Adobe Chat Transcript - GNSO Council Meeting 10 April 2014

Marika Konings:Welcome to GNSO Council Meeting of 10 April 2014

Magaly Pazello:Good morning! I am here!

Alan Greenberg:I'm now on the call.

Amr Elsadr:Hello everyone.

Bladel:quite a bit of background noise

Marika Konings:The survey is still open at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/JB5MDBH

Amr Elsadr:I still haven't filled that survey. Apologies about that.

Marika Konings:I will resend the email as well

Amr Elsadr:Thanks Marika.

Osvaldo Novoa:Hello everyone, sorry I am late, I was delayed in another meeting.

Brian Winterfeldt:I am on now as well - both here and on the phone line.

Bladel:I would volunteer to assist Maria, if desired.

maria farrell:will do, jonathan. thanks!

John Berard:note that it is NTIA transition, not INTA

maria farrell:not that the distinction is always obvious... ;-)

Marika Konings:Will do! :-)

Martin Sutton:Hi - jut to let you know I have joined the call.

maria farrell:I think james means this recent announcement: http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-09apr14-en.htm

Lars Hoffmann:@maria: or this: http://www.icann.org/en/about/agreements/iana/transition/draft-proposal-08apr14-en.htm

maria farrell:oh yes, sorry. that's the one, lars.

Marika Konings:Or this one: http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-2-09apr14-en.htm

Marika Konings::-)

Amr Elsadr:Thanks for pointing that out Marika. I seem to have missed that announcement.

Bret Fausett, Registry Constituency:Apologies for my late arrival. I'm on now.

Marika Konings:If I understood correctly, input to the strategy plan as well as strategy panel input will both be considered for the next iteration of the strategy plan.

John Berard:Wait, what is the outcome of item 2? A new version of the proposed comment to be circulated?

Marika Konings:@John - the item comes backs under 6.1 (if you were referring to MSI input)

John Berard:I meant, RE: MSI strategy panel

Gabriela Szlak:Welcome Martin!

Brian Winterfeldt:+1

Amr Elsadr:The timetable seems like a good one to me.

Gabriela Szlak:Just a question: the FAQ that was shown was also sent to us already?

Gabriela Szlak:the FAQ that is shown now I mean

Marika Konings:@Gabriela – yes

Gabriela Szlak:Oh so I missed it...
Marika Konings:You can find it here: http://gnso.icann.org/mailing-lists/archives/council/msg16005.html

Gabriela Szlak:thanks

Jonathan Robinson:All. A reminder that we are targetting completing the meeting within 90 minutes. Current forecast is that we will need the 90 minuts.

Jonathan Robinson:@james. Agreed. it is a positive step that NGPC has acted in this way. We need to now take that and deal with it well / effectively.

Bret Fausett, Registry Constituency:Dropping Adobe chat but I will be on the call on my telephone.

Amr Elsadr:@Volker: +1. The substantive policy issue is not as relevant to us as defining the appropriate process.

Amr Elsadr:@Volker: +1 again. I sympathise with the need for spec 13. Just not sure the NGPC is going about it the right way.

Jonathan Robinson:Implementation will not take effect until 45 days from the publication of this resolution to: (i) provide the GNSO Council an opportunity to advise ICANN as to whether the GNSO Council believes that this additional provision is inconsistent with the letter and intent of GNSO Policy Recommendation 19 on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains; or (ii) advise ICANN that the GNSO Council needs additional time for review, including an explanation as to why additional time is required.

Bladel:+1 Thomas.

Amr Elsadr:@Thomas: +1 here too.

Ching Chiao (DotAsia):+1 Thomas

maria farrell:I like this idea too = can we do it in a reasonable time frame?

Amr Elsadr:Are we talking about launching an implementation review team consisting of the original WG members?

maria farrell:yes, I think so, Amr.

maria farrell:maybe we could go back to our constituencies and ask for volunteers who were involved in the process at the time.

Amr Elsadr:I believe the IRT's role is defined in the PDP manual.

Marika Konings:@Amr - as this PDP predated the revised PDP process, no implementation review team was created.

Bladel:conflict with Rec. #19 is a substance question, IMO.

Marika Konings:The PDP Manual does note that: ICANN Staff should inform the GNSO of its proposed implementation of a new GNSO recommendedpolicy. If the proposed implementation is considered inconsistent with the GNSO Council'srecommendations, the GNSO Council may notify the Board and request that the Board review theproposed implementation. Until the Board has considered the GNSO Council request, ICANN Staffshould refrain from implementing the policy, although it may continue developing the details of theproposed implementation while the Board considers the GNSO Council request.

Amr Elsadr:@Marika: Is there a problem with launching one this late in the game? I'm not sure about the procedure.

Marika Konings:@Amr - the challenge may be that as the policy was developed such a long time ago, it may be a challenge to form an IRT at this stage (are original WG members still around, as it is quite a few years ago, do people still recall the details of the discussion)?

Amr Elsadr:Yeah. Good points. That will be a challenge.

Ching Chiao (DotAsia):we also need to know how NGPC thinks -- if Spec. 13, in their own opinion, violates Rec. 19. It seems to me that in the later it indicated the the Resolution does violate Rec. 19 and they are asking the Council to fix it

Marika Konings:Committee of the whole

maria farrell:yes, happy memories...

Avri Doria:To note from history: there was alwasy a notion of continuing discussions on GNSO recommendation 19 at the time.

Ching Chiao (DotAsia):sorry "letter" , not "later "

Amr Elsadr:Thanks Avri. Speaking for myself, I feel we do need to become better informed on all this over the course of the next couple of weeks.

Alan Greenberg:Really good point Jonathan. They have finally done what we have been telling them is required. DO NOT make possible changes to policy without us. Now that they have, we need to make sure we act responsibly in getting back to them.

maria farrell:+1 James

Amr Elsadr:@James: +1. and thanks.

maria farrell:GNSO is a lot bigger and broader than, e.g. RSAC. and How do the nominations get finalised once we make them -?

Avri Doria:Do we propose that all groups have the same level of particpation, i.e. the number of GNSO particpants should be equal to the number of ccNSO representatives.   Or do we think we should have more than others?

Bladel:Correct.

maria farrell:So avri, we need more reps because we are big, not 'more than others'? fair enough.
Amr Elsadr:@Jonathan: RE: CCWG-IG..., I believe you're correct.

Daniel Reed:I'd distinguish the future of Internet goverance from the current GNSO mission. The first is broader than the second.

Gabriela Szlak:I fully support John in what is going to say which is our shared views on this topic
Marika Konings:Please note that there is no reply period: http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/strategy-panels-25feb14-en.htm

Gabriela Szlak:oh... why is that Marika?

Marika Konings:I'm not sure....

maria farrell:And sorry, it is Amr who's done the legwork of making inputs already, not me.
Amr Elsadr:It was actually Jonathan. I only commented on his draft.

maria farrell:right, right. jonathan drafted and you responded.

Amr Elsadr:@Marika, @Gabi: Not sure that a reply period is really necessary. It wouldn't serve any purpose, as the blueprint and recommendations are based on the work previously done. They're not meant to change following public comment.

Ching Chiao (DotAsia):sorry wrong hand

Gabriela Szlak:thanks Amr

maria farrell:tks all. useful meeting.

Amr Elsadr:Thanks. Bye

Daniel Reed:Thanks!

Bladel:Thank you!

Magaly Pazello:Thank you !

Ching Chiao (DotAsia):thank you Jonathan

Thomas Rickert:Bye all - thanks Jonathan!

Ching Chiao (DotAsia):thanks everyone

Brian Winterfeldt:Thanks Jonathan. Thank you all!