GNSO Council Adobe Transcript 19 November 2015

Marika Konings: (11/19/2015 14:21) Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of 19 November 2015

Carlos Raul: (15:35) Guten Morgen Liebe Sorgen

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (15:46) It is 80"s night on Adigo?

Heather Forrest: (15:48) Thank you, Good (very early indeed) morning!

Glen de Saint Gery 2: (15:51) Heather do you need a dial out so early in the morning?

Heather Forrest: (15:51) Yes, Glen, that would be very helpful, thank you!

Keith Drazek (RySG): (15:54) Hello everyone!

James Bladel: (15:55) Morning all!

Glen de Saint Gery 2: (15:55) I will arrange that now

Heather Forrest: (15:56) Much appreciated, thanks Glen.

Glen de Saint Gery 2: (15:57) Please join the phone line if you can and if you need a dial out please let me know

Julf: (15:57) queueing for operator...

Valerie Tan: (15:58) Hi everyone!

Mary Wong: (15:59) Hello and welcome, Valerie, Julf and everyone!

Marilia Maciel: (15:59) Hello all!

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (15:59) good afternoon!

Rubens Kuhl: (15:59) Hi @All!

Marilia Maciel: (15:59) Waiting to be connected through the phone

Rubens Kuhl: (16:00) Also waiting on the phone bridge.

TONY HARRIS: (16:00) waiting for conf. coordinator on phone

Julf: (16:00) Got through, hello everybody1

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (16:00) they are a bit slow today. i waited 5 minutes

Keith Drazek (RySG): (16:00) It was a bit slow getting an operator, but I can confirm they're working. ;-)

Carlos Raul: (16:00) ok

Carlos Raul: (16:00) I;m waiting too

Julf: (16:01) They are slow even after you get through :)

Rubens Kuhl: (16:01) Just got in.

Marilia Maciel: (16:01) waiting

Jennifer Standiford: (16:01) waiting

David Olive: (16:02) Welcome Everyone

Amr Elsadr: (16:02) Hi all.

David Cake: (16:02) I'm still waiting on an operator (though I can use AC in the interim)

Marilia Maciel: (16:02) I am in

James Bladel: (16:03) Joining the bridge, wiating on operator.

Donna Austin, RySG: (16:03) waiting on an operator too

David Cake: (16:04) Welcome all

TONY HARRIS: (16:04) I am in

Rubens Kuhl: (16:05) AC says recording is on.

Carlos Raul: (16:05) we lost Glen???

Rubens Kuhl: (16:05) But phone bridge recording might not be.

Glen de Saint Gery: (16:05) volker would you like to start?

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (16:06) yes, please glen

Marika Konings: (16:06) Glen, we cannot hear you on the bridge

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (16:06) Glen -- you appear to have dropped off the call

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (16:06) we cannot hear you

Rubens Kuhl: (16:06) And AC recording is now indicating off.

Paul McGrady: (16:06) An operator called me, but the call was dropped when being transferred from the front desk of my hotel. Can they please retry me? Thanks!

Rubens Kuhl: (16:08) Adobe Connect still not recording.

Marika Konings: (16:09) @Rubens - for the Council calls we do not record the AC room, only the call itself.

Rubens Kuhl: (16:09) Tks Marika.

Marika Konings: (16:09) similar for GNSO WGs

Mary Wong: (16:09) FYI there is also a live audio stream for any community member(s) who wish to follow along (though they are not able to speak during the call).

Amr Elsadr: (16:10) Link to the live audio stream if anyone wishes to share it: http://stream.icann.org:8000/gnso.m3u

Mary Wong: (16:10) Thanks, Amr!

Carlos Raul: (16:10) waiting for the dial out please

Carlos Raul: (16:11) Welcom Steve!

Mary Wong: (16:11) Welcome also to Robin from the CCWG group as well!

Amr Elsadr: (16:13) Aplogies. Who was asking about the DNS EC?

Keith Drazek (RySG): (16:13) Volker, a bit difficult to hear you.

James Bladel: (16:13) @Amr = that was Jolf

James Bladel: (16:13) Sorry...Julf.

Amr Elsadr: (16:13) Thanks James.

Marika Konings: (16:13) @Julf - I don't recall see any email (I may have missed it) could you maybe resend them so I can also make it available in the Adobe Connect room when we get to the item?

Amr Elsadr: (16:13) I didn't see an email either.

Julf: (16:16) @Marika will do

Amr Elsadr: (16:16) @Volker: Isn't there a social agenda involved in the meeting planning as well? ;-)

Julf: (16:17) resent, subject is "DNS Entrepreneurship Center"

Marika Konings: (16:23) @Carlos - correct

Marika Konings: (16:23) @Carlos - Jonathan agreed to continue in his role of co-chair for the Consultation Group

Marika Konings: (16:23) which was supported by the Council during the wrap up session

Marika Konings: (16:24) which of course does not prevent the new leadership from actively participating in the CG ;-)

Amr Elsadr: (16:24) @Marika: Yes..., that was my understanding as well. Jonathan's staying on this group, which I believe makes sense.

Carlos Raul: (16:24) lost the bridge just as wanted to talk. Sorry

Carlos Raul: (16:26) Please restablish dial put bridge to +506 8837 7176

Carlos Raul: (16:26) dial out

David Cake: (16:27) I'm also continuing in the CG, though as councillor not VC.

Mary Wong: (16:30) @Volker, Paul and James have hands up

Nathalie Peregrine: (16:30) @ Carlos, we are dialing out out once agin

Mary Wong: (16:30) (sorry David, I assumed that was an "old" hand)

Carlos Raul: (16:32) there is a problemNathalie

Carlos Raul: (16:33) will try to survive with Adobe on my laptop

Carlos Raul: (16:33) thank you

Marika Konings: (16:34) The Council may want to think about how this continuing liaising can be done - e.g. is there a need for a formal 'liaison', should there be a standard update on IETF activities during each GNSO meeting at an ICANN meeting, invite IETF leadership to the next meeting?

Rubens Kuhl: (16:36) Due to the way is structured, we might want to split IETF into IETF WGs like DNSOP, EPPEXT etc.

Rubens Kuhl: (16:37) Yes, we hear you.

Carlos Raul: (16:37) hardly

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (16:38) carlos, that may be your line

Carlos Raul: (16:38) no

Carlos Raul: (16:38) have no line open at the time. The volumen differences between the different spekers is amazing

Mary Wong: (16:38) @Rubens, it may be a topic to discuss with the IETF as to how best continuing liaising can be accomplished. Your suggestion may well be the preferred way, or there may be others worth discussing between the Council and them.

Carlos Raul: (16:39) normally a cel phone can handle that better than my cheap laptop

Carlos Raul: (16:39) but today the audio bidge over the phone is really bad

Amr Elsadr: (16:39) We can go throught the resolved clauses first.

Amr Elsadr: (16:40) I do.

Nathalie Peregrine: (16:45) apologies for the disturbance, the operator is isolating lines as qickly as possible

David Cake: (16:46) Rubens, n IETF that is a natural way to organise it. Worth noting that Suzanne Woolf is co-chair of DNSOP, and so probably available to speak to the GNSO

Jennifer Standiford: (16:48) Thanks James

Rubens Kuhl: (16:48) Some familiar faces at ICANN meetings also listed as area directors and WG chairs at https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/

James Bladel: (16:49) Call dropped, apologies. Reconnecting.

Amr Elsadr: (16:51) That's a big swallow Carlos. :)

Nathalie Peregrine: (16:52) @ Carlos, we will dial out to you again now

Amr Elsadr: (16:52) I can hear Carlos again.

Mary Wong: (16:52) We can hear you, Carlos

Keith Drazek (RySG): (16:52) everyone please mute phones and computers when not speaking

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (16:52) it is beter to use dial out - AC room has had real issues as of late....

Keith Drazek (RySG): (16:52) and if you're on the phone, mute your laptop speaker (or vice versa)

Jennifer Standiford: (16:53) for some reason, the adobe connection is not stable today. is anyone else experiencing issues with getting kicked off.

Mary Wong: (16:53) @Susan, Marika is doing it now.

Carlos Raul: (16:55) I think is good.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (16:56) I can agree to tha language proposed. If necessary it could be narrowed to items that have been raised in the public comment on the initial report.

Carlos Raul: (16:56) maybe "drafted in detail", instead of "called out"

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (16:56) but only if the council considers the proposed language too broad

Keith Drazek (RySG): (16:57) +1 James

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (16:57) "included in the charter"

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (16:57) ?

Rubens Kuhl: (16:57) With a new (3) Resolved, old 3 needs to become 4.

Marika Konings: (16:57) For the record, the WG will be required in any case to reach out at an early stage to all SO/AC/SG/Cs for input on the issues it is addressing so this just reaffirms that commitment and notes the specific input on the charter is also welcomed.

Carlos Raul: (16:57) +1 Marika

Rubens Kuhl: (16:58) I believe it to be in scope, Amr.

Marika Konings: (16:58) @Amr - it is part of the impact assessments that are covered in the charter. If we start calling out one, we probably need to call out all?

Marika Konings: (16:59) the issue was also specifically called out in the Final Issue Report and the framework which are all considered foundational documents for the WG

Amr Elsadr: (17:00) @Marika: Is it in the charter? Been trying to figure out where. We were discussing this during the monthly NCSG policy call, and we are concerned that a risks assessment is not the same thing as a rights impact assessment.

Amr Elsadr: (17:00) But I would appreciate a reference that was made in the final issues report. I may have missed that.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:03) " any items" -> "any items raised in the public comments"

Amr Elsadr: (17:03) I was dropped off the call. :(

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:05) i can agree to both versions

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:05) it is just a suggestion

Rubens Kuhl: (17:06) Yes we can hear you.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:06) sounds great amr

Heather Forrest: (17:06) @David - Marika has her hand up

Amr Elsadr: (17:07) Or rather sastisfy my concern, not satisfy me. :)

James Bladel: (17:08) +1 Volker. That's a sound addition.

James Bladel: (17:08) Otherwise the "goal posts" will keep moving.

Marika Konings: (17:08) Could I get the specific language that is being proposed?

Marika Konings: (17:08) so I can put it in brackets in the AC room?

Mary Wong: (17:08) Echo

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:09) Marika: same as yours, but change "any items" to "any items raised in the public comments"

Susan Kawaguchi: (17:10) Thanks David

Amr Elsadr: (17:10) If there is a procedural issue with amending the first resolved clause, I'm fine having this in the third resolved clause instead.

Mary Wong: (17:11) @Amr, any specific language that you want added?

Marilia Maciel: (17:12) I agree with Marika. The initial language she proposed was better. However, we have one specific amendment tabled for consideration. We should examine this point.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:13) I'll make it easy: if the new language will be accepted as friendly with the narrow language, I'd prefer it, but if it is the aspect that would prevent it from being friendly, I'll withdraw

Amr Elsadr: (17:13) @Mary: Trying to come up with some elegant language. Something to the effect of "any input provided during the public comment period for the preliminary issues report, but not explicitly made clear in the charter, be considered by the PDP WG". Does that work?

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:14) I think that works, Amr. There should be a reference to the public comments already submitted.

Marika Konings: (17:14) @Amr - would you like to see that added at the end of the first sentence of resolved 3?

Amr Elsadr: (17:15) @Marika: Yes. Thanks.

Amr Elsadr: (17:15) @Keith: That's what I'm thinking too. Like I said, this point was also clearly included in the staff report on the public comments.

Carlos Raul: (17:16) yes

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:17) 3. The WG, when convened, is instructed to reach out to all SG/Cs for additional feedback on any items previously raised in the public comments to the initial report that it believes should be considered that may not have been specifically called out in the charter. Should the WG be of the view that after the review of this feedback changes need to be made to the charter to address these, the WG is expected to come back to the Council with proposed changes to the charter for the Council to consider.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:18) only change: any items previously raised in the public comments to the initial report

Heather Forrest: (17:18) Just to clarify, is this new language just for the avoidance of doubt, given what Marika has highlighted about the procedures already requiring input from SGs and Cs?

Marika Konings: (17:19) I believe so

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:19) i withdraw mine in favor of Amrs

Marika Konings: (17:19) and it also reaffirms the need to review input that was received on the Preliminary Issue Report

Heather Forrest: (17:19) Surely both points are self evident?

Heather Forrest: (17:20) Are we unnecessarily complicating the motion?

Carlos Raul: (17:20) YES

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:20) we consider these points to be self evident: that the WG consider...

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:20) ;-)

Susan Kawaguchi: (17:20) yes

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:23) Thanks to Susan and Carlos for accepting the amendments as friendly

Stephanie Perrin: (17:23) lost sound

Carlos Raul: (17:23) Gern geschehen

Marika Konings: (17:27) @Marilia - the Final Issue Report calls out that "What risks do stakeholders face and how will they be reconciled?"

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:28) i do not think we will have a perfect motion, and we are behind on time....

Marilia Maciel: (17:28) @Marika, I see that you believe the assessment is packed inside risks. I do not feel this way and I believe that risks assessment is not the same as impact assessment.

Carlos Raul: (17:28) fully support Susan´s preocupations

Mary Wong: (17:29) Assuming that the NCSG and Registrar input that was just submitted/discussed were indeed provided as the public comments to the Prelim Issue Report, doesn't the language in Clause 3 now expressly cover it? (repeating what James B said, I think)

Carlos Raul: (17:29) I already had expressed the same worries to Amr

Amr Elsadr: (17:29) @Mary: Yes, I believe so.

Carlos Raul: (17:29) I support amneding the motion, but NOT the Charter

Carlos Raul: (17:29) at his point

Amr Elsadr: (17:30) @Carlos: I see your point now, which is why I'm suggesting an amendment to the motion, instead of the charter.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:30) amending the charter during this call is like open heart surgery on a timer, so registrars decided against doing this at this stage.

Marika Konings: (17:30) @Marilia - impact assessments are also covered in the charter and the Final Issue Report, if I am not mistaken

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:30) Wasn't privacy deferred to WS2 in the CCWG? It wasn't deemed out of scope or anything.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:30) ...among many other HR-related issues.

Mary Wong: (17:30) @Stephanie - so are you proposing that the charter and not just the motion be amended at this time?

Susan Kawaguchi: (17:31) can we call for a vote on this motion?

Susan Kawaguchi: (17:31) and the amendments proposed?

Stephanie Perrin: (17:32) Keith finally I believe it may have been (not following closely enough) but the very fact that someone could pull out freedom of speech and free movement of data (not in the UDHR) and refuse to accept privacy indicates where we are with respect to rights.

Mary Wong: (17:32) @Susan, if you accept the new Clause 3 as friendly, the Council will just vote on the motion as amended.

Stephanie Perrin: (17:32) Mary, yes.

Marilia Maciel: (17:33) Yes, David

Carlos Raul: (17:33) No

Stephanie Perrin: (17:33) Yes

Carlos Raul: (17:33) I have discussed this with Amr before

Susan Kawaguchi: (17:33) is it really feasible to amend the charter at this point?

Amr Elsadr: (17:33) I thought we were now talking about amending the motion, not the charter?

Carlos Raul: (17:34) +1 Amr

Carlos Raul: (17:34) amend the CHARTER

Mary Wong: (17:34) @Amr, Stephanie and Marilia are proposing amending the charter.

Marilia Maciel: (17:34) We did, the one proposed by Amr

Carlos Raul: (17:34) is not possible

Marika Konings: (17:34) This is what Amr had posted: , a reference to a change in the charter be made to include a bullet under the phase 1 deliberations on page 69 saying something to this effect:"Rights Impact analysis: Have registrants rights that may be affected been analyzed and considered?

Stephanie Perrin: (17:34) Yes, that is what we are reiterating.

Mary Wong: (17:36) This is for the second proposed amendment - to the charter.

Mary Wong: (17:37) (to be clear that what the Council is now being asked to vote on is the proposal from Stephanie and Marilia; the proposed new Resolved clause 3 has already been accepted as friendly).

Heather Forrest: (17:37) And this is a Board-initiated PDP, so amending the Charter has implications from that perspective, I believe

Marika Konings: (17:37) The Council could also adopt the current charter and come back to possible future amendments at a later stage (also per resolved clause 3)

Heather Forrest: (17:39) Susan and Carlos did not accept the amendment as friendly

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (17:39) do we have all amendments on the screen?

Carlos Raul: (17:40) Susan and Carlos did not accept the "charter" amendment as friendly

James Bladel: (17:40) Heather: That's why the vote. Susan & Carlos accepted the other (Item 3) amendment as friendly, so this would be the Stephanie/Marillia amendment.

Mary Wong: (17:40) Council is being asked to vote on a motion that approves the charter AS AMENDED by the proposal from Stephanie and Marilia.

Marika Konings: (17:40) I've posted the proposed language at the bottom of the motion in the middle of the screen

Rubens Kuhl: (17:40) What is the preferred way to vote: AC Green/Red Agree/Disagree ?

Marika Konings: (17:41) Glen will do a roll call vote

Marika Konings: (17:41) or can

Marilia Maciel: (17:41) Thanks, Marika. Page 69 of the charter. I do agree with the motion.

Amr Elsadr: (17:41) The way I see it, is that both types of changes achieve the same result. Why are folks on both sides opposed to one or the other option?

Marika Konings: (17:41) it would need a simple majority in order to pass and the be considered as part of the overall motion. And yes, Paul, you are correct, if it fails, the motion will be considered as previously amended.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:42) Has the privacy issue been previously raised in public comments?

Stephanie Perrin: (17:42) yes many many times

David Cake: (17:42) Yes, Keith.

James Bladel: (17:42) Yes.

Amr Elsadr: (17:42) @Keith: Yes.

James Bladel: (17:42) As have the RrSG comments.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:43) Then why do we need the additional reference? Shouldn't it be included in/covered by the blanket statement?

Mary Wong: (17:43) By the new Resolved clause 3, presumably, Keith.

James Bladel: (17:43) @Keith I believe so, yes.

Amr Elsadr: (17:43) I would vote yes for either version (motion or motion + charter). Not sure what the issue is at this point.

Stephanie Perrin: (17:44) Yes it is included Keith, but it is better placed in the Charter as a matter of ongoing attention.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:44) we are voting on the hostile amendment. while i agree with the content in general, I believe it is already covered

Mary Wong: (17:45) For the benefit of new Councilors, note that an abstention counts as a No vote.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:45) I see the proposed amendment as unecessary in light of the new proposed clause 3.

James Bladel: (17:45) Agree with the amendment, disagree that it ishould be in the motion.

Nathalie Peregrine: (17:45) Valerie is not on the audio birdge

James Bladel: (17:45) agree with the -charter- amendment.

David Cake: (17:45) I agree with the goal of the motion, but believe it is procedurally problematic.

Julf: (17:45) Mary: thanks for the clarification

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:46) No need to single out any previously raised concern. If something was raised in public comments, it's covered.

Amr Elsadr: (17:46) @Keith: Same here, but either solution achieves the same result. Not sure why there is a preference to one and not the other.

Susan Kawaguchi: (17:46) @ amr - I have no issue with amending the charter when the WG begins but adding one element to the motion is problematic to me

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:47) Agree Susan

James Bladel: (17:47) Amr: Because then we would be compelled to explicitly include our list of amendments, which were much more extensive.

James Bladel: (17:48) And we feel that this leaves the door open sufficiently to get this on the table.

Amr Elsadr: (17:48) Got it James.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:48) Aye

Marika Konings: (17:48) Correct Amr

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:48) friendly amendment included

Stephanie Perrin: (17:49) We will assuredly be putting it on the table, I hope you don't get tired of hearing it.

Amr Elsadr: (17:49) This'll be a complicated PDP. :)

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (17:49) I for one want to discuss it, Stephanie

James Bladel: (17:49) To the contrary, Stephanie, I think it's a critical point of the work.

Susan Kawaguchi: (17:49) @ stephanie makes sense to do it at the start of the WG.

Mary Wong: (17:50) The PDP Manual does obligate a WG to reach out at an early stage in its work.

Stephanie Perrin: (17:50) Thanks Susan, that would be most welcome. Especially since we have been discussing it in the GNSO review working group, as a worthwhile recommendation from the Westlake report.

Valerie Tan: (17:51) @Nathalie: sorry, my audio bridge got disconnected. Have arranged for a dial out. Thanks!

Nathalie Peregrine: (17:51) thanks Valerie!

Mary Wong: (17:56) The background to Wolf-Ulrich's presentation is in the referral request document: http://tinyurl.com/peqmrqd.

Valerie Tan: (17:56) Hi Glen

Valerie Tan: (17:58) Glen, I can hear you but I am having problems being heard, I think

Rubens Kuhl: (17:59) I'm hearing two people...

Rubens Kuhl: (17:59) Sounds like Valerie and Glen.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (17:59) We can hear both Valerie and Glen

Rubens Kuhl: (18:00) Hearing multiple audio feedbacks...

Keith Drazek (RySG): (18:00) Wow the audio isues today are really challenging.

Marika Konings: (18:01) can everyone please mute their phones and computers when not speaking

Keith Drazek (RySG): (18:01) I hope this isn't typical.... ;-)

Donna Austin, RySG: (18:01) Defintiely not normal Keith, so hang in there.

David Cake: (18:01) yes

Keith Drazek (RySG): (18:01) Aye

Jennifer Standiford: (18:01) yes

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (18:02) Thank you!

Heather Forrest: (18:02) Procedurally, are we even able to vote on this given the timing?

Donna Austin, RySG: (18:02) Can we defer please, I have not had an opportunity to review.

Heather Forrest: (18:02) Agree with Donna.

Amr Elsadr: (18:03) @Donna: +1

Rubens Kuhl: (18:03) Agree with Donna as well.

James Bladel: (18:03) +1 Donna

Keith Drazek (RySG): (18:03) Defer please

Stephanie Perrin: (18:03) me too, as mentioned in my email. Complex issues, require discussion of the entire communique

Heather Forrest: (18:03) Let's get this in good shape well in advance of next meeting so we're not caught out discussing at length during the meeting

Keith Drazek (RySG): (18:04) Whoever is typing, please mute.

James Bladel: (18:04) +1 Heather

Valerie Tan: (18:05) I'm getting several echoes in the conversation

Keith Drazek (RySG): (18:06) @Valerie: Is your laptop/computer microphone active, in addition to a phone line?

Nathalie Peregrine: (18:06) Stillnow Valerie, asI hearnothing?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (18:06) I must unfortunately drop off now, as I am due on the CWG IANA Stewardship call starting now. I'll listen to the recording of the rest of the call and report to the ALAC accordingly.

Marilia Maciel: (18:07) Thanks, Oliver! Bye and nice mtg

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (18:08) Thanks @Marilia!

David Cake: (18:11) Thank you Olivier

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:12) in the interest of time, can we get an indication who wants to ask a question?

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:13) we are "a bit over" and have still a lot of important issues to cover, so I'll try to keep this as brief as possible

James Bladel: (18:13) I have a quick question for NIck on the Venue, but only partly related to security. I can wait or defer.

Marika Konings: (18:15) Nick is also in the chat, so you may want to type it here?

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:15) we may also be able to pose our question in writing to Nick, right?

Marika Konings: (18:15) and yes, we can also pass on questions after the meeting.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:16) good

Jennifer Standiford: (18:16) Thanks Marika, I am curious about the security at/to/from airport

Jennifer Standiford: (18:17) also, with the posting of the location of where the security details will be located, should we be concerneed that others may gain access to this plan?

Donna Austin, RySG: (18:18) Can we have the details about the firm Chris works for? Happy to have this in writing.

James Bladel: (18:18) Can we get an update from the Moroccoan authorities about security enhansmences outside of the Venue, e.g. the Airport?

Philip Corwin: (18:18) I have received concerns that the rooms in Marrakech are 1) non refundable/changeable 2) prepaid and 3) not available on Thursday night. I'm also hearing people have to now email the hotel a scanned copy of the front and back of their cc.Those are unprecedented and will discourage people from attending, especially businessIt's not security related but it certainly is related to the next meeting

Geoff Bickers: (18:19) Donna - I will send that to Glena nd she can distribute

Donna Austin, RySG: (18:19) thanks Geoff

Steve DelBianco: (18:19) Staff -- please read Phil Corwin's question to our guest

Nick Tomasso: (18:20) Philip, i am working to reolve this issue now and will report back shortly..

Mary Wong: (18:20) We have taken note of the questions in the chat and will pass them on to Nick and the team.

Philip Corwin: (18:21) Thanks. I have lost my phone connection in Panama. cal I please have a call back.

Glen de Saint Gery: (18:21) Thanks Geoff, I will post it on the GNSO website and it will linked in the minutes.

Marika Konings: (18:21) @Phil - I've passed on your request to the operator.

Philip Corwin: (18:21) Thx Marika

Donna Austin, RySG: (18:24) Volker, can we have a sense of how long people can continue to stay on the call?

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:26) Donna, will ask after this, but I will try o be on time

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:26) if anyone hasto drop at the top of the hour, can you please give an indication in the chat

Marilia Maciel: (18:28) Me Volker

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (18:29) yes, me. 5 mins before would even be better

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:30) ok, so no extention.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:31) if you wantto speak to this, please raise your hand in the adobe. I will close the queue after thomas is done

Philip Corwin: (18:31) This is not the updated timeline distributed to CCWG this morning. For example, it does not include call scheduled on 11/26 whivh is Thanksgiving day in US

Steve DelBianco: (18:34) @Phil -- this tmeline doesn't show any of the many calls CCWG will have between now and 30-Nov

Thomas Rickert: (18:35) Well spotted Phil. We will make sure Marika sends the updated document with the call on the 26th reflected in it to the concil list. Thanks!

Amr Elsadr: (18:38) Loud and clear Robin.

Nathalie Peregrine: (18:39) We can hear you

Amr Elsadr: (18:40) Thanks Robin and Phil for sharing those concerns.

Stephanie Perrin: (18:42) +1 Paul

Philip Corwin: (18:42) FYI, just on adobe audio again with ability to comment in chat room. Phone dropped again.

Amr Elsadr: (18:43) Same here Phil.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:43) final words, not last

Stephanie Perrin: (18:43) For those of us whose full time job is not ICANN related, and that includes most of us in the non-commercial group, this kind of pressure, on top of other ongoing work, is almost impossible.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (18:43) Everyone should use the November 15 update document to begin (or hopefully continue) socializing the CCWG work with our respective communities. We don't have to wait until the final proposal is published and translated. At least not at the chartering organization level.

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (18:44) right, but there may be comments coming in that may influence our thinking by raising issues not considered

Robin Gross: (18:49) There are also concerns about the changing role of the GAC - away from advisory and toward decision making. that change could make the reccomendations unacceptable to US congress or NTIA.

Heather Forrest: (18:50) Agree we need more time and should discuss further on the list.

Donna Austin, RySG: (18:50) We do need to understand the process that up on the screen. it's the first time i've seen this and it raises concerns.

Rubens Kuhl: (18:51) First item I would like feedback from other councillors in the list is why we are considering only 4 endorsements from a group expected to be near 20 people.

Heather Forrest: (18:51) +1 Susan

Rubens Kuhl: (18:51) (for a group)

Donna Austin, RySG: (18:52) Agreed Rubens, this is part of my concern too.

Steve DelBianco: (18:52) @Susan -- the CCWG proposal includes a new process for AoC Review team composition. More slots are anticipated for GNSO.

Marika Konings: (18:52) @Rubens - please note that the 4 is a remainder from the original ATRT process and I believe it was flagged for discussion

Marika Konings: (18:52) #4

Susan Kawaguchi: (18:53) thanks Steve I will take a look at that

James Bladel: (18:54) Thanks Margie.

Steve DelBianco: (18:55) Margie's explanation suggest to me that GNSO could submit more than 4 names for this review.   After all, it's about gTLD expansion

Marika Konings: (18:55) Are there any objections to the additional GNSO Requirements as if the Council wants to receive this information, we need to get back to the candidates ASAP.

Steve Chan: (18:56) @Volker, sure thing.

Stephanie Perrin: (18:56) My question is on the matter of the closure of the period for application, if additional volunteers come forward who might have missing attributes, is it possible to consider them? There is so much going on in Internet governance generally that it may be we missed peoople

Donna Austin, RySG: (18:56) Marika, I'm not sure understand your question?

Marika Konings: (18:57) On page two there are a number of GNSO Requirements provided - in order for the Councl to review the information that is requested, we will need to go back to the candidates.

Margie Milam: (18:58) @Stephanie-- I don't think its possible to include additionall volunteers as we already had one extension and did a substantial amount of social media to get the word out. With 72 applicants -- we had a very good response.

Marika Konings: (18:58) we still have two minutes of scheduled time ;-)

Heather Forrest: (18:59) Can we submit questions on the list?

Stephanie Perrin: (19:00) Thanks Margie, how is the final slate of candidates actually chosen, and what weight does the GNSO endorsement carry? Sorry to trouble you with basic questions, but it is still rather opaque to me.

Heather Forrest: (19:00) Understood, Volker, but the timing is now very tight

Heather Forrest: (19:00) We cannot get into a substantive discussion now. I am not suggesting we postpone voting. Just keep the option for questions later open

Mary Wong: (19:01) @Stephanie, the ICANN CEO and the GAC Chair make the final decisions, after the SO/ACs endorse their candidates.

Amr Elsadr: (19:01) David and Volker..., thank you both for your time as VCs.

James Bladel: (19:01) Thanks you Volker, David. Today and this month.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (19:01) Thanks all

Mary Wong: (19:01) Some of the Review Team may also be independent experts not representing an SO/AC.

Philip Corwin: (19:01) bye all

Susan Kawaguchi: (19:01) Thanks all!

Heather Forrest: (19:01) bye all

Rubens Kuhl: (19:01) Thanks all, bye!

Amr Elsadr: (19:01) Thanks all. Bye.

Julf: (19:01) Thanks and bye!

Volker A. Greimann - Co Chair: (19:01) can we have an action items list for issues to discuss on list and circulate?

Mary Wong: (19:02) @VOlker, yes