

GNSO Council Public meeting - Adobe Chat Transcript – 30 June 2016

Marika Konings: (6/30/2016 09:08) Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of 30 June 2016

Rubens Kuhl: (10:55) On the project list, it seems protection of IGO-INGO is listed both as Board Vote and Implementation... is that due to the reconciliation (or lack thereof) of GAC Advice ?

Marika Konings: (11:02) @Rubens - correct, there are a number of items that are in implementation (those recommendations that were adopted) and those that still with the Board for consideration.

Heather Forrest: (11:11) Can we simplify: Intends to adopt?

Donna Austin, RySG: (11:13) agree Heather

Avri Doria: (11:50) seems gender should always be an underlying element of diversity that is considered at ICANN in all roles.

Paul McGrady - IPC 2: (11:50) +1 Avri

Rubens Kuhl: (11:54) One other diversity angle is organisational diversity, like for-profit and non-profit, large x small ...

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: (11:57) @Avri: we added this aspect to the application form

Donna Austin, RySG: (11:58) We really didn't know that the CSC had to be set up until Marrakech, so we've been working hard to get all the ducks in a row to make the NTIA timeline of 15 August.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (12:00) For the record, the GNSO is not the only component part of ICANN pressured by this timeline. The ALAC's also feeling the strain, but we just have to do it

Paul McGrady - IPC 2: (12:00) @Donna - thank you and the others for the quick work on this!

Keith Drazek: (12:25) I have a general question about the structure of CCWGs. Does anyone know if the CCWG on CCWGs (CCWG Squared) recommendations support CCWGs with an open-ended mandate? Perhaps a question for later.

Keith Drazek: (12:25) future recommendations, that is.

Mary Wong: (12:28) @Keith, the CCWG-Squared isn't planning a black and white recommendation on that point, but it does contemplate at least implicitly that most if not all CCWGs will have a close date.

Keith Drazek: (12:28) Thanks very much, Mary!

Mary Wong: (12:28) It certainly (expressly) contemplates that a CCWG will produce final output - which does imply that a CCWG typically has a life cycle that ends.

Keith Drazek: (12:29) Makes sense, thanks

jennifer gore: (12:33) i agree

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (12:35) Apologies, @James, but I need to run out again as I have another commitment starting in 10 minutes.

Rubens Kuhl: (12:49) BTW, one other implementation group is about to send us a note making the impact of this even higher: the thin to thick WHOIS migration.

Rubens Kuhl: (12:50) Was it DNSO or GNSO policy ?

Avri Doria: (12:50) was the statement about nothing havng changed in privacy law since 2005 a tongue in cheek stmt?

Avri Doria: (12:51) GNSO policy I beleive, one of the first things i voted on as a council member

Avri Doria: (12:53) i think the complaint is the implementation of the policy.

Mary Wong: (12:54) @Avri, James was referring to the date the Council adopted the report and sent to the Board

Rubens Kuhl: (12:54) Next time we could say in the policy "breaking the law before getting a waiver is not an option"

Avri Doria: (12:54) the policy did not require the registrar to break the law merely said they did not have to break the law. perhaps it is more implementation than policy that is at fault.

Mary Wong: (12:55) The policy calls for ICANN to develop a procedure to deal with situations where a registrar can "credibly demonstrate" the conflict.