

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
GNSO Wrap Up
Thursday 27 March 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://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar>

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

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, everyone, let's get this session underway. I'm sorry we're starting it a little late. We've got an opportunity to run this wrap up session. Have we got the recording on the way? Thank you.

So let me formally welcome you to the GNSO Council wrap up session at the end of this Singapore meeting. For those of you who may or may not be familiar with it in general the purpose of the wrap up session is as it describes, the idea is to try and vacuum up and collect up any open items or issues that either need a little further discussion in order to get them to go to the next step or capture any action items coming.

We've had a minor issue with capturing some of the items due to a computer glitch. So I would really like to ask you if any of you are aware of an open item that you think isn't captured on an agenda which we'll put up in a minute or two and you think needs to be covered in this meeting it would be great to have your notes on that.

I'll put my stake in the sand, I've done some work this morning on - GNSO statement or a statement from myself in regard to the IANA transition that we need to make at the ICANN public forum. And we had a pretty substantial discussion on that, as you know, the Council list - I know Mikey burned the

midnight oil on a draft of a variant of his own view of a charter, a personal view of a charter.

But I would very much like to run through some of the key points with you. So certainly I, you know, I'm pretty keen to get your feedback but there's another issue as well and that's that we've Jennifer Wolfe, our NomComm appointed - I think nonvoting councilor on the phone. And, Jenn - it's very late for Jenn and she's done us - the good work of joining the meetings. So I'd like to cover the GNSO review item first.

So there's a draft - I mean, I wouldn't even necessarily call this an agenda; these are talking points that we may want to cover or we'll put on an action list for a future meeting.

But some of these are more urgent than others and so I think without further ado we should kick off with Jenn's input and leading us on the discussion on the GNSO review whilst the rest of you have the opportunity to cast your eye over these talking points and see if there's anything - if you could either look at them and think of any input you may have or any other points that you think we've missed and need to cover off in this wrap up session.

So the GNSO review, as you know, we covered in the weekend sessions and we touched on, in the Council meeting yesterday, and there's opportunity now to talk about next steps.

One housekeeping item in particular with somebody on the telephone connection, can everyone please make sure when they finish speaking that their microphone is switched off because there's otherwise the danger of feedback which makes in particular the broadcast audio from the telephone difficult to hear.

So let me let Jenn introduce the discussion - the topic and thoughts on next steps and then we can have a brief discussion around that. And I'll ask

Marika and Lars to capture any outcomes of this to go on to the task and the action list that we run as a matter of course for the Council.

So, Jenn, over to you please.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks, Jonathan. And thanks, everyone, thanks for being so kind as to let me go first when I know there's a lot of other issues to discuss. I wanted to take just a few minutes this morning with all of you to discuss the GNSO review, as you know, we did have Ray present the version of the - excuse me, the intention of how he plans to run the review.

And I wanted to just ask for generally feedback or anything that we need to take back to him in terms of feedback on how the review will be run. And then also I would like to seek feedback on the idea of a self-review.

We had discussed the potential of creating a committee to follow along with the GNSO review process and then develop some methodologies for conducting a self-review using the same measurement criteria so that we would have something to compare when we get the final results from the external review conducted by the auditor.

I think this could be really valuable for us to have as an ongoing process during the review but certainly to have something to compare it to so that if we don't feel completely satisfied with the results of the review that we have some data points that we can actually use to compare and to have as a discussion to go forward particularly if recommendations are made in terms of any potential structural changes to the Council or to the GNSO as a whole or certainly to any of our organizational mechanisms or processes.

So I'd just like to take a few minutes and ask for feedback and then discuss next steps of how we could form a committee to start the process of developing a self-review methodology.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jenn. Can I ask for any feedback, input or comments for Jenn on the point she's raised? Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. I'm not sure it's actually on the point she made but it has to do with the GNSO review in general and that's - and perhaps I misunderstood what I was reading but at one point it was talked about that there was no structural issues being discussed as part of this review that we were avoiding structural - avoiding structural review.

And one of the things that I wanted to bring up that concerns me that I think is worth a look, now perhaps it's something we're going to say we live with, is this whole house notion that we've got now that when it was created was supposed to be just a counting fantasy.

And, you know, so that we could structure our voting but not necessarily supposed to have a functional purpose but it's got at least two functional purposes at this point and yet there's really no structural design on how that happens.

And so it's not necessarily that we remove it or fix it but at this point I'm just wondering is that excluded from the review especially since that was largely an experimental notion during the whole restructuring and it was kind of an ad hoc solution to the problem of how do we have variable, I mean, how do we have differential voting without it looking like we have differential voting?

So I'm just wondering is reviewing that does it work, does it need more work or what have you, is that part of the review or is it excluded?

Jonathan Robinson: Jenn, would you like to come in on that?

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure, you know, I don't think we know for sure if that will be part of the external audit because they haven't completely framed that for us yet. So I

think it's certainly something that we should make note of to monitor as that comes forward. And certainly we can provide feedback during that process.

But it's - Avri, if you think that that should be part of our self-review I think we certainly have the ability to survey that within the GNSO as a whole as part of the self-review. I mean, do you think that that would be an appropriate step even if it's not covered in the external review?

Avri Doria: Thank you, Jenn. This is Avri speaking again. Most definitely.

Jonathan Robinson: So I think that's exactly how I would have answered it. Feedback in part because clearly this is a Board-initiated review brought to us by the Structural Improvements Committee of the Board so by all means let's feed it back and it has the option to be part of our own self review and we can define the terms of that.

The only point I'd make is that in - I suspect you'll have a view on this as well, Jenn, but in doing the self-review whilst it doesn't limit us to that we should try and match it where possible to the scope - to a similar scope of the Board-initiated review so that we can cross reference our own outputs with the outputs that come from that. But like I said that doesn't limit it in scope to that, it's just that we should at least cover those elements.

John.

John Berard: Hi, this is John Berard. Not being a part of the Council at the time and probably not paying as close enough attention as I should have at the time is there an opportunity to get some documentation about the discussion that led to the current structure that we have? I mean, is there something ICANN - others who aren't as hip to it as we need to be can get ourselves briefed up?

Because if it's opening a Pandora's box I may, you know, discretion may be the better part of valor in that regard. But on the other hand I think Avri's point is a good one.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. We can look back because I'm assuming that there was indeed a final report on that - well, Avri's making this gesture so if you need something to read on the plane you may need to look for it beforehand that basically outlined, indeed, the discussions or where it came from and how they ended up - or came to that conclusion of the house structure. And I think Avri has some more info on that.

Avri Doria: Yeah, quickly no Rob did a recommendation report, the one that went to what became the SIC and that is actually a fairly concise report. I mean, there was an immense amount of other gop around it but there is a very good report on it.

John Berard: The SIC, that's from one of those bad Star Wars sequels isn't it?

Avri Doria: That was (Sic) but...

John Berard: Oh sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay any other comments or questions? Jenn, is there anything else you would like to say - perhaps you can just capture for us in summary the next steps then and so that we can have those captured by our very helpful policy staff as the next steps and action items.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes. Thank you. I think our next step is we need to from a committee to determine the scope of the self-review. And I think that we should start that probably within the next month so that by the time the external review is

shaping up by London we have a committee formed who can lead this effort forward to scope out what our self-review might be.

And I think absolutely, anything that we want to add in scope we could add. But we do definitely want to mirror the measurement criteria being used so that we have valid data points to use. But I think Avri's point is really excellent and I'm sure there may be others as we continue down this path. So I'm happy to continue forward in leading that committee but if others want to join we could certainly move forward in setting up some times to meet and start scoping out what a self-review might look like.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great, Jenn. So that's a call for volunteers which we have had previously but I certainly think we should refresh that call for volunteers to join you. And I know Marika wants to say something so I'll come to you, Marika. But I do want to, on behalf of the Council, thank you for the work you've done so far. And I know Ray was extremely complimentary about the input and assistance.

And I know - and I think others are aware that you have a background in this kind of - in these kind of review techniques so I think you were very valuable in, you know, sort of being a sounding board as well over the last month or two or more in assisting Ray.

Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe we actually already created a mailing list a while back so maybe we just want to go back to that list to see who was on there and make sure that they still want to be involved and then as well circulate it to the Council to see if there are any others that want to be added to that list. Because just to confirm we're now talking a Council group of volunteers, right? Council members.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay, we'll do that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. So I think it's refreshing that list and making sure it still remains. That's an interesting point is - because to the extent that it's a list of Council volunteers I think that's self-review of the Council. The question is what is the scope for a self-review GNSO-wide which clearly is going to then go beyond that. Avri.

Avri Doria: Avri again. Sorry I'm speaking so much. One thing you may also want to look at is not only Council but past Council members especially during the people that were, you know, there before the transition and were part of the older GNSO who have watched the change and may have, you know, a really good viewpoint as to what we've become and those that have been on this during the intermediate years.

I think including people from, you know, the GNSO is also reasonable because it is the GNSO's Council. And, you know, there's those few, you know, persistent means about the GNSO and its Council that never quite go away that you don't want to exclude from this conversation so that may be - how was that as a way of talking around it without actually saying it? But that you might not want to exclude from the analysis that gets done.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. That was pretty clear to me. And so the question in my mind then is are we talking about those - that as far as the group is concerned or making sure they get the input because there's absolutely no doubt in my mind - it's a very good suggestion - that former councilors and of course GNSO-wide inputs, the question is in terms of forming a group to look at the self-review of the Council how wide do we want to create that group? I suppose there's no harm done in having it open to others to participate in.

Maria.

Maria Farrell: Yeah, just - sorry a question of clarification. So the GNSO review that is the one that is being done, you know, led by the - Ray and Jennifer have set out the scope and done all of the work on that. And then this is the GNSO Council that's doing the self-review not the GNSO self-review, that's - I've got that right, okay brilliant. And there's another question which I've completely forgotten so...

Jonathan Robinson: I'm not smiling because it's necessarily - okay so let me just make sure we were 100% clear. The Structural Improvements Committee is the Board-designated subcommittee that's going to oversee the Board initiated review; it's their review of the GNSO. So that covers both the Council and the GNSO.

What we've done is appointed Jenn as a liaison, if you like, to that committee and as a conduit to keep an eye on what's going on, to assist where appropriate. And now we've agreed to from a group that - a critical part of that kind of review process is to undertake some form of self-review. Ideally, as I said, which maps at least in part and covers the scope of the review.

What you wouldn't want to be doing is doing a self-review that goes off and looks at those things and the Board-initiated review that goes off and looks at those things which is why the coordination and the joining us is required.

Having got that in place there's a slight open question I detect as to whether or not - well our self-review really can only be for the Council to the extent that it's councilors conducting that. And so there's a little bit - and maybe it's something we need to think about a little more and not try and force to a conclusion now as to what the self-review actually means.

Because there's a self-review of the Council and - which is an organ of the GNSO and then there's a review of the whole GNSO and the question is what scope is there for self-review of GNSO.

I wouldn't mind looking at what was done previously because Bruce spoke to us about what was done previously so I think John's question is a good one for all sorts of reasons to inform things. And I know I certainly got some document back probably almost a year ago from Bruce now about the previous review. They're not confidential documents, he just referred me to some public documents relevant to this so it's probably worth looking at what was done previously in terms of a self-review.

But that doesn't stop us reconvening that group to start to work on this. And so I think we'll - we certainly got a few action items but there may be more to follow.

Okay let's draw a line under that point and move on to the next one. I see Edmon is here which is great. There was this - there was the closing of the JIG and there was a - I think that led to the possibility of - there's an opportunity for - sorry, let me just instead of muttering here let's close off the GNSO review item. So, Jenn, thank you very much again. You are of course welcome to stay on but we won't be calling on you specifically in respect to this and I know it's late for you.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. Thanks so much, everyone, for being so kind to let me go first.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks again, Jenn. Next item is this issue of IDN variants and whether or not we have a policy liaison. And I was concentrating on two things because I wrote to Ram Mohan about this so I think - can someone help me with Ram's role? I think he - does he chair the group? Mary, if you could just speak to that a moment and just let me know.

Mary Wong: Yeah, the Board has several committees and working groups and that includes one on the variants issue and Ram is the chair of that specific Board working group.

Jonathan Robinson: Because what we had was - I think via Ching we had the proposal of a - some form of liaison to that group. And I wrote to Ram and informed. And I think, Edmon, your name came up from memory as a prospective liaison. Yeah, go ahead.

Edmon Chung: On?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Okay. Edmon here. So just to I guess clarify on that not really a kind of liaison to the Board IDN group. I think the - what was brought up - I won't rehash all the discussion but right now there is a project going on in what is called the label generation rules which is how IDNs are going to be incorporated into the root. It's basically a set of rule sets that certain IDN top level domains could or could not be added into the root.

In that process a community document was produced about a year ago which is called the procedures of coming up with the - what is called LGR, Label Generation Rule set. In that procedure document it suggests that a set of - there would be an integration panel, multiple generation panels and a set of advisors.

And specifically in the procedure document the advisors are supposed to include linguistic experts, DNS experts, as well as ICANN policy process experts.

The issue I wanted to bring up is that right now the panel and the advisors, at this particular point, does not contain ICANN policy and process experts. It's very heavily weighted on technical expertise including Unicode and IDN and DNS.

So I think it is this particular element that I guess the suggestion for the Council to consider speaking up, speaking to that, and letting that group know

and potentially also suggesting a role kind of as liaison but also within the procedures would be called an advisor on the - on that particular group. So I don't know whether Ching wants to add to it. But that's the background.

Ching Chiao: No, thank you, Edmon. I think it's well put. But I think a specific question needs to be addressed is that would you suggest us to put one person to kind of liaison with multiple LGR groups? Or each LGR group are you suggesting what would be the...

Edmon Chung: The way the process works right now there is one called Integration Panel, five persons, and then there's a pool of advisors. So far there's three. So and then there are multiple generation panels for each language or script. So the suggestion is in the pool of advisors supposedly in the procedures there should be a policy procedure expertise. There hasn't been one appointed.

And from the discussion with the team there isn't any indication or - that further advisors would be appointed at this time. So that's why the concern is raised.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Edmon and fellow councilors, what I did was on the back of that item I wrote to Ram and highlighted to him, in his capacity as chair, this issue, this concern over the linking to the GNSO policy work and what was going on. And he's written quite a comprehensive reply to me which I think answered the question.

And basically what they've offered is regular reporting and interaction with the GNSO by coming back to us on a regular basis. So my difficulty is I'm not 100% sure that answers the question. I know this is kind of hot off the press, I really got the letter - in fact I think it's just come in this morning at 10:41 so I haven't even had a proper chance to digest it, which is why I'm fumbling a little.

But it does appear to answer the question - they're basically saying they will send - is there a comment - someone would like - yeah, go ahead okay. So that's my sense is that they are prepared to recognize that concern and engage with us properly in order to ensure that that's - so I don't know if that addresses the concern or at least if we're prepared to try that or not so that's where it seems to have got to at the moment, Edmon.

And I know you certainly haven't had another chance and councilors possibly haven't even had a chance to read the letter yet. Mary.

Mary Wong: Yeah, this is not so much about the letter, Jonathan, which I guess you've just forwarded to the Council list because of Ram's contribution as the chair of the Board variant working group. This is more to go back to the background that Edmon was providing and we did touch base with the ICANN staff who are supporting the IDN variant project.

And so they have suggested that in line with what Ram seems to be proposing in his email that in order for us to familiarize not just the Council but the community on the work that's being done recognizing that there are certainly new members on the Council and newcomers to the community that in addition to the regular updates that they will be providing under Ram's request at least at every ICANN meeting but probably or possibly more frequently than that they're happy to do a sort of primer session on the things that Edmon was talking about.

For example, the work that's going on is extremely technical so without going into technical details more like a chronology; why are there 17 LGR panels? What stage they are in their work? What role does the integration panel play in terms of reviewing the outputs of all 17 LGR panels?

And as Edmon was saying there was a call put out, there was - there's a call out for experts to those LGR panels, all 17 of them. And those are the technical and linguistic experts Edmon refers to. All that work then goes to an

integration panel which, as Edmon says, currently has three advisors. And the call for advisors foresees that ICANN will also call on additional advisors as and when the need arises.

So the sense here from the team working on the project - and it may be helpful in getting the community and the Council to figure out not just where they are but what the role of the community would be in this ongoing technical work.

And the last piece that I'll add is that as Edmon knows really well this is a multiyear, multiphase program and has been ongoing for a while, it's anticipated they will go on for quite a while further. So the team thought that it would be helpful not just to do the regular updates but to do the primer session possibly as soon as the next Council call or even as a separate webinar for the community.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mary. I know Ching wants to speak and so let me give you an opportunity, Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, Mary. Just want to very quickly add to what your point is that - and glad that Ram wrote back to us for the - actively engaging with the Council about the updates. And I'm seeing this as the two things that we should both do is that they should come back to us as other groups.

And I'm glad that at the Board level, I mean, in the implementation process or the development process they are willing to engaging back to us. But what we are suggesting actually here is that we participate as part of their pretty much as a group and we have a GNSO keep our close eye on their work. So, I mean, I'm pretty sure that this goes hand in hand.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I'm pretty sure I suggested - and as I say, I haven't had a proper chance. Maybe we should digest the response because I'm pretty sure I said

one suggestion was for GNSO liaison to ICANN's - or IDN variant TLD program and that's what they've responded to.

So I wonder if we shouldn't just go through this properly, make sure that whether or not it meets the requirements. One of the things we committed to you as a Council, and the sentiment was very strong, is that we've leaned heavily on I think Edmon and yourself in the past. And one of the issues that seems to me is we need to try and get - spread the workload a bit and the base of knowledge.

And what we tend to do is say IDN's it's complicated, you know, and then just hand it over to you guys. And I think part of what seems encouraging about this is the prospect of bringing in others within the community to - and not just the Council by a long way to try and contribute to this.

Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, so I think that's very welcoming news. And I think that's great process going forward. I did want to highlight one particular part so it doesn't get lost. I understand the background, I understand this is great interaction. I want to highlight a particular piece that is missing because the procedures of creating the LGR groups, of creating those panels, the procedures themselves that were created by the community with the community's input, specifically asked for that the advisors pool include this sort of expertise. Currently that is missing.

And that's, you know, that's the part where I wanted to highlight because in the procedures themselves it's supposed to create a pool of advisors that include this. Right now it's only - it only includes a linguistic expertise, technical expertise and so on. And that's the part where I think we wanted to flag.

So the interaction is great and absolutely agree that - I obviously want more people to be better - more knowledgeable about the whole issue because that Board is into universal acceptance as well and many other of those issues. And I think that's certainly great.

But right I'm sort of flagging the concern because it is sort of - dis-aligned with what the procedures are. And this is the area where, you know, we are - as the GNSO policy side this is where we should, you know, flag the issue back to that particular group, not the overall IDN variant group. So there are a number of panels created - procedures created. There's a missing piece right now in that particular panel so that's it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I may have missed that subtlety so it's something we might need to pick up on and follow up on. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: So I sat through the - one of the sessions yesterday and got the sense of the process flow on all that. I have about 1 millimeter thick. Is there some way that you and Ching could sort of guide us as a Council as to - and give us those heads up that say, hey, this is important and this is why and this is what we need from you if you agree.

I mean, I think we need a guide through this because it is so complicated. Have we already established that relationship and this is what's happening or...

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey, if I may?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I mean, that's what we - I wrote to Ram about the liaison issue. He's come back with a comprehensive answer about keeping us informed but Edmon's clearly saying actually there's more to it than that; there's a layer beneath where - and so I think we need to go back and say, hang on, are you

sure you understood what we were offering here and how that's perceived to fit into your structures?

Because I think what my letter to him has got us is our interaction component and our information component but it's clear that Edmon's looking for, you know, insertion into the process at a lower level and we need to make sure that that's - option is explored.

Edmon, if don't know if you - if I've got this right.

Edmon Chung: That's perfectly correct. The correspondence - I haven't read it yet but the correspondence seems to be at a higher level, the overall IDN variant project, which I agree very much with Ram's - what you've said about Ram's response. I'm talking about one particular project that is ongoing right now that has indirect impact though on new IDN gTLDs so that's...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Maria - that's bound to happen at some point. Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Jonathan. Maybe a suggestion would be that, you know, as communication has been established now maybe we invite Ram to the next GNSO Council meeting to continue this discussion. And then maybe in the meantime maybe Edmon is willing to provide a response or further explain after having reviewed Ram's email to see where indeed the disconnect is so, you know, he can maybe come on next meeting and see, you know, where we align and where we don't align or see what next steps that may be a path forward.

Jonathan Robinson: I think that's fine. I feel - Edmon, are you okay with that?

Edmon Chung: Yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: I think it's clear that it's not resolved. It may be partially resolved and we need to pick up on that. Yeah.

Edmon Chung: Sounds good.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. So, I mean, we'll record that on the action item that we have an open item here as to how we liaise with this particular group. One thing I'm very keen to come to - and I cast my eye over has - I'll just pause a moment on this list of things. Some of these are quite sort of basic and administrative, we should be able to tick them off relatively quickly.

I know Bret has to leave half an early; does anyone else have to leave before 12:30? I'm very keen to get your view - I've prepared, I mean, there's an invitation to - for the so-called SO and AC leaders to come up on the stage as part of the public forum. And in line with the direction I believe I've been given I've got to stand up and say something about the views of the, you know, within the GNSO of the IANA transition.

I'm conscious we don't have a prepared statement so I'd quite like to run past you the kind of things I'm proposing to say. So I think I'm going to table that or put it on for 11:30 so we make sure we've got potentially up to half an hour given the size of this and the substance of it to talk over that with your permission.

So I think we'll go through a couple of other items before 11:30, work 11:30 to 12:00 on that and then come back and pick up on any other items. And bearing in mind that I said to you if there's any other items you'd like to cover that aren't on this list let me know.

So in terms of the smaller items then we haven't - we had heard from the group working on ICANN meetings. And we have the, I mean, I think there was some sense that these clearly impact on the Council. Can I get a feel for whether we would like to pull together a group to respond to that output of the - I think they - I'm not sure what they're called, can someone remind me of that - Meetings Working Group, I that what they're called?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it's the Meetings Strategy Working Group I believe.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. So the output of the Meeting Strategy Working Group which is available for comment. We heard from them on the weekend sessions. Is there a desire or a willingness to respond to that output?

Maria Farrell: Yeah, it's Maria speaking. I know a lot of us weren't able to be in the room for the presentation but a few of us were and we had some comments. I thought mine were actually kind of overly-negative. I know I'd like to address that slightly.

But I think it is - in fact I would encourage fellow Council members and GNSO and people to take a look at the meeting strategy because it's a very well put together document for sure and very well researched and presented. It certainly would have, I think, a pretty big impact on the amount of policymaking we might get done over the course of the year.

So I would put up my hand to draft some, you know, or to be in a group drafting some form a response and - Jonathan, do you remember what the timeline is on that? But I would put my hand as a volunteer and encourage anyone else to join.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Maria. I mean, I think we would love to have a pen-holder if we're going to do it and I suspect at least half a (unintelligible) volunteering. Marika has a point though on it.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. On the timing so the initial comment period is open to 4th of April but then the reply period runs until the 25th of April. And I think as a comment has been submitted I'm assuming that the reply period will remain open and I will also confirm that with my colleagues to make sure that we can actually work I think to the 25th of April deadline instead of the 4th of April.

Jonathan Robinson: Well that's an interesting point. I don't know how others feel. I mean, in principle we should comment in the initial period rather than the reply period, I understand that there's nothing to stop us letting it run over. But so the notional deadline at least for the moment is the 4th of April. If there's any chance of - that's quite tight; I guess that's next Friday or so.

Maria Farrell: Can I just come in, sorry, ahead of John here, just by way - I would love to do this but I'm going to be on holiday for a week for next week so I won't be able to do that. I could try and get a draft out tomorrow morning but that's - somebody else will probably need to take the comments on board.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got John and then Chuck.

John Berard: John Berard. I don't think it's a good idea for the Council to have a comment in this first phase. But I've been thinking based upon the reaction from some of the steps that we have taken, in particular, the instigating the conversations in the public meeting that there may be an opportunity for the Council to synthesize if we can, the point of view of the constituencies and stakeholder groups that comprise the Council.

So I would be in favor of someone taking a look at the responses, the comments in the primary period and seeking to assess a common, you know, common points of view that could be expressed, that could be given the extra weight - the extra nod of the Council but built by a review of the primary comments and then issued appropriately in the reply period.

Jonathan Robinson: So that's interesting, John. So you see it's not necessarily appropriate for us to respond - to comment in the initial period. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. There may be one area we might want to comment sooner. I don't know, I could happen during the reply period too. We all know how that happens. Several of us, you know, were skeptical about some of the more significant changes that are being proposed.

At the same time I was personally impressed by their thought processes. They really tried to do a very thorough job of considering issues that many of us raised. So I don't think it's bad to give some of these ideas a try. I think the one comment that might be worth making is that it might be better to try some of these more significant changes on an interim basis, a pilot basis and then being able to pull back if they really - if the group's analysis doesn't pan out.

For example, just to give one example, the reduced time for public forum, you know, I think a lot of us wonder, I mean, how can that work? Well maybe they've restructured things so that it'd work? I don't know. But if it doesn't you wouldn't want to be locked in to that kind of a change over a three-year period or something and not be able to fix that.

So I think the one comment may be - it might be better to pilot some of the more significant changes and then either be able to modify them but any sort of a permanent change on some of those might be problematic.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chuck. Any other comments on this? Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks, Jonathan. I was just going to say that I agree with John's assessment. And I think it might be, all due respect, Chuck, but I think it might be worthwhile to wait for some of the responses coming out of the constituencies and stakeholder groups before Council takes any sort of position on it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Well just a comment, I don't think that's inconsistent with Chuck's comment as well. It's really just a question of timing so that should be okay. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. One practical consideration may be there that we do have - we have seen the tendency that people actually submit comments on the last day of the reply period so that may actually not give any time for

reviewing those and synthesizing those. So, you know, one thing you may consider as well because this does heavily impact the Council as such as well because we'd also have, you know, our specific items are responsible for organizing the weekend sessions.

You know, there's this basically strategic focus on, you know, changing the duration of the meetings. So I understand that there are specific considerations that constituencies and stakeholder groups will have on how do you also organize their work during ICANN meetings.

But I think there's also definitely a Council perspective that may be provided looking at, you know, the meetings we schedule as a Council and the work we're doing and also the work we oversee or you oversee in the working group models that, you know, that's your responsibility too. So I think, you know, hopefully - and I think that doesn't prevent as well, in addition to that, if indeed there are statements from different groups that the Council then wants to endorse or enhance to additionally provide a response. But I see some challenges with I think the timing of that happening possibly.

Jonathan Robinson: John, did you want to respond to that?

John Berard: Yeah, this is John Berard. I think that whether a constituency or stakeholder group waits until the last day of the reply period to file primary comments, you know, that is a - either a decision or a difficulty because of resource allocation or availability and so we should be mindful of that.

But my point remains that I do not think that the Council, as an entity, should be making primary comments but I would be more than happy for us to, reviewing the SO and AC - the constituency and stakeholder group comments from those that comprise the Council to offer a consolidated view in the response. I wouldn't have any problem with that.

Jonathan Robinson: So might I suggest it can work like this, I mean, we've had a couple of things that are arguably within the purview of the Council. One, well it certainly - to the extent that it impacts the Council's work, this is something we could start to work on right away.

I'm not saying, John, that we put it in without hearing what stakeholder groups and constituencies have said but we could start to draft something on that. Hear me out and then by all means respond.

Second, we've heard Chuck's point on the pilot. And then, third, we've heard yours on making sure we, you know, and the way in which I might suggest we do that is that we proactively reach out to stakeholder groups and constituencies and ask them I guess, A, if they intend to do any - to respond to this, and, B, if they can give us early drafts of that response to start to try and work on that.

Go ahead, John.

John Berard: I think it would be totally appropriate for us to offer comments with regard to the way the Council is scheduled during the course of a meeting. You know, we've got what, between I don't know, what about 18 hours' worth of face time all in. Maybe we could use, maybe we could use less, maybe we could use it differently. I don't know, that might be an interesting conversation to have.

But that - I don't see any other, you know, and whether we want the soft drinks instead of just coffee at our breaks. But I don't know that I would be comfortable going beyond the way it affects our business specifically.

Jonathan Robinson: So let's agree - we do intend to respond, do intend to put something in, it's likely going to be - well it seems clear that it's going to be in the reply period. That seems to be consistent, Maria, with your holiday and so on. So if

you could come back and hold the pen and pull together John and anyone else to work on that that would be great.

All right, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. Don't we have a call scheduled for April 10 if I'm not mistaken? Do we or do we not or am I confusing that with another one, we do, right?

Couldn't we perhaps try to get stakeholder group and constituency comments ready by then and that would give us I think enough time to prepare something - sort of a statement that is consistent with everybody else's.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got - John, would you like to respond to that? I've got - I suppose my - there's two thoughts here really. One is I think what I've heard from John is we really want to wait until we've heard - I'm just thinking about the timing here. The other thing is that meeting is really scheduled out of necessity to cover one administrative topic. I'm not sure of the agenda.

So I'm reluctant to start to grow the agenda because once we put one thing on we could put something else. And I suspect so this something we can handle on list anyway, Amr. So my - I am a little reluctant to let that agenda start to organically grow.

John Berard: I realize I can be flip and I apologize. But in the BC, and I'm sure in other constituencies and stakeholder groups there are timeframes that are allocated for the development of public comment and I'm not certain that the 10th would be adequate for all of us to be able to meet those.

Jonathan Robinson: All right let's close that discussion on that item then. I want to switch to this statement because, for me, more - I think anything else other than this IANA transition and statement to public forum can be dealt with if necessary online or in other ways. So I'd really like to - I think this is a substantial issue

of the meeting. It's come up kind of off piece as far as our pre-prepared agenda is concerned.

And I would very much like to sound you out on the kind of thoughts and see whether I've effectively synthesized the kind of comments that came through yesterday. Any objections or concerns with that? Right, give me a moment to pull up some notes I've got and we'll go through it then.

So what I have is rather than a - I mean, we simply don't have - and I think it would be unrealistic to have a GNSO pre-prepared statement in the timeframe that we've had available given that we had Constituency and Stakeholder Group Day on Tuesday, Council meeting on Wednesday and it's now Thursday morning.

So I've pulled together some thoughts that I think I've gleaned through a combination of one to one conversations, one to many conversations, the Council meeting, my own stakeholder group meeting.

And I'm going to take you through what I've come up with there and I very much appreciate any, you know, sort of constructive input or comments on that.

So what I - we had that Monday meeting when a bunch of people came up on stage that were invited to be on stage and there I talked about the GNSO composition structure and processes. And I would expect to highlight that again now and in particular highlight that the GNSO is a multi-stakeholder bottom up consensus driven and multi-stakeholder body and methodology-using body, that we comprise diverse stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And it may even be overly simplistic to expect us to be represented by a single voice. It almost certainly is. I can't simply - I can't represent that composite in a single voice. So I can channel some of the key points but to represent a single position is unrealistic and so I don't propose to do that.

But what I can do is cover off some key themes. And for me the first key theme is that we're in a time of tremendous current activity and load without this IANA transition overlay.

And coming into the Singapore meeting we already had a very full and preplanned agenda. But notwithstanding that, I mean, it's clear to me that we absolutely welcome the opportunity to take on this challenge and appreciate the trust of the NTIA in asking the ICANN community to come up with a process and a method for handling this transition.

And so from the various discussions that have gone on within the GNSO that I'm aware of, within the Council, the Council together with the ccNSO and other ICANN stakeholders, I mean, I perceive huge enthusiasm and even excitement for the willingness to cooperate and work together and get this done.

But also a recognition that this will need input as well as from those ICANN bodies from outside of the ICANN community as well. And we shouldn't be closed to that point.

So the overarching view I've picked up that is that this process must be bottom up multi-stakeholder and consensus-driven. And in fact everything I hear seems that that's consistent with what the NTIA has said anyway.

And that within our bodies we have the tools and mechanisms to work in this way already, while some adaption may be needed, there's tremendous existing capability of both tools and talent.

Without a doubt the project needs to be properly scoped, planned and executed and there's certainly a feeling of urgency but also a concern over the potential for being rushed. So whilst there's a need for speed there's also a need for an appropriate level of deliberation and a need not to rush.

To that extent we might question the deadline of the 27th and is it really necessary? And if so what is that deadline of the 27th today for? We really, I mean, have a view that we have to break the problem down into component parts and then in a sense these start to become projects within a program of work that need to be resourced effectively and we need the facilitation and support, which is our understanding of the role of ICANN, in supporting the community in doing its work on this.

We had the advantage of the GNSO and ccNSO councils meeting yesterday. And in that meeting there was a strong sense of recognition and the potential for the opportunity to work together on a scoped out and segmented problem to define key areas of common interest and commonality and to come together and potentially initiate a cross community working group that's open, transparent and inclusive.

And I think if we have this kind of foundation based on a well-worked charter that's the - that seems to be our - the collective basis on which we could do some successful work.

So in summary really there's a sense of enormous enthusiasm and motivation and being equipped to take on the challenge but we need to do it at an appropriate pace and not necessarily spring straight out of the starting gates.

So that, I feel, was an attempt to summarize things. Is it clear enough? Is there something substantial missing? Does it get the points that you feel we've discussed across? Any comments or thoughts on what might - how that covers things? Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Jonathan, I think that's excellent.

Jonathan Robinson: Great.

Thomas Rickert: I guess I have one question or point for our discussion which is whether we should add something quite strong as to what our role would be. I mean, the ccNSO in the statement has thankfully been passed on by John, has said that the ccNSO is willing to take the lead on working with the CC world.

I think in the statement that you made I haven't heard a clear message as to where we see our role. And I think that we should put something in there. And let me try to be brave; let's say we're going to take the lead on that or we offer to take the lead on an overall coordination effort being very inclusive, you know, taking into account everybody that wants to be there.

But, you know, I guess somebody has to pick up the stick, everybody says that they're doing things in their respective arenas but I haven't seen somebody stepping up and saying okay we will drop the charter where we now even have a draft. You know, so I think we should be courageous.

Jonathan Robinson: How about a joint lead with the ccNSO?

Thomas Rickert: If we can reach out to them before their public meeting. But I guess somebody needs to make a firm statement, let's do it, let's get it done. We will - and maybe even say we are going to circulate a draft charter for people to take a look at as a starting point then we would have a concrete working (unintelligible), you know. And maybe even offer a date for doing that. You know, let's discuss how much time it will take us to get a first draft charter ready and then something - offer something to the community.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got Chuck and then Amr.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. I guess it's mainly a question, Thomas. Are you saying taking the lead within the generic names community or taking the lead in the overall IANA transition project? Because keep in mind we have a couple other IANA functions that affect other SOs and ACs too indirectly so

just a question for you in that regard. Taking the lead in what part of it? All of it?

Thomas Rickert: I would offer that. I recognize that this would be too broad for the Council's remit but I guess that somebody needs to be at least - be inviting the others to the table and put something on the table as a constructive way forward. So that doesn't mean that we should be trying to mission creep but I guess that somebody needs to stand up and say well I'm going to invite everybody for this discussion.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, can I respond to that? Yeah, Chuck again. And that's okay I think as long as we make it clear that we're in full cooperation with those other groups. And I think it would be good on a side note if Jonathan gave them a heads up that we're going to offer this.

Jonathan Robinson: I know we've got a couple of people in the queue but let me just let you know where I think we've got to. I agree, we would have to let people know. I did have some conversations last night - I spoke with Olivier and from the ALAC. I spoke with a couple of other people. But, you know, please go ahead, Avri, let me let you speak and I think you're next in the queue and then Mikey.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. I don't think that we should offer ourselves as any sort of lead. I think it's quite reasonable to say that we welcome it and we intend to participate. I think in terms of gTLD concerns we, you know, as the GNSO Councils have, you know, have the lead in terms of making sure that we bring the community of gTLD, registries, registrars, users, registrants, however, you know, whoever, into the discussion and so it's good to say that.

I think in terms of the charter I think that - I think the charter is out there and it's a wonderful thing. I think saying that one of our members has already offered the beginnings of a charter and, you know, we think that's a good idea and a way to work if we do, I do.

But, you know, I don't think we should try to put ourselves as anymore other than the - as the ccNSO has done - as the coordinating voice that'll bring together all the gTLD related concerns for this to it. So that would be my opinion.

And I think that the working group that you all are talking, you know, the cross community working group you all are talking about, is one way to coordinate with all the others. And if you've gotten far enough to say we're going to do that then that's a great thing to also indicate. But I definitely would stay away from putting ourselves in any sort of lead on this except for gTLD related concerns.

Jonathan Robinson: That's helpful. I've got Mikey and then Keith.

Mikey O'Connor: No it's okay. You know, I kind of like that. This is Mikey. I full approve of Jonathan skipping Berard, I think that's a really good idea. I want to chime in with Avri. What I was modeling that draft that I worked up last night on was the DSSA charter.

I'm sure Chuck, if you've read that charter you see a lot of your words in there because it was a fabulous piece of work. But it was a joint piece of work and I think that's one of the things that made it so compelling was that the five leaders of the ACs and SOs, Chuck and Cheryl and Olivier and so on, walked together; they marched in step.

And, you know, it was almost impossible to ignore the collaboration that happened so fast. And so to the extent that we can model something like that, you know, in no way trying to undercut your point which is somebody has got to get this thing rolling and I think that we can certainly do that. But I do like us being sort of in a crowd rather than at the very point. I think it's better that way. That's just personal reaction.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. I've got John and then Keith.

John Berard: We already have permission to do this. On Monday the IANA transition session, you were among the group that sat on the dais and we heard from Fadi that this was the process of building the process by which the transition would occur.

So it seems totally in keeping with the - with that permission that the Council offer a draft charter for coordinating the work of the G-space entities to contribute in the way that we clearly have been asked to contribute. And in keeping with the relationship that we have with the stakeholder groups and constituencies that send us here so I think that's great.

I also think that if you wanted to take that charter and send it to Byron and say, hey, this is what we're thinking of doing, feel free to steal whatever you'd like, if you want to collaborate that's cool too. Send it to Olivier and say, hey, this is what we're thinking of doing; borrow if you choose, participate if you will.

You know, I think that - I don't think I've ever heard the Council being called a bully pulpit but in this instance it very well may be.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I'm sorry?

Jonathan Robinson: What was the expression you used?

John Berard: A bully pulpit.

Jonathan Robinson: And we're supposed to know and understand...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Well anybody that sort of - I don't know, I guess...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Is it? Oh I thought it was more British than American. Teddy Roosevelt then, is that the origin? Yeah.

David Cake: It is Teddy Roosevelt.

John Berard: Teddy Roosevelt...

David Cake: ...has also changed in meaning since Teddy Roosevelt used it.

John Berard: Well? Well we can just take this offline.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Let's not get into the semantics of it if you could just talk in plain English.

John Berard: I believe that we have permission to do something and that something might very well be to offer a charter to organize the G-space response and participation and for you, of course, because you've already been tabbed as part of that group to circulate it more broadly.

Jonathan Robinson: Probably in some ways - Keith, we'll come to you now, my question is how much on a limb, and if so how so can we go beyond that apparent...

John Berard: Well you're the one that's out there so...

Jonathan Robinson: That helps. Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Jonathan. Actually, Amr I think was in the queue from earlier, let's go to him first and then I'll come back.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Keith. Actually the reason I put my hand down was because Chuck and Avri more or less went over what I wanted to say. And I did mention this yesterday in the meeting with the ccNSO - I think it's a great idea to have a charter come out of the GNSO but I wouldn't necessarily, as Thomas suggested, include that the GNSO Council is going to take any role in this process.

I think to avoid any difficulties we might have experienced with the current Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance is that sure it's great - okay we have a charter, we have a draft charter right now, it's all right for - a person or a small group of people to get going and get that started.

But I think it would be a good idea to circulate that to everybody on the SO AC list and get everybody on the same page from square one to make sure that the scoping of the conversation and the mandate of this cross community working group is something everybody agrees on before starting the actual work and coming out with the recommendations just to avoid any repetition of complications down the line so thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: I couldn't agree with you more. And I think we're talking about the principle of a charter rather than the ownership of the charter. Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you, Jonathan. I agree (unintelligible) and support very strongly the statement that you led with. I think this conversation has actually been very, very constructive and I think we're all very close here in terms of supporting sort of the path forward.

I think - I agree with Avri that we need to be very cautious about territoriality, turf battles, sensitivities. If you look at the IANA functions there's basically four primary functions that fall into the two categories of naming and

numbering. I think we need to be very sensitive about the other entities and groups both inside and outside the ICANN community in terms of the perception that any one group might want to take sort of the lead on developing, you know, sort of the answers or the procedures moving forward.

That said, I think it's highly appropriate that we, the GNSO community, take the initiative to bring together or to suggest ways of working together on the various issues. And as I said in one of the sessions yesterday I think certainly on the naming side of things that we ought to be working very closely with our colleagues in the ccNSO as it relates to TLD registry implications and interactions with IANA.

But I support just about everything that's been said here and you've got my strong support for the statement that you led with.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Keith. That's very helpful. So, Thomas, I detected some reactions to the word "lead" and I think we'll have to be very careful of the use of a word like "lead" but that doesn't stop us showing leadership.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, and I guess that sometimes, you know, I had a chat with Chuck yesterday evening and I was using the word "framework" which he understood for the Council or for this project manager that I suggested - or ICANN to provide actually framework in terms of substance, right and I was thinking of resources. And so sometimes maybe there are some language issues.

The - I hear what you're saying and I hope that I've made sufficiently clear that it's not for the Council or the GNSO community as such to mission creep or patronize other stakeholders. Nonetheless, Mikey, for example, in the draft charter that you circulated you mentioned, as stakeholders, the ICANN corporation, ICANN community, Contracted and Non-Contracted Parties, other internet ecosystem organizations and the users of the Internet.

So I think we see some in there that you don't see in the GNSO, right? So I think what we need to - and I haven't heard anybody say that, you know, there are commitments to work in the respective areas of competence or expertise but we mustn't allow that to end up being patchwork where certain parts are missing and that there is not the concentrated effort.

And I think that we could potentially find a way to offer help with this or whatever words you might wish to use for it. But I guess that what we should avoid is that everybody's only thinking in their own silos and then we end up having something that is not all encompassing or can't reach everybody's consensus. And I think that the GNSO with its experience in policymaking is well placed to offer help with this.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Thomas. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. Chuck Gomes again. And with - I think everybody knows I'm in agreement with all the concerns about us coming out too strong. I mean, if we go back historically when we first start talking about cross community working groups, the GNSO did something on its own and refused at that point in time to involve the ccNSO and to wait until we did our thing. And that backfired on us later.

So understanding that I have concerns in that regard I think Thomas is onto something and we have to do it very tactfully with lots of communication with those other groups.

But if we're not careful, if nobody takes some leadership, not taking charge but taking leadership - and this maybe a conversation, Jonathan, that you want to have with the other leaders, it's probably helpful to have one or two people of that group of leaders that will agree to kind of coordinate the efforts of the group. Otherwise it's just going to get stuck with a bunch of people doing their separate things and I don't think that's what we want.

So I suspect that that's what you're getting at there, Thomas, that - and we don't have to volunteer to be that lead but I think we should suggest that there needs to be some - a coordinator for that group of leaders or a couple coordinators to make sure it just doesn't get bogged down in a bunch of - five or six groups doing their separate things.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, Chuck, and I guess if I were to express my personal view I worry a little bit about that, you know, Thomas mentioned the word "patchwork" and although patchwork can lead to a quilt the challenge is it may not if there's no one there to put the quilt together. And it might look pretty ugly if everyone does their own piece of patchwork independently.

So for me this - where I've heard this really strong point I think in some kind of unifying charter at the outset is this concept of a common charter seems to be of potentially tremendous value to get the community off to the same start, the broader community.

And, you're right, someone's going to have to stick their head up a little without sticking it out so far that it puts people's noses out of joint. I had a feeling last night, and sometime these feelings can come and go, because you drift close to a potential solution and not. But I had a feeling with the conversations that were going around last night that there was a willingness to come together as a community, get round a common charter.

My concern is notwithstanding whatever the quality or not of what Mikey has managed to do already the danger I feel slightly of us putting his charter out too far into play - I think we should subtly share it with - like you said, perhaps with the ALAC and the ccNSO and say, look, is there another word we can use other than straw man that won't have such negative connotations? Because in a sense it is what we would call a straw man for a charter I think.

So anyone got another expression that we could use to - on the basis on which we could circulate that?

Mikey O'Connor: Equally obscure, I'll check with my fellow grenade thrower here but how about trial balloon?

John Berard: That'll work. How about red herring?

Mikey O'Connor: No.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Rough draft works, I think it really - is what it is.

Jonathan Robinson: And it's a rough draft of a cross community charter. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, and if you're going to be even more wobbly it's a tentative first draft.

Jonathan Robinson: Klaus, please come in.

Klaus Stoll: No, no, it's fine, absolutely fine. I really appreciate the quality of the conversation. I think one thing which we have to be absolutely clear, we have to make sure that these draft and all these things are coming from the community and not from staff. And yesterday even we also had a conversation about look, take me as an example, my board is now asking seriously if I'm working for ICANN for them.

And I'm - I talked last night to other people. They are exactly in the same boat if they're in the private sector or in the non for profit sector like me it doesn't seem to be much difference.

And I think we do also serve as to the other - to the rest of the communities if we start a conversation with the ICANN staff and with the Board about how do we get resources into that process which are not staff resources? I think these needs to be resources specific for the community.

And then we have actually the time and the ability to work on these proposals and more depth and get more quality. And I just would simply use the argument of - no sorry, special times need special measures.

And, Jonathan, maybe what I would like to see if the rest of the Council agrees just that you mention it somewhere.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: Mention that there might be some resource question but make it clear that the resources shouldn't go into staff but should go into the community because otherwise it will be just okay, we stock up on staff.

Jonathan Robinson: ...reply before we come to Chuck. It is in there and I'll make sure it's appropriately emphasized. I'm pretty sure it's in there but I take your point. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes again. A lot of good suggestions in terms of terminology what we call a (unintelligible) I'm not going to get into that. I think the more cautiously we can word that the better just to make it very clear. But I don't know if you're thinking about doing this but I think you ought to actually put this trial balloon or very tentative draft charter, whatever we're going to call it, out to them and ask for them to respond and comment and contribute to it and critique it.

I mean, I don't think we want to wait around, in other words, be more specific in terms of, hey, this has come out of our group, we want to put it on the table for discussion by all of the parties in this but be specific about asking them for feedback on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chuck. So let's just capture that for a moment. So I think what I've heard is terminology, tentative draft charter. So - and I think we are

asking Mikey to put that tentative draft charter to us, to other groups within the ICANN community, ccNSO, ALAC, others, start to circulate that, float that trial balloon, Mikey, that tentative draft charter, and get it out there so that we - but make it clear this is not a GNSO charter. Avri, respond.

Avri Doria: Only a question. With it already being floated to the IANA transition list isn't it already out there? It's out.

Jonathan Robinson: I didn't realize...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: The IANA transition list is rocking and so it's out there already. And it's, you know, right now it's out there as Mikey's late night couldn't find pizza but I got a lot of Coca-Cola extravaganza. It's purely a wild care freelance thing and has absolutely no, you know, I go to great lengths to make it clear that it's, you know, it's a maverick thing, it's not - but, you know, it's out.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Since when were you a maverick. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes again. I would just suggest though that there is still value in you specifically asking for feedback, that you would welcome feedback from the other SOs and ACs on that. That would communicate to them that we're really looking for this to be a team effort.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, and Jonathan, I think it probably would be more effective if it came under your signature than mine. You know, because then you could sort of disown me and sort of say, you know, this is - it's out there...

Jonathan Robinson: The problem I got a...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: You see where I'm...

Jonathan Robinson: Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you. So just maybe a further point on this is that you could simply say that there was a - one of the GNSO councilors that took the initiative to put this out that the GNSO itself is still looking to evaluate this and we would suggest that maybe this is a good starting point for others.

That way it's clear that this is not a GNSO proposal but it is the work of a GNSO councilor who has taken that initiative and maybe - maybe this is a good starting point for all of us.

Jonathan Robinson: Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I understand that we've concluded that part of the conversation. Possibly another question that it would have is surrounding the NTIA's wishes. When we discuss we were not entirely sure as to what the specific requests were. And unless that has been resolved by everybody between yesterday and today it might be worthwhile including something in the statement voicing this uncertainty and that we would like to work with the NTIA to further clarify the work statement that we need to get going.

Jonathan Robinson: Responses or thoughts to that?

Mikey O'Connor: I want to emphatically agree. When I was writing that charter I was writing it with the idea in my head that in effect the NTIA is the customer. And to the extent that their request is, you know, I was taking words out of their statement and I found them a little thin. And I left that section of the charter pretty thin for that very reason. And I also put in the charter a role for the NTIA and I was modeling that role as sort of a customer role.

Now Avri raised some good points on that list that we need to circle back to. But certainly it seems to me that there should be a role. And one of the questions that Avri raised was, you know, let's not give them a veto kind of role. So, I mean, there's a lot to work through there. And I think it would be really good to sort of get those conversations moving.

Jonathan Robinson: Keith.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: So this is Keith Drazek for the transcripts. I'm a little bit concerned about at this stage signaling or going back to NTIA and asking for more specific direction, if you will.

I think the words that they chose in their announcement in the FAQs on the NTIA Website and Larry Strickling's comments at the NCUC event here on Friday were very carefully chosen. I mean, this thing has been in the works for a long time. And very clearly, in my view, NTIA has tasked the ICANN community and ICANN with managing a process or initiating a community bottom-up consensus based process for figuring out what comes next.

And I think a very specifically did not sort of dictate what that might become. And so while there may be questions that come out, you know, of the charter discussions, of the cross community discussions trying to figure out okay what exactly are we trying to address here, I think those are reasonable questions to be asked. But I think it's a bit premature to ask those questions now until the community representatives have come together, have had the opportunity to have a conversation, to sort of start working on the charter.

And, you know, I'm not - and I'm certainly not saying that NTIA shouldn't have a role in this process, I think they absolutely should. But really what they've done is they've given us and other community members, inside and outside of ICANN, the opportunity to kick off a process. And I think we should be very

careful not to sort of prejudice the outcome or to even assume that certain things will be the outcome.

There's more on the table here than just coming up with accountability measures and accountability mechanisms within ICANN. This is a much bigger discussion and I think we need to be very careful not to self-limit or ask for potential limitations on us and on our work as we engage on this so thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Keith. And, Mikey, I know you want to speak, I'm just checking if there's anyone else who maybe hasn't got a chance to say anything or would like to - Mikey, come in then.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, this is just a question for the group that we don't have to answer now. But I don't have any particular aspirations. I would be happy to continue as sort of a rapporteur, stop entirely and hand it off to somebody else, keep charging hard and so on.

So when you're talking to the others, you know, it would be helpful for me because I do have the attention of that list and I could certainly exit my current phase and nudge things in one direction or another as I do that. So just keep that in mind as you have those conversations with the other leaders of the ACs and SOs and so on and feed me my lines, that's all I'm looking for.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Maybe I'll go out on a small limb here and say there's one other thing that I think I've sort of understood and have started to socialize personally with as many people as I can. And that is that there is a clear distinction between the work we're discussing now and that of the existing cross community working group. These are two separate efforts.

And I didn't get pushback or lack of agreement or lack of understanding with those with which I socialize in the course of conversations last night. There seems to be a clear recognition that whilst the existing cross community

working group touched on elements of the IANA transition that was prior to knowing that it was a reality and the reality defines a new opportunity and that new opportunity is the formation of a new group.

And so we are at that genesis formation point of a new group and these two should be able to coexist and operate alongside one another. So I don't know if anyone has a different view but that's where I think I'm at at the moment and I certainly got a sense that a number of others were at last night.

Any o there comments or thoughts on that? I'll refine what I've prepared based on this very helpful input and I'll take the point to reach out to the other SO and AC leaders about the nature of that tentative draft charter. Let's see if there's anything else we need to cover off now.

The next item we had on the bullet point was the prospective Council comments on the strategic panels. And my sense is that we've certainly got to a point where we want to comment on the work of the multi-stakeholder Innovation Panel and in fact in my back drawer somewhere I've got a draft of some comments that I'll circulate to the list and we're happy to take an initial lead on that.

I guess the other question within that - and maybe these could be captured as action items, Marika, is that Action 1 is responding to the output of the multi-stakeholder Innovation Panel. Question for which there may be an action is do we respond to any of the other panels as a Council? Are there any other panels that we should or could - well it's probably could or should more be responding to?

And I don't mind if that's an open question but it may be that there's some input here. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes again. One of the things I noted in that session with the four panels earlier this week was is that most - and this applies to at least three of

the panels, I guess I haven't analyzed it with regard to Vint's panel on the ICANN's involvement in the Internet governance ecosystem.

But most of their recommendations are tactical not strategic. Now that's not bad. But if you're looking for input into a strategic plan tactical recommendations don't fit very well. Now they still may be very useful and in the multi-stakeholder Innovation Panel there's a lot of neat ideas in there that may help us in our work in the GNSO but that was a general observations that it shared with them whatever day that was.

Jonathan Robinson: John.

John Berard: Yeah, thank you, Jonathan. At Tuesday's meeting of the Commercial Stakeholder Group and the Board this point was made that the recommendations were far more tactical than strategic. The point was also made was asserted over the weekend session that there was no consultation by the strategy panels with elements of the ICANN community.

Steve Crocker was clear that appropriate comment would be - would come at a time should any of those recommendations make their way into the ICANN strategic plan. So his point to us was there's no need to go to the, you know, go the extra mile, there's no need to offer comment until you see these things embedded in the strategic plan.

I don't know if you - I mean, I take him at his word. It seems like an appropriate path. But that would suggest that we don't need to - or maybe ought to comment on the panels individually at this time.

Jonathan Robinson: That's helpful and I'm happy to take that at face value. I'll tell you one of the thoughts that's occurred to me though is that there's been this - actually quite substantial financial resource and other resource gone into these panels. And the works sort of spun out in these various areas.

I would be quite interested to try and - and yet when we've talked about it now we talked about it with Theresa, with Fadi, you obviously talked about it with Steve, originally it seemed that there was a strong intention to weave these pretty substantially into the strategic plan. They were to drive the strategic plan.

And I feel like we've seen quite a lot of back pedaling from that position at this meeting; your example being one of them. So I guess it's - I'm not sure what my point is, it's just an observation really that that's - there's a couple of things really. There's lots of work gone on, it's cost lots of money. It's now not clear how much use is going to be made of all of this.

And it leaves us in a slightly uncertain position but I don't know if that sparks anyone else to make any related comments .

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey for the transcript. The other thing about those things is that I'm in Kristina's boat, I haven't gotten through the 28 hours of reading yet, I mean, it's a boat load of material. But the material that I have read contains errors. And I learned at the knee of my mentor, Mr. Chuck Gomes, that when there are errors we need to correct them.

And so I think in at a minimum maybe we divide it up into chunks and, you know, we draw lots as to who picks which one but I think some group of us needs to go in detail into each one of those and just understand them and understand if there are errors in there and if there are come out with at least comments that set those straight because otherwise the concern would be is that they sit on the shelf for a few years and then they arise again from the dead and find their way into some document riddled with errors that we've never bothered to correct. And then we're playing catch-up.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. I've got Maria and then...

Maria Farrell: Yeah just a short - it's Maria speaking - a short observation. I think the fact that the documents are now not explicitly part of any process, any decision making process, liberates us to read them and reflect on them and judge them entirely on their own merits really.

So, you know, I think there's some useful information in them - I found them somewhat useful in some respects, otherwise not. I think they're sort of interesting and informative and probably not - and rather expensive but probably not much more than that at this point.

Jonathan Robinson: Elliot.

Elliot Noss: Yeah, I want to - Elliot Noss, Tucows for the record, I wanted to pop up a bit and extend on Mikey's point which I thought was a great one. You know, I think the - one of the things that disappointed me through this expert working group - or sorry, the expert panels - keep my experts straight - expert panel's process was that there was really a lack of participation from the general ICANN community. You know, some of them were crickets, there was, you know, the usual suspects and Mikey and I and Bertrand kind of on a list almost by ourselves.

And, you know, and there was lots of arm-waving about, you know, not being consulted or not being involved, etcetera. And I think, you know, the key to multi-stakeholder is to get yourself, you know, to get one's self involved.

I think, you know, to echo some of the earlier comments, you know, Keith's in particular, the stakes around multi-stakeholder are significantly increasing. I think we're all talking about that.

The big opportunity around these strategy panels is that, you know, and something I was really impressed with was the quality of the people that Fadi was, you know, Fadi and whoever else were able to bring to be involved in these. They don't know the work of the ICANN community in detail.

Those, you know, errors are exactly, you know, should be expected from, you know, smart people who don't get complicated content. And something like what Mikey is talking about, you know, would be fantastic because it would, you know, get involvement.

And, I mean, we should all really look at the biggest opportunity with these strategy panels as the opportunity to maybe engage some additional really smart people in this process. And I think any way we can do that, you know, we just benefit, you know, multi-stakeholder and, you know, spend sort of less time drinking our own bathwater. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Elliot. Any other comments or input? I mean, so my takeaway on that is we don't - we will comment formally on the MSI panel. I'll lead some commentary on that. We may comment on other panels. There's a desire to error check but Elliot also makes a good point, to the extent that we can coop and - co-opt and retain the interest of any of the contributors to those panels our comments should maybe bear that in mind. And our objective should be to add value to and bring into the community rather than push away and potentially alienate.

James.

James Bladel: Just a quick comment. When we had the weekend session over here Fadi announced he was dissolving a couple of more - a couple of the panels. One of my questions was there plans, announced or otherwise, to constitute new panels in the future? Is there anything in our discussions with them that would indicate that we have any role or involvement in any future panels that would be set up?

I think the answer is that they're still going to just - just the dissolution of two panels doesn't necessarily mean that that's changed the overall approach or perspective on how to use these things going forward.

Jonathan Robinson: True - I'm not sure - let me Marika respond and then I've got Chuck in the queue.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to clarify I think the two groups that Fadi was talking about were the board advisory groups which are not expert panels because they were formed of - existing of Board members as far as I understood.

Jonathan Robinson: I mean, I have an interpretation of those board advisory groups, which as you say have now been pulled back from. But the idea behind those as I have understood it personally is that they were groups designed to take Board members to reach out to the community and be a sort of conduit to the Board on particular areas.

So, look, you're charged with bringing in information in and around this from the community as opposed to the strategy panels which exist a little bit more out there. And so - all right I think it's, you know, personally I suspect for many of you we've had an exhausting few days. And I'm happy to call it a wrap. Is that an Americanism or is that a - just checking.

But we could draw a line under this unless there are further comments - and basically I'm expecting that to the extent we haven't dealt with items on this list we'll pick them up but Marika's going to catch me here.

Marika Konings: No, this is Marika. Just one question on the item of review of the weekend sessions, for the last meeting I think we actually sent around a little survey asking people for input. Do people think that's helpful and it may help, I think Volker's next on the list to help the London meeting to get some ideas or suggestions, you know, what worked, what didn't work, you know, where should we spend more time less time.

Would that be something that people think is people if I try to send it out later today or next week or something? Or do you prefer to send suggestions on the mailing list, I mean, either way.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm with you. I think a survey is very useful. It's always good to know some feedback, and I mean, I think you did a Survey Monkey type survey previously and I'd be very happy to have it and respond to it.

Great. Let's draw a line under things then. Thank you very much. Thanks, everyone. And we've had pretty enthusiastic and continuously engaged participation which is fantastic and in a great spirit as well. You know, there's been - we've managed to air views and in constructive, thorough, well-argued ways and in a way that seemed to engage everyone in the room in all of the sessions we've had.

So personally I feel very energized and infused by this meeting, it's been great. So thank you very much all of you and thank you to the ICANN policy staff who've supported us and thank you to those of you who are in the room who've contributed to our work and our deliberations. Great. So we'll call it a day here and see you all in the public forum.

END