**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference**
**29 January 2015 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 29 January 2015 at 12:00 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-29jan15-en.mp3
Adobe Chat Transcript
http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-29jan15-en.pdf
on page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jan

**List of attendees**:
NCA – Non Voting – Carlos Raúl Gutierrez

**Contracted Parties House**
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Volker Greimann, James Bladel, Yoav Keren

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Donna Austin, Bret Fausett

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

**Non-Contracted Parties House**

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Phil Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi – absent apologies,

Osvaldo Novoa, Tony Holmes -  absent apologies, Brian Winterfeldt, Heather Forrest

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Amr Elsadr, Marilia Maciel, Edward Morris,

Stephanie Perrin, Avri Doria, David Cake

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed

**GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers**:

Cheryl Langdon Or – ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer - absent, apologies

Mason Cole – GNSO liaison to the GAC

**ICANN Staff**

David Olive - VP Policy Development

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director

Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director

Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director

Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Cory Schruth – Systems Engineer

Coordinator: The recordings have started, you may now begin.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much. Would you like me to do a roll call for you, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, let me welcome everyone to the Council meeting, 29 of January. We hope to take only one hour of your time, not the two hours that some of you may expect. Hopefully you've seen that we plan to conduct an efficient meeting and deal with a few items within an hour.

So, Glen, yes please see to the roll call.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Bret Fausett. Don't see him on the call yet. Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yoav Keren.

Yoav Keren: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann:  Present.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Thomas Rickert I don't see on the call yet; he'll probably join in a few minutes. Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin:         Good morning, all.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Susan Kawaguchi, I believe is still on holiday. Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt:  Present.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest:    Present.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa:    Present.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Tony Holmes. Tony's not on the call yet and I think he will be joining for the first 30 minutes. Edward Morris.

Edward Morris:    Here.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr:         Present.

Glen de Saint Géry:    David Cake.

David Cake:        Here.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Marilia Maciel.

Marilia Maciel:    Present.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Avri Doria.

Avri Doria:    Here.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Stephanie Perrin.

Stephanie Perrin:  Present.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Dan Reed. I do not see Dan Reed on the call yet. Carlos Gutierrez.

Carlos Gutierrez:  Good morning.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:  I'm here, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry:    Patrick Myles is absent and sends his apologies. And for staff we have David Olive, Rob Hogarth, Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Steve Chen, Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund, Steve Sheng and myself, Glen de Saint Géry. Have I left off...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry:    Yes?

Thomas Rickert:    Glen, this is Thomas Rickert. I'm present.

Glen de Saint Géry:   Oh thank you, Thomas. Thank you very much. Thank you, Jonathan, then it is over to you. Just to remind people before though to say your name before speaking for the transcription purposes. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson:   Okay, thank you, Glen. Thanks everyone, again, for joining the call and of course welcome, again, and especially to Phil Corwin who joins us for the first time for the - I'm sure many of you know Phil and will look forward to meeting him in Singapore. But I'm sure he adds experience and a great dimension to the Council so welcome, Phil.

Phil Corwin:   Thank you, Jonathan. I'm delighted to be here.

Jonathan Robinson:   Great. I look forward to working with you. We have the audio enabled for the first time in Adobe Connect so it is available to all of you. If you are taking advantage of the microphone capability and the audio on your computers just be aware - in fact regardless of how you're joining to of course mute if you aren't speaking.

We've got really key purposes of this meeting; one primary probably and two secondary but nevertheless it entails three items. One, a quick opportunity to review the actions, where we are with current activity; two, and this is really was - in many ways the primary purpose of the meeting to ensure that everyone is as up to speed as they reasonably can be on the work of the Cross Community Working Group on the Stewardship Transition; and finally to take advantage of being together to ensure that we're in as good shape as we can be ahead of the Singapore meeting around just over a week from now.

So, let's - before we get on with the meeting in earnest let's make sure we just check if there are any Statement of Interest updates. And I assume Phil, if you haven't already filed one you will shortly be filing either an updated or a current Statement of Interest but just let me check under 1.2 if there are any updates or comments regarding Statements of Interest.

Thanks, Phil. I note from the chat that you'll file one shortly in the standard form I'm sure.

Under 1.3 there is an opportunity to review or amend this agenda. Any comments or issues in relation to the agenda?

Next under 1.4 we have the opportunity to note the status of the minutes. And my sincere apologies, this is something we were relatively good at and it's slipped with everything else that's been going on. They need reviewing and simply checking prior to posting to the list so it's really pretty much on myself and the vice chairs to do that and we'll turn that around in short order and try and make sure that's all sorted out together with the minutes from this meeting so we're back up to speed by the time we meet in Singapore. Apologies again for that.

So in terms of the action item, I don't intend to go through it in fine detail but I note that there was a request that meeting notices were sent to the council about the expert working group meetings. This is really the work that's going on to plan for how to integrate the expert working group work into - back into GNSO policy development and their - a meeting, I note, going on today.

You have received a note in your Council mailboxes about that. So if you haven't seen that exact 20 UTC, 2000 UTC tonight, at least for those of us that are in a UTC time zone so 2000 UTC.

Additionally, on that just noting that those two letters were sent off - and you would have seen copies that have gone to the list, one which is relating to name collision and our essential intention not to undertake any significant policy development work at the moment. And the second was a response to the Board requesting comments regarding future rounds of new gTLDs.

With respect to the GAC communiqué there is some work going on and there's a live discussion about how we process GAC communiqué. There is also an action, I'll need to talk with Thomas Schneider and/or GAC vice chairs. I'm afraid that hasn't happened, and I'm not quite sure how to make it happen. Everyone has been desperately busy and in particular the work on the transition seems to be absorbing an inordinate amount of time and running that CWG and doing all the work associated with it.

I did talk with Thomas Schneider this morning together with the co chair of the CWG group talking about - giving him an update and a briefing ahead of the GAC meetings in Singapore. But unfortunately we didn't get to cover the more general point. So I think it is something we want to carry on working on and find a way to discuss this, so that remains an open item.

So if we could move back to the main agenda then I think that covers all I was wanting to say about the action items unless somebody has any questions or comments in and around open or other actions.

Okay so the next item is Item 3, just waiting for the agenda to come up. I see there is one in the notes but I just want to make sure about that. Yeah. So there's the two items in the consent agenda. One is to approve a request for the extension of timeline for the issue report on rights protection mechanisms. This is something Mary Wong mentioned at our previous meeting.

And in addition to approve the formation of an informal community group to review the IDN implementation guidelines and moreover to approve the draft GNSO Council letter in response to these.

Are there any questions or comments on either of those two consent agenda items? And I'll remind you the process that we need to either generally accept that these are on the consent agenda or if someone is not comfortable with it, bring it off for further discussion, and then to simply take a vote to accept the consent agenda.

All right, Glen, if you could just - we'll record a voice vote. Is anyone not in favor of the two items being approved on the consent agenda, or the consent agenda being approved as is? Would anyone like to abstain? So, Glen, if you could record then that does present were in favor of the consent agenda as it stands.

Glen de Saint Géry:     Thank you, Jonathan. I will.

Jonathan Robinson:     All right, the next item is what is intended to be the substance of this meeting (unintelligible). Just a reminder to remain on mute please. We now deal with the work of the cross community working group to develop the transition proposal.

This is a group which as you know, is a cross community working group charter by four different chartering organizations. And it's done extensive work since formation including preparing an initial draft proposal that's been reviewed for public comment.

I know many of you, if not all of you, have been tracking the detail of the work and what's going on. It was our intention to, as the notes say, to originally - the original target was to try and respond to the timeline proposed by the ICG in terms of preparing a response from the names community, a proposal. But ultimately this proved to be unrealistic. And so the CWG is meeting later today and will consider the impact of that and a new timetable with a revised target in that.

When the CWG comes to look at that new timetable it will become clear that there are various elements of risk involved with that timetable. And one of those is the mechanics and process and time required for the chartering organizations to approve the ultimate proposal.

So really a key element of this discussion session today is twofold: One, to create an opportunity for any questions or any issues or any points in and around the work of the CWG so that the councilors are properly appraised of that work and feel are in a position to work with their respective communities to educate, inform, and just generally bring them along.

And secondly, I guess, for any comments as to how or what if anything needs to be done to assist or how it might best be handled to ensure that the respective constituencies and stakeholder groups that comprise the GNSO are able to make a decision to support or best understand the proposal. It's really to understand the mechanics of how they will deal with that.

So I think it's worth highlighting that we have four representatives from the GNSO on the cross community working group as what are known as members in addition to the open participants. So I think it would be - if I could just get - remind the Council who are the stakeholder group members, who are the sort of, if you like, the official representatives of the different stakeholder groups from the GNSO.

My memory is that it's - well I wouldn't mind a reminder actually. I'm pretty sure I know exactly who they are but if someone could just remind me and the Council who those participants are? James, go ahead.

James Bladel:     Hi, so we're talking about the IANA coordination group? Have I got the right group?

Jonathan Robinson:   The stewardship - the transition group. The stewardship transition group.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel:     The cross community group or the coordination group?

Jonathan Robinson:   Well the cross community group, James.

James Bladel:     Okay, then I got the wrong one. Sorry.

Jonathan Robinson:   No problem. Thanks. So I see in the chat Marika has put a link to the full membership of the CWG and Donna reminds us that she's the Registries Stakeholder Group member. There are representatives in any event from each GNSO stakeholder group.

But the key point is not all of those - thanks Marika - there we go. So what I wanted to highlight there really is that you've got, Greg, Graham, Avri, Donna, Stephanie. So that covers all - NCSG, CSG, Registries and Registrars.

But the point being that not all of those are councilors. So when it comes to working with and approving the proposal, which is going to ultimately be done through the - in the GNSO through the Council, it's critical that councilors know and understand, A, the history of the development of the work; and, B, the proposal as it currently stands.

So are there any comments as to how your different groups or constituencies are - how well appraised they are about this and what effort if any is likely to be required to take them through the process of understanding the proposal as it eventually settles and the sort of approval mechanisms?

It would be great to have any questions about the process and substance of the proposal as it currently stands, understanding what if anything needs to be done in Singapore and any comments you've got about how your groups might manage it.

Donna, Thanks. Go ahead.

Donna Austin:     Thanks, Jonathan. Donna Austin. So from the Registry perspective, we have - the Registry meets - as a conference call every other week so we provide - generally provide an update on the status of the CWG work at that time.

We didn't get an opportunity to do that yesterday as fulsome as I would have liked because we had ICANN - Fadi, Akram and Cyrus on the call. It is our intention to - my understanding, Jonathan, is a discussion document will be published on 2 February, so next Monday. And there will be a number of questions in that. We do hope that we have time to go through that with the RySG during the Singapore meeting.

But given that we have one proposal that's on the table, which is very similar to the one that was posted on 1 December for comment, and there are discussions going on about alternative proposals, I do find it a little bit of a challenge of defining that balance to keeping the RySG up to date on what is useful information because sometimes we move past what is useful information and move onto something else.

So finding a balance is a bit of a challenge that we try to update as regularly certainly on the calls. And if there's any substantial decisions taken we will do that by the email list. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson:     Thanks, Donna. That's helpful and it's a reminder that it's worth pointing out that plans, with respect to the work of this group in Singapore. But let me go first to Avri and then I'll talk a little bit more about that.

Avri Doria:     Okay first, I put my hand up, are we all supposed to be going through on what we're doing or did I just assume that? I may have missed it. If so I'm ready to say what is we're doing; if not I'll put my hand down.

Jonathan Robinson:     Avri, let me tell you what I was thinking. And I'm open to any other suggestions. It feels to me that it's important that all of the respective groups, and significantly also the constituencies, feel after speed and up-to-date as to what's going on such that when it comes to the proposal, I'm not surprised by it where it sat going back over old ground and looking for reasons for things that may have been already processed.

So really this is an opportunity to do two things I think. One, for the Council to be as up to speed as possible on the work of the CWG; and, two, to talk about how the different groups might be processing and ultimately coming to a decision on the proposal as it is made.

So, yes, some form of update as to how the work is going on in your group, and whether you need anything more, and whether you see impediments to supporting the proposal as it's eventually developed. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I just wanted to be sure. So in some ways we are doing what is similar to the Registries. We only the every three weeks to four weeks meeting. And it's definitely discussed during that meeting. There is a subgroup that - it's an open subgroup within the NCSG that focuses on issues of this.

There are announcements and forwarding of issues to our full discuss list which has several hundred members on it, you know, keeping them informed. There is periodic updates that I put out. At the moment I'm lagging. I sort of missed my last one.

But the introduction to the legal issues, first four pages, was so good I used it as the status update last time. We've had one NCSG phone call focused on this issue. We will have more as it gets closer.

We discussed, you know, it's hard to say how it's going to go in terms of, you know, accepting the proposal that's out there. There is fairly strong opinions in the NCSG on one type of model versus another. So, you know, we are participating and there's members participating in the meetings.

And, you know, it's still very much in churn. But we will continue to follow that process. I believe that as much as any of our several hundred members want

to they are following along. Certainly the opportunity for talking about it, for questioning it, and for being updated are being made available.

Jonathan Robinson:   Thank you, Avri. Let's go straight to Phil.

Phil Corwin:   Thank you, Jonathan. But just briefly, within the Business Constituency I've been - we have had some discussion on our biweekly calls. I'm a participant, not a member of the stewardship group. I've been passing along Greg Shatan's reports. He's been doing a great deal of work there. And on the accountability side we've got Steve DelBianco from the BC as the lead CSG liaison to that.

What I did want to mention, and I'll provide a link in the chat room - I published an article just the other day - and this is relevant to what going on - Secretary Strickling spoke at an event in Washington on Tuesday and said two key things.

One, that the Department of Commerce, NTIA, would abide by the Congressional appropriation language enacted in December which prohibits NTIA from spending any money to actually do the transition in this fiscal year which ends September 30, the same day as the last date of the current IANA contract. And that implies at least some extension, perhaps short-term, of the contract.

But more important he raised a series of more than a dozen questions about the direction data stewardship group has been taking which indicates some NTIA concerned about that and desire for them to reappraise what's happening. And since the US government eventually has to approve the total package I think that's a significant.

So I did want to mention that. And I'll provide a link in the chat room to the article which also contains the full text of his remarks in case people haven't seen that. That's all I have to say on this.

Jonathan Robinson:   Thanks, Phil. Thank you. Thank you. I think that's a couple of really interesting points that there may be some form of softening around the September 30 deadline or quite how significant that is is difficult to read. And you're right, there's some questions that the CWG hasn't yet really absorbed and dealt with. Both the fact that they are coming from the NTIA and the substance of them but I agree. And then second, I think it's very helpful to have your engagement in this bill specifically because I'm aware there are sensitivities in the way in which we work in terms of structure of the GNSO and the requirement in this particular instance and others, in fact, for SG type representation or membership.

Although the group is open to participants and you highlight that you are a participant, I think in this particular instance perhaps most specifically in the case of the CSG, it's very useful that the constituency counselors are engaged and informed such that they bring their constituencies along individually as well as relying on their collective information and liaison, if you like, from the SG member of the group.

We make a couple of remarks about the way in which the CWG is likely to operate in and around Singapore. First, it's proposed that there will be some webinars next week on Tuesday. So these webinars will be to update the community at large in general about the work of the CWG and bring the community up to a common place as to where the work of the CWG has gone, where it currently stands, where there are critical areas of convergence of opinion, where there are critical areas of divergence and where there are critical areas of outright disagreement.

In addition, those webinars are planned - those holdings of those webinars I guess is contingent on getting the documentation out in time which it currently looks like we will be able to do. The documentation to support that is really two fold. One is a so-called discussion document. It's a discussion document which is something that Donna mentioned. It's hoped to be published on

Monday. So effectively, almost a full week ahead of the ICANN meeting. I know it would be ideal to have it out sooner, but the practical reality is that that is what is likely to happen.

What we'll attempt to do is not produce any new information but effectively try and synthesize and distill down the work of the CWG into those key areas -- convergence, divergence and disagreement -- and then more to push that on another level and try and highlight where there are critical questions or issue that broad community input would be very helpful on.

As the proposal currently stands, it broadly bifurcates into a so-called internal to ICANN solution and an external ICANN solution. And then there are variants on those but primarily -- probably the most significant variant on how the internal solution might be structured. All of this is dependent in any of those recent areas that I just described to some extent, if not to a large extent on the form of legal advice that the CWG is able to get and what becomes the possible plus other external parameters like the (Strickling) comments that Phil just mentioned.

It's definitely a moving set of parts. In one sense you could take the view -- and Donna sort of hinted at this -- that the movement makes it difficult -- and others have also talked about this -- makes it difficult to keep the groups appraised of things. On the other hand, having some understanding of that movement and continual update gives a sense of the story behind how we get to where we eventually end up. I think that might prove to be important in the end in terms of driving this to some form of ultimate consensus which is not going to be an easy task.

The intention and expectations will be that there will be a discussion document with key questions for the community that is published and available in Singapore. And in some ways this is what this is going to be about -- making sure that your respective groups, constituencies and stakeholder groups as they respectively work will be in a position to process

and understand what has gone on and how and what the key questions arising are.

So that may be as far as we can take it now. But let me pause a moment and see if there are any questions, comments or issues that anyone would like to discuss at this point in relation to the work of the CWG or anything associated with it.

One final remark on that, of course, you will be aware from previous meetings and your knowledge of the landscape that Thomas Rickert who is also a counselor is the co-chair of the parallel related and interconnected work on accountability. That has key links with this work but also I guess ultimately with some of the concerns that have been in and around counsel-related activity and that is how accountable the structures are to follow and adhere to GNSO based policy recommendations and to the extent that they don't, what recourse we have.

So I think that accountability track is also absolutely critical, closely related to this work and important to keep a close eye on. But for now, that is not the core topic of discussion.

All right. We'll leave it at all. Please bear in mind that the key points of keeping full up to date with what's going on, being in a position to continually remain up to date and ultimately to support a proposal which hopefully emerges with relevant and appropriate level of consensus from the community.

Slip over then into the practicalities of planning for the ICANN meeting in Singapore. You will have seen recently there is a schedule published. It's a relatively familiar schedule in terms of shape and structure. It's been worked on -- thank you, Volker for your efforts together with Glen and other policy staff. The schedule is primarily focused in and around a series of updates for the GNSO as a whole as to the policy work going on on Saturday and then

shifting over into Sunday with key discussions and interactions with Theresa Swinehart, the ICANN CEO. Then moving onto (unintelligible) transition, ICANN accountability and meeting with the board and the GAC on Sunday, excuse me.

It would be very helpful, I'm sure, to be in contact with Fadi, with Steve Crocker, Chairman of the ICANN Board and with Theresa about the substance and the GDD people, in fact, about the substance and content of their interaction with us on Sunday. I know Volker would appreciate any input on that, so please provide if you feel particularly on behalf of the GNSO and the council.

If there is something that your particular group is also specifically concerned about and it won't get dealt with let's say the board on the constituency days and you'd like it to be raised with the board and it's relevant to the council, it would be great to have your input on that. So if I could just encourage everyone to provide that input. I see the agenda for the two days.

Also, of course, what we then do is go onto meet with other groups -- both on the Sunday and also on the Monday -- where we will meet with the ccNSO. Currently that is planned for a breakfast session. I'm a little worried about how effective that session is going to be and so I may talk with Byron Holland, Chair of the ccNSO, and see what we can do about that if that makes sense. But it is scheduled for a breakfast meeting on Monday.

Then, of course, we have the council meeting on the Wednesday -- the formal council meeting. If you, again, as counselors or your groups feel that you'd like to see something specific on that agenda -- there will be a motion deadline coming up very shortly -- it would great to have your input there.

A part of the content and substance of what we deal with is driven by the groups. We all make a reasonable amount of fuss about the use of the bottom up process. I know many of you are stretched and busy with a lot that

is going on, but it would be great to have any input you might have about content on the weekend sessions, particularly Sunday and also on Wednesday.

Any comments or questions relating to Singapore content scheduling issues? Any concerns? Raise them now or provide information on lists.

Question from Donna in the chat as to whether the ccNSO, GNSO breakfast conflicts with the Woman in DNS breakfast? I'm not clear on the overall schedule but I would...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:    Yes, it does. Cheryl here. Sadly it does. Not happy.

Jonathan Robinson:    As I said, I have reservations about both the productivity and you've given another reason to be concerned about that. So we'll do our best. I just ask for your understanding that scheduling is not an easy thing to deal with. Together with Volker and support staff, we will see what we can do about that.

Heather asks if we are having an update on the GNSO review from Westlake. That's a good question, Heather. I'd like to - I'm pretty sure - I don't know whether Westlake is going to be present in Singapore -- and obviously (Jen) is no longer on council who was a key liaison point with all of that. Can anyone - I do recall there is a GNSO review topic on the weekend sessions, but I'm just not sure if Westlake is involved in that at all.

Someone give me a nudge or assist me with that point? Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong:    Thanks, Jonathan. Hi. This is Mary. The review is not supported by our team but our understanding is that the Westlake initial findings will be presented and discussed in Singapore. There is a session scheduled for I believe Wednesday morning. We can find out if (Richard) and (Colin) are going to be in Singapore, whether they're going to be presenting remotely.

There definitely will be a session with the presentation of what they've done so far is our understanding.

Jonathan Robinson:     Thanks, Mary, both for that reminder and just to remind all of us that that review is a board commissioned review driven by the structural improvements committee of the ICANN board. We were able to interact with the structural improvements committee and provide our input to the extent that they commissioned the external group -- professional services group Westlake -- to undertake the review. There were various interviews and interactions Westlake, but that's a good point. It's not us driving that review, per se. So that was probably the session I had seen which is the Wednesday session.

With that, Marika, you put in a chat is a meeting of the GNSO review working party. The question is what, if anything, of Westlake's work will be published? That is what I would be interested to know.

Anyway, to the extent that we can find out, Mary has offered to see if she can turn over some stones and just see if we can find anything out there. If that could come back to the council, it's a good question Heather and interesting point.

So bear in mind there is - this is - I'm aware that there is a reasonable amount, probably more than we would usually have, I think, of white space in this agenda, both in and around the Saturday lunch time. Between 12:00 and 4:00 on Saturday, there is quite a bit of space to prepare for discussions with the board, with the GAC, with the CEO to discuss any substantial issues.

So there is opportunity to take advantage of what feels -- from my perspective at least -- like a very frenetic time with a couple of breathers and also to shape the agenda for Wednesday. So it will be really great to get any input from counselors, any direction from your groups as to what you would like to see covered in the sessions. Don't promise it will be, but to the extent that it's there, we will do our best to accommodate any suggestions and points.

Okay. That's probably enough for now. I did promise we'd try to keep it to no more than hour. So that really covers that I had hoped to achieve. Let me pause for a moment and just make sure that there is an opportunity for anyone else to contribute from staff or from the council if you feel there is something you'd like to say before we wrap the meeting up. Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: Just an idea to maybe use the joint ccNSO or GNSO meeting, both of which are chattering organizations for both cross community working groups -- maybe we can allocate huge parts of that meeting to search transition issues as well because I think we would really be well advised to advance our conversations on that topic to be ready if and when a decision needs to be made with the FOs and ACs as well as the ccNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Thomas. It's my understanding that would be the substance of the meeting. My concern is less about the value and content of the meeting but the point is well taken, in any event, and more about the scheduling and timing of it in particular now that we know there is another schedule class that people are concerned about as well.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Thanks. Avri speaking. I just have one question and perhaps it's an (error). I can barely leave it and I haven't looked at the copy that was sent to us. For example this morning in this morning, we went through the stewardship work without also going through the accountability work. I'm wondering how many chances we're going to have since at the end of the day, the first part of accountability and the transit have to both pass through council.

How do we coordinate in council because that is one of the coordination places where we -- and the ccNSO obviously -- are responsible for making sure that the two do dovetail? The groups themselves are trying and bunches of people working back and forth between the two groups. But at the council

level, we're also going to have to spend a certain amount of time paying attention not only to each of the groups but to have their connecting.

So I just want to make sure that in here somewhere to have that kind of conversation and also just to sort of ask that it be on our ongoing schedule in the same way that the stewardship group was on a particular agenda today. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson:    Well, good questions and good points Avri. Actually it's interesting. You've flushed out something I think and maybe someone (unintelligible) or someone can help me on this. But as I see it, we've got back-to-back sessions on Sunday relating to the stewardship transition and the actability. But I notice that adjacent to the accountability session we've got listed as presenting (Alyssa), Wolf-Ulrich and (Milton) who to the best of knowledge are really ICG people in that sense. So I'm just not quite sure that something is right.

I'm happy that the sessions are back to back. It should be helpful to have them back to back. I think it will aid what you're talking about, if I understand it properly Avri. Nevertheless, that doesn't mean those points should not be brought out in that session.

Okay. Good. So it looks like - Go ahead.

Glen de Saint Géry    I was advised to ask the Chairs and the GNSO reps of the ICG group about presenting at that session. If you'd like me to change, I think we can probably.

Jonathan Robinson:    Well I know (Alyssa) is not going to be in Singapore in any event. But I do think, Glen, that needs to be taken offline and just understood what the - it just doesn't add up properly at the moment with the presenters versus the topics. So something needs to be ironed out there. We can pick that up offline with Marika, yourself and Volker and tidy that up. It doesn't negate or - Avri's point is still well made and well taken.

Amr, why don't you go ahead?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. Regarding the board GNSO working group, at Singapore and GNSO, I was just wondering on Saturday if any of the board members of that group would be present during the discussion or is it just the GNSO members? Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: That's another good question. Marika, I see your hand is up there. Any thoughts there?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I know that the board members have been informed of this meeting. I think calendar invites will be sent as well, although, of course, it will depend as well on what is on board schedule itself. But I think at least the invitation is an open one, and maybe there is also someone that can be highlighted during the meeting tonight if that is something that will be welcome.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. If anyone who is present on that meeting tonight could highlight that, that would be useful. I wonder if it would not be worth raising as one topic that Volker you might like to take note of if others are supportive of this.

One thing I've heard quite a lot of about is how the board participates and engages with the community during ICANN meetings? This is kind of a little example of that in the sense that here is a topic that is a GNSO board topic. We do, of course, get to have the time directly with the board, which we should not undervalue and that's great that we have that time.

I've heard people sometimes concerned that the board is kind of holed up in a separate place. The question is whether that is something we want to talk with the board about how they manage their time at ICANN meetings. That might be one topic to just discuss with the board during our interaction with them.

I'll personally - reflecting that which I've heard previously and possibly now suggest that and I see (Collis) has a (unintelligible) in the room there. But I'll suggest that as one such item, Amr. And Heather highlights that is just something that came up at the end of the session. I've heard sort of comments and ruminating -- however you want to put it -- of concerns about this.

I remember certain board members being always active and present at our weekend sessions and that seems to have changed now. It doesn't occur. That is certainly one thing we might want to talk about. Thanks, Heather, noting that Fadi was receptive to such a point when we discussed it.

All right. That is just one little idea. If you have other ideas for productive engagement. One thing I would say to you is I continually hear good feedback as to we are perceived to be a productive working functional part of the ICANN ecosystem. I know there are concerns about elements of how even structural concerns and so on. I think it's encouraging to me. I think we need to build on that.

Having the discussion with the board, I think it's important as I have said many times to scene set, and they can keep them aware that we are a productive, functional, effective unit. Nevertheless, there are always areas that can be improved on. Please provide any input you can as to how we can make best use of this time that we spend in Singapore with all of the effort we go to to travel there and works things out.

Okay. I'll call for any other business. Hearing none.

Thank you, all, for your participation, particularly those who had to get up very early for this or stay up very late. Thanks for coming. Thanks for being part of the session. Look forward to working with you over the next week and, of course, in person in Singapore.

END