

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
Open and Substantial Strategic Session
Saturday 07 February 2015**

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/#feb>

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

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So what we have now is effectively between now and the coffee break set up for around 4 o'clock we've got an opportunity to work through a number of key items.

There was the - there's a session normally titled Open and Substantial Strategic Session. The plan there is to revisit the items that came out of the Council Development session in LA and make sure we check against those reluctant to call them strategic objectives but the aspirations that the council set itself.

And then we need to go into some preparation work which we've done very little for - a little of in order to meet effectively with I guess to some extent Theresa, Fadi and the board tomorrow.

Typically we've done more preparation in advance of the meeting. I've got a couple of notes I'm going to grab of items that I've picked up over the while and so I'll step out in a few minutes and get those.

But we'll work through some items. So if you could have in the back of your minds collectively and individually things that we need to - that would be useful discussion topics to have or things you'd like to hear from Fadi and in discussion with Fadi and/or the board bearing in mind that he is a member of the board.

So it's important not to as far as possible duplicate across those two because he will be present at both so focusing more probably on areas that he's responsible for as an executive and then matters for the board afterwards. But let's come to that later.

In the meantime Marika has kindly prepared some slides with summarize the or hopefully prepared some slides which summarize the work that came out of that session and LA which in some ways updates what we've done a year or so ago.

I think it's worth walking through those and trying to ascertain what if any action needs to take place from those.

So let's walk through those and just capture the key areas there. So can we have the first slide?

So out of that came six different areas of activity or focus. One focus on strengthening the working relationship with the GAC Two, and to some extent you could put one going in front of most of these I think because they had been previously picked up on as areas of ongoing work, increased efficiency and effectiveness of the council, facilitate entry of new volunteers into the GNSO working groups, acknowledgment and respect for the role and work of the GNSO in general in particular by the board, preparedness and understanding of by council and others topics under discussion and role function of the GNSO council in the GNSO.

So let's work through each of those individually and just check where we are and if there's anything else we should be doing.

So the kind of things we could and should be doing is direct communications with the GAC. We talked about a possibly informal early indication of subject matter of the communiqué, communicating effectively via a liaison, regular meetings amongst GAC council and board to facilitate coordination of

information, identify views and points of contact within the GAC to work with (unintelligible) encourage contacts.

I think the way you've structured this Marika is those six are things that are actually going on (unintelligible). Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. That's correct. And what is on the top is what we actually identified in Los Angeles is how we would measure success under each of these objectives.

Jonathan Robinson: So you've got your bullets and what does success look like and then what's actually been going on. And so later in this meeting we'll be looking at the preliminary recommendations coming out of the GAC GNSO Consultation Group.

We get that there's regular updates from GNSO liaison to the GAC. And we started the discussion - well we didn't really get too far with that as to how we might effectively engage with the GAC on the communiqué. (James) your hand went up. Let's hear from you.

(James): Just quickly, you know, we have our GNSO liaison to the GAC but is there any talk of having a GAC liaison to the GNSO?

Jonathan Robinson: Want to try and respond to that Mason?

Mason Cole: No, not that I'm aware of.

(James): Okay. I mean that's fair. Does anybody see any value to that or is that something we should be pursuing?

Jonathan Robinson: So just to give a partial answer to that -- it may be full answer if anyone else wants to add to it -- first of all the council if you look in the bylaws is structured such that we can have liaisons from other groups like our ccNSO liaison, ALAC liaison.

There's no reason from our point of view why we couldn't have a GAC liaison. I understand it was tried at some point in the past and didn't work for whatever reason for the GAC.

So we have discussed it. It remains a possibility. But currently the way in which the genesis of Mason's role that GNSO liaison to the GAC was all about making sure that the GAC was fed with information and was - had access to information on GNSO policy work so that there was no basis on which the GAC could say we didn't know that was going on, we had no opportunity to find out that was going on.

And clearly the work of the consultation group is about making that whole process as structured as possible.

(James): And so and I think that's working. And I think my point was just that when we talk about getting, you know, a sneak peek or an early indication of what they're talking about in the communiqué it would be nice if that were a symmetrical relationship and not simply a one-way conduit.

Jonathan Robinson: But maybe the passing of the communiqué is the way in which we deal with that right, I mean rather than necessarily via - I mean a liaison is one mechanism or tool.

And so the question is does - can anyone remind me us to where we got to? I mean Volker and (David) you are both working on that in different ways.

I think you were looking at the more sort of medium term and (David) you're going to look at the LA communiqué and see what if anything could and should be done with that.

(David): And yes and I didn't do that and the time has passed I guess unless we incorporated into a process following this meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: So really it then comes down to what we do for future meetings and where we are with that?

Man: Well the current thinking on the scoping for this is that we create a GNSO panel so to speak, not a council not a working group but a kind of a panel, advisory panel to the council that would be staff supported that would analyze the communiqué from the GAC following its output, i.e., intercessional - in an intercessional way.

Then direct the different analysis results to either working groups or the different constituencies of stakeholder groups for comment and coordinate the feedback from these various working groups, stakeholder groups or constituencies to the council in a consolidated way so that the council would be able to either one or two meetings - not ICANN meetings but council sessions after the communiqué has been published to respond to the board not to the GAC with advice and detailed analysis of what's the policy implications of that communiqué would be, how the communiqué affects existing or future policy work and how further policy work would be needed to implement that advice in the communiqué.

Jonathan Robinson: So this strikes me then this is a really interesting point because if - I get two things out of this. So Steve can I ask you to capture a list for our meetings with - I wonder if I should do this myself?

Maybe I should just capture it myself. I'm just wondering - if you can work with me on it and I may just do it myself.

But for the meeting with the board it strikes me that this would be useful to get a heads up to the board that this is where we're thinking.

And my suggestion is that we consider processing the GAC communiqué from this meeting in that way and we get on with it.

And I - and then I guess the next point is to follow on to that suggestion we'll need a lead for that group. I might look to my right on that but there may be someone else. James your hand's up to sort of perhaps respond to that.

(James): I did not volunteer.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (James).

((Crosstalk))

(James): No. Just a question is do we really need a formal standing panel organization or body?

I mean it sounds very situational that we get a communiqué. We say okay this touches you, you and you. Can you three go off, you know, and then the next time around it'll be three different people perhaps and just kind of keep cycling it through on a more of an ad hoc situational basis.

I'm just very concerned that we're very, very quick to set up new organizations and new structures and new groups and then, you know, appoint liaisons to them and have them. And I don't think it needs to be that cumbersome personally.

You know, and I would just be resistant to that. That my just shooting from the hip here a little bit.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so good point but we will need someone to be responsible for holding the pen or carrying it.

(James): Absolutely. And jut I feel like that can change based on the nature of the communiqué.

Jonathan Robinson: Well Volker wants to respond, Marika wants to respond. So we got Volker and then...

Volker Greimann: First of all I want to say the current thinking is then that's what I'm proposing that we would look at. And then of course I'm looking for feedback and comments on that before we form an actual action plan.

The reason why I have my thinking opted for a standing panel is a gain in time because the communiqué will usually be published after all council sessions have concluded.

Therefore appointing different - appointing liaisons or people to coordinate this after the communiqué has been published would always incur a certain delay as the council will probably take a month to come together after that and then have to appoint those people.

If we have a standing panel, a standing group of persons that would just coordinate this then we would possibly gain up to a month of time.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika?

Marika Konings: I just have one suggestion or idea could be that you could create a kind of template. So basically as soon as a communiqué comes in you break that down in pieces and basically have columns that say, you know, it's being dealt with by existing GNSO activities, will be dealt with by, you know, this is our - this is policy, this is implementation or a kind of structured approach.

And that is something you could for example post on a wiki that everyone could then have access to and populate. And again then the council would come back and say okay is this a document we have consensus around to work its way through that.

That may be a way of doing it in a structured way and still giving more people access at holding the pen even though you probably still need one person to drive it forward and keep it moving.

Jonathan Robinson: So you're suggesting the use of a template, one person who's responsible for leading and coordinating that but then that will be handled by the council?

(James): Yes.

Marika Konings: The template could basically be the response...

(James): Yes.

Marika Konings: ...where - and I think that's maybe where some discussion would need to happen okay so what would those categories be that you want to, you know, provide input on?

So that may require some work to think around what are the real, you know, categories you need to fill out the template but it might be a way that you can then recycle it for every communiqué that comes in.

You break that down in pieces and for each of those you identify, you know, is it something that concerns the GNSO?

If yes, you know, this is how we will deal with it or this is how we're planning to deal with it and this is how we will engage with you on that topic as obviously you have an interest in it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I've got Mason and then (James).

Mason Cole: Can I just to get away from that for a moment? Can I be reminded what the objective of parsing the communiqué is? To whom are we communicating and to what end?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so let me try and respond to that and then Volker if I get it wrong go (unintelligible).

The objective is to say are there any policy implications of this? And to the extent that they are which is the bit that we haven't discussed yet how do we communicate that back to the GAC? What the fact or as Volker said is our intention to communicate that to whom, to the board, to the GAC?

So that's my understanding. Volker?

Volker Greimann: Yes one of the problems the board faces when dealing with a communiqué is the board is not the policy making body. That's us.

And a lot of what the GAC communiqué advises to the board, raises as advice to the board is actually affecting policy work or requires policy work. So having this short line of the communiqué between the board and the GAC circumvents the GNSO.

And we are trying to insert ourselves into that process by looking at the communiqué and advising the board what this actually means and with respect to policy implications that we have for both ongoing or past policy work or issues that have no policy work currently which would need new policy work.

Jonathan Robinson: So (Steve) for our meeting with the board I think the topics are really the primary topic is GNSO GAC. And then the secondary topics that go underneath that are status update of, a status update with in relation to the consultation group and secondly proposed activity or relating to the communiqué. Is there any - is there a third topic that should be covered under that?

I just want to make sure because it feels to me like this feeds very nicely into our work with the board.

I know we had - did I come - I've got Mason, (James) and Stephanie in the queue so I think that's - have I lot - I'm not sure which of you have already

spoken in that little list that I had. I know you haven't Stephanie. (James)
were you still - Mason - so (James) and then Stephanie. Oh, sorry Mason...

Mason Cole: Me first.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead. Yes I thought you were deferring to (James).

Mason Cole: I'm happy to.

Jonathan Robinson: No go ahead, go ahead.

Mason Cole: I think with an opportunity here in a couple ways to improve the relationship
with the GAC.

One is we can engage with the GAC sooner so that they don't end up talking
past us in the communiqué. And we're seeing this now. I was talking with Phil
just a little while ago.

He and I are going to step out in just a few minutes and go meet with some
folks from the GAC to talk about the IGO INGO Curative Rights Mechanism
Working Group so that we don't end up with a communiqué that is too far
afield of the actual policy work.

I would be a little concerned that if we react to the communiqué without
engaging the GAC first that they'll view it the same way that we're just talking
past them.

So I'm not sure what the right answer is but we should at least I believe as
just - just a respect for them, let them know what we're doing with the
communiqué so they don't get taken by surprise.

Jonathan Robinson: So I'm 100% in agreement with you there. And my - that's my only
reservation about talking to the board about it tomorrow.

But I think we can say we're thinking about this and then we can as we develop our thinking which is we're close to maturing on we can talk with the GAC about it.

But at least I think it would be useful to talk with the board about it as well. But you're right we mustn't mess it up from a kind of diplomacy point of view.

Mason Cole: Right. And as long as the GAC understands why we're doing it...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Mason Cole: ...then I think it will be received with good intentions assumed.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. (James) and then Stephanie.

(James): So quickly, you know, Mason and I are thinking very much alike here I would want to make sure that the template would not, you know, come across something like thank you for contacting the GNSO, your communiqué is very important to us sort of response.

And but I do think we need to on that point respond not to the board but to the GAC. I feel like we're talking about who's talking past whom here. You know, if we're saying that we're going to parse the communiqué then send our response to the board I feel like that's just kind of feeding into that same cycle where it's organizations having this communication, this dialogue or trilogy through, you know, this third party.

I feel like we need to, you know, turn that around and engage with them directly.

And to Volker's point I understand what you're saying about having a standing committee cutting down on time.

I view it a more lightweight process where, you know, by the time everybody is getting on planes after a ICANN meeting they're reading the communiqué and they know that by the next GNSO council meeting that they have - we have a response teed up so that we're ready to go on that.

And it doesn't in my opinion doesn't take a standing committee that we can actually make those assignments a couple of days after the communiqué is published, people are taken the communiqué home and, you know, they've passed out a rudimentary or at least some bullet points of a response.

But maybe it's through the templates, you know, but something is ready so that the next post ICANN GNSO council meeting we're ready to go, we're ready to make a motion on a response.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So a couple of things, there's an action item for (Steve) which is what we want to do is I think we want to complete the work on the process for dealing with the communiqué.

So it's really to the extent that may already be an open action item. So we but we really want to - okay so Marika nods to comment. Marika I've got Stephanie next. Did you want to respond directly to (James)'s point? All right respond and then we'll go to Stephanie.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to maybe comment on why I think the discussion is around providing this to the board.

Because at least I think where this action item already had came from is feedback from the board that they would welcome or at least one of the board members indicated that he would welcome feedback from the GNSO on the GAC communiqué because that would help or assist the board in evaluating or responding to the GAC communiqué.

So I think his idea was that, you know, having a document from the GNSO that would say, you know, these issues in the GAC communiqué are clearly,

you know, gTLD policy related issues and these are how we're dealing with them would give the board kind of their ammunition to go back to the GAC as they respond to the communiqué to say well, here you go. You know we've heard from the GNSO but they are actually dealing with this issue which is, you know, completely within their remit so, you know, we'll have them deal with it.

And so I think that was the original thinking about why its response to the board. So I just want to provide that feedback.

Jonathan Robinson: So let's not use the word ammunition. We're not at war with anyone here.

The other point though is I think James made a valid point that we shouldn't lose sight of and that's that notwithstanding whether we go to the board to provide them with the information they need to deal with whatever the GAC's communiqué is there's still a diplomacy issue which is what Mason picked up on which is which could well be part of your role is to say to the GAC look by the way this is where we - how we are responding or have responded to the communiqué and here is how it's going but it's gone to the board. We're letting you know via this channel as well.

Stephanie I need to come to you and then respond to that Mason.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. Thanks very much, Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I originally put up my card in response to (James)' remark about not over processing, you know, not creating new procedures.

On the other hand and I realize it's a big step forward just to even be responding to the communiqué. That's a baby step forward.

But if our ultimate goal is to strengthen our relationship with the GAC and to improve policy outcomes between the various bodies somehow we have to have a strategic overview of what's going on and how their thinking is evolving so the episodic response yes here's the communiqué, we figure out

how to respond, Mason has an enviable job of being diplomatic about how to make sure that's received. I'm avoiding the use of the word incoming.

Strategically I can see right now if there's a gap between the NCSG and the business group on our definition of what's in the public interest and what human rights are and what due process is let me tell you I think there's a huge gap between what both our groups, not just the NCSG in the GAC view as what's in the public interest what's their role?

So from a long-term strategic vision there's got to be a lot more clashes unless we figure out a way to have a better discourse on that. And that's a long term strategy.

So in other words if we're just responding I don't think we're moving to the next step of maturity in this relationship.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. And to be clear I mean Mason you probably want to come in here. This is part of a strategic initiative which is what the Consultation Group is doing and its multifaceted the liaison. It's the relationship between the chairs. It's the processing of the communiqué which happens to be a new nuance to the whole thing.

It's not - it's certainly not ad hoc, nor piecemeal I hope. I hope it's integrated in the way. Did you want to come in Mason?

Mason Cole: I was going to make a point on your - I'm sorry this is Mason. I was going to make a point on your previous the point that you made.

If we do this well and we do it right there maybe issues in the communiqué that could have been addressed that end up not being addressed because the GAC's understanding is further than it would be otherwise.

Jonathan Robinson: To make sure I understand that point -- it's Jonathan -- that the point there would be that it wouldn't come out in the communiqué because we had sort of headed it off through effective communiqué?

Mason Cole: If you want to put it that way yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Are there any other - I mean so what I've captured from this is that there is a willingness and an intention to do with the communiqué and understand the policy implications.

We'll - we intend to do a broadly along the lines already agreed. There's a reluctance to set up a specific committee and that's something which we want to do speedily by the time we next meet as a council.

My feeling's we need at least in the interim one person to own this. And I'm - I proposed Volker, I don't know if you - and really in this capacity as someone who's carried this work but also as a vice chair it seems to make sense to me that someone grabs it and says I'll help fill the templates, run that past the council, get in shape for the council to review and process it at the next meeting. How does that sound?

Volker Greimann: I would hope for some more input though if anybody has any ideas or suggestions on how to structure this.

I am willing to own this but I'm hesitant to create all this out of thin air. So any comments and feedback would be helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes and this is Marika. I'm happy to try to assist with at least the template and starting work on that if that's helpful?

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Marika, sterling job. That will be great. So that will be the intention that we draft the template. We can work with this. And we can - we

don't have to, you know, that's good enough I think if we have a template, we have an intention, we have someone who's going to run with it, the council and broadly we've got a process. Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: As you well note ICANN runs a Web site where all the GAC advice is established and how the board deals with it.

And maybe we could use our template, provide that to the board and they could then also publish our input on that GAC on the communiqués, i.e., GAC advice where it, you know, it's affecting GNSO policymaking.

Jonathan Robinson: So my thought is that that link perhaps to our discussion with the board today or tomorrow which is what the one set of sort of items that we are trying to process through in this broader session and that Steve has started to help with making and some (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Volker Greimann: Can we flag that as a complete proposal with the board because it's my impression that particularly on new gTLD issues policymaking has done pretty much between the GAC and the ICAN board at the moment.

And it would be good to see our role being highlighted and then improved in that regard as well. And, you know, having mentioning our - having - seeing our feedback on the communiqué mentioned in that public register would be a good thing to have there.

Jonathan Robinson: All right let's move on to the next subject and I think we're done with that. Let's move onto the next subject. The lines cut off at the top but I assume it says increased efficiency and effectiveness of the council.

Marika maybe you could help me by talking to this slide just what reminding us what - where this came from?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it was triggered by some of the conversations that happened at the last meeting where there were some last minute changes to motions that weren't discussed beforehand. And I think that created a sense of frustration or, you know, additional delay that wasn't necessary.

I think also focusing more on, you know, how we measure time between initiating something and a final decision. I guess that helps us focus as well where efficiencies can be created.

And counting initiatives and completions I think goes to that same point. It also dealt with, you know, give counselors as much notice as possible on certain things coming up on the agenda.

And again I think this last point goes again to the how to deal with motions and changes that come up during council meetings.

I think this is again a conversation around if amendments are provided and how do those counselors deal with those if they haven't been given specific instructions by their respective groups?

So I think those were some of the points that came up as, you know, how to measure success or what issues to focus on.

But I put as, you know, what have we done? Maybe this is a focus point for the next period because I don't think anything concretely has been done in this regard that would count as an achievement or change in this regard.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Marika. Any comments? Any questions? Okay instead of waiting I'll just ask my own. How will we proceed on this?

How will we - will we start generating statistics off these measures of success and see if we fulfill this stated goal or what would be the, like you said here focus point for the next period of how to measure and increase this effectiveness and efficiency?

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. I think that's as well when you get to the last slide a - brought a question or point of discussion for the council how would you like to move forward on each of these items?

Because, you know, for some of them I've identified I think initiatives or actions that, you know, would qualify under the strategic objectives but they weren't necessarily initiated to meet those. It's more, you know, happens to be aligned.

So I think the question is, you know, is this something where, you know, council members should be assigned to each of these priorities and, you know, put forward ideas or work with staff on, you know, what could be done to achieve those and again report back at the next meeting?

And is there a small committee that should take responsibility for this and again come up with ideas on how some of these objectives can be achieved?

So that, you know, at the end of the year when we come back again for development session we can say okay, what did we actually achieve and how does that compare to where we started off? So I think that's it probably the point of discussion or consideration for the group as a whole.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Marika. Okay I see no hands so let's move on to the next topic already.

This is (unintelligible) of the entry of new volunteers into the GNSO Working Groups. This is a past topic of a former colleague of ours who's no longer with us on the council level but I think many of us carry this question at heart.

If you could just summarize the slide and then we'll open for discussion.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, just focusing in on maybe some of the initiatives that have been undertaken in this area that doesn't go along the lines of what was set out as, you know, measures of success.

And we're working on the GNSO onboarding program. And (Mary) and (Lars) will talk more about that this afternoon as we talk about the PDP improvement.

I think you've all seen the new one-stop shop GNSO information page that we've created to facilitate access and information to GNSO related content.

We also did that for GNSO related meeting information. So there's one page that hopefully makes it easier as well for newcomers to access that information and get familiar with GNSO activities.

And I'm also going to be re-launching shortly the GNSO newcomer Webinars. Several of you have cohosted those last year.

And we think we're going to slightly change the format to instead of monthly move it to a quarterly format and then give more opportunities for those signing up to indicate what they really would like to hear about so we can, you know, tailor make those more.

And so those I think are some of the things that we've been working on that I think would qualify under this heading.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Marika. First hand up is (James) and Heather.

(James): I thought Heather was before so okay. So I think just commenting on this slide and then the one before about being efficient in our operations something that's - I've been looking for the right moment to kind of tee up this thought here which is that this group, the GNSO is responsible for managing the policy development in ICANN. And I just I feel personally lately that we're not doing a very good job.

And I think that we just need to come to terms with that fact because for a very simple reason that I don't think we have any real awareness of our capacity for policy work.

We don't know what we're capable of supporting at any given moment and it seems to be dwindling. We keep saying we're going to reach out, find new volunteers. Where are they coming from, you know?

We've been talking about this for years. Does - has anybody, you know, help me find them because I, you know, we can hire three of them, you know, right now we're so buried in stuff.

We see what we have on our plate today. We see what's coming down the line with RDS, with the new, you know, topics.

And my - and then we're still saying things like well how do we get new volunteers, you know? Here's my question. At what point do we say this has got to wait. This has got to stop?

We understand it's important whichever group or constituency is driving this but it - there's just no more room on the cart, you know, for anymore projects that are going to take, you know, 18 to 24 months?

There's no - there are no new bodies coming in to help us build up our workload, build up our capacity to do policy work.

So this is something that I'm struggling with, you know, obviously personally as you can tell my tone but just generally, you know, organizationally and across the institution.

And I guess I'm putting it out to this council am I completely out of line by making these comments? And what are we going to do about it? At what

point do we kind of put the brakes on some of these things and say we just can't take X on until Y, you know, comes off the stack?

Jonathan Robinson: Interesting point (James). Next in line is Heather or just anybody would like to respond directly to the comment of (James)?

Stephanie and (Yoff) and Thomas.

Stephanie Perrin: I should I suppose say I'm a newbie so maybe you can blame some of my (overwhelm) on that.

But I'm not that much of a newbie and I totally, totally, totally agree with you (James). I think that's why I brought up the World Administrative Radio Conference.

I mean, I think ICANN is trying to do a good job of extraordinarily complex global issues and pretend they can do it in I mean, I hate to keep picking on the four days.

But I mean IANA has taken over our lives. We've got people who are trying to work on the IANA I don't know how many days a week and also figure out what - how we're going to respond to that EWG and also figure out everything.

I'm on three working groups right now. And I'm not going to be on any - and I'm not showing up on time for the policy and implementation one half the time.

We can't drag new people in without training them. We don't even know kind of policy depth we've got around this table, you know, in terms of the complexity of the policy issues that we're being asked to solve.

So I think it's kind of like crisis. And I didn't see that in the GNSO review. I didn't see the kinds of things that I'm obsessed about with respect to the job we're doing here so thank you for saying it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Stephanie. (Yoff) is next.

(Yoff): Yes I totally agree with you (James). I think that I've been hearing for many people I hear for a long time. I've been hearing this conversation about volunteers in the community and outreach and so on that over ten years and I've never seen them, you know, coming. So we have some new people that are coming. And usually they have interest around it and they get - that's where they get involved in most cases.

And I totally agree with you that we need to somewhere to say okay stop that there's not - we can't do all these things, no one to do that. And the main thing that happens is that you don't really - we're talking about a consensus policy that all stakeholders are being represented in the right way.

I think the only place where we really get full representation of the all the stakeholders is here in the council. But unfortunately against what I believe we don't discuss policy. We only discuss how to manage a policy.

And in the working groups you don't get that. In most cases you get people that are have time to get involved in that. And usually they might be with special interest and you don't get all stakeholders there. And that's, I think say that's the main problem.

Jonathan Robinson: Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: Yes. At the risk of sounding like a broken record I think it's not for the GNSO council to do that type of outreach. We're here to take care of policy development. The wider GNSO, the SOs and ACs they should be doing outreach.

I'm fully supportive of an induction program for councilors to bring them up to speed. So that's within the council's remit but I think the general outreach activity is not within the remit of the council.

Having said that nonetheless I think there are many amongst us including Avri, (James) and myself who've done newcomer seminars for interested individuals. And we will continue at least for my part I will continue to do that.

But I'm fully supportive of (James)'s notion to strike that off our list once and for all and not because it's not important but just because it's not our job to be engaging in that.

(James): Can I just point out that wasn't quite what I was saying. I wasn't saying it wasn't our job it wasn't our focus...

Thomas Rickert: No but I think it is.

(James): Okay because you said at the end there you agree with (James) and then you said this thing that I wasn't saying so...

Volker Greimann: Next up is Heather then myself, (David) and then I go to the microphone.

Heather Forrest: Thank you. Thank you Volker, Heather Forrest for the record. In fact my comment follows neatly on from the comments of Thomas.

I'll speak a positive note in this discussion and say that as a new member of council I've found the newcomer Webinars to be very helpful and I commend Marika and her team on the way those are run.

I do think they could be made more helpful with a focus on some of the procedural aspects of what it is the council does and not just the substance of a council does. But I commend the efforts that are taking place there. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. (David)?

(David): I have I - just to Thomas, I think there is a difference between recruiting new volunteers and facilitate their entry.

Like maybe the council as a whole shouldn't be directly trying to drag them in but making it easier, removing barriers to entry is something we should be doing.

And I have to - but really Marika I wanted to say for a start I'd say the new GNSO information page I'd just say that seems to be a great initiative and thanks to all the staff who worked on it. And you're pointing (Margie) especially that that's like I haven't heard anything bad and I've heard a lot of good right?

And that's probably the only bit of the ICANN Web site I can say that about lately.

The but particularly Marika I wanted to ask but I think you (unintelligible) this I'm sure, well the staff anyway with whoever's relevant do we have any sort of indication of how and how many newcomers are genuinely are using the on boarding program or the newcomer Webinars? Have they gone on? How many people have used those Webinars who have either are new entries to the policy processes or so on?

Do we have any sort of statistics measuring its value basically is what I am trying to get at or anecdotes for that matter?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I mean we could get at information I think but at this stage it would be more anecdotal because of course we do track, you know, who signs up, who comes and participates.

And it has been a bit of a mixed bag. And, you know, complete newcomers people are either interested in joining a working group but at first when they learn more.

We've also had people that have been, you know, doing many working groups but just want to, you know, refresh on some of the processes and procedures.

And also some, you know, that go in-between that have been participating but still feel that it is beneficial for them to come there. And it's kind of an open environment, you know, any questions you may have.

And we have seen the participation per Webinar is relatively small. So it's, you know, between two to five people. So it's normally a small group of people that comes which I don't think is necessarily a bad thing because it does mean that they feel that it's an open environment and can ask any questions they may have.

But we are trying to see if there's a way of, you know, enlarging the group a bit by maybe changing it from a monthly format to a quarterly format as that having them as well indicate beforehand what they want to hear about.

Because now we basically start off and maybe some people don't even know what they should be asking for once we open the meeting. But if they have some topics on a Google form that they need to fill into to participate it may be easier for them to say oh, well I actually would like to learn about these and these things.

So we're trying to see if we can target that more and, you know, we're happy to look in the previous statistics. But of course it's has to assess, you know, is that the only thing that led them to participate in the NGSO efforts or, you know, was this just someone recommended it but they had already intended to sign up?

But again I think what we're also working on I haven't mention it here we're also looking at tools to facilitate working group sign up so that it's no longer everything needs to go through the secretariat and a lot of, you know, administrative hassles that need to go through that it's also more streamlined process, very clear information on then how that happens. And that for example would allow us as well to then ask people as they sign up, you know, how did you hear about this?

Is it because you attended a newcomer Webinar that you heard about this initiative? Is it someone spoke to you? You went to the GNSO Web site?

So I think there are ways that we're trying to see as well, you know, to facilitate. And as you said, you know, lowering the barriers to participation which probably may also help us in gathering some of the information on, you know, who are - where are these people coming from, you know, what do they need? How can we make sure indeed that we provide them the support that they need to keep engaged and participate?

Volker Greimann: Thank you Marika. Next in the queue is myself that Greg and then Chuck and then I would like to in the interest of time cut the queue and then move to the next topic.

From my side just a brief observation, I don't think we have necessarily a shortage of people that can do work. If you have a topic that is of interest to many people for example the Privacy Proxy Working Group then everybody and their dog will show up.

We have other working groups that are of less interest that have less than ten people showing up or and some constituency might not even show up at all. That is I think more of a problem than the problem of having people that are able to do it. We have enough people that are able. We have to have more people that are willing.

And second point one of the things that I'm missing here on this list is outsider interest, outsider participation, how to gain participation of experts in a certain field that might not be a member of the community?

How to - what outreach is being done to members inside the community to get active, currently not active but also outside of the community that might be able to provide valuable input either as experts that are on hand for answering certain questions or as full participants.

And then I'm going to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Volker, Greg Shatan for the record.

I had the privilege of attending yesterday a meeting of the SO AC, SGC leaders in preparation for the high importance high interest topics session on Monday. There are three main topics that are being discussed.

But they're really all variations on this topic or on how to resolve this topic or tools for managing this topic or something along these lines.

So there is a great deal of congruence between what the councilors are discussing and what the leaders of the stakeholder groups that you are representing are discussing. A mechanism to bring all that to gather and to move it forward is clearly important.

So to the extent that Thomas is concerned that this isn't really the work of the council that may be true but it is the work of the groups. And it is - it's going forward and how to capture that is critically important. And to have that discussion maybe even amongst yourselves with your executives about how they're dealing with that.

And I would encourage those who are interested in this topic to in their copious free time attend the high interest topics session because it really touches on many of the same issues. Thanks.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Greg. And the final one on this topic is Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And I - without undermining anything that anybody has sat on this I want to give less doom and gloom picture because I just said I'd look at the Policy and Implementation Working Group and looking at just those that have attended at least almost half of the 40 some calls we've had and meetings we've had five of those 13 people were relatively new.

And by relatively new I mean in the last four or five years before that they weren't involved. So that's about 38% of the real active members that are new that wouldn't have been here four, five years ago.

So I don't think it's all doom and gloom. And I think that some of you in your groups are doing a good job of getting new people involved in the working groups.

And I'm certainly seeing that as a working group member and in this case a co-chair where there - I've gotten quite a few new people that are involved.

So it's not all doom and gloom. That doesn't mean we shouldn't be doing what (James) is suggesting or anybody else is suggesting. We're going to always have a recruiting challenge and we need to keep working on that and get better at that. But there are good things happening and there are new people involved.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Chuck. And with that I would like to table this discussion, move back to it if we have more time at a later stage because we still have to go through the prep for the board meeting and the meeting with Fadi which is of utmost importance that we complete this today so we have something to discuss tomorrow.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Thanks Volker. I agree with that. So I wonder just to check with on the recording would you like to pause the recording now and then - okay so we'll just - we'll stop the recording now and we'll then and we'll come back to that in a moment.