Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference
25 September 2014 at 18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 25 September 2014 at 18:00 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20140925-en.mp3
Adobe Chat Transcript
http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-25sep14-en.pdf

on page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#sep

List of attendees: NCA – Non Voting – Jennifer Wolfe
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Volker Greimann, Yoav Keren- absent apologies proxy to James Bladel
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Ching Chiao, Bret Fausett - absent, apologies proxy to Ching Chiao
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Tony Holmes, Osvaldo Novoa, Gabriella Szlak absent, apologies proxy to John Berard, John Berard, Brian Winterfeldt, Petter Rindforth
Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Klaus Stoll, David Cake, Avri Doria, Amr Elsadr, Maria Farrell, Magaly Pazello –absent, apologies proxy to Amr Elsadr
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison
Patrick Myles – ccNSO Observer – absent apologies

ICANN Staff
David Olive – VP Policy Development
Marika Konings – Senior Policy Director
Rob Hoggarth – Senior Policy Director
Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director
Steve Chan – Senior Policy Manager
Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst
Glen de Saint Géry – GNSO Secretariat
Josh Baulch– Manager, Meetings Technical Services
Julie Hedlund – Director SSAC Support/Policy Director absent apologies

Guests:
Mason Cole – GNSO Liaison to the GAC
Karen Lentz - Director, Operations & Policy Research

Coordinator: The recordings are connected.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Could I just ask everybody to mute if they are not speaking? And could you please just acknowledge that you are on the call when I call your name? Thank you very much.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Council call on the 25th of September. On the call (I hope) we have Brett Fausett. He's absent and he has given his proxy to Ching Chiao. Ching? Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yoav Keren is absent and he's given his proxy to James. Volker Greimann I see is not yet on the call. Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Gabriella Szlak is absent and she has given her proxy to John Berard. John Berard.

John Berard: Yes, ma'am.

Glen de Saint Géry: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Osvaldo Novoa. I don't think Osvaldo is yet on the call. Tony
            Holmes. Not yet on the call. Maria Farrell.

Maria Farrell: Hi, Glen. I'm on the call.

Glen de Saint Géry: Amr Elsadr. Not yet on the call. David Cake.

David Cake: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Magaly Pazello is absent and she has given her proxy to Amr
            Elsadr. Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: I'm here, thanks.

Glen de Saint Géry: Klaus Stoll.

Klaus Stoll: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Daniel Reed.

Daniel Reed: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jennifer Wolfe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Patrick Myles, our ccNSO observer is absent and has sent his apologies. And we have our guest on the call is Mason Cole. And for staff we have Karen Lentz, who will be presenting. And for staff we have David Olive, Marika Konings, Rob Hogarth, Mary Wong, Steve Chan, myself Glen de Saint Géry, Julia Charvolen.

And have I left anybody - David Olive, I'm sorry, did I say you, David? Lars Hoffman. And have I left anybody off? Marika reminds me that I haven't said her name but I think I'm did. I'm sorry if I didn't, Marika, and you're on the call. Jonathan, over to you. I think we have everybody.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. Just to check if you confirm that Volker, Amr and Osvaldo are on the call now.

Glen de Saint Géry: No.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: ...not on the call. Osvaldo is not on the call. And Volker is not yet on the call.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...so we expect them to join...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: ...they will join, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Hi, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Council call on the 25th of September. We've got a reasonably full agenda. I hope - we should be able to get through it in the time allotted though.

So picking up then after the roll call, as usual we'll just call for any updates to Statements of Interest please. Hearing none I'll call for...

Coordinator: Excuse me, Volker Greimann joins.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Welcome, Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yeah, apologies. Little one took a little bit longer to put to bed, sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Congratulations. That's very exciting news anyway and a distraction I'm sure. If we could call for a review or any amendments to the agenda, 1.3. John.

John Berard: Jonathan, thank you. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Loud and clear, John.

John Berard: Okay. I want to just ask that a Post-It note be put on the calendar so
                 that we don't run the same problems next year. I know Gabby and I
                 suspect Yoav are not here because of the holiday. And it would
                 probably be good to make sure that our meetings don't conflict with
                 any major religious holiday that would bar or prevent participation next
                 year.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks John. It's unfortunate that we're missing it seems at
                 least a couple of people because of that. Yes, fair point. We'll try and
                 keep an eye out for it. It's difficult with all of the respective international
                 holidays, time zones and so on but I take your point.

                 Glen, I'm sure you'll note that as well when we plan out the calendar
                 for next year and we will make best efforts to accommodate the
                 various issues that we have to.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: As far as the minutes from the previous Council meeting are
                 concerned I think they're still - haven't come out yet so apologies for
                 that. We'll put them through the process in short order and get those
                 out to the Council shortly.

                 Normally we would go through the action list. At the moment I've
                 scanned it through under Item 2 and checked it. And it seems that

there are really only a couple of points that are of substance and aren't covered in the main agenda.

So those really pertain to first of all the Expert Working Group final report. We were requested to provide feedback. To the best of my knowledge we did not and I'm casting my mind back but I don't think we provided specific feedback.

In addition, we have been requested to form some - a form - a reasonably sized team by Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN Board. But I think really in his capacity as a key participant in the Expert Working Group.

So my reading of Steve's letter, which you should have seen forwarded to you on the Council mailing list, is that the essential request is for a handful of participants from the GNSO, meaning four or five, and to work together with a Board group to try and shape what the questions are and how we might work.

You might remember that we had originally asked staff to try and clarify for us what the principle issues that needed potential work on. And I think staff are probably, and maybe someone can help me here, holding back a little now that we've got that request from Steve.

So, question, are there any questions or comments around that? My suggestion to the list was that we consider forming a team where we put a representative, not necessarily from the Council, but we go out to our stakeholder groups and seek one per stakeholder group. James, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi, Jonathan. Thanks. And I think that I guess I would be happy to either volunteer or to round up a volunteer from our stakeholder group. My question, however, is I'm not 100% clear on what this group will be doing and what the expected output will be and then what the, you know, what the receiving body or organization will do with that outcome.

So, I mean, I think if we can nail down those questions in particular, you know, I'd be glad to help provide someone if not fill that role. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I'd be happy to give a stab at that based on Steve's letter but let me defer to John who's got his hand up first.

John Berard: Thank you, Jonathan. John Berard here. I forwarded a suggestion in response to your email that in formulating the committee of Council members to participate that strong consideration be given to appointing Susan Kawaguchi who will be taking her place as BC councilor at the annual general meeting in LA.

I will admit it will be my undying loss not to be able to participate in such a thankful job. But Susan has actually served on the Expert Working Group and who now takes her seat as the councilor might be a good asset for us as we navigate what I think is a narrow bridge between the recommendations of the report and the policymaking process.

So I just - having done it on paper I wanted to verbally suggest that Susan be strongly considered for that group.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks John. And noted. And just recording that we still have to come back and then clarify James's questions. And I'm still willing to do that. But I see Avri has her hand up. Just to make it clear, though, I don't see that we're necessarily seeking - and this has nothing to do with Susan, she may well be the best qualified candidate - we're not necessarily seeking Council members here although, you know, that's unclear I guess from the request so that's a good point.

But fire away, Avri, your hand...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah, I was just going to basically follow John's wise lead and then all of a sudden I got a little nervous and I was going to say something similar though I'm not leaving the Council, we have Stephanie Perrin coming in who was also on the EWG and I would strongly recommend that we have her as part of this group. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Could you just enlighten me as to which group Stephanie is - group or constituency Stephanie is...

Avri Doria: NCSG.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. So I think that this is excellent and it's good that we're going to have two councilors - incoming councilors that were former members of this group. My only concern is that, you know, in the absence of - at least from my perspective a clear understanding of what we're going to do, I'm not sure if, you know, we should just

reconstitute the EWG or at least, you know, give deference to those members who have EWG experience.

You know, or is this more of an implementation review team, you know, because that's an asset in those situations. But in, you know, in this aspect if we are simply formulating questions that might later formulate, you know, the basis of a charter for a PDP or something that's, you know, that's probably a different task.

So I'm just trying to understand - and I know you're still waiting to answer that question. But I think perhaps without discounting the experience of Susan or Stephanie, maybe we should figure out what we want to do first before we start throwing names into a hat, that's all.

Jonathan Robinson: James, let me take a stab at what I think is going to happen and then I'll welcome any support or challenges - support for or challenges against that. What I understand to have happened is we had an intractable problem with Whois in very simplistic terms.

For the first time, we tried an experiment, an expert working group was pulled together and did the work that they did. We, as the Council, and representing the GNSO's policy development function, made some noises at the time and said that's fine, well it may be fine, but in any event we have a policy development process and we need to make sure that's respected and understood and not in any way bypassed by this expert working group.

We received the appropriate assurances and the expert working group went on and did its work. It's now completed its work and the question

is how does one now integrate that work or join that work up in some way with the GNSO's policy development process.

And because the expert working group is, you know, the work of an expert working group is a unique experiment, it takes some expertise to try and figure that out.

And I think that's what I understand the request from Steve Crocker is to say, well, give me experts from the GNSO who potentially - and I think the suggestion may well be a good way - who potentially have knowledge of both the work of the expert working group and the mechanics of the policy development process and the nuances of the GNSO to come together and say well given this report, given the way the GNSO works how do we marry these two up now and how do we get the right policy development process to kick off?

So that's the way I understand the question. So this is - I don't think it would be correct to sort of make it - to talk about an implementation review team, it's a working group to bridge this hitherto unchartered type of work that of the expert working group with the policy development process.

So that's my two cents worth on it. James, is that a hand in response to that or in follow up from that or is it an old hand?

James Bladel: It's both. And just I'm confused because I thought the EWG was a PDP that was initiated by the Board. So it's fine if a PDP is, you know, feeding other PDPs, I guess that's - but I thought that their recommendations, at some point, were going to have to be presented to us in tact, you know, for some kind of up or down vote. I don't know.

I really don't understand. And it's probably because it's so unusual that it's...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...but I stick by my interpretation, let's hear what Marika has got to say and then we'll go to Volker who's next in the queue.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So indeed the Board requested at the same time as they launched the EWG they requested an issue report. And the issue report was specific to focus on gTLD registration data services with the idea being that once the EWG would complete its work those recommendation would feed into the final issue report and then basically the next step would be, you know, form the working group and actually look at the EWG recommendations and as well other information that is provided at the issue report.

So a PDP has indeed been started and as it was a Board-requested issue report there is no intermediate vote of the GNSO Council on initiation. So in principle it just moves on to the next step.

And I think what we're basically trying to figure out through the conversation with the Board is how that next step should actually happen. You know, how do we actually make sure that the pieces come altogether. I think there has been talk as well is there a way in which work needs to be split up?

Of course we're looking at as well a charter for a working group that would scope, you know, the exact questions that the PDP working group would be looking at. And as this is, you know, to a certain extent

I think the first time that we're in this situation with a Board initiated PDP that, you know, doesn't follow the traditional path.

I think this is, you know, part of the exercise of talking to the Board to really make sure that, you know, on the one hand, you know, the GNSO is comfortable with what the scope and the next steps are but at the same time as well that the Board is comfortable with that as they were the ones who, you know, requested and initiated this process in the first place. I think that's where we're currently at as I understand it.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so it feels like, having heads up response, thanks Marika, that just thinking about the constitution of the group in that respect, and I know, Avri, you've got your hand up, I'll come to you right in a moment, that one should be thinking about expertise in the subject matter but also in the workings of a PDP.

Avri and then - go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. Avri speaking. So, yeah, I wanted to bring up two things, one is the issues report and the whole process was with Board's permission I believe, put in a halt state. And I think that, yes, one of the things that will need to come out of this is completing that process.

There's two points I want to put on the table about that. One is now that the EWG final report has been out and there's been lots and lots of talking about it I do think that we will need to sort of finish a comment period on the draft issues report taking everything into account that's been done. And so that's one thing.

And another thing I want to put on the table is that while the EWG definitely drives to some extent or perhaps to a very large extent, the content of a PDP, that we are not necessarily limited to just issues or just solutions that were proposed by the EWG and that the chartering post a final issues report would indeed be able to take things that had come in, in the comment period for the draft issues report, etcetera.

And so basically saying there's a lot of steps to do to get back into the path of a PDP. We halted it for EWG but we should now continue it as it would be continued. And, yes, we don't take a vote after the final, we just start working on the charter. We probably vote on the charter I would think but there's still a lot of steps to go through. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Avri, it feels to me like some of those points you just made are what might be part of the work of this little group, this little working group that's proposed, is to try and get - assist with getting that back on track. And I think the Board is not quite clear how to get it back on track. Volker.

Volker Greimann: I think Avri is completely right. This needs to feed into a standard PDP. And I think the EWG has provided - I'm using a term here that has color but I'm not using it in the color term - straw man for the work of the PDP that has to be initiated now.

But the end result has to be something that has been filtered through the standard multistakeholder process and through the community. So we have a draft straw man, a proposal and now the community has to look at it (unintelligible) it and figure out what to do with it and that's the work of a standard PDP. That might be in a limbo or pause state and that we now need to officially kick off or get the ball rolling to start.

Jonathan Robinson: And again I don't see any contradiction with what you've just suggested, Volker, and follow on from what Avri is saying with what's being requested from the Board unless I'm being, in some way, naïve. But it doesn't strike me that that's the case. The objective of this little group is to try and build that bridge and get it back on track.

Alan, your hand is up next.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. In listening to people it strikes me that knowledge of the GNSO and the policy processes that are available, and I say processes because the discussions that are going on in the Policy and Implementation group in fact are taking some interesting turns including talking to the gTLD division and, you know, understanding how they're going to be implementing things.

It strikes me that knowledge of the policy processes is probably more important than knowledge of the EWG outcomes. And there's probably a danger in having too many people on that group who are part of the EWG in that there may be a tendency for them to, you know, push what the report said as opposed to looking for how the next steps can modify it as necessary, you know, based on a PDP.

So I think we need to be careful we're not just doing a rubber stamp of the EWG in setting up the processes to follow. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Maria.

Maria Farrell: Thanks, Jonathan. Yeah, I actually wanted to support some of these that Alan was just saying. I mean, about not rubber stamping this EWG

report because to my mind there's been a fair amount of ambiguity about the status of the EWG report and whether it could or should constitute an issues report for a GNSO PDP. And it sounds like the message we're now getting is that it broadly does not come to an issues report.

And I certainly welcome that because I think in the NCSG, you know, we have had long-standing concerns with how representative the appointed group was, the EWG, to begin with. Then when it produced its report in June a member of the NCSG and the incoming councilor, Stephanie Perrin, produced dissent to the report, you know, which I think was quite damming in some respects. And I don't think we've seen a proper answer to a lot of the questions that are challenges and issues that Stephanie proposed.

So I think we need to step very, very carefully with this, you know, not simply, you know, has the sort of knee jerk response of oh the Board is telling us to do things and we'd rather not.

But I think we really need to be very careful of the strength of the straw man proposal such as this one and it becomes - the debate then becomes well everybody is either for it or against it and it tends to dominate the discussion to a degree which isn't entirely healthy, you know, given that certainly some parts of the Council have really quite profound concerns of how the EWG report came to its conclusions and what some of them are.

So I'm just basically saying - sounding a note of caution in how we deal with the EWG report, how we prepare an issues report and then ultimately how we charter the PDP that will go forward. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. And I should note in the chat that there was some sort of - a couple of expressions of support from John and Volker for Alan's points which were made earlier in the conversation.

This is turning out to be a slightly bigger topic than I had envisaged but let's make sure we hear from Marika and then Amr and then we'll try and bring it to some kind of position. Marika...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I also typed it in the chat but I really want to make clear that as I understand it, it was never the intention that the EWG report, as such, would be the final issue report.

I think the whole idea, at least from the staff's perspective, was that as part of the final issue report we would also incorporate the EWG recommendations like we've also included, you know, information about other previous efforts so that a PDP working group, as it starts, basically has all the information it needs on the subject to start discussion and basically to start deciding, well, is this something we need to discuss further? Yes or no.

You know, do we need to get input on it? You know, what do people actually think about it? And I think that's - indeed, that is what an issue report is really about, it's scoping the issue to make sure that all the information about the issue is available on the table, you know, lighted from different perspectives that, you know, we're able to find.

But I don't think it was ever the intention that the EWG would be producing an issue report, you know, without going through the normal channels as we do.

So, as said, you know, at least from staff perspective the whole idea would be just to add the EWG report to what we already have as a preliminary issue report as another set of information and recommendations that have been provided by an expert group so that the PDP working group has all that information at its hands to start considering as they look at the issue.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. I've got Amr in the queue next.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. Well, two points actually, first point is on - I was personally under the impression that the expert working group final report would be the - would serve as the final issue report of this PDP. It's news to me now that it isn't. But that is the impression I was left I think back in Singapore.

But my main point is that from a process perspective this PDP is quite messy because normally this process, even on a Board-initiated PDP there would be a public comment period that is allowed between - following the preliminary issue report.

And from a context perspective that's pretty useless in this process because there's been a year and a half now between when the preliminary issue report was published and when the final issue report will eventually be published. It's been a year and a half so far because the preliminary issue report was published back in March of 2014.

And so the ICANN community has been deprived of the opportunity to provide any comments on this issue report which, as Marika put it, kind of scopes the issues of what should be included in the PDP. And I think that's - that to me is very problematic. I know I've raised this issue in the past and - but I thought it'd be prudent to raise it again now. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. Volker, I think that's an old hand so if I could ask you to take that down if it is. And I just - it feels to me like we've got a request from Steve Crocker, we've got an expert working group report, we've got an issue report that's a precursor to a PDP and it's a matter of trying to bring this together.

I'll just remind you that Steve's note to me that the Council all seen was since he says the expert working group is a solid piece of - is a solid piece of work and intended to provide a much stronger basis for moving forward with a PDP than we've had before.

So it's quite clear he's - we made a strong point the Council, much earlier in the process, and he seems to me acknowledging that the PDP is still the way that this work is going to be done.

I understand the concerns that people have made about, you know, the sort of completeness of the EWG's work. But really the question in front of us now is do we respond to Steve's request and provide him with some GNSO expertise to work with Board members and understand how this PDP might go forward?

My feeling is we should. We've had a couple of names suggested. Now here's what I was going to suggest to you that perhaps we do a four

stakeholder group team, that gives us four. Steve's asked for four or five and possibly a member of staff who is very familiar with the PDP processes to assist.

Now I'm not suggesting that the stakeholder group participants won't be but it just perhaps shores up the process point as well. So I guess that's my proposal to you that we go back to Steve and say, yes, great, we'll work with you as to how to integrate the EWG work back into the PDP process. And for that we offer you four representatives from the GNSO; one from each stakeholder group plus a member of the GNSO policy support staff.

How does that sound as a proposal? Is there any support for that? Or is there an alternative that someone might like to suggest? Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr again. I just typed something in the chat. And I don't know if it's actually possible from a process perspective or not but I would imagine the best way to integrate what's been going on with the expert working group which as far as I can tell has been pretty much an ad hoc process with a regular Board initiated PDP is to issue a new preliminary issue report on this PDP and allow for public comments on that and then follow the normal path of a Board-initiated PDP. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Amr, to me that feels like an interesting suggestion. But I kind of feel that that's what's being asked of this little working group, this little task force is how do we get this whole thing back on track? So in a way that suggestion is what it feels to me like should be fed into this little taskforce or working group but maybe I'm missing something.

I've got James and then Alan.

James Bladel: Yeah, so thanks. James speaking. And it seems like, I don't know, my head's kind of spinning right now but it seems like this - the approach - and I think, Jonathan, this isn't too far removed with what you're proposing is it sounds like we need a motion for the - the composition of a drafting team with the membership that you describe that would actually take the recommendations and the final EWG report and then construct, you know, a charter for a PDP.

And it sounds like what we're doing really is just laying out what the composition of that drafting team should look like and who should be on it and how large it should be. It sounds like that, you know, it sounds like that is where we're headed with this. And I see I got a red checkmark with Avri. Please, correct me because I really don't know where to go with this. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Avri, would you like to respond directly to that before we pick up Alan and David in the queue?

Avri Doria: Sorry. This is Avri. The reason I put a checkmark is I don't think we're at the point of a charter yet. We're at the point of figuring out how to move forward with this; how to restart the PDP, how to finish the issues report, how to then, you know, so restarting the issues report, does that include doing a proper comment, you know, then the issues report is finalized, then a charter group starts up.

So I think this is group is prior to that, it's figuring out the process to get us to the charter. Now they may indeed be the ones that write the charter but it wouldn't be a joint Board/GNSO charter writing effort,

though of course, you know, I see no reason why Board members couldn't participate. It would have to be a GNSO chartering group. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. With regard to Amr's point I would strongly agree that we can - staff cannot go from this, where we are today, to a final issue report. I think we need a cycle of them incorporating the EWG stuff and then going out for public comment. But I agree with you that that's probably an outcome of this group.

Now, you know, I disagree strongly with James saying this is a drafting team. W have been complaining for years that the Board shouldn't just go off in their private little enclaves and make decisions and then make pronouncements that we've said, talk to us first. They're now saying we would like to have some Board people and some GNSO people talk about how to go forward before we do anything or the GNSO does anything.

This is what we've been begging for so I think we embrace it, we name some people who we think will be able to participate well and with regard to your suggestion of having a staff person I'm not sure we can volunteer a staff person but I would like to think that the Board would automatically include someone from staff who knows what they're talking about in relation to policy processes so maybe we don't need to do that but it wouldn't hurt to suggest it. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. And that's what I was probably saying, just to respond directly to that. I mean, I think we could - I think Steve would

be perfectly receptive to a response from me/us saying we can offer you four - an expert team of four people to work with you to get this process back on track plus we suggest you involve a member of the GNSO policy staff. Thanks for that input. David.

David Cake: Yeah, I wanted, I mean, I generally wanted to agree with the point that I don't think a drafting team is premature. But also wanted to say that what we might end up getting here is not even simply a PDP, this is - the EWG represents an enormous pile of work. This Board group may decide to see if we can divide it into - well part of what they should be thinking about in the whole process is how to divide this into sort of more less suggestible chunks rather than having one giant working group to deal with an enormous number of issues.

And it also - of course we bear in mind that Chris Disspain spoke in London about what other work needs to be done outside the GNSO such as, you know, do we want a report from SSAC and a few other things like that. So I think this group would also be acting as a coordinating point for other things the Board might wish to do on this topic such as request reports from other ACs - from ACs and so on.

So I do think this working group has a - there's a need for it and it may not be simply working through the GNSO process entirely. That said, the point on - about staff is very true. But of course the Board and the GNSO staff are not quite the same group so I think definitely we should ensure that someone from the policy staff who really, really know the GNSO processes very well is on there. But of course that's something we can suggest. That's it - thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David. Thomas and then I think we might have to bring this whole - because although it's a pretty important topic we've got quite a bit else to cover. Go ahead, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Jonathan. I may be mistaken but I think I haven't heard an answer from the whole group saying yes to the idea of responding to this request and actually sending people to that group.

If I'm wrong with this then I would at least support the notion that definitely we have to send people, we have to send logical people, I think the GNSO needs to take back leadership of this issue which I think was the fear at the time when the EWG was installed that things would be dealt with outside the GNSO. So I think this is a good opportunity for us to really gain leadership and get influence on this topic.

I would suggest that we do not fill the seats with staff that when naming the GNSO's representatives we should clarify that our expectation is that experienced staff people would also be joining the group.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Thomas. Yes, to be clear, we've been asked to, if possible, contain it to four or five people. And I in no way suggested that we should fill that with staff. And certainly it feels to me like, from the GNSO point of view, we find it relatively easy, not completely I acknowledge, to provide four people that are reasonably representative of the GNSO. So that's my suggestion.

And to Alan's point, I mean, I think - I'll just take minor issue, very minor, Alan, with the word "begging" I think we've been working hard with the board to find ways in which we can work more constructively

with them. And I think this is the perfect opportunity to do so. So I would advocate from the chair that we respond to this request, put our best team in there who know and understand GNSO processes above all but who also ideally have some knowledge of the work of the EWG.

So perhaps we can - having had this pretty in depth and comprehensive discussion we can put a call to the list for those four volunteers and if there's a strong need to put a fifth in perhaps we do that. Alternatively we stick to the four and suggest, as I proposed earlier, that we - that they certainly - the Board considers having at least one member of the GNSO policy staff there so that they can also assist with knowledge of GNSO processes and ensure that we don't go off track there.

All right so I see a couple more hands have come up. I was hoping to draw this item to a close but let me be respectful of your desire to give input. David, I think yours is an old hand so I'm going to skip over that and go to Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yeah, I just would like to caution everyone that sending in a small team might be detrimental to both the process and the end result. And I think a broader approach might be warranted. This is one of the most revolutionary ideas and proposals out there for a long time. And this will cause a lot of change.

And having this small elite group of people in the drafting team here as well might not be the best idea and that before we go back to the Board and name certain number of volunteers we should really think about if that's the right way to go forward or if we should push for a more broad group of people.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So you're urging, Volker, that I don't bring this to a close at this point and we take it up on the list a little longer and see or, I mean, yeah, I mean, this is not, I mean, to be clear this is not a drafting team.

But perhaps I should encourage everyone to go back and look at these notes and look at exactly what he's asking and see if having looked at that note again maybe that's the right way to do it that, you know, see whether you agree or then still disagree with this proposal to respond to it.

Because essentially what he's asking is that we offer those people up to meet in LA to start the process of figuring how to reintegrate the work of the EWG with the PDP. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. This is Amr. Yeah, again, in light - I wasn't very clear on what the purpose of this joint working group would be. And in light of the fact that it's more about the process rather than the substantive issues raised in the expert working group final report I think we may need some more time to consider who we would like to be on this working group. So that's just my personal thought, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well I've made a suggestion for how we go forward but I've had enough pushback to just approach it with a little more caution. And so here's what we will do. I will re, you know, just as a reminder I'll resend these notes even though you've got it, I'll resend it. And probably copy into that the - what this proposed solution is and see if there's either an alternative or support for that. And only once we get to that point do we then propose the actual members of that.

So let's bring it to a close now. I'll pick up that action on list and we'll try and come to some form of conclusion but giving everyone an opportunity to just reconsider in the light of the discussion we've had now. So thanks, that's a pretty substantive issue and it's worth - this is a unique thing that's happened with the expert working group so I understand why we needed to talk about it a little more detail than it first appeared.

Next topic on the action list is the CWG on Internet Governance charter. I think we need to - I take your point, John. Sorry just to close that point, I do see your point that not responding is bad optics and that's exactly what I feel and it goes to Alan's point of, you know, that we've been seeking constructive engagement with Board, GAC and others and it's a key kind of strategic objective of the Council.

So we mustn't, I agree, to that extent we mustn't squander that opportunity. We have the respect of and the opportunity to work with the Board and we must take that properly but I'm happy that we consider it carefully how we do that. And we will respond and we must respond.

Going on to the CWG on Internet Governance, it's also an optics issue. We had the charter floating around on Internet Governance. And no councilor - let's put it plainly - no councilor has come up and made a motion to either accept or propose to modify that charter. And so we really do need to bring that to a head.

I understand from John's useful report, again, on the ccNSO that they have now adopted that charter. And so it really does need a councilor with knowledge of that area to pick up on that and propose something I

suggest to the next Council meeting as a motion, which is actually going to be the LA meeting. Any comment or input on that CWG on Internet Governance without us going into too much of a detail on just any - just an opportunity for anyone to comment or respond.

Avri, I see a checkmark from you, that's good. But I will - I am relying on someone in the Council to make this motion so please bear that in mind one of you who has experience and knowledge to bring that forward. Avri.

James Bladel: Jonathan, this is James. I apologize for interrupting. Can I get in the queue?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, James, I've got Avri in the queue and then I'll come to you.

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri. I used to be a member of that group. I then became an observer of that group. I'm willing to work with people to help write up a motion in time for the LA meeting on it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. And it may be instructive to look at what the ccNSO has just done, it may be helpful, it may not of course. But they've just passed a motion to adopt that charter so that may help you with a shortcut.

James, I'll go to you and then, Amr, your hand is up. James.

James Bladel: I was just going to volunteer as well so I volunteer to assist Avri.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, James. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. I guess we've had very little to say about this charter so far. But, yeah, I would recommend that we move forward and have something ready for LA and thanks to Avri and James for volunteering to work on that.

I don't know how the Council would normally treat a charter for a cross community working group so much as a regular GNSO working group but I would imagine that the Council would either proceed with a motion if no one has much to add on it as has been apparent since the last Council meeting or if there is a problem with it then whoever on the Council does have a - have any concerns should probably voice them and perhaps we should send the charter back to whoever has drafted it and making those points clear and asking for some modifications. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, and I would just make a brief comment there, Amr, on optics, I mean, yes I agree with you on process and ultimately if that's necessary we have to do it but, again, optically it's not great to have effectively - the perception from the outside will be we've sat on this for quite some time and not responded with requests for any change or modification.

So I guess my opinion on this is if at all possible we should adopt it as-is unless we have serious concerns with it given the elapsed time. But that's a thought. John.

John Berard: This is John Berard. Amr's comments, in my mind, reflect exactly the conversation we had at our last meeting which I thought was going to trigger some reconciliation between the notion that was before us at

the time and some potential out of (unintelligible) review changes that were being contemplated to the charter.

I thought that was why we didn't vote on it then. And I was expecting that that would be - that that would be managed by - and that we would be looking today at revisiting it. But clearly we're not.

Am I mistaken? Are the questions that Amr is raising not the same ones that we raised and asked, you answered, at our last meeting?

Jonathan Robinson: John, just to be clear, we haven't had - this is the charter on Internet Governance from the cross community working group, this is not on the transition just in case there's any mixing up between the two on anyone's...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I will admit to being confused from time to time but I believe - I thought this was an Olivier-driven initiative that there was - that what was before us then was somehow potentially going to be modified or need to be modified and that we would wait for that modification before we revisit it. I will admit to being confused but I think that is my recollection.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me just make a point in case anyone is unclear on this. We had a charter that was put before us as a motion that we voted on. That charter was on the cross community working group to deal with the transition - the stewardship of the transition. There was an ALAC-proposed potential modification to that but the - it was accepted that

we could vote on the charter as-is and potentially consider that modification as a subsequent motion. Put that aside.

Then there is another charter which deals with the cross community work on Internet governance in general and that charter has not been put as a vote or a motion before the Council at all. And that charter was the one that I understood from your report was voted on and passed by the ccNSO Council today.

John Berard: That's right, yeah, thank you for correcting my recollection, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem, John. I just wanted to make sure that we weren't talking (unintelligible) on the two because there's a lot going on and there is potential for confusion. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. Avri speaking. So my (unintelligible) is indeed at the last meeting - there was no motion on it yet but you've clarified that. At the last meeting it was brought up that there may be issues. We basically went a whole other month without any issues being brought up on that charter. It sounds like whatever questions that has been in people's minds have either fallen away or been resolved.

So that's why I think it's time now especially with one of the group having already approved it for us to look at the charter as it stands and to vote it up or vote it down or perhaps that will be the forcing function where someone will say oh wait a second, but there's an issue. But we basically last month said if anybody has an issue bring it up because we got to do something.

And, you know, if I had been thinking I might have tried to make the motion deadline for this one but I was thinking well I'm not really a member of the group and I'm not going to champion it. But at this point with the ccNSO having done it I think we should follow suit and either agree to the charter or be quite specific about why we can't. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah thanks Avri. I'm with on that. So in the interest of keeping the meeting on - we'll accept your offer, thank you to you and James, and we'll keep the process moving along.

Right, so next item on the agenda is the letter to the NGPC regarding the proposed modification of GNSO consensus recommendations. I happen to think that we've got a good letter and I'm happy for Thomas to introduce it or make any comments he would like to or Mary. It feels to me like it's a great opportunity to clarify some of the concerns we had.

We had Chris talk to us previously. The letter now seeks to really firm up that position and say we understand what you're saying and it's A, B and C. So frankly I'm personally satisfied with the letter as it stands. I'm happy to put my name to it. But this is an opportunity to either get your collective support for that letter or any comments that you would like to make on it and then move on from there.

So the letter is on the screen in front of you. Thomas, I don't know if you would like to say anything or Mary. Please put up your hand if you do and give you priority. Failing that we'll go to the Council for any comments or questions. Thomas, go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Jonathan. And I think you've done an excellent job introducing the topic so I hope that this is an item that we can make some time with. But I'd like to stress that not only is the current status of the work of the GNSO encapsulated in this letter but also that we provide some information on our understanding of what the NGPC asks of the GNSO Council.

So the questions that we were speculating about in terms of the trademark clearinghouse, whether this is merely a post-registration notification or more, is specifically spelled out in this and therefore I think that Mary who has drafted this letter has done an excellent job and if it were my position I would also gladly put my name to it. But I think we should open it up for the councilors to ask questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Thomas. I do have a hand up next so let me just clip to that. It's Alan. Please go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah thank you. I haven't read the letter very thoroughly but I think there's something missing form it. We correctly point out that we can only reconstitute or reconvene, whatever, the working group by giving them specific wording to approve or not.

And we echo what Chris said is that with respect to the Red Cross we still know - we know what the demand is from the GAC. But we do know what the Board is - what the new gTLD process committee wants to offer them and therefore we do not know the wording that if we approved it would make everything go smoothly.

You know, I would really - and I think Chris specifically said we should ask them what wording do we - do they want us to approve. So adding

something there, asking the new gTLD process committee what exactly are you proposing the you will present to the GAC and hopefully they will approve so we know what it is we're - what wording we're prepared to approve.

As it stands now it's conceivable, I'm not saying it's likely but it's conceivable we could say exactly - we could approve exactly what the GAC wants and the new gTLD process committee says, no, no, we're not prepared to offer them that much. So I think we need clarity from the committee as to exactly what it is they're prepared to offer the GAC so we can ratify it not.

Jonathan Robinson: So I understand that that's precisely the purpose of this letter. And so having exchanged the relevant letters with the new gTLD program committee, Alan, we will then be in a position to give the guidance or make the appropriately clear request back to the working group according to the processes.

So what I'm not clear on - and perhaps we need to take this offline is what modification - well we will need to take it offline if you - it sounds to me like you're proposing a specific modification to the letter. So...

Alan Greenberg: Well, Jonathan, if I may? Maybe it's there and I've missed it but I thought one of the things we are doing with this letter is asking the new gTLD process committee what is they want us to approve with respect to the Red Cross. So far all we know is what the GAC has asked us. And I don't see that question there.

Jonathan Robinson: Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Jonathan. Hi, everybody, this is Mary Wong speaking for the transcript. Alan, you're right, it is not in the letter specifically as to proposed language or the nature of the proposed amendment. And the reason for that, as you also point out, is, you know, we don't as yet know what the NGPC might be doing.

So looking at the discussion that Chris had with the Council earlier this month it didn't seem that we were at a point where the NGPC had made a decision. And that discussion between the Council and Chris was not specific on the nature of that recommendation.

At the same time, in terms of putting it into the letter, there were a couple of choices - there are still a couple of choices obviously. One is what's here, which may be a little too indirect, I suppose. Another is what you've suggested which is to put something in and specifically ask is this what you had in mind? If not, what would it be?

And I think this is the purpose why Thomas and I - one of the purposes of putting this forward and as Jonathan says, for discussion prior to amendment or adoption.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, my quick answer, then I'll be quiet, my only concern is when they come back and say yes you got everything right we still won't know what wording to put it when we try to reconvene the working group. And they may not know the answer yet and they have some work to do but I think we should be asking them.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, Mary. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: It is my understanding that the NGPC asked us to (unintelligible) exactly what the GAC has been asking for with respect to the RCRC names which is why this was stated in the letter. And then two paragraphs later we ask the NGPC to confirm whether our understanding is correct. So implicitly, Alan, the question is in the letter.

Certainly if you're looking for an alternative answer, or variation of the protections that are asked for then the question would need to be asked differently. But it is my understanding that this was the ask that was put before us and that we ask for confirmation whether or our understanding is correct. Does that help?

Alan Greenberg: I'll be leaving the Council soon so it won't be my problem. But I thought I head Chris say we have - that the NGPC had not yet made a decision on what to offer the GAC, they still had to discuss that and until they finalize that and tell us the answer I don't see how we can reconstitute the working group.

Jonathan Robinson: So can I just make sure I understand this? The letter is satisfactory as far as dealing with the IOC names. That feels - sorry, the - not IOC, the international organization names. But from your point of view, Alan, it's not satisfactorily clear in flushing out how to deal with the Red Cross names.

Maybe it would be helpful to get some suggestions offline or as to how the letter might be modified. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Jonathan. Mary again. And just to follow up on that it may be helpful to clarify that the thinking behind this also is that this isn't a

letter that the Council then sends off and then immediately goes off and starts thinking about the language or nature of any amendments it might make.

As Petter noted in the chat, there's nothing promised at this point except that the Council is willing to consider it. So the assumption that I believe Thomas had and in working with him I think that was what we wanted the draft to say was we're going to expect an answer from the NGPC and discussions or further discussions.

And we don't say it in the letter but I believe that Thomas and my expectation was that some of those discussions would occur in LA. So maybe it'd be helpful for the Council to consider what sort of next steps and discussions could it, for example, be a topic for the Board GNSO meeting or should it be other conversations in or after LA. So hopefully this helps.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah absolutely Mary, that's my understanding that this isn't the end of it. And I must say I'm not sure this is - this may be too nuanced and detailed for GNSO meeting. But in any event this is not the last word on the subject. I suggest that, you know, I take your point, I think it'll be very good to get a variation of this letter off as soon as possible to keep - it's already been around a while.

Can I ask for subject to, I mean, the intention is not to get this letter off and then reconstitute the working group; there is no way I expect that we're going to try and reconstitute or make reference to the working group without some further steps including a response to this letter.

So can I ask if there is support to send a variation of this letter off with any input that Alan will help make over the next few days? Can I just see if there's any objection to that because I'd quite like to get some sort of response - I think we've got good clarification on the international nongovernmental organization and international - I'm getting tongue-tied on this - IGO names. It certainly deals with the IGO names adequately and it would be good to get something off. John.

John Berard: Yeah, this is John Berard. Are you asking, Jonathan, for us to give you approval to revise and send or to revise, let us see it and then send?

Jonathan Robinson: Well I guess it will be revised on list so effectively it's revised, review and send. But essentially I expect it to be materially the same subject to some clarification from Alan in and around the Red Cross names.

John Berard: Yeah, you have my support and by extension Gabby's, I have her proxy.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Any concerns with that approach? Really I'll ask for objections to that to make it simpler. Any objections to sending off a letter materially similar to this one subject to (unintelligible) wording relating to the Red Cross names?

I'm not seeing any objections. I know multiple attendees are typing so that sounds like we have support to try and move this along. I'm going to close that item now. We just passed the top of the first hour and we've got quite a lot to get through still.

Mason Cole, who many of you know from his previous work in the GNSO and on the Council, is available to us for Item 5. It felt to me, in talking with Mason, that this was a useful opportunity prior to us going to LA for the Council to have the opportunity to hear from our liaison to the GAC and to just have - understand as clearly as possible what the purpose of this role is and to (unintelligible) or comment on that. So that's what this next item is all about.

Mason, let me give you the floor and as we move into Item 5 then and introduction to the GNSO liaison to the GAC.

Mason Cole: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Mason Cole speaking. I see I have 10 minutes on the agenda; I don't think I'll need that long at all. I just have a brief presentation to share with the Council about the organization work that I've tried to do over the last several weeks for the GNSO GAC liaison role.

First, just let me take another moment to say thank you to everyone on the Council for their support of me for filling this role. I have not doubt that it's going to be a challenging role but I'm looking forward to it and I want to thank the Council for their confidence.

So as a way of a bit of background on me, many of you know this, we're getting a little bit of background on the call here so maybe you could mute your line if you don't mind.

This is just a brief overview of my past involvement in ICANN. Many of you know I was secretary and chair of the Registrars group. I served on the Council for a term where I also served a year as vice chair. This is a quick rundown of my current roles in working groups.

Some of those may, frankly, be cut back a bit because of the time the GAC GNSO role is going to take up but for now this is where I'm contributing inside the community.

So in terms of objectives of the role, I derived this and the methods that I'm about to describe from the description provided by the consultation group that oversaw the creation of this role and then just my own thinking.

So in terms of objectives the idea is to facilitate a good flow of information between the GNSO and the GAC. And by that I mean primarily from the GNSO to the GAC.

The GAC has very much a desire to participate in GNSO policymaking when they determine that public policy applies. There's not really a good definition for what public policy means. I hope to help the GAC arrive at some sort of delineation of what that means so that they can selectively apply their attention to the things that are relevant to them.

When it comes to GNSO business - sorry, did somebody have a question?

((Foreign language spoken))

Mason Cole: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Mason - we need to call for muting the lines please. It may be you as well though, I don't want to single you out unfairly but if we could make sure that all lines are muted please?

Mason Cole: All right thank you, Jonathan. So in general then also assist with engagement of the GAC in GNSO processes where that's appropriate. So how do we go about doing this? There are a number of methods, one is my job to...

((Crosstalk))

Mason Cole: ...and objectively represent and communicate policy work to the GAC so that they understand what we're doing. And by that I mean without regard or favor to one house or constituency or stakeholder group over another; I represent the entire GNSO.

Second for my updates to the GAC on PDP activities, guide the GAC in opportunities for early engagement in GNSO work. I think this is where one of the bigger challenges is going to be.

I do know that the policy team has done the - the staff - policy staff team has done a very good job of condensing information from the policymaking community to the GAC and the GAC is continually challenged to make use of that - make use of that information and return to the Council or GNSO policymaking groups in a way that's as constructive as they probably would like it to be.

Also just ensure that the GAC's ongoing understanding of GNSO methods and processes is complete. I know there's been some tutorials provided to the GAC about this. I intend probably to do something along the same lines just as an introduction for the role.

And then just provide the Council itself with updates on GAC activity so far as those issues relate to anything that the GAC is interested in GNSO work. And then finally work with the consultation group to develop specific mechanics for early engagement of the GAC.

Current thinking about the liaison role, it's a one-year pilot program. It can be potentially renewed in late 2015 if the GAC and the Council believe that it's been a useful exercise.

As I said, neutral and objective representation of GNSO work. Important role is liaising also with staff. I've already talked with Marika about getting briefing materials and a process for getting answers to questions and that kind of thing. And then otherwise just liaising with other working groups as needed to make sure that this role is up to speed on what's happening inside the community.

So in terms of preparation between now and Los Angeles, I've conferred with Council leadership, with Jonathan, on a number of occasions. I'll continue to do that. Also talked with staff to get some assistance with policy briefings for the GAC. And, excuse me, I do need to speak with GAC leadership as soon as I can.

I think one of the more important things to do here is set expectations about the role. What I don't want to do is inappropriately have the GAC believe that this is an advocacy role rather than an information sharing role so I want to be careful to avoid that trap.

And then I'm also working on an opening presentation to the GAC for Los Angeles which will include a review of Council procedures, review the current Council work and then opportunities for engagement.

And Alan, I see your note, I'm aware that there will be a new chair, that will be an opportunity for additional engagement.

So in Los Angeles my plan is spend some time having the role introduced to the GAC and then open up new relationships with GAC members. Excuse me. Brief the GAC as I discussed. I'll probably spend quite a bit of time in GAC sessions that are not closed sessions except for times when I need to be with the Council itself to make sure that I'm up to speed on Council work.

And then debrief the Council at the conclusion of the LA meetings on what happened with the GAC day by day.

Okay, that's pretty much it. Jonathan, I'll turn the floor back over to you although I'm happy to answer questions if I can.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks very much, Mason. I see there's a queue of questions coming up so I'll be first-rate to those. John, you're first in the queue.

John Berard: Just slow to take my hand down, sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem. Thomas next.

Thomas Rickert: Mason, thanks for the presentation. I have one question for you which I'm sure you'll be able to answer. Now that we have you as a liaison will you be able to address the GAC with the information from that GNSO Council or the wider GNSO, i.e. would you have writing access to the GAC mailing list?

You will remember that sometimes we wanted to send information or a letter to the GAC, and at least if my memory doesn't fail me, sometimes this communication has not really made its way to all GAC members.

And I think it would be excellent if you could sort of take over the role of the messenger to the GAC and make sure that the information that we want to be conveyed is actually being conveyed. If you don't, you know, maybe you can take that week you for your discussions with the GAC leadership team.

Mason Cole: Right. Mason speaking again. Thank you Thomas, for the question. I do have access to the list although I don't have posting rights. I can request that information be sent to the broader GAC on behalf of the GNSO. I do have the privilege of requesting the floor in a GAC meeting if the opportunity presents itself for me to make sure that the Council's view needs to be represented in front of the GAC.

And just let me reiterate again that the critical role here is to transmit information from the Council to the GAC and to ensure that the GAC is fully up to speed on what the Council is doing. And if that GAC identifies a public policy role in which it wants to be engaged early on in a policymaking process then I can help guide the GAC on where that would be appropriate to do. But mostly this is a flow of information from the Council to the GAC.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, and just if you'll permit me, James, I'm sorry just to come in ahead of you on this and just to try and help with that because I've obviously worked closely with the consultation group. And so clearly we're going into an area which some of us will have concerns about.

But there's a history here of us coming to a late point in the process where the GAC is seen to get involved too late or at least so late that it causes all sorts of problems. And we have - for example an ATRT 1 recommendation that actively encouraged early engagement with the GAC.

So a primary objective here is to ensure that the GAC is a sufficiently engaged such that early engagement takes place. To be frank, it's not quite clear what we'll do with that early engagement. We have not yet properly worked out the mechanics of what we do there and that gives rise to appropriate concern.

And this is one - Mason's role as liaison is one remedy to enhance participation, cooperation and early engagement with the GAC. And we kind of - we're putting one fix in place without all the other fixes. So there's some risk with that and that's - I thought it was worth probably making that point. James, go ahead with any comment or question you may have.

James Bladel: Thank you, Jonathan. I actually have several so I'll keep them very brief. The first one being that yes I agree with you that as a former member of the ATRT 1 team we definitely wanted to get the GAC involved in the policy development process earlier and in fact as early as possible. However I would point out that that doesn't preclude their ability to - or preempt their ability to get back involved at the end of the...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I'm picking up an echo or some background, I don't know if folks could make sure their lines are muted.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: And then I just wanted to thank Mason. This is a potential lightning rod of a position. I think he's definitely, you know, doing a huge service not just for the GNSO but the wider community by volunteering to become the link between these two organizations. I think that's important.

A couple of questions I had, one is I think, Mason, you really hit on it, you know, early on in your presentation was that defining are establishing some guidelines on what thresholds must be crossed or test must be satisfied in order for (unintelligible) issue to fall into the realm of public policy, I think that's important.

I think it's important, you know, in the respect that it should at least impress upon the GAC that, you know, just because something is important doesn't necessarily mean it's exclusively the domain of public policy so I think establishing that will be important.

I'm looking forward to not just the GNSO informing the GAC but I'm looking for the reciprocal side of that conduit as well. So, you know, I want to look forward to that.

And then the final thing I had a question for Mason which I think is about three slides back when you were talking about the different presentations and materials that you would be preparing, not your opening presentation.

I think that some of them were specifically about policy, and if we can go back maybe one or two more slides. There was - oh okay, sorry I must have heard it rather than read it.

I wonder if it might be beneficial for one of the - and maybe not be opening presentation but maybe perhaps a subsequent presentation to include an overview of the commercial industry, and I mean all aspects of it, not just the registry registrar but also the other, you know, industry elements that have sprung up around the domain name space as well as the technical - and again, you know, keeping it at a high level and an overview fashion but the technical considerations of what is and what is not possible for a domain name.

Because I think that there might be some absence of understanding of those subjects on the GAC and I think that those would be essential for the GAC to issuing its advice in not only a timely but also a really effective manner. That's just my thoughts. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Mason speaking. Thank you James. I think that's actually a really good point. I know that during my time as chair of the Registrars that was always a continual challenge making sure that the community understood where the difficulties might be and certainly an implementation of certain policies. So I think that's probably a good idea and I'll take that suggestion gladly.

Jonathan Robinson: All right in the interest of time then I think we'll bring that item to a close. And for me, you know, of course obviously very grateful to Mason for making the time coming to us, and as James said, for taking on the role which I think is challenging but interesting.

But it's also important that we as a Council, and hopefully those that's listening to the recordings, understand and appreciate what is attempting to be achieved here. And so this for me forms not only an opportunity for the Council to properly understand but for the wider community to understand where we're going and so that's hopefully - we've made a useful contribution to that.

Thanks again, Mason.

Mason Cole: Sure thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...to - yeah, thank you. And of course you're welcome to stay on the line if you would so choose.

Mason Cole: Well I'll excuse myself now because I need to catch a plane so thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Thank you again.

Mason Cole: All right, bye-bye.

Jonathan Robinson: Will move on to Item 6 then which is an opportunity requested by James to bring you up to speed on the final recommendations of the working group that's part of a series of working groups that you'll be familiar with.

The objective here is to try and bring us up to speed so that we are in a better position to move this work along to the next level, i.e. potentially vote on the final report in LA. Thanks, please go ahead James.

James Bladel: Thanks Jonathan. And I will try to keep this brief and succinct as possible. The Inter Registrar Transfer PDP Part D, so you read that correctly, the fourth in a series of PDPs has now, as of Monday, concluded its final report. And I believe, if my understanding is correct, that that was published today.

So that was not only a long and, you know, and intensive effort to get to the end of this particular PDP but this is the fourth and final PDP in this series so we are at the end of the end and we are very, very pleased to be at this point.

So what I'd like to do this quickly run through the final recommendations and then just kind of tee up this particular issue for our meeting in Los Angeles. And do I have control, Lars? I'll just scroll through I guess. Yes, okay.

Here's the background. I'm not going to read it to you because we just went through the interim report earlier this year and were in the open comment period in London.

But we received a healthy dose of comments and we spent the time intercessionally between the London meeting and this Monday incorporating those public comments into our final recommendation as well as some additional information that was raised during those deliberations. And the final recommendations reflect that sum total of work.

So we addressed our six charter questions. We arrived at 18 policy recommendations all of which are supported by full consensus. You

know, essentially we are introducing reporting requirements for disputes, that's transfer dispute protocol.

We are addressing the scenario where a domain name that was acquired through a fraudulent transfer, typically known as a domain name hijack, is moved around through multiple registrars in an effort to launder the source of the transfer.

We have, most importantly, removed registries as the first tier of the dispute process and it will instead focus on the independent dispute resolution providers. We have extended the statute of limitation to file a dispute from six months to 12 months. All of these of course corresponding with recommendations in our initial report.

We did not address the issue of disputes of inter-registrant transfers or when to claimants, individuals or organizations claim to be the registrant. We did provide, I believe, some help on that area by providing a list of use cases or different scenarios and pointing to existing policy where applicable.

We did call for some improvements to ICANN's Website for the presentation and centralization of information on dispute options. We examined the utility of the FOA, which is the form of authorization that is submitted for each transfer.

And there were several individuals that believe that this is now obsolete and that the fact that we used an authentication password is sufficient to transfer a domain name while others, including ICANN compliance, felt strongly that the FOA was so required.

But most importantly, and here's something that did not appear in our initial report, is that we have called for some future work once this IRTP is implemented and others are implemented, to begin to gather data and look at the sum total of transfers to understand whether or not all of these new policies have improved the overall accessibility, understanding and utility of the transfer function.

It is far and away the most frequently cited policy in complaints to ICANN about registrars. And it is usually the general public's first exposure to ICANN is that someone has taken their domain names or they're trying to transfer and they're having problems with a registrar.

And what we're asking is to begin the process of having a top to bottom review of whether or not these policies have succeeded in their objectives of making - of improving that situation. And in order to do that you need to have some measurements so you'll see that the final report has some calls for measurements and data collection as well.

So here's the next steps. We're going to present the final report during our weekend session. We will table a motion for the Council to vote on adoption of the final report and its recommendations.

We will publish the final report for comment after ICANN 51. I believe, Lars can correct me, I believe this is an optional step but we will go ahead and take that option. And then we will expect the Board to review and ultimately approve these recommendations sometime early next year.

And I believe that's the end of the slide deck. So how did I do on time, Jonathan? I'm willing to answer any questions that anyone might have

but, you know, I don't see a significant departure from the work that we did leading up to the meeting in London. And I expect that this will be a fairly non-contentious subject going into LA.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks James. We'll be well prepared for that at least. And thank you very much for taking the time to do it and do it quickly. Alan, your head is up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'd just like to commend James as chair and the group as a whole for the diligence and care that they put into this, way over and above what the charter called for or I think some of the expectations. I was a member of the group, although not very active for much of its life, but I was really impressed. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Alan, it was good having you on the group.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'm going to repeat white Alan just said but I joined the group halfway through. I joined at the end of B or mid-B and have been amazed at the diligence. And, you know, it has been extremely well chaired through the process. So I just wanted to basically say the same thing that James has done an amazing job with that group.

James Bladel: Thanks, Avri. It was good having you on the group. Avri was also my co chair for IRTP-C, the immediate predecessor to this one. And I think what both Avri and Alan are referring to is that we received not only some new comments in the interim but some new members joining the group that had some very - that had some ideas and contributions that we were trying to incorporate into the initial report without diminishing

the work that had gone into it previously. And I think we were able to achieve that.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, James. Well fine compliments indeed. I think we need to be thinking about an award at the PDP Oscars or something. That's a trademarked term, by the way. And so hopefully we can recognize you in some other way that nice to get that from your colleagues.

Good, well let's move on then and keep going to Item 7, and we have someone who has patiently waited to talk to us on Item 7. It's an important point. It's a little shame that Brett, who is leading the discussion group isn't on the call, and we've already mentioned that. But, Karen, it's great - Karen Lentz is on the call and it will be great to hear from you as to the recent staff work on dealing with subsequent rounds as was requested from the Council during the ICANN meeting in London. So let me just answer it over to you, Karen.

Karen Lentz: Thank you, Jonathan. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thank you.

Karen Lentz: Okay. Hello everyone. This is Karen Lentz speaking for the transcript. I sent earlier this week a report to the Council that, as Jonathan said, was requested as part of a motion passed by the Council during the meeting in London on work and consideration and planning for subsequent application processes for gTLDs.

So there were five topics that were requested in terms of a status report. And I thought I would just kind of give the highlights of those

briefly and then turn it back to the chair for any discussion or questions.

The first - so the first topic was basically the status of the set of applications that we've received and that are in process now. So there is a chart in the report that goes by phase with the evaluation processes, dispute resolution contention, etcetera, and shows the percentage complete of each of those.

The evaluation and dispute resolution are substantially complete in terms of phases. There are roughly half the applications that were determined to be in contention sets the remaining subject to some contention resolution procedure.

And so that kind of drives the remaining phases for contracting, pre-delegation and delegation because there are dependencies is underway and applications might come out of that contention process. So that's projected in there - our best estimates at this point.

And the second topic that was requested is a timeline and work plan for the review specified in 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments. So this is a review that really covers three areas; that calls for a review team to be convened to look at what the impact of the new gTLD program has been on competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. So the new acronym for that is CCT.

The Affirmation also called for that team to look at the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process as well as the safeguards that were built into the program.

And so particularly with regard to assessing competition, trust and choice preparations for that have been underway for while with the development of some proposed metrics for how you could evaluate what the impact has been in those areas.

And then there were a few community efforts to do that. Most recently there is an IAGCCT who has been involved in recommending to the Board which metrics are the most useful and cost effective to collect to help inform this review.

That group, earlier in the year provided an interim recommendation to do a consumer survey and an economic study as part of gathering some baseline data to help meet those assessments and so those efforts are underway as well as the collection of other baseline metrics.

In terms of the other areas of review, the - we have some activity going on in those areas which will also hopefully provide an input to this CCT review team in which I'll touch on a little bit later here.

In terms of the timeline, the current projection is for this review process to start about a year from now. That would enable, first of all, just more experienced with that new gTLDs having been out there and in the market and used by people.

And secondly, it will, you know, there are also expected to be a range of TLD types out there so you'll have IDNs, you'll have community-based TLDs, brand-related, etcetera, so there would be the full diversity of types that can be taken into account in that review.

In terms of the process and timeline once the review team is convened it's of course up to them to plan and schedule their work. Typically it's been with other review teams under the Affirmation it's been a - once the team is convened it's been a 12 to 18 month process for them to come up with their recommendations at which point the Board considers those and determines which to take action on.

The other point to make here on this review is also that it's a recurring review. So we're talking here about the first one but it's not - we're not going to look at competition, trust and choice only ones, it will be an ongoing effort.

The third area is ask for ICANN's work today on evaluations of the first round. The name that we are giving to this is Program Implementation Reviews, at least that's where the staff has focused currently in terms of looking at the implementation and operational aspects of having this application and evaluation process.

We've tried to - and there's a huge range of areas to look at and so we've tried to come up with some structure for the way that we are evaluating the experience and trying to capture the lessons from it. We've tried to distill them into what are called in the report, focus areas, so you would sort of cluster a group of questions together that are related to some area.

And then there's also kind of a list of dimensions so that for every subject matter area you also looking at things like timeliness and efficiency and cost and predictability and all these factors to make sure that there is a consistent level of review.

So the outcomes, you know, of this kind of depends on what the, you know, what the in-house is revealed. It's expected that we would provide this analysis with the community and discuss the - sorry, to provide it for review and comment and discuss that with the community and that could lead to some projects related to operational improvements or implementation.

The next topic that was asked for is a post-launch independent review of the trademark clearinghouse. And I actually go a little bit backwards on this area because there are several reviews that do relate to rights protection.

So what we have been doing as staff is to gather statistics on the usage of the rights protection mechanisms so far on the clearinghouse, on sunrise, on trademark claims, on URS. So we'll have quantitative data. We're looking at the customer service questions and looking at trying to identify which areas seem to generate questions or confusion or comments so we capture those topics of discussion.

We've had discussions with the service providers and we are planning for a session in LA which is focused on gathering user feedback from those who have actually used the RPMs to make sure we account for that perspective.

So this will - is intended to inform a couple of things. One is the independent review of the clearinghouse which was agreed to as part of the sessions with the GAC previously. And so that data that we've compiled is intended to be an input to that which is targeted for early next year.

Then there's also, as you may know, a pending request from the GNSO for an issues report or an issue report, sorry, that reviews all of the RPMs including UDRP and the RPMs that were developed for the new gTLD program. So again, the work that we're doing now is intended to inform that issue report so that the data is available before that's created.

And then finally with this area and with the previous staff work that I mentioned on program implementation, both of those are also intended to be input to the CCT review team and those areas are also called out in the AOC.

Last point that was noted was the timeline. So there is a rough timeline included in the report that is focused on the reviews. It maps out the work that we know of is happening and how long we think it'll take. There are of course a lot of interdependencies between these tracks.

So I've talked about most of the things that are on there. There is - if you're looking at the timeline on Page 6 of the paper there is a green line toward the bottom that describes - that denotes the GNSO activities. So we're way of the formation of the discussion group and understand that the goal there is to identify areas where the GNSO may wish to initiate policy.

And then once that's known we can have a better idea of how to account for those plans in with the rest of the plans. So just to note that, you know, including this is really not an attempt to speak for the GNSO or try to schedule that work but just to anticipate that it will probably be going on.

And the last line at the bottom for next round development, which is really kind of any dotted line, based on the, you know, outcomes of what we're calling the program implementation review, you know, some of those projects could start as early as, you know, early next year. But it's fairly hard to predict right now what outcomes will lead to things that need to be built or designed. And so that's kind of a placeholder right there for now.

Final point is that also earlier this week we published a work plan, a draft work plan, for the program reviews and assessments and that's really intended to inform a session that's planned for the meeting in Los Angeles. It's substantially the, you know, all of the information is the same as it is in this report, it's a little bit more formal and has more detail in terms of Board resolutions and such that the content in terms of the plan is the same. So we're hoping to get input on that.

And with that I will turn it back over to you, Jonathan. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Karen. That's a very helpful overview. I had the chance to read them paper before, you know, certainly in the scope of the work. Any comments or questions? Yeah, I see a hand up from - not sure who got in first, let's give you an opportunity to ask a question, Brian, since we haven't heard from you, I don't think so far. Go ahead.

Brian Winterfeldt: Hi. Thank you, Jonathan. Brian Winterfeldt from the IPC. Karen, thank you so much for the update. I know we've all been waiting for information on this and it's nice to see such a detailed organized report.

Not surprisingly I'm focused on the rights protection mechanism review aspect of this. And I noticed that the timetable looks at several different groups that are going to be taking a look at the RPMs.

And I guess I'm wondering how those are going to be sort of coordinated or eventually tie together. So essentially I'm looking at the GAC mandated independent review that's slated for February 2015, then the standing issues report on RPMs is scheduled for it looks around April 2015, and then 9.3 AOC review that's going to stretch into 2016.

So I just wanted to kind of at least put a placeholder, and I don't know if you have an answer today, but it seems like it would be important to think about how these separate reviews will ultimately relate to each other and hopefully in a meaningful way and that they can benefit from it.

And then I also note that you mentioned sort of how the GNSO policy development process is sort of in a nice green bar kind of across all of this but how that's going to actually allow us time to do our policy development work after we've seen the reviews that are being conducted by those various groups.

Karen Lentz: Thank you Brian. So this is Karen Lentz speaking. So it's an excellent question. If you look at the - what the GAC requested they named some specific things like, you know, exact match versus including other terms which were, you know, topics of discussion at the time. I think it will depend somewhat on the, you know, on the terms of reference for that independent review and what exactly the outcome

would be whether it's, you know, operationally focused or would, you know, suggest items to feed into the policy process etcetera.

So, you know, that's something that is targeted to start but probably won't be completed by the time that the GNSO is deciding to, you know, whether or what policy work it might want to undertake in this area.

So take your point and, you know, if there's anything that I can - that we can look at to sort of refine that area - better scope out those interdependencies we'll do that.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you Karen, that's really helpful. And we'll, of course, take a look at I know this information is pretty fresh and we appreciate you sharing it with us again. And we'll definitely discussed with the IPC and come back to you if we have any suggestions or recommendations that we think might be helpful to further refine the processes.

Karen Lentz: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Brian. James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. James speaking. And thanks, Brian, that was a good question. Karen, just real quickly, would you consider this work plan, you know, given what we know about the interdependencies and some of the other scheduling issues Brian raised as well as just the general cadence of work that ICANN, would you consider this to be a best case scenario?

Let me put it this way, a fastest case scenario, the fastest path?

Karen Lentz: Well if you - probably yes, I would. You know, this is kind of, you know, the best that we can scope out at this point. I think it's - there's probably, you know, other things that we haven't take into account. You know, one of the, you know, types of feedback that we were expecting to get is wait, you missed this or that other thing.

So, you know, we have, you know, for the things which you can, you know, sort of put a timeline on, you know, like we have a project plan for executing the economic study; there's, you know, we can estimate the, you know, review team activities according to, you know, was previous processes have been like.

You know, for the things which, you know, are staff work or engaging someone to do something you can have a pretty good idea of, you know, of how long it'll take to do those reviews and create those inputs.

What's harder to predict is the, you know, the discussions on the outcomes of those things and, you know, like with the green line it's, you know, at this stage we don't know, you know, what's going to be the topic of policy - sorry, policy discussion or what the outcomes of that will be. So, you know, altogether this is the best look but, you know, I think there are probably things in it that aren't accounted for yet.

Jonathan Robinson: Karen, thank you. It's Jonathan speaking. Just to check, I assume you've got a session on this in LA, I'd imagine there's a dedicated session for this.

Karen Lentz: Yes there is, it's on Monday afternoon.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Well thank you. It we are at 10 minutes before the hour and we've got two or three items we need to canter through. So I think we should appreciate that input and we'll certainly come back to you in LA either via the dedicated session or via the session you're holding on Monday.

That's very useful and much appreciated update to the Council and through the counsel to the GNSO as a whole.

Karen Lentz: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Karen. All right I'm going to push us on then to the next three items. I think we can deal with these in the time allocated because I hope we can deal with them relatively briefly. Item 8 is just - touches on the cross community working group to develop the transition proposal.

As you know we approve the charter at the last meeting. And really there's a couple - there's two points I would like to highlight and just see if there's any other comment or question on this.

First, is that the GNSO has the opportunity to put forward up to five participants and unlimited number of observers but really we need four or five. And the reason it's up to five is to accommodate different groups and the way in which they break up and have requirements to sort of segment their interest in this kind of thing.

So really my purpose of having this on the agenda is to remind you that we need volunteers who are committed and going to be dedicated

to doing this work. It's one of the most high-profile projects around, as you know. And there is a meeting scheduled for this group on 6 October, Monday, about 10 days from now. I can forward you the exact details, but it would be really good to make sure we've got the volunteers.

Can someone help me and reminds me if we have - for which groups we do not have volunteers yet or, someone from staff perhaps? Thank you Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just getting off mute sorry. I believe we have volunteers from the CSG. I think it's Greg Shatan. And from that Registrars, I think it's Graeme Bunton. And we're still waiting for the Registries as well as the NCSG. And of course you yourself Jonathan are member as well for the Council resolution.

Jonathan Robinson: So Registries and NCSG please, and to the extent that I can do something about that Registries I will so let's get a couple more hats in the ring of dedicated and committed volunteers to do this. And I think I'll leave it at that. There is an opportunity to interact with the coordination group at ICANN 51 which we may take advantage of. But in the short-term the most important thing to do is to get the team together and on the - thank you, Avri, I note that the NCSG selection will be available soon.

Interest of time I'm going to move us along to Item 9 which is this Board working group on the Nominating Committee. Just to keep this high on the agenda of the Council, and anyone in the GNSO, this was a significant change proposed to the structure and organization of the Nominating Committee.

If anyone wants to comment as to work if it's going on in their groups in respect to this and really my question to you is what, if any action over and above that which may be taking place within the groups and constituencies should the Council be doing.

The public comment periods on this is running from 21st of August to 21st of October. So we do have an opportunity to formulate something in LA. And there is a reply period from 22nd October so there's a little time here but any input you'd like to make now to keep this issue warm, it just seems to be such a significant change that I feel we shouldn't just let it slip past us with little or no comment or recognition. James.

James Bladel: Thanks Jonathan. You know, I would just perhaps suggests that one approach would be in addition to anything that is submitted into the comments from individual organizations or from stakeholder groups that the Council itself consider weighing in on this in the public comment. I think it directly affects our, you know, visibility and the ability to participate in this group. And I think that we need to - we need to take that opportunity to say so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks James. So I think I'd encourage you and anyone else with a similar view to keep this issue alive going into LA. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I just wanted to point out that in addition to the obviously relevant to the GNSO change in representation and distribution there are some other very substantial changes that are recommended particularly the one about delegation voting and that's a really major change from what I'm told from people on the NomComm. And I think

that probably needs to be considered also over and above the obvious one of representation. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I wonder if anyone who's willing to put up their hand to potentially lead to a Council-based response thinking of this very much from a Council/GNSO wide perspective in addition to specific stakeholder group perspectives. Any volunteers to try and draft up something? James.

James Bladel: So hi. Thank you. James speaking. I'm tentatively volunteering to do that however I think that a Council responds should perhaps be withheld until the reply period to give us an opportunity to review and synthesize the responses that are received from the various stakeholder groups to make sure that there's no daylight in between the Council itself and the other GNSO components.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. That's an excellent suggestion. It's consistent with one that John Berard has made in the past so that's helpful. Well let's keep it alive. Let's keep it on the agenda. That helps us to - I think we'll keep this on the agenda for LA. The reply period commences at or around the end of the LA meeting so that's - all dovetails together quite well.

I think we'll draw line under that no because of the time and just leave the last couple of minutes to hear any comments on the LA schedule. I know there's been work going on in the background to try and build up the LA schedule under Item 10 so you can look forward to hearing from me, in particular on topics for our key interactions, as usual with Board, senior executive staff and so on.

And then I know under Item 11 there is an opportunity for Jennifer Wolfe to just give a quick plug for the participation in the survey. Jen, I don't know if you're on and you'd like to make a point here...

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...but just before I go to you I see David's hand come up and I suspect it has to do with Item 10 so if you could just bear with me one moment while we take David and then will switch to you, Jen.

David Cake: Yeah, just to say really quickly we have been working on the schedule for LA. We have sort of filled up Sunday with the normal sort of interaction with senior staff. We don't yet have final confirmation for a lot of them so the timetable is still working on but we will obviously on Sunday we will meet with Fadi, Theresa, I think Cyrus from GDD and the, you know, the Board, I think are all sort of currently being juggled in the agenda.

And we are shaping up to the Saturday schedule fairly firmly. And obviously as usual that will be mostly the, you know, reports from working groups and so on. If anyone does have any comments on things that they would like to change for this, you know, it's still not too late so please let me know. That's all really.

Yeah, we have a longer meeting with the GAC than normal to talk about the new liaison and various things. We'll be, think the GNSO review team is on the schedule. That's about it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Thanks, David. So we've got two or three more minutes than just to give Jennifer the floor under any other business. Go ahead, Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, thank you Jonathan. This is Jennifer Wolfe. Just to give a brief update on the 360 assessment and the review. I'm sure will have time to talk in more detail about what's been happening during the LA meeting but since we just have a few minutes just to let everybody know so far we've only had five of the councilors complete the survey.

I'll be sending out a follow-up note after this call just reminding everyone. But we really need to have 100% participation from Council members. The survey takes about 10 to 15 minutes to complete, if you just does to the questions. If you want to spend more time and provide more detailed responses you can certainly do that.

Just really want to encourage and ask all of you to please take some time between now and the Los Angeles meeting to complete the survey. It doesn't reflect well on the Council if we only have five Council members willing to take the time to provide feedback so please take some time and complete the survey between now and LA.

We have made the decision to extend the survey process through the Los Angeles meeting. It'll be announced during the opening ceremonies, will be promoting it throughout the week so that we can hopefully get more participation. We've only had 133 people so far complete the survey and we'd like to see some much bigger numbers.

So we'll be talking more about it in the LA meeting but for now please do take some time to complete the survey. I'll send out a link. It's very simple but very much appreciated and helpful to us in terms of a public perception of the Council to see that we have 100% participation by everyone. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jen. Really good point. So I don't know whether we should go so far as to name and shame. I can say I have not yet filled it but I will do so. And I'll just support you in encouraging everyone to do so. I think the least we could do is support you and support our work by doing that so strongly echoed.

David, I think your hand up was from the previous item so if you could just let me know? Yeah, okay good.

Right, we hit exactly on the top of the hour. I just check if there's anyone else needs to say anything under AOB? Well thank you very much everyone for a well-timed and constructive meeting. I think we've covered quite a lot there and that's useful discussion.

I know we spent quite a bit of time on the EWG work but that's obviously very important and unique situation. So thanks for helping us make up the time and for the contributions during the call.

I think that finishes the call, Glen, so we are in a position to stop the recording and wish everyone a successful evening and rest of the day depending on where they are.

END