free to do that.

Jonathan Robinson: So unless it's - my proposal I think to you, Heather, and to others, unless it's a kind of arms race where we have to have two co chairs from each side, how about we have one from each?

Heather Forrest: I'll speak to that point, Jonathan, and do so indirectly. And in so doing get to another point that I'd like to raise. The study group was a ccNSO initiative, the study group that preceded this group. We're still, if you like, under the ccNSO banner. The meetings have consistently, from the study group onward, and of course in the study group there was a reason for it, have been much more heavily attended by ccNSO than GNSO.

I personally, speaking in a personal capacity here, have significant concerns given the importance of this issue to the community. We need more GNSO participation and I do believe that given the background of this working group it would be more useful to have a second co chair from the GNSO. I think there are strategic reasons for this to ensure that our voice is heard and to help me in my so-far useless attempts to get more GNSO participation.

Jonathan Robinson: Well the point is - couldn't be more clearly made. Then let's put out a call for a second co chair if we don't have a volunteer here. All right we'll do that to support you on that, Heather, and well made. Any other comments or questions? Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead.

Heather Forrest: May I make two more points very quickly, Jonathan? One thing is to point out for those who weren't in this morning's meeting I think it needs to be said, and clearly so, there are two separate tracks on this issue, the GAC is working on this issue and part of what came out of this morning was a clear identification of the fact that these two tracks overlap.

I have concerns about the lack of acknowledgment more broadly of the GNSO's role in the policy development process here. This really will fall on our feet and I think that message needs to be communicated more clearly.

And I think the GNSO Council also needs to be aware that there is a GAC member - Argentina, the GAC member from Argentina is participating in this group and that has an impact on the group's outcome and this sort of thing. So, hence, again, I would like to emphasize that GNSO members should be participating in this group. Thanks, Jonathan.

Volker Greimann: Okay, we're forming up a queue now. First I had James. Who is the lady in the...

James Bladel: Thank you. And first off apologies, the ICG interaction ran very late so I apologize for coming in so late. And I wasn't clear if we had already selected someone for the Privacy Proxy - or what's known as PPSAI group to replace Maria. I'd be happy to do that for convenience purposes. I'm very active in the group, excuse me, I've - don't really typically miss a call.

However, again, I would point out I'm very active in the group so that's - if that's a problem, you know, just let me know. But if no one's rushing to, you know, fill that role and keep the Council updated on the work of that group I'd be happy to fill in. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks James. We hadn't selected someone so your name can go in the ring. I think Heather is making a really important point. And is there someone else in the queue?

Volker Greimann: Yes, there was a - I'm sorry, I don't have your name yet.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, Volker. So, Heather, I think my question is, is it the understanding that that working group is going to feed into next round, is that kind of where the discussion going or...

Jonathan Robinson: Let me help you for a moment and see if I get - I mean, Donna, this is - I sort of - this has dawned on me a little bit and what seems to be happening is that the GAC is doing a bunch of work on this same subject. As Heather pointed out there's a prospective overlap between the work that we're doing.

Now the GAC is an advisory committee in the ICANN group and here they are appearing to do a bunch of self-initiated policy work. They haven't passed it over to one of the supporting organizations to initiate, they appear to be doing something on their own.

So this is an interesting issue. What they might expect to be done with this and how it - so that I think is the sort of political problem if you like. Lars, did you have a point? We've got someone on remote.

Lars Hoffman: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Amr, go ahead and then, Heather may want to come in after that and anyone else. Avri, sorry.

Amr Elsadr: Hi, this is Amr. And sorry I don't mean to interrupt her line of discussion. So as James just mentioned he'd be willing to step in for the PPSAI and I was going to recommend either he or Volker take on the job. I'd also like to

volunteer for the translation and transliteration PDP if no one else wants the job, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. So we've got Heather, Avri and then Thomas is it?

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Jonathan. Merely to agree with you. I think this is a sleeping issue. There was zero acknowledgement this morning until I spoke up and specifically made the point, A, the timeline of this group of the cross community working group needs to align with our own work in the GNSO in terms of new gTLDs policy development processes; and, B, that under the bylaws the responsibility lies with the GNSO.

This worries me and having GAC participants involved in a cross community working group and having a completely parallel track within the GAC with a proposal authored by one GAC member or a handful of GAC members, I think there's communication needed on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. I guess I'm being a little slow to understand the problem. One of the things is we are encouraging GAC to participate in as many of our working groups and cross community working groups as is possible. So while there could be issues with the way in which a particular person at various times in various working groups may participate I'm not sure I understand the problem there.

And then on the second side I guess I need to understand more. The GAC can only give advice. Now if they have working groups within the GAC, call them what they will, within the GAC to figure out what their advice is or perhaps even standing behind the person that's participating - in fact one of the things I've always thought about the GAC that said we can't participate because we are not representatives that one person could actually participate and have a group behind them.

So, I mean, I don't understand how it's working. But I don't see it as a problem in itself from the descriptions I've seen unless there's something in the dynamics, in the politics that's making it one. But in looking at it flatly and sort of from very much outside I don't understand.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me have a stab - anyone is welcome to try it. But, I mean, as Heather said, the bylaws ask us to make the policy in relation to generic domains. I think if the GAC was doing something which was recognized that, implicitly or explicitly and that it was clear that their work was designed to inform their advice should there be policy work in this area that would be okay.

Unfortunately it's not clear that yet that that's the case. It's not clear how their work integrates with the policy work. And if it's - and so in a sense it's perhaps the first step is to ask that question and so the - because it appears at the face of it that there's GAC work on policy going on.

Avri Doria: Why...

Jonathan Robinson: Thomas would you...

Avri Doria: Why do we assume it's that? I mean, is there some indicators that makes us think that it's not just to inform their advice? I'm just curious.

Jonathan Robinson: So we've got Thomas, Volker, Donna.

Thomas Rickert: I just wanted to offer myself as a volunteer for the ccNSO Council liaison thing. I think we're not really following the order anyway so I think everybody picks something from the menu, isn't it?

Jonathan Robinson: Look, it's great that we're actually picking off those items on the menu because it looks like that menu is getting nice and thin now so - but we do have a thread running which I suspect Volker and Donna are.

Volker Greimann: Moving back to the topic, I think this is one of the areas where while the policy making responsibility lies with the GNSO the information from the GAC or individual GAC members can be very valuable because I don't think there's any policy issue out there currently being discussed that is so intimately tied to national interests as country names and territory names as part of TLDs.

And having the GAC or individual GAC members work in this working group from the start, participate, share their opinions, voice their objections which may later lead to GAC advice that might conflict with this, is very valuable. The earlier we have their voice heard, their participation, the better.

And it might be disruptive to the work but it will help in the end...

Jonathan Robinson: Now let me make a point just in case it's not clear. We have a country and territory names working group that's doing its work. I have no idea what the level of GAC participation or not in that. Independently of that work the GAC is doing their own work on country and territory names with their own working group. And I think the concern is the lack of coordination or understanding of the inter relationship between the two.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a clarifying...

Jonathan Robinson: Please.

Avri Doria: But I thought you - I thought you said that there was at least one member of the GAC participating in the cross community - sort of.

Jonathan Robinson: The participation in the cross community working group clearly, from a cross community working group is great and to be welcomed as Volker said. The concern is that in addition to that there's an entirely parallel piece of apparently policy oriented work going on outside of that cross community working group and without coordination or discussion how they link.

Volker Greimann: Donna, you're next in the queue.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Volker. So just as a point that the GAC only provides GAC advice, it's not actually - theoretically correct. The GAC over the years have also developed guiding principles on a number of issues, Whois, new gTLDs, delegation, redelegation.

Now maybe they're going down that path, maybe this is what this document will end up be, a set of guiding principles. And my understanding when they do this for the new gTLDs, that was actually taken into account during the policy development process.

Now I understand at the end of that when it came to, you know, the GAC still wasn't happy with a number of issues, that's where the GAC scorecard and all that stuff came into account. But I don't know that we need to be kind of hysterical about this at this point in time.

If it is a principles document then that's - I think that's fine for them to develop that within their own - within the GAC. I guess, you know, if it does go up as GAC advice then that could create some problems. But I think we just - maybe the hysteria level at this point in time is a little bit unwarranted.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Donna. Anybody else who would like to chime in on this topic or any others of - that we have?

Jonathan Robinson: Mason.

Volker Greimann: Carlos and then...

Carlos Gutierrez: I just had a question if it's on Mason Cole's radar this issue.

Mason Cole: That's just - I was just about to have the radar go off on this issue so, yeah. Yeah, I think it'd probably be useful for me to speak with the GAC about where they are on this issue and see if we can get better coordinated. Does the Council agree?

Jonathan Robinson: Mason, I'm going to be like a stuck record on this, I would say this is - I mean, I don't know yet whether that's the right thing to do. I would be - we've got - I was going to suggest that this is something we bring up with the chairs at the first meeting with the chairs. And I think you should be at those meeting with the chairs. So to that extent yes.

But, again, it's - if you remember, you know, this remit of the liaison is what's going on in the GNSO, we're here to tell you. And I accept that that may involve sometimes relaying things back but I think we've got to be very careful we don't channel it all through you.

Mason Cole: I agree with that. I'm not suggesting that I broker a deal between the GNSO and the GAC.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so it's certainly something we should use - either Mason or whichever - sorry, Tony.

Tony Holmes: I was just going to say that I agree with Donna, I think we should keep a - keep this fairly low; I don't see it as a big issue for us at the moment so let's keep reasonable about it.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. So we've done with the queue. And make no mistake, there was no hysteria involved or intended but I do think it's something that should just be aware that there's something. And Donna makes a good point, the reference to the principles in the past, it's a - so knowing and understanding that that's been done, that's a good point. Gabby.

Gabriella Szlak: Just that I was in that meeting this morning and actually as Donna says, it was mentioned that the purpose was to actually create some kind of principles so it's in that line I think.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So I think we've perhaps gone as far as we can on sub bullets on chairs and the issue that that throws up. I'm going to skip down one to another chair point which is the interim chair on the accountability drafting team.

We've made a call for participants in that drafting team. We've had a number of volunteers come forward. The GNSO has actually ended up with three or four prospective volunteers. The other groups we did ask for only two per group. Yeah, well my suggestion is that we let everyone go along and if the other groups object we turn them into alternates or let people drop out.

If the other groups don't object then - and we can just offer that option so we've got more volunteers but if anyone's got any concerns about that. That's my temptation. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I just want to say since I was in the previous one if anyone has to drop out or become an alternate I'm more than willing to do so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So and then the next thing we've got is we have a need for someone to step up as for one of those volunteers to step up as a chair or co chair of that group. So, Thomas, I don't know if this is something you would consider. I mean, we can maybe have a word offline with Keith if he feels strongly it's something he wants to do.

But I guess this is a test for the Council if anyone's got any views about any strong feelings in either way but, you know, how we feel about - or if you're willing to do so, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I suggest I reach out to Keith and if he wants to do the chairing thing that's okay otherwise I would volunteer to do that part if that's okay for everybody.

Jonathan Robinson: Any concerns or objections with that? I mean, I think we need to get something going with this. Avri, you're...

Avri Doria: I was just saying I've already semi-dropped out so why would I care?

Jonathan Robinson: All right well here's my suggestion - Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Indeed just to note that that group is expected to already meet next week so and it would be good, you know, if Thomas and Keith speak together to get a confirmation on who's willing to take that on. So staff can work with that person as well to get things moving.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Thomas, you get that, right? It's urgent. Have a quick sidebar with Keith, decide. I'll put a note out to the Council seek any, you know, come back to the Council and say, look, I'm available to talk with Keith, he's okay or vice versa. We'll seek objections and I think we're going to have to do it on that basis. Thank you.

Skipping back up then to groups - groups to open up processes for IANA transition. What this is about is that the various groups that have put forward participants to deal with the IANA transition members and/or participants the idea here is to try and make sure this whole process is as open as possible so it can't be criticized in future for not having been served.

I know from my position in the Registries that there has been some work done to try and ensure that others outside the Registries - that the Registries processes are opened to accommodate other participants. Is anyone else aware of any other outreach or opening up of the groups to permit additional participation?

It would be really good to get an idea if maybe we need to give you a specific example of what the registries have done. I don't know if Donna or Bret, either of you would be able to write something, put a quick memo to the Council about what the registries have done so that others can then pick up - would you be willing to do that, Donna?

And I think it's pretty much formulated on - that would be great, thank you. So we'll give an example of what the Registries have done and if anyone else can say, okay, now I get it, this is - we can suggest this in our group or it's a matter of demonstrating that - and being able to show that the processes have been opened up adequately and thoroughly.

Facilitated PDP working group in Marrakesh. Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just on the previous point I actually note that Keith is in the chat and he nominates Thomas so just wanted to put that on the record.

On the item of the confirmed group for facilitated PDP face to face working group meeting in Marrakesh I just need to note we already flagged this I think in the session on Saturday that, you know, staff suggests that we move forward with the Curative Rights PDP Working Group as they seem to be a good candidate and, you know, will have done some work and probably be at a good moment in their process to benefit from that session.

We flagged that in the meeting that they had this week just to see if that would be something they would be open to and it seemed that they would be very interested in pursuing that. So we just want to make sure that there are no objections to that so we can go ahead with planning as we do need to give people a early heads up that, you know, they may be expected to stay - accommodate early or stay a day longer depending on when it would be organized.

So basically kind of a last call does anyone have any concerns if we move forward with that working group to organize a session for.

Volker Greimann: Yes I think it's a - I stated that before, this is very helpful procedure, helpful new plan. And the only thing that we should take into account that these - the definition of which working group we take should made at an earliest point possible probably ideally before ICANN requests the travel plans for all participants of the ICANN meeting, i.e. as soon as possible; next week maybe, something like that.

Because otherwise travel plans are set already and many participants cannot come because they have booked for later dates.

Jonathan Robinson: You'll be very pleased to see the following bullet then, Volker. Timely confirmation of travel to Marrakesh. Marika, just flipping mentally back to that previous point, do you know if we've captured on the action list the requirement to send the message of, you know, thanks and well wishes to Heather and to welcome the new GAC chair and vice chairs? Is that on the action list already?

Marika Konings: On my list that I still need to put into the - on the wiki.

Jonathan Robinson: As long as it's in the pipeline.

Marika Konings: It is in the pipeline.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Reminder of logistics for GNSO Council development session tomorrow. Comment or question?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So on the previous point on the confirmation of travelers Glen would like to flag that.

Jonathan Robinson: What's the point?

Glen de Saint Géry: Travelers to the next ICANN meeting in Marrakesh, if you could please - I sent out a message this morning to the heads and secretariats of the various constituencies and stakeholder groups that we need the names of the supported travelers by the 10th of November.

The rule is 90 days before the beginning of the meeting and from the travel team I have got the 10th of November as being the date when you have to let me know who from your groups is going to be supported.

With the Marrakesh meeting take into account please, like a lot of other countries, that particularly perhaps for Morocco that visas have to be obtained and that this is always a complicated and long process so please if you can insist that you get the names to me by the 10th of November. Thank you. The constituency, yes. Yes. And it is usually the constituency itself that each constituency has its own way of choosing the supported travelers.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so presumably that note goes out Glen to the chairs of the groups as well. I mean, that's - you are asking the councilors to assist with that and make sure that happens but it's gone out to the chairs of the...

Glen de Saint Géry: The note has gone out this morning to the chairs of the groups, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so on the logistics of tomorrow's meeting, I mean, this is essentially - we're departing 9:00 from the lobby here. Glen, can you...

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes, we departing at 9:00 from the lobby with the bus to the office. And then the meeting will start at 10:00 but we have to leave here at 9:00 to make sure that we'll get there at 10:00. And there will be coffee and pastries when we get there.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful, okay that's good to know so it necessarily a need to have breakfast beforehand.

Glen de Saint Géry: Exactly unless you want to have something different for breakfast.

Jonathan Robinson: And the idea is to gather for a few minutes beforehand to discuss anything informally especially for new councilors, people who are new to ask anything that immediately crops up to you before we sort of hunker down and start going through the agenda of the day.

And then we're going to wrap up around 5:30, 6:00 and depending on what the cancellation conditions with the evening meal I will come back to you with what's happening there.

What else, if anything, needs to be covered in this...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: ...we probably can't cancel.

Volker Greimann: Just a sub point that we skipped down from I would like to volunteer to organize the next meeting's schedule after David has done such an admirable job for this meeting I think it's my turn again.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker. Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan, I don't think that we are able to cancel the cooking classes without paying a substantial amount of money.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So I think it looks indeed that, you know, the payment we have made we're going to incur so basically, you know, whoever wants to come but if, you know, I can imagine that some may feel less enticed to come along so but please let us know because we do need to probably give them

final numbers I think there will be at least 5 people from staff so if you like hanging out with staff so the GNSO team will be there so, you know, it is a really fun experience so...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I mean, we've committed to, I think - don't be so - I mean, it's great. And those that were signed up I'm sure will want to go. I mean, it would be great if we could all go but let's - I'm sure those that have committed and would like go if it's not cancelable I got a sense that it'll be a fun thing to do. And so let's not pretend it won't be.

Any other - have we missed anything else that anyone else would like to cover? All right great. Thank you all. Thanks for the participation on the weekend through Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and tomorrow.

Oswaldo.

Oswaldo Novoa: No just that information, I excuse myself for arriving late because I had to go a signing of top level domain, one of the new ones. Today we signed the first Latin American and Caribbean regions top level domains in ICANN.

Jonathan Robinson: Congratulations. Okay great. That's it. We'll call that a wrap and see you all through the course of the afternoon. But certainly at 9:00 tomorrow morning in the lobby of the Hyatt. Thanks.

END