ICANN

Moderator: Glen DeSaintgery-GNSO
April 12, 2012
6:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recording has now started. Please go ahead.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much. I'll do the roll call for you, Stéphane.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks.

Glen DeSaintgery: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Council call on the 12th of April. Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Jonathan Robinson. Mason Cole.

Mason Cole: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Stéphane van Gelder.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: We have apologies from Yoav Keren and he has given his proxy to Stéphane van Gelder.

Zahid Jamil.

Zahid Jamil: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: John Berard.

John Berard: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Brian Winterfeldt, not on the call yet. David Taylor, not on the call yet. Osvaldo Novoa is absent and has given his proxy to Wolf Ulrich-Knoben. Bill Drake.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Wolf Ulrich-Knoben?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Wendy Seltzer.

Wendy Seltzer: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Mary Wong is not on the call yet. Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Joy Liddicoat.

Joy Liddicoat: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Wolfgang Kleinwächter is absent and as far as I know he has not sent in a proxy form. Has anyone received it perhaps in the meantime?

Bill Drake: Glen, this is Bill. I think we have a time zone problem and I'm hoping it will be sent by somebody soon.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Bill. Mary Wong.

Mary Wong: Yes I'm here, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. Lanre Ajayi.

Lanre Ajayi: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Carlos Aguirre.

Carlos Aguirre: Yes, here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen DeSaintgery: Han Chuan Lee. Han Chuan we are going to call active because he has some connectivity difficulties.

For staff we have Liz Gasster, David Olive, Rob Hogarth, Margie Milam, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Brian Peck, Berry Cobb and myself, Glen DeSaintgery. And have I left off anyone?

Thank you, Stéphane, you - over to you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks very much, Glen. Welcome everyone to this GNSO Council call on April the 12th. I actually thought of an April Fool's joke which was to do a Council call today but someone took me seriously. So I'm sorry about that. I know we're all very busy. But unfortunately this has to fit into everybody's agenda on the last day of the new gTLDs. It is difficult so we particularly appreciate everybody's participation today.

Can I ask at this time if there are any updates to statements of interest please? Hearing none...

John Berard: Stéphane, this is John. I did recently modify my statement of interest to indicate that I do have a client that is applying for a new gTLD.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you, John. Has that been sent in to Glen?

Zahid Jamil: Sorry, Stéphane, this is Zahid. I'll make the statement as well.

Stéphane van Gelder: Did you both send those...

Zahid Jamil: No I haven't sent that in because it's just happened...

John Berard: I modified my statement of interest on the wiki.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay great.

Glen DeSaintgery:Thanks, John. I'll note that in the minutes.

John Berard: Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: And Zahid's as well, Glen, please.

Glen DeSaintgery:Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Any more updates to SOAs? No? Any requests to review or amend the agenda please at this time. Apparently not. You have the link to the minutes of the previous meetings and the date of approval which is today I think for those minutes. And as usual I will draw your attention to the GNSO pending projects list.

In this case today I think Liz has an update that she'd like to provide for the Council. So at this stage can I pass this over to you, Liz, and ask you to update us as you wish?

Liz Gasster: Thank you, Stéphane. Good day everyone. Just very briefly two quick points on the pending project list. There is an item on Whois access that came out of the registration abuse policy's final report remaining recommendations. It's on the last page, Page 16, of the latest pending projects list.

And just to note that I think we're still waiting for feedback I think from the ISPs and that's fine but just wanted to update everyone that that's still an open item.

And then also the SSAC and the GNSO, as you know, completed their final report on internationalized Whois registration data. So at Costa Rica you all decided that you wanted to coordinate submitting this report with the SSAC to the Board so staff will be preparing a motion for the next meeting for your review to actually formally consider that report and hopefully move it along to the Board in coordination with the SSAC.

That's all I have, Stéphane, thanks. And I'm happy to answer any questions.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks a lot, Liz. And thanks to Julie for looking after that IRD work. On the Whois access thank you for reminding us. This was a consent agenda item a while back. There was an objection from the ISPs so perhaps we can ask, as you said, for the ISPs to update us on their discussions on this topic at some stage so that it doesn't fall to the wayside.

The - let's move to Item 2. There's no items on the consent agenda today.

So we can move straight into Item 3 which is the thick Whois policy development process item. And you will all no doubt remember that as a Council we have expressed the opinion that it may not be timely to move forward with this PDP at this stage.

As I explained on the list we've had a lot of discussions in - certainly in the leadership team. And we've discussed with general counsel as well on the threshold for this motion. There's no specific threshold for a motion to delay a PDP in our rules at the moment.

So what we've decided to do is to apply the standard simple majority threshold and also perhaps to raise this issue just as an FYI basically to the SCI so that maybe the rules can either be adapted to reflect the fact that we haven't prepared for this or we don't have a specific rule item for this or just to confirm that absent any specific item what it said in the bylaws which is that if there's no specific rule then we (deport) that to the threshold that I just mentioned.

Perhaps we can just confirm that. So some kind of guidance there perhaps would be useful. And I'll let Wolf, who's chair of that group, write that down and tell us if the group wishes to work on this or not.

And on the motion itself, let me - before I read the motion ask Jeff to - Jeff wanted to introduce a motion so he made that request so let's honor that and ask Jeff to speak.

Jonathan Robinson: Stéphane, it's John...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, Stéphane, it's Jonathan. I'm on the call just to let you know. I'm sorry I'm late.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you, Jonathan.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Stéphane. You actually gave a lot of the introduction I was going to give. But the other thing I wanted to add was that there was a couple questions back and forth as to why we actually need this as a motion.

And I think because, you know, if you look at the PDP as it exists no - sorry, you look at the bylaws and you look at the PDP manual initiating a PDP does initiate some of the steps that you're - that are required including development of a charter, including other timelines that are set forth.

So just thought that - as Stéphane said in discussion with the general counsel's office - oops - and also in discussion amongst the leadership that if we are going to plan to delay this motion that we do so because of - we do so affirmatively in a motion as opposed to a wrap-up session.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Jeff. So let me read the motion, which was made by myself and seconded by Yoav. Whereas the GNSO Council requests an issue report on thick Whois at its meeting on 22 September, 2011. There's a link provided. Whereas a (permanent) preliminary issue report on thick Whois was prepared by staff and posted on 21 November, 2011 for public comment. And there's a link provided.

Whereas a final issue report on thick Whois was published on February 2, 2012. Link provided. Whereas the final issue report recommends that the GNSO Council proceed with a policy development process limited to consideration of the issues discussed in this report and the general counsel of ICANN has indicated the topic is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the GNSO.

Whereas the GNSO Council initiated a PDP at its meeting of 14 March (20). Link provided. Whereas at its wrap up session on the 15th of March of this year also taking into account the current workload of the GNSO community the GNSO Council (does) support a delay in the start of a PDP until contract negotiations on the dotCom agreement are complete.

As the result of that negotiation may determine whether a PDP on thick Whois is still required. Therefore be it resolved the next step, creating a drafting team to develop a charter of the thick Whois PDP, will be delayed until the Com negotiations have been completed by 30 of November, 2012.

And we do have amendments that have been proposed I believe by Jonathan. Those amendments are on the wiki. Jonathan, there was some back and forth on your amendment so are we sure that the version that now appears on the wiki is the final one?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Stéphane, as far as I can see that looks - it covers the issue of removing a specific reference to the dotCom agreement although it doesn't currently have ad ate on it I don't think. And there was some discussion about a date for - so it deals with the staff and GNSO resources I believe which doesn't seem to have a date certain in there. And some people were arguing for a date.

Stéphane van Gelder: So let me read what - the amendments that you had - the two additional phrases - the last whereas clause. Whereas at its wrap up session on 15 March taking into account the current workload of the GNSO community GNSO Council does support a delay in the start of the PDP until ICANN staff - this is the amendment - and GNSO resources are available to deal with this.

And on the resolved - resolved the next step, creating a DT to develop a charter of the thick Whois PDP will be delayed until - this is the amendment - ICANN staff and GNSO resources are available to deal with this.

So there is - your amendments have not removed mention of the dotCom negotiations and ICANN staff and there is no date. So if that was your intent perhaps we - while I open it up to discussion we can - you can tweak that and

then submit that as amendments to myself so I can accept it as friendly or not. Or do you consider that these amendments are what you want?

Jonathan Robinson: Stéphane, I'm struggling a little bit to see whether the - whether the full reference to the dotCom agreement seems to have gone. Is that correct?

Stéphane van Gelder: I'm reading through it. Yes it has gone.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. And so...

Stéphane van Gelder: That is dealt with.

Jonathan Robinson: I think there's really - the issue I'm aware of is not whether this now accurately represents what I've proposed but that there was further discussion on the list and that further discussion focused around either removing specific reference to ICANN staff or probably making it clearer so the wording might say something like until both ICANN staff and GNSO resources are available to deal with this. In other words it makes sure that it covers both of those.

And then the second issue was that some raised the concern that this was sort of kicking it into indefinite territory and there was a request for a day certain. So while this reflects accurately what I've proposed it doesn't fully reflect later discussion so that's really why I have a minor concern.

And I could put adapted or - but it would be - I guess it's useful to hear if those...

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, well let's - let me accept your amendment as friendly on behalf of both myself and Yoav seeing I have his proxy. And let's open it up for discussion. And if there are any further tweaks those can be proposed as friendly amendments. So...

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: ...does anyone want to make any comments at this time? John.

John Berard: Okay so who is it that gets to determine when ICANN staff and GNSO resources are available?

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Us as a Council I would say.

John Berard: Is that the - well as long as that's everybody's understanding that's fine. But, I mean, you know, we have had meetings where we've taken input from staff as to the inelastic nature of their ability to handle more stuff. So I'm - I'm just curious as to how we are really every going to know...

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah.

John Berard: ...is there a - how are we going to measure the availability of staff and resources. That's all. It's just seems a little speculative as opposed to the specific of the negotiations.

But on the other hand I don't support linking the motion to the dotCom negotiations so I'm sort of caught betwixt and between. I think on balance I'd

prefer as it's been amended. But I am unsure as to how we will know when it is time.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. You make a good point. And I'm sure you've seen some of the discussion that happened after Jonathan proposed his amendment. Liz did raise the staff's resource point asking that staff - the lack of staff resource not be cited as a reason for delay.

And I expressed some surprise at this because Liz has been very vocal in telling us in the past about the staff resource problem. Liz did send a message this morning explaining that Marika would have bandwidth to take this on. And so I think that answers your first point and may require us to remove the reference to ICANN staff.

We have some clear direction there from staff that if the Council decides for this work to be done now then staff would be able to take this on. Liz, is that accurate?

Liz Gasster: Yes it is. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you. So perhaps John or someone else can propose another friendly amendment to just remove the reference to ICANN staff.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Stéphane, just a brief point. It's Jonathan. I'd like to respond to that if I may?

Stéphane van Gelder: Go on.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I suppose the...

Stéphane van Gelder: Go on, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: The concern there really is it's - when and if staff resource is available isn't the overall picture. Staff resource is available (unintelligible) staff is doing. So there's some sort of - and we've talked in the past about having a matrix (unintelligible)...

Stéphane van Gelder: Jonathan, you're breaking up certainly for me. I don't know if anyone else can hear you properly. But...

Jonathan Robinson: Let me try again.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: ...the point you're making.

Jonathan Robinson: How is that, Stéphane? Is it clear now?

Stéphane van Gelder: Much better. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Good. So the issue here is although it's clear in isolation that staff resource may be available it's the overall - it's really in the context of what compromises are being made in the matrix of work. So it's great that Liz has made it clear that staff resource could be mad available or freed up or capable of doing this.

                      But really isn't it - isn't the bigger picture that we need to assess the combination of resources and the combination of work that's being done at

any given time and say well what are we prepared to compromise. And that - and work on or give up working on in order to do this work.

So I would be in favor of the amendment saying until both staff and GNSO resources are available to do this or something along those lines that recognizes that it's the combinative resources and in the priority context. So simply saying that staff resource is available is very helpful but it's not a necessary condition to doing the work. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you, Jonathan. Let's go back to the queue and, Alan, you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I don't support the amendment but what I'm - want to bring up is we seem to have some revisionist history that - I unfortunately could not make it to the wrap up meeting; I had a conflict. But the original motion said that factoring in workload but the main concern voiced was that we not do this until the contract be revised.

And we seem to have a revisionist history here of what happened at that meeting. And, you know, I think it's fair game to propose changing the conclusion - the therefore but I'm not sure it's reasonable to change what the logic was at which the concern was raised over. Thank you.

Am I still here?

Jeff Neuman: You are...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Stéphane, are you still around?

Marika Konings: Stéphane got disconnected.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So I'll just - I'll go on. This is Jeff. I'll just go on with my comment and then when Stéphane joins. I do want to - obviously I supported what Jonathan has - the amendments Jonathan has brought up. The registries had a very long discussion on this. And it's very clear that the registries do not - for the topic - again I'll talk about when we get to Item Number 5 - but the registries do not believe that this - the Com contract should be used as a mechanism to delay the PDP.

VeriSign strongly believes that the PDP should happen right away or actually they're in favor of a PDP right away so even the registries are not of one mind on this. But I do think that, you know, I agree with Jonathan's point about both ICANN staff and GNSO resources need to be available.

Although Liz did point out that ICANN staff could be made available now the question that Jonathan raised is what are we giving up and what are they going to say about the next item that we want to be addressed by staff? Will we have resources for both of those? So that's my concern.

Has Stéphane rejoined? Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'm trying to get him back on the line.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Jonathan, do you want to - an additional comment?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jeff. Yes it's just a brief response to Alan. And, Alan, the honest truth is I don't recall exactly how our conversation went in the GNSO.

But reflecting what happened within the registries group the stronger - the key concern for us was about - a significant part of the discussion that took place previously in the registries group was all in and around the fact that this primarily this work would be done on - affecting one of our members and therefore we need to be very careful about when resources were directed towards this relative to something that affected all of our members or potentially a bigger community.

So that's - it's not an attempt to be revisionist but rather to reflect the - and if the two got juxtaposed in our later Council conversations, you know, I (unintelligible) sort of - my strongest theme in all of this has been ensure that I've been aware and the registries (unintelligible) to ensure that sufficient resources are available and the dotCom negotiation was a secondary consideration as sort of a context point which is - so just to indicate that there wasn't in any sense an attempt to be revisionist but rather to reflect the history of the conversations in that - on the whole. Thanks.

Stéphane van Gelder: And I'm back. I was disconnected. Sorry about that, everybody. So I missed a bit of the discussion that you've had. I hope I haven't missed too much of it. Jonathan, you've just spoken so Wolf is next.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yeah, thanks, Stéphane and all. Yes, I would like to come back to what John was saying. So there's also the feeling - the amendment of the motion is a little bit too general just saying to - or referring to availability of staff and GNSO resources and not fixing a date.

So I wonder - if you look to the first motion, though, which says, okay, until the dotCom negotiations have been completed by 30 of November so why not just to delete the dotCom negotiations but leave the date in it so this November. This gives us certainty that we have a limitation of that.

If - in case, you know, we have - staff resources would be available before that date then we could start as well before that date. But I would like to have a date in it so that we can be sure that we will start at a certain date. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: And I have Alan next.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. Two points, I agree with Wolf that I really think we need a way to get this back on the table otherwise especially because we have a different threshold than the threshold needed to start the PDP; we have a way of indefinitely delaying something based on a rather nebulous concept of whether GNSO resources are available. And I don't have a clue how we gauge that.

And the second is on the substance of the registry comment of we shouldn't be doing something based on a single registry member. If Council will remember domain tasting was addressed - although it affected other members it was aimed at one registry member and that was a proposal that was - that was supported in general by the registries.

So I think we have a different set of rules that are either evolving over time or perhaps are being invoked based on the specific situation. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you. David.

David Taylor: Thanks, Stéphane. No, just agreeing there with Wolf and Alan that - to have a date in there because I think it's something which certainly we wouldn't want to see that it's indefinitely delayed. And I don't know when GNSO has ever been fully absolutely resourced so that we can do everything we want to do. So I think we're always going to have an issue whether we've got enough resources available.

And this is for Whois, I mean, certainly IPC and a lot of business are keen to see Whois - thick Whois across all registries so that's certainly clearly our position. And anything which delays that possibility of those discussions seems a shame.

So we're even in two minds on the whole motion; part of us think we shouldn't delay it so we wouldn't like this motion and others think well yes okay let's see what's resolved in the dotCom. So that was put in there originally in the whereas until the dotCom agreements are complete.

And that was my feeling, probably along with Alan's, when we had the breakout at the end of Costa Rica that that was one of the reasons. So I'm not sure about the revisionist comments as well and whether we're sort of changing things. But that was the thought but certainly whatever we've got to have a date in there.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, can I suggest that - I've heard several comments about having a date in there but no one's proposed either a date or a friendly amendment to do that. So that's what we really need at this stage. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Stéphane, that's exactly what I would propose as well. And it seems to me that the logical date is around the 30th of November because as it so happens that will deal with the dotCom issue without explicitly including it in

the motion. So that would be what I would suggest that we have something like a 30th of November. So I'll put that on the table as a suggestion...

Stéphane van Gelder: That is in the motion that we have on the wiki as it is. Resolve the next step, blah, blah, blah, will be delayed until the dotCom negotiations have been completed by 30th of November, 2012. Would someone like - I mean, when people are asking for a date, just so that I can understand, are they asking for an additional sentence that say the GNSO Council will consider this at its meeting following that date or something like that?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so Stéphane, I'm not necessarily asking for the date to be removed; that date can stay it's the specific reference to the dotCom negotiation so the date can stay if the reference to dotCom goes out.

Stéphane van Gelder: Oh okay, okay. Well can you propose some text or let's just work through this. Resolved the next step the thick Whois PDP will be delayed until 30th of November, 2012.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Stéphane van Gelder: And...

John Berard: Okay wait a minute. When did it become - why don't we just go - I'm sorry, I'm jumping the queue, I apologize.

Stéphane van Gelder: Go on, go on.

John Berard: This is John. But if we can just - why don't we just adopt what I thought was a very sane off-hand comment you just made that we will delay it until the first GNSO Council meeting after the 30th of November.

Stéphane van Gelder: That's fine. Are you suggesting that as an amendment?

John Berard: Yes, I'm suggesting it as an amendment.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. And I'm fine with accepting that as friendly. So, Marika, can you put that in - I know you're typing it now so that's probably being done. So while that's happening let me - Jeff, you're next.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I'm not sure it needs to come back to the Council at that point so I'm not sure why we would add the reference to the meeting afterwards. You could just tell (FAS) to just start it December 1 or take your next steps after that. Because the next step is really for - well I guess maybe we do have to set up a drafting team for a charter maybe that's it. But why don't we just say we'll constitute a drafting team after November 30?

Stéphane van Gelder: I think it makes sense to take this back to the Council, put it back on the Council's - on the top of the Council's pile, have them - the Council of that time - look at it and initiate the proceedings there. I think if we say what John has just proposed and I've just accepted that does the trick.

John Berard: Also - this is John again. Even though the 30th is the date when the current dotCom contract expires there is no guarantee that the new negotiations will be complete by that time.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. Marika, are you able to modify what's on the wiki? Sorry, should I be looking at the wiki or what's on the - in the Adobe?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I've modified it on the Adobe Connect.

Stéphane van Gelder: So I can't see that (mod).

Marika Konings: If you scroll to the bottom it's in the last resolve clause. It's the part in the middle.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. Yeah, sorry. Thank you very much. Okay, Jeff, are you still in the queue?

Jeff Neuman: No, sorry.

Stéphane van Gelder: John, are you?

John Berard: No, sorry.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you. Any further comments? Any opposition to a voice vote on this?

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Alan.

Liz Gasster: This is Liz. I'm sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Stéphane, it's Alan. I have my hand up.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, go on.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I just have a question. Does that mean it's subject to another delay when it comes back to Council?

Stéphane van Gelder: That's for the Council of that time to decide.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Any opposition to a voice vote on this?

Liz Gasster: I'm sorry, Stéphane, it's Liz. I just was going to mention that the ICANN staff language is still in the whereas clause.

Stéphane van Gelder: Whereas...

Liz Gasster: The last whereas clause.

Stéphane van Gelder: So we - yeah, well spotted. So we'd asked for - Jonathan had suggested in the start of the PDP until both ICANN staff and GNSO resources are available. So, Marika, could you add both - that's it. Thank you.

And once again any opposition to a voice vote on this? Glen, please do a voice vote.

Glen DeSaintgery: I will, Stéphane. All those in favor of the motion please say aye.

Stéphane van Gelder: Aye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Aye.

Glen DeSaintgery: Is anybody opposed to the motion? Is anybody abstaining from the motion? Stéphane, the motion passes unanimously.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you very much, Glen. Thanks to everyone. Let's move onto Item 4 then. And here we have another complicated situation because we have two motions on the table; both are to request an issue report on the protection of names - of IGOs under the new gTLD program. The first motion was made by Thomas; the second was made by Mary.

Can I first of all ask if both movers of the motion are still making them? Has there been discussion between you two? Are we still looking at two motions? Thomas or Mary...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: This is Thomas speaking.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah.

Thomas Rickert: Stéphane, thank you. We have been communicating in the meantime. Certainly this is a crazy period of time to be working with the 12th approaching or now being (unintelligible).

Where we actually have been able to amalgamate the ideas of the motions into one which is why I am withdrawing or request to withdraw my motion so we only will have to deal with one motion.

Nonetheless if you commit, Stéphane, I'd like to give a little bit of background information as to why I put this motion in in the first place and what happened in the meantime. I think...

Stéphane van Gelder: Please do.

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: ...have vivid memories of the GNSO sessions, in particular the public session where allegations have been made that the GNSO would not properly follow its bottom-up process and that due process and policies would be circumvented in the case of the IOC/RC discussion.

During my statement in this meeting I made clear that to me working on the IOC/RCRC issue for the top level for the first round was an implementation detail that we have been working on following the Board's resolution. But that everything exceeding that would actually require a proper bottom-up process.

And I mentioned, for those who can remember, during that meeting that I would ask for the initiation of the PDP regarding this. So (with) the wording that I proposed for my motion I tried to sort of create a catch-all not only reflecting the now, you know, current - the ongoing discussions about protections for the IOC and RCRC at the second level but also to sort of respond to the continuously incoming requests by other third parties.

And my idea was sort of to have a process bottom up, have an issue report prepared to see whether any such protections should be granted at all and if so what the eligibility criteria for these organizations would be. The reason for that being that I think that third party requests will come in over and over again.

I think that the GNSO needs to make its position very clear following with the proper processes. And also remembering that there have been policy recommendations made by the GNSO where no such special protection was granted in the first place.

And I think that, you know, since the Board has sort of circumvented the GNSO recommendations by making the resolutions that it has made in favor of the IOC/RCRC it needs to be made very (firm) here what the procedures are or how the GNSO is going to deal with such requests.

Now after I had sent out my draft motion there have been some comments saying that there would be a danger in addressing the IGOs specifically that the route that that request should take would be circumvented if the GNSO picks up the subject directly.

Also a little bit of history was missing in the whereas clauses by not mentioning (specifically) the original GNSO recommendations. And so I - I entered into a communication with Mary. And I think that we've come up with a proposal (indeed) I'm going to suggest amendment to her motion to accommodate these concerns.

And I don't know whether this has already been made available in the - in Adobe. But I'm sure that we will have time to (be addressing) changes later on. I would ask Mary to first (unintelligible) change as friendly. And in the light of this I have now withdrawn my motion.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Thomas. So we're just looking at Mary's motion. It is up on the wiki now, on the Adobe as well. And if you have friendly amendments can you just confirm that this is the motion as amended or is this the original motion that we're looking at, Mary?

Mary Wong: Stéphane, this is the actually the original motion; it's not the amended motion. I emailed it to Marika a few minutes ago but she hasn't quite got it. So

hopefully while that is making its way through cyberspace can I just confirm what Thomas has said in terms of the process that we engaged in?

Thank you, Stéphane, for your reminder about the Council's past resolutions. And, you know, explained basically that I think at this point obvious neither Thomas nor the NCSG in terms of these concepts was far apart at all.

But the amendment really pertained to us as NCSG wanting to include some mention of a current (step) that was proposed by our new member constituency. And that was the substance of the change.

Marika, are you still waiting for the text?

Marika Konings: Yes, and Mary, what I maybe can do is just upgrade you as a presenter which means you can just copy and paste the new language into the Notes part, maybe that's the quickest way.

Mary Wong: Okay.

Stéphane van Gelder: While you're working that - through that - and thanks to both for helping out with that. The first step we should do here is to ask if there is a second for this motion. This motion has not been seconded. If it is isn't we will not be able to consider it.

Zahid Jamil: Stéphane, this is Zahid. I'm not on the Adobe or wiki. Is it possible for the new motion to be emailed to the Council list so we can have a look at it?

Stéphane van Gelder: Is it? I don't have the text so that's why I'm not answering, Zahid.

Mary Wong: Yeah, I can email that to everybody. But I'm not sure why it's not going
                    through. It might be my email servers.

Stéphane van Gelder: What we do - I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: ...that's also why we read out motions when we consider them. So perhaps
                     I can ask Mary at this stage to read out the definitive version of the motion
                     that you'd like us to consider and then go back to the Council and ask if there's
                     a second.

Mary Wong: I can do that. It's not very long. Shall I start?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, please.

Mary Wong: Whereas on September 7, 2007 the GNSO Council approved by super
                    majority vote a PDP on new gTLDs with a number of recommendations none
                    of which afforded special protection to specific applicants. Whereas the
                    GNSO Council has the resolution approving new protections for the first
                    round of the new gTLD program as recommended by the GNSO's
                    International Olympic Committee and Red Cross Red Crescent Drafting
                    Team.

                    Whereas this resolution indicated that further discussions were required on
                    associated polices relating to protection for certain international organizations
                    at the second level, if any.

                    Whereas comments have been received coincident with the motion that
                    included requests from international governmental organizations requesting

the same protective rights as those for the IOC and RCRC for the current and future rounds of the new gTLD program.

And whereas various possible criteria for the grant of protected rights to such organizations was suggested at the ICANN meeting in Costa Rica including one based on the concept of international legal personality.

Now therefore be it resolved the GNSO Council requests an issue report to (proceed) the possibility of a PDP that covers the following issues: First, definition of the type of organizations that should receive special protection at the top and second levels if any and policies required to protect such organizations at the top and second level.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: Yes.

Stéphane van Gelder: Sorry, I can't tell because we don't have the final text on the wiki so...

Mary Wong: Yeah, I'm going to try and email it to everyone if that's...

Stéphane van Gelder: Well you've been made a presenter. Does that allow you to upload the text?

Mary Wong: I can't find the (unintelligible) so it's probably my problem.

Marika Konings: Mary, it's where the (Notes) is now in the middle part you just copy and paste it in there. I can just remove what is there now and then you just copy and paste...

Mary Wong: Oh I see.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...your language is in there.

Mary Wong: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Well done. Thank you very much. That's very useful. So can I ask if anyone wanting to second this motion?

Thomas Rickert: I do; this is Thomas.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thomas, thank you. Now we can go into the discussion of the motion itself. And I will open up the discussion on behalf of the registrars. And I guess what - I'd like to ask you, Mary, in light of the comments that both the registrars made in Costa Rica and your group made I fail to understand the logic of doing this type of work now based on the fact that we were all very clearly told by the GAC that these - that the IOC and the RC were special cases.

That there were no other organizations anywhere that were deserving of the same level of protection. And that this is why we should entertain the work that was being done at the time by the drafting team.

So I fail to understand why after hearing your opposition to the motion that was passed in Costa Rica, which turned into an abstention afterwards, and hearing comments such as the ones that we made as - before taking the vote

why we would now go into a process on trying to determine whether other organizations deserve this or some type of level of protection. Sorry for the long-winded question but I'm sure you get the point.

Mary Wong: I do. Should I answer it or Jeff has his hand up.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes. Well can you answer it and then we'll go back to Jeff.

Mary Wong: Right and I'm not sure that this would be a complete answer. I think that others on the Council in my group that might be able to supplement what I'm going to say.

First of all I think recalling what Thomas said just a minute ago that, you know, some of us were concerned about essentially the possibility of going around the Council. And that possibility was something that we had - our group had talked about in Costa Rica and to us that remains (alive).

The other is that, as Thomas said, we may be wrong but we don't think we are that these requests will not go away. So having made that special exception for those two organizations and even understanding that the GAC has said, at that time, that this is a special case then we had the letter and then the request from the Board.

It just seems to me that as a Council to first of all safeguard our position as - on behalf of the GNSO as policy development manages and developers. And secondly just to make sure that we do our work correctly that the issue report seems the way to go. I mean, it doesn't obviously predetermine that we're going to have a PDP but it will certainly give us a better understanding of the (unintelligible) is right now.

There's probably a few other reasons but those are just two of the main ones. And certainly the third from the NCSG's perspective, as I've mentioned, is that our new member constituency has started to get involved in the policy and other issues and this is the first one, if I recall - I could be wrong, someone correct me if I'm wrong - but where they have actually made a proposal.

And so we, as councilors for the entire SG, feel it incumbent on us to bring it to the Council and so encourage further participation and discussion.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Mary. So at this time perhaps I should add that we've had communication from the Board that they have concerned receipt of our recommendation to protect certain names from - the RC and the IOC names at the top level. These are the recommendations obviously that were sent following the motion that was passed in Costa Rica.

They understand these recommendations. They have decided not to make any changes to the Applicant Guidebook at this time. And we are told that there will be a resolution on this posted very soon if not - I don't know if it'll be done today but this is some information that we received this morning and that I wanted the Council be made aware of.

And now let's go back to the queue and Jeff is next.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Stéphane. So thanks, Mary, for making some of the changes. And I do appreciate the new constituency weighing in; I think that's great. So the one question I have is - is I still don't remember what the international legal personality test was or what that concept was.

But in any event that seems more like the solution or a proposed solution as opposed to presenting the issue. Would you accept it as friendly if you just

ended the sentence at, "...and whereas various possible criteria for the grant of protective rights to such organizations was suggested at the ICANN meeting in Costa Rica," and just end it there?

Mary Wong: May I respond, Stéphane?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes you may.

Mary Wong: This is just a comment, Jeff, I understand the concept. And I certainly understand the sentiment. I should say that our member constituency - at least those that have been discussing this with the councilors on their behalf - wanted that specific mention in it.

And I'm going to look to my fellow councilors to just figure out if we can find a way out of this. One thing I should note is that the current whereas clause, the one that you just read out, Jeff, is a bit of a change from the original because it's been expanded to just try to be more neutral to say, you know, there's a number of different criteria and just including this one.

Perhaps what I could suggest is, Jeff and others, if are you comfortable to leave the mention of it maybe we could amend the way it's said just to make sure that it's not presupposing any sort of direction or discussion of that concept. Does that make sense?

Jeff Neuman: It does. And, Stéphane, if I can respond?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes please, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think the issue is I just don't know what that is and I don't know if half the Council knows what that is. And so my - I have no problem with ICANN

staff coming to you and asking you guys what it was that was presented and looking that up and then including that in the issue report.

I just - it almost sounds like a GNSO endorsement of a topic that I don't recall what it is. So unless we want to define it here, which I'm not sure it's easily definable, I really prefer that to be taken out almost to the point where it's almost - I don't want to have a hostile amendment because I support the rest of it but it's just - it's to that point where unless we define it I don't think it should be mentioned.

Mary Wong: Stéphane, can I try to...

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: Jeff - and, you know, this is interesting because that discussion has started to take place on the NCSG listserv and there are others more qualified than myself to define it. For example, there are a number of academic papers that the NPOC has referred our membership to. And that's been quite an interesting discussion.

Others have said it should be UN plus 10 so basically UN type organizations. So therefore you're right, I mean, there's not necessarily one thing that we can say is the definition.

May I suggest at least for now if we set - if we go back to the whereas clause, that last one we're talking about, for the last part if - can we add the word an - the article an A-N - saying including one based on the concept of an international legal personality?

Jeff Neuman: I'd like to hear from the rest of the Council on that. I don't know if that's...

Stéphane van Gelder: So what's the situation here? Have you, Jeff, proposed a friendly
                       amendment? And have you, Mary, refused it as friendly?

Jeff Neuman: I did propose a friendly amendment in the whereas clause at ICANN meeting
                    in Costa Rica period.

Stéphane van Gelder: And, Mary, you do not consider that friendly is that correct?

Mary Wong: Well...

Stéphane van Gelder: It's either yes or no at this stage.

Mary Wong: Okay I'm just discussing this with my fellow councilors while doing this
                  quickly. So, actually, Stéphane, Jeff and everybody, I accept that amendment
                  as friendly so we can strike that mention of international legal personalities.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you, Mary.

Mary Wong: You're welcome.

Stéphane van Gelder: That's just be done. Thank you, Marika. We have - Margie, did you have
                       something you wanted to say?

Margie Milam: Yeah, just put me at the end of the queue.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. In that case John.

John Berard: This is John Berard. I think my anxiety over this motion is rooted in the fact
                     that we seem to be trying to do the GAC's job here. I'm particularly concerned
                     with the suggestion that we're acting on the basis of things like requests from
                     international governmental organizations.

                     I hearken back, as I said in my email to you guys, that we did, at the end of the
                     Costa Rica meeting suggest that it really was the - or the - say that the process
                     was the intergovernmental organizations should go to the GAC, the GAC
                     could then consider advice to the Board, if the Board thought it was effective
                     policy they could direct it to the GNSO Council.

                     Now we seem to be, you know, jumping the (shark) on all that stuff. I just
                     think that this puts us in an awkward position and which is why I suggested to
                     both Thomas and to Mary that their motions be withdrawn. But now here we
                     are and they're on the table. I just don't know how this adds - I just don't know
                     how this accomplishes anything that is on our plate right now.

                     And we just had a conversation about GNSO resources. Is this the kind of the
                     thing we want to devote resources to when they're tight?

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you very much, John. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I echo some of what John said. I believe given that the GNSO has
                     received the last letter from the Board from other international organizations
                     it's inevitable that we will have to embark on a policy development process on
                     this.

                     I object to one of the specific terms in this one that is saying we have to come
                     up with a definition of the type of organization. I think what we may end up

with is an algorithm not a definition. And that algorithm may well put some of the onus on the GAC to actually define or to identify specific ones.

I'm not sure we're able to do this or that we have the standing to do that properly. So I think the term definition is a bit too prescriptive in this particular wording. And moreover I think this whole thing short circuits the existing group we have that's looking at the second level protection for the Red Cross and the IOC in the first round.

And I think to have the two parallel operations going on is going to be very difficult to manage. And I really think we should delay this until that group has finished its work whatever it ends up with. There's a strict time limit on that one so we're not delaying it forever. But I think we should serialize these and not try to do them in parallel. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Alan.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Margie.

Margie Milam: Yeah, this is...

Stéphane van Gelder: Zahid, I've got you - I've got you next.

Margie Milam: I just wanted to - as someone who's going to probably be involved in the drafting of the issue report I just wanted to make sure the Council would clarify the intention here. Is this intended to address just new gTLDs or also existing TLDs since we are talking about second level protection? So if you guys could clarify that that would be most appreciated.

Stéphane van Gelder: I believe it is - there is a mention in the - and this is not my answer because I'm not the one who made the motion. But there are several references to new gTLDs so perhaps that's kind of a half answer there. But I'm sure Mary and Thomas can add more detail to it.

Let me turn to Zahid and then go back to Mary and Thomas who are both in the queue anyway.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you, Stéphane. I just wanted to say that it's good to see that the NCSG has written that amendment. It makes a lot more palatable because there was that - this is one of the things I was really anxious about seeing the definition that it was (unintelligible). Thank you for that.

So - but in addition to that I would just sort of chime in with the comments made by John and especially by Alan and especially as a last point that we have a parallel process currently continuing and doing this right now may be seen to prejudice what we're trying to do in that group right now which is supposed to come up with sort of result in a very short timeline.

I'm really concerned about what passing this motion would do to the working group's ongoing work. And if anybody would like to comment on, you know, whether there's some way we can not let that happen - I don't see how that can be done but if someone can comment on how that, you know, can be protected from anything that happens in this motion it may be helpful moving it forward.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Zahid. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Stéphane. I have a question for John and Alan. We do have a review with the second level protection for the IOC RCRC anyway. So what - how would you envisage to deal with those without deploying the bottom up process for our discussion?

Likewise we have seen that the discussions surrounding the first level protections for the IOC RCRC took an awful lot of time. And I think it's - it's true to say that the second level protection will be much more complicated as a task for the drafting team.

So we might end up facing a situation where we haven't been able to complete the work of the drafting team prior to the execution of the first RRAs. And in that situation we could only (put through), if any, these protections by consensus policy. So if we keep on working with the drafting team on this we might end up being too late and having no legal means to implement those protections.

And I think at this point in time this is not particularly about protecting the names of certain organizations but this is about protecting the integrity of the GNSO as such because if we deal with this only in the drafting team we might be criticized for now following due process and doing policy by not deploying the PDP.

And I think we also have to be very cautious about that because that's something that is very closely looked at in the Affirmation of Commitments.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay, Mary. Thanks, Stéphane. This is actually a follow up to what Thomas has just said. And I think his sentiments very definitely are echoed by a lot of NCSG members both from NCUC and NPOC.

A couple of points; first I think it was Alan who raised the word definition as problematic. I would be happy to accept a friendly amendment that changes that word from definition to consideration if that will help alleviate that concern.

Secondly - and again following on from what Thomas has just said - I don't think that us doing this in any way - it precludes a sort of discussion or tracking as we should be doing as a Council anyway - of what the DT is doing.

Recollect that the DT is concerned with specific protections for a specific one of (case) as we've all acknowledged. So in some ways, as Thomas has alluded, that is a little different from what we're trying to do here. I guess the point about not wanting to duplicate, replicate or look schizophrenic I honestly don't believe we will because this is somewhat different; there is the integrity concern that Thomas has raised.

And certainly, I would hope that during the preparation of the report and our discussion of it - because again we have public comment periods where the preliminary as well as the final issue report gets discussed and debated. I should think that during those discussions at least that consideration on what the DT is doing or has done up to that point will be part of that discussion. So that would be my response to those concerns that have just been raised.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks, Mary.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Was someone trying to speak? Okay, don't think so. So we have no more discussion. We have a motion that's been amended, made, seconded so we

will proceed to vote on this motion. I would suggest that we not have a voice vote on this but do a roll call vote. I'm objecting to myself asking for a voice vote so that's done.

So, Glen, could you please do a roll call vote on this please?

Glen DeSaintgery:I'll do that, Stéphane. Wendy Seltzer. I'll skip Wendy. Rafik Dammak. Rafik, do you vote yes or no? Perhaps he's on mute still. Stéphane van Gelder.

Stéphane van Gelder: No.

Glen DeSaintgery:David Taylor.

David Taylor: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:Stéphane van Gelder for Yoav Keren please.

Stéphane van Gelder: No.

Glen DeSaintgery:Brian Winterfeldt. Brian Winterfeldt. Bill Drake for Wolfgang Kleinwächter if the...

Bill Drake: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:...Council will take the verbal proxy that has been given for Wolfgang?

Stéphane van Gelder: I don't - hang on. We've not had a proxy - a proper proxy, have we?

Glen DeSaintgery:No. In the Adobe Connect chat.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, well I think we need to stick to the procedure here and this has been the subject of a lot of discussion, proxies and we've had a procedure. I think we need to stick to it. So unless you've got a proxy through...

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: ...the established procedure I don't think we can allow Wolfgang's vote.

Glen DeSaintgery: A proxy has come through by email from Konstantinos who said that he is not able to get to a computer to fill in the form.

Stéphane van Gelder: If we - you have a proxy by email?

Glen DeSaintgery: It's not a form filled in.

Stéphane van Gelder: So what do you have?

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks, Bill. Apologies but I'm not at my computer and I can't fill it in. Konstantinos.

Stéphane van Gelder: Well I don't think that's a proxy.

Bill Drake: And, Stéphane, this is Bill. I subsequently put a request into the Adobe Chat about this point asking if the Council would accept that. And several people said yes and nobody objected. So we were hoping that...

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, I'm not - I'm not reading the chat all the time so sorry I missed that, Bill. I do not - I mean, we do have some very specific rules on this. I'm not comfortable with circumventing them. So let's do what you've just suggested and put this out to the Council as a whole and ask if anyone objects please.

So we are - sorry the question is does anyone object to us accepting - who's been named as proxy for Wolfgang?

Bill Drake: Me.

Glen DeSaintgery: Bill Drake.

Stéphane van Gelder: Bill. So does anyone object to Bill being Wolfgang's proxy noting special circumstances which are connectivity problems for the people who are trying to submit that proxy? Does anyone object to that?

Hearing no objections, Bill, please vote for Wolfgang.

Bill Drake: Yes. And thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Bill. Can I go back to Wendy Seltzer please?

Wendy Seltzer: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Rafik Dammak. Rafik, are you on the line? On mute? I'll come back to him. John Berard.

John Berard: No.

Glen DeSaintgery: Joy Liddicoat.

Joy Liddicoat: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Zahid Jamil.

Zahid Jamil: No.

Glen DeSaintgery: Mary Wong.

Mary Wong: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Osvaldo Novoa, Wolf Ulrich-Knoben will you please vote for Osvaldo?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: William - Bill Drake.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Wolf Ulrich-Knoben for yourself.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Lanre Ajayi.

Lanre Ajayi: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:Mason Cole.

Mason Cole: No.

Glen DeSaintgery:Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:Wendy Seltzer. Rafik Dammak, are you on the line now?

Rafik Dammak: Yes and I vote yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:Thank you. And Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt:Hi, Glen. I'm on and I vote yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:Thank you very much. The results are - the contracted party house four votes
              in favor, three votes against so that's 57.1%. The non contracted party house
              11 votes in favor, two votes against and that is 84.6%. So it passes.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you, Glen. Thanks to you all. Let's move onto - sorry, I've got a
              request on Item 6, Maguy Serad has woken up very early to be with us and to
              present that item. So would anyone object to me switching those two items
              around and go with Item 6 first and Item 5 after that?

Hearing no objections can I go then to Item 6 and let Maguy - and Pam, I don't know if you're on - give us a presentation on the report on this item please.

Maguy Serad: Yes, good morning, Stéphane and good morning everyone on the call. This is Maguy Serad. With me from the ICANN Contractual Compliance Department on the call I have Pam Little joining us from Sydney and Paul Redmond who is also joining us from Marina del Rey.

The objective of this presentation is to provide the GNSO Council an overview of the report that was submitted by ICANN Contractual Compliance on 16-March, 2012.

The report was submitted by request from the resolution on October 6, 2011. And the objective of the report was to provide a background of uniformity of reporting and the activities underway.

Glen, sorry, do I move the slides or do you?

Glen DeSaintgery: Marika is in charge of that...

Marika Konings: Maguy I've...

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, Maguy.

Marika Konings: Yeah, Maguy, I gave you control so if you just move with the arrows you can move them yourself as well if you want.

Maguy Serad: Okay, thank you. On the agenda what we're going to do is give a report request background - we've got the content of the report - and address the question that was asked of us at the end - compliance and policy development.

So on Slide 4 the report structure that was submitted consists of the following bullets that were by request from the GNSO Council. You wanted to - us to describe existing systems, improvements and changes made since the reporting group report, improvements and changes foreseen in the near future and gaps.

So before we proceed in the details of the report - giving you a highlight of it - we'd like to put it a little bit in perspective by giving the GNSO Council an update of where we are with our tools and systems.

Slide 5 has an overview of our tools. Currently for contractual compliance we have three main ticketing systems that we refer to as C ticket for consumers, W ticket for Whois related matters and UDRP ticketing system.

As you can see from the slide those ticketing systems were created at different intervals throughout the years and they are separate systems that do not integrate. Therefore we've got a lot of manual lookups that takes places to be able to deliver on our operational validation of those tickets and follow up and follow through.

What we are putting together - so this report projects the three-year plan that has been put in place since my arrival. We are in Year 2 now. By Year 3 we hope to reach what we call our future state which will be one central system that will reflect the common process that we have been working with for over the past few months and have been communicating to the different stakeholders about.

This future system should have more of an automated work flow where the complaint administration will be on exception-based. This also should allow us to incorporate the complaint management system with what we call the customer relationship system.

And we hope to have that also interfaced with other supporting applications. So we are targeting to get from current state to future state in different (sizes), which I will describe shortly.

On Slide 6 reflects an overview of the process approach. Many of the team on the call today have seen this process. This is really important because it supports us reaching our future state. In the past all complaints were managed and processed in a different fashion.

We have created, with the support of the stakeholders groups throughout the ICANN community a - what we call a - the consistent approach where no matter what the intake of our - the complaint is we will go into a three-step process to evaluate, to assess, inquire or even yet to issue notices following this three-step notice which leads us into enforcement. So this will also be reflected in the tools.

The compliance application improvement plan that we list on Slide 7 will support the previous two slides. How are we going to accomplish that? We have three-phased plan as you see listed here to help us get to future state. We cannot get to an all-inclusive centralized tool immediately.

So the short term plan is basically to enhance our current systems and our current tools, improve the way we manage the documentation into a more centralized focus and implement system integration with standardized

business processes to the extent that the tools today allow us because we really need to improve on our reporting and transparency of the compliance issues and challenges.

So the short term has helped us evolve a bit here and we are on target for the August deliverables.

The mid term plan started at the beginning of 2012. It's a parallel effort to the short term. We have been defining and implementing - defining the how and the requirements to consolidate the compliance systems and developing a gradual roll out of the dashboard based on the requirements and the expectations of the different stakeholders.

And we are also working on delivering what we call a compliance risk and audit strategy approach calendar. Ultimately the long term would help us get to what we call the future state where we would have expanded to a truly centralized solution. And it will be a phased approach to that rollout.

Slide 8 is in support of the request and the report is compliance data and policy development. We'd like to highlight to the GNSO Council that it's true in 2011 Compliance did receive about 45,000 complaints. And as you see in the pie chart the complaints have different sources.

Our highest volume as - it should not be a surprise - is our Whois inaccuracies. Next highest is the customer service which is a - customer service is like a catch-all bucket. Sometimes we receive requests that are not within the scope of contractual compliance but we still have to make sure they get addressed and transferred to the right people.

The next largest is transfer issues. But in summary the point is not all complaints that we receive are valid which at the same time not all valid complaints lead to contractual violations or enforcement actions.

As you saw in the process because of the fact we initiate through prevention before we get to enforcement we have learned and we hope to, by ICANN 44, bring more transparency to the complaints as they evolve through the phases.

And you will see that not all complaints lead to enforcement because we do get collaboration from the contracted parties and they do resolve the issues that are brought to their attention.

Most compliances, in Bullet 3 we state, are resolved without the need for a (unintelligible) action. So the fourth bullet here, complaints received by ICANN, do not capture all abuses. Am I still on the call?

Man: Yeah.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes you are, Maguy. Carry on.

Maguy Serad: Oh okay. All right good. The data derived from those complaints is limited. The scope is limited to our contractual compliance obligations even though under customer service we do see a different level of data but it's not the data that's going to help us drive and develop and make recommendations for policy development.

We do recommend to the GNSO that other sources also should be explored if the community decides to develop additional uniform reporting visibility. Like I stated again in the first few bullets the transparency we're going to bring forward is as it evolves and the types and the geographics of the data.

I also want to assure the GNSO Council that Compliance has collaborated and continues to collaborate with the policy staff to bring forward recommendations based on lessons learned and based on the data we see in our operational work.

With this slide I think - let me go out - I would like to conclude the presentation and open it for questions. It is at the very level. The report does provide you additional information.

Stéphane van Gelder: Maguy, thanks. I know it's very early for you. Thank you for giving us that presentation getting out so early to do so.

Can I open this up to questions please?

I see no questions and (Marika) did you have some comments on the next steps on this?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika let me just pull up a couple of slides I just the follow ups really. They still remind everyone where I read this discussion all comes, you know, (unintelligible) stacked to the discussion if the registration of you is (unintelligible)'s working group had and just here on this screen now and I don't connect from you she actually does the (counsel)or (unintelligible) saving back from the six of October 2011 and where the request was made to the ICANN compliance department, you know, to a point on (unintelligible) existing systems.

And basically asking for that information prior to further conservation of this the map that issue of recommendation from the registration abuse policies working groups.

And that recommendation specifically said that the working group recommended that the GNSO and the larger ICANN community in general create and support uniform reporting processes.

And that was a recommendation that was adopted with unanimous support.

And just to provide a little bit of context around that because I think that recommendation itself, you know, minor explain what they were looking for they didn't even do in their report a list of tentative goals and based all this effort, you know, should have should the (counsel) decide to go forward and, you know, just adhere, you know, that should provide just in time education knowledge to people wanting to report problems it should make it easier to submit a valid complaint will hopefully reduce the number of erroneous complaints improve on the standing of the limits of ICANN policies and other options to pursue if the issue is not covered by policy.

Looking at improving the (unintelligible) of policy and compliant activities improving data available for GNSO working groups and the ICANN advisory groups policy making and improving data for our compliant activities and also trying down to the question on, you know, what comes first.

The policy process are a definitive data describing the actual problem and along the suggestions as to how data can be gathered when it hasn't yet been included in the reporting at process.

So basically, you know, based on that it's now for the (counsel) to, you know, consider the input that has been received from the ICANN compliance department and the former debt presentation and the report and if how to

address the registration of use policy of recommendation that was made with regard to the issue of the uniformity of reporting.

Man: Yes.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay thank you very much. Are there any further comments on this?

It appears that there aren't. So we'll move back to item five on our agenda today. And thank you once again (Maggie), (Pam), and the compliance staff that were on the call for this item.

Woman: Thank you Stéphane.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you very much.

Woman: Right, I'll hang up.

Stéphane van Gelder: So back to item five which takes a little bit of explaining there's been some comment on this item. So Jeff had volunteered to explain and introduce the items.

I'll turn over to him now.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Stéphane and, you know, I apologize for the title of this because it may be more a misnomer than in actual GNSO (counsel) comment on the dot com contract renewal.

But I just I'd ask this topic you put on and the reason I did is because of a statement that was made in the from ICANN staff when they posted the dot com renewal agreement.

So as kind of a practice to this whole thing let me just state that, you know, there's as of registry and other registries agree with me that ICANN should not be using the contract renewal process as a chance to get into contracts things that fall within the picket fence that a registry does not want to voluntarily adopt.

That we as registry do not believe that that is an appropriate use of the contract renewal process that we think that, you know, basically to do so is to is to improperly use ICANN's monopoly over this function to circumvent the process that was agreed upon in this industry as the way that our contracts should work so I just want to make that comment.

That said the rest of the comments, you know, I think are going to be a little bit of a surprise to you because they don't necessarily jive with the way you think I would have position I would take.

But I'm very concerned with the notion of how GNSO (counsel) decisions and actions are taken and used by staff in ways in which we may not have intended them to be used.

So if you look at the announcement that came up about the dot com renewal there's a paragraph in there that says moving to maintenance of a Thick who is database the question of transitioning a large existing registry that Thick who has raised operational and other issues that require further discussion and consideration this has been recognized by the GNSO as that body recently agreed to undertaking a full policy development process in the matter and then cites to the resolution.

The problem I have with that is that actually does not reflect our discussion. Again I don't necessarily agree with the view that a number of people have taken in account (counsel) that this should be part of the contract renewal but as was discussed earlier by (Allen) and by others in the IP constituency they did discuss the fact that they had hoped that this would be addressed to the contract renewal process.

Again not that I agree with that but the point is that it seems like ICANN staff in putting up that announcement essentially took the GNSO position out of context and basically used it in what I believe was a way to deflect lame from them to put on the GNSO to say well we didn't address the Whois issue because the (counsel) even the even they decided they were going to do a PDP.

So to me that seems again if ICANN staff is going to be taking those positions or is going to be using GNSO decisions to justify a position that ICANN staff has I believe they should do so very cautiously and in some circumstances should be coming back to the (counsel) to make sure they understand the position of the GNSO before using it as a means to justify why they took a certain action or did not take a certain action.

So this is kind of the reason why I wanted this on the agenda. Again I don't necessarily agree with the I mean I agree with ICANN's staff when they say that this should be addressed in the third PDP as opposed to the contract negotiation process but I disagree with the way ICANN staff used the GNSO (counsel) decision as a means to justify that decision as opposed to just saying that things within the picket fence is registry doesn't want to adopt should be handled through the PDP.

Does that make sense?

Man: Yes.

Man: Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I was just wondering if that makes sense. I feel like I babbled a little bit, so.

Stéphane van Gelder: No I'm sure you haven't babbled thank you very much that was very clear.

                And the intent then is to either just make the comments that you've made or take this further and ask for these comments to be either recognized in some way or the announcement be modified or something be done as a result of the comments that you've just made.

                So two questions for the (counsel) really -- first of all is this discussion one that the (counsel) wants to have and if so what are the suggested action points from this point on?

                So first of all I mean if anyone wants to speak to this and if no one does then I guess we'll have our answer.

                And it looks like we do have our answer. So Jeff I think you've made your point and...if I interpret the silence then the (counsel) wishes to drop this item to drop this now and just leave it as is.

(Somma):   Stéphane this is (Somma) speaking I just have a question what would be the means or the tools channel whatever for the (counsel) to do something about this or maybe I could direct this question at Jeff, you know, putting this on the agenda what outcome did you have in mind?

Jeff Neuman: Well (Unintelligible) I first wanted to see if it bothered anybody else. I'm actually kind of surprised it doesn't bother other people because I know that there are some that are going to file comments on the on this dot com agreement some negative comments about not including I think who is on there.

So this is I don't know if that people are tired today that there was at least up until an hour ago looming deadline but I hope to get is just a little bit of discussion on this if it's not if nobody cares and nobody cares I mean it could just be a comment but we filed in the comment process it could be something as simple as that.

(Frankly) I'm a little bit surprised that's nobody else is raising a point but...okay.

Man: Now well Stéphane if I may?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes can I just clarify the statement you just made Jeff because not everyone's maybe not everyone knows that ICANN's new gTLD pack system is being taken offline and ICANN is extended the application period to April the 20th which is a reference you just made to looming deadline that we had.

So just to make sure everyone's on the same wavelength there and back to you Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you Stéphane. My silence Jeff was not that I don't have a position on this but that I'm wondering what can be done.

I think that your comment is sort of in-line with criticism that was voiced in connection with the (IOTRPRP) deadline requests by the drafting teams.

So I think, you know, maybe this is some more general issue on how the staff actually supports or interacts with the GNSO (counsel).

Stéphane van Gelder: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes no I think there are a number of things that have happened lately that when you take them all put those together are cause for concern it's like the members from ICANN staff treat over the things we do as part of their advocacy piece.

If they support it they'll use what they can if they don't then they'll argue against it but again I'd like to, you know, build this totally see something on the chat.

I'd like to hear a response as to, you know, why that was taken out of context or why that was used to justify the position that ICANN staff didn't include I think who is in the com agreement.

Stéphane van Gelder: And let me add to that and find answer to Thomas's question because you're not doing so Jeff which is just a little joke which is that what the first thing that we can do which is being done as is through this meeting is that the meeting's recorded there are minutes they're having this discussion now so this discussion that we're having goes into those minutes.

So anyone who takes the time to either read the minutes or listen to the recording or read the transcript will get the gist of the discussion that is being had now.

So that's the first thing and once again if those if there are people who want to take this further then they can but I think clearly there's not a strong desire to do that and that will also be shown in the minutes of this call.

And Jeff you made sorry (Anna) you were next.

(Anna): Yes just a quick comment. If I'm reading the documents correctly the announcement on the comment period for doc the dot com agreement it says the GNSO decided to undertake a formal PDP on this subject and unless I'm mistaken we did not. And we have not at this point.

So I don't see how (counsel) can just let that go and not at least put a comment anything that was inaccurate that was not a reflection of what happened.

It was referring to the motion that went forward on the specific things for the first round and through from a drafting team and not a PDP. So I'm not sure how we could just let it drop but not my choice.

Stéphane van Gelder: Is there anyone from I mean staff is being singled out here I think it's only fair to give if you wanted I'm not saying that you should but does anyone some staff want to respond?

Liz Gasster: No, it's Liz.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay that's fair enough. No problem.

Jeff Neuman: Well Stéphane this is Jeff. Just to be fair this may not be the same staff that was involved with putting that announcement out.

So I know (Julia) posted something on a chat team this was unfair to the staff that was on and I just want to make it clear that I'm not I don't know who's responsible for putting those announcements out so I'm not blaming all of ICANN staff.

I just obviously someone from ICANN staff put that announcement out. So whatever approvals that have to go through my point is that it's inaccurate at best it's inaccurate and at worst it's a little misleading because I think when initially when we were discussing as was just brought up, you know, an hour ago we were discussing that I think who is people did want to wait to see what the outcome of the contract process was and there were people that were hoping again not that I agree with this but there were people on the (counsel) that were hoping that this would be dealt with in the contract renegotiations process.

And this report basically uses the decision to initiate the PDP against those people that wanted the contract process to be used or the dot com renewal.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. Perhaps I can make a personal comment as well. And then John I've just seen your hand up so you'll be next but personally I do I mean this we all apparently are a bit uneasy with this topic.

And my personal view is that there is nothing wrong with speaking out if we feel we've been misrepresented in some way as a group.

Just as long as we make sure that we're not blaming anyone who's not to blame. So I do commend Jeff personally on speaking out because I think it does take courage to do so.

Just as long as he's right to speak out and I have to admit I've not looked at this in enough detail to be able to determine whether there has been representation or not.

So it's difficult to taking it from that. It's difficult to make any further comments but I also have to add that in my dealings with the staff that support the GNSO I've I'm dealing with people that are very fair minded and always very careful to make sure that what we do is portrayed correctly.

So that may also be backed to Jeff's point that he feels maybe someone else is being involved here but certainly the staff that we deal with I think are exemplary.

John.

John Berard: So feeling this the this theme of Jeff's comments that I who have been vocal in the past and haven't been saying anything so I will now say something.

I fear I feel that this misrepresentation in the announcement of the in posting of the dot com contract is one of the reasons or one of the outcomes of that I had been concerned about when we were in Costa Rica and balancing the value of negotiations versus PDP were a central to our discussions.

At that point I thought I did not want to muddy the waters I view this paragraph the approach and the dot com announcement as mud in the water.

The other point is that I believe that it is an institutional problem not an individual problem.

And institutional because either out of trying to bend over perhaps too far or not far at all, you know, it's like well they said this so we can't do that or I don't want to do that and I see that they accept this.

I believe that's an institutional problem not an individual problem which is not something that we can deal with nor should we deal with here or perhaps at the GNSO (counsel).

It maybe a broader GNSO question.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you John. Any further comments on this?

Thank you all let's move on. Item seven is an update on the RAA final issue report and probably more on the status of the negotiations that Margie is going to provide for us. Margie.

Margie Milam: (Unintelligible) on Marika's putting up the presentation now.

Essentially this presentation that I was going to give in Costa Rica but we ran out of time and the GNSO (counsel) meeting.

So some of this is going to be a refresher of what was discussed in Costa Rica and while waiting for Marika to put up the slides.

All right. Well my screen's a little slow. Here we go, okay. So these are the slides from the Costa Rica meeting.

Essentially I wanted to provide you an update as we did distribute the final issue report just prior to Costa Rica and that's also linked to the status of the negotiations so I'll give you a brief update on that as well.

As you recall the amendment process was meant to cover several issues the law appeasement recommendations that had been submitted to during the prior work done by the RAA drafting team.

And then the (unintelligible) was also trying to list through the (MRM) GNSO recommendations that came from the final report published by the RAA drafting team as well as from staff and from the registrars that focus on popular that are meant to advance the strong protection and deal with development and authority issues.

As staff we've worked through these negotiations primarily from the standpoint of prioritizing the law enforcement recommendations because they were part of the (DBC) check endorsements and some of the communicated that were developed in prior ICANN meetings.

And since we've seen some (unintelligible) resolution where the (unintelligible) were kicked off there's been a tremendous amount of work done that's on staff side in on the registrar negotiation team side were there were, you know, well more than 12 at meetings weekly phone conferences as well as a status reports and information published on the extent of Wiki page that I provided here.

If you look through the Wiki you can see that each issue is actually identified and the (unintelligible) on where it originated.

As (Kurt) mentioned in Costa Rica, you know, in it's taken more time than expected to do the negotiations because there's you know, obviously a lot of work that's done on the side of the registrar negotiation team.

They have to go and work with their stakeholders to make sure that they have at least a common viewpoint on each of these issues. And as staff we've also faced difficulties in that we've been trying to focus on (LEA) recommendations yet sometimes it's not exactly clear what the (LEA) recommendations are trying to address.

And so through the negotiation process there's actually been consultations with members of the (LEA) negotiation or the (LEA) representatives that came up with these recommendations to try to get more clarity on what they were looking for.

And, you know, we did not publish a fill agreement before Costa Rica because a lot of the amendment topic as you can imagine are contingent on agreement on other topics and so from the registrar's standpoint and the ICANN staff standpoint it was important to make sure that we, you know, we publish a full agreement that reflects everything as opposed to partial issues.

And as you recall in Costa Rica there's also some issues that require a little bit more attention in particularly from the community and you saw that in the session in Costa Rica where we have the validation of Whois information for example that's one area where it's not clear yet where (unintelligible) validation should be dealt with and where we should draw the line and discuss with you all the obligations that the registrars might agree to.

And so with the next steps once we get through this process and actually publish an agreement we were asked specifically what the next steps would be on the registrars would lead to renew their agreement under the new performance (unintelligible) has approved as (unintelligible) of Internet stakeholders.

And this is language from the existing (REA) which indicates that a recommendation would need to be approved by two thirds of the vote of the GNSO (counsel) and they would also need to be a report that documents the extent of agreements or disagreements of the affected parties and the outreach to those groups and then it would be needed to be adopted by the boards.

So this process is a little, you know, it's coming straight from the (REA) as it exists today.

And then once that happens there would be approximately a, you know, a five year period where the, you know, it might come into play because the registrars were buying up to it as their agreements renew.

Although as you may recall in 2009 ICANN tried to adopt incentives to get registrars to approve the new form earlier and that might happen as well in this case as we come up with a new agreement that comes out of these negotiations.

And then to the extent that there are policy aspects that are reflected in the agreement that they want to be implement earlier the GNSO (counsel) has always tired to get a consensus policy (unintelligible) that might (unintelligible) those obligations into effect immediately like (unintelligible) offset.

And then with respect to the PDP as you may recall in as far as the resolutions ask for a PDP on what they call the remaining issues.

In other words what are their items that would be remaining after the negotiations to the extent that they're not adequately addressed in the RAA the GNSO (counsel) would be asked to conduct a CDP on those issues.

And so what, you know, this again is one of those issues that we talked about earlier today with respect to prioritization depending upon how many issues are outstanding at the point that the negotiations conclude there maybe a whole bunch of it work that needs to be done on the GNSO (counsel) side and there maybe overlap with existing policy projects.

You know, you look at the work that's being done on Whois the UDRP best practices for example some of the recommendations talk about dealing with (unintelligible) registrations and that's a list that have overlapped best practices and work that maybe and initiated by the (counsel) and then a (unintelligible) contract as well is another area where there maybe overlap.

And so our staff recommendation in the issue reports was essentially that the (counsel) knowledge that it hasn't feed the final issue report but that we felt that it really isn't appropriate to start a PDP at this time because negotiations have not concluded yet.

And so our suggestion is that, you know, once there's a report published at the conclusion of the negotiations with the list of items that haven't been addressed then that would be the point where, you know, the GNSO (counsel) could act and we given the discussions that took place in Costa Rica we've probably (unintelligible) appropriate that causes forward confirm their instruction that they want a PDP to be initiated on these topics because as you may recall there seemed to be confusion in Costa Rica as to whether or not the (counsel) was required to institute the PDP (unintelligible) all the topics or the board felt that it should be more at the (counsel)'s expression.

And if you the bylaws as they exist today the (counsel) would be obligated to initiate PDP on all of the remaining items.

But it's not clear that all the board members really understood that was the implications of their resolutions. So our suggestion would be to get (unintelligible) board when the negotiation conclude about whether, you know, which topics they feel that the (counsel) should be mandated to proceed on a PDP.

And then on this slide I provided you the links for the information where the final issue report is listed. There's also a status report that talked about the status of negotiations as of March 1st which is right before the Costa Rica meetings and then I've also provided a link in case any of you missed the validation workshop which was excellent in Costa Rica and really played up a lot of the issues and the highlight is a lot of the issues related to the validation issue.

And with that are there any questions?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes I think Zahid has a question for you Margie.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you Margie for that. Unfortunately I can't see the presentation because but I'm sure that they'll be and I can't find either link on the page and the page.

Would it be possible to send it around and I had a question. On item I needed a question some weeks ago asking for some sort of maybe sort of a status to see that other than the law enforcement recommendations what about the recommendations and I think they'll identify in the high priority items by the GNSO whether they were part of the negotiations and something could be sort of provided to the (counsel) to have a look into that.

Is that something that is part of the presentation you just gave or would you be able to provide that subsequently?

Margie Milam: Zahid it's Margie. Yes I have that request from Costa Rica and I'll send it out to (unintelligible) or this morning and I will get you again I assume all the people tomorrow.

Just so you know the board of status report that was published prior to Costa Rica took an extensive amount of time of negotiations between the contracts (unintelligible) I mean the negotiation team and ICANN staff it took several weeks just to figure what should go into that status report.

And rather than open up, you know, another discussion on a report versus negotiating the existing agreement we decided not to take up any of the negotiation team time and prepare another status report.

So what I'm going to circulate this morning is a document that identifies the status based upon what was published prior to Costa Rica so it won't updated from for today but it will reflect the information that came out of the summary report that was published prior to Costa Rica so that we wouldn't take time away from negotiations and we would just focus on the negotiations and the issues at hand as opposed to focusing on facts and other (unintelligible) if that makes sense.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you that's actually very good. And I completely understand that it would be not to give us a newer version of what happens today that's completely understandable, not a problem.

But the focus was just to figure out that in the negotiations even if we were to look at from Costa Rica point of view, you know, how much of what GNSO

said in its report etcetera in there or is in discussion just to get clarity on that that would be helpful.

Thank you so much for that.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks John are you still in the queue or is this from before?

John Berard: It's from before I'm sorry.

Stéphane van Gelder: No problem. Mary...Mary.

Mary Wong: Okay. Yes sorry I was on mute. And this is going to sound incoherent I warn everybody.

I just wanted to go back to Margie's final the final part of your presentation Margie and maybe some of this will be addressed by what you're going to circulate this morning.

You know, this comes from some of the discussions we had amongst the (counsel) I guess in Costa Rica and with the board. And other (unintelligible) things have progressed since the negotiations.

I think my concern or question remains kind of similar to what I raised previously which is you had mentioned something about the board not really understanding the import of what they have so I was wondering if you could elaborate a little bit on that.

And secondly I guess in terms of the negotiations they're ongoing then when does the when should the (counsel) be deciding on what to include in the PDP?

It sounds to me that from the recommendations going from the issue report that essentially we are doing a wait and see until the negotiations have come to an end whatever end that might be and then we make a decision based on what you have left over.

Would that be accurate?

Margie Milam: Yes Mary I (unintelligible) sort of report or announcement negotiation included. And then report could also identify issues that are still outstanding, yes.

Mary Wong: Okay and did you have any for the information on the board's lack of understanding that you can share?

Margie Milam: No I'm (unintelligible) probably conversation that took place (unintelligible) just some comment with board members I think (unintelligible), you know, at that point we might when the report gets published we might perhaps suggest that the (counsel) send a communication to the board and say, you know, we understand that many issues are outstanding, you know, is that the board's intent that a PDP be initiated at this point on all of these items and they going to be coming from direction to the (counsel).

If that to confirm that that was their intent.

Mary Wong: Okay thanks just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: That was very useful. I see no further hands. We are getting close to the end of this meeting. I have asked Marika if she would be willing to push back her update on the new PDP to the next meeting and she has very kindly agreed to do so.

So Marika thank you for that. It's only the second time we're pushing you back because we had intended to do this in Costa Rica just as we had intended to have Margie's presentation in Costa Rica which explains the slides.

Man: Are we still here?

Woman: Stéphane?

Man: I think we lost Stéphane again.

Woman: Yes. We'll call after him.

Man: Well I think...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think he was ending the meeting...I recall.

Woman: But there's still an item on their any other business that you might want to get to quickly.

Robert Hoggarth: Well I can do it real quick, Jeff if you'd like.

Jeff Neuman: Yes please.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes sure thanks. For everybody this last item agenda this is Rob Hoggarth from ICANN policy staff.

The last item is noted as an announcement about the new GNSO Website and given the fact that I had mentioned to all of you in Costa Rica the latest progress on the site this meeting seemed to be a good chance for a very quick update for you all in the heads up.

I'm pleased to report that the small team that's continued to move forward on the development of this site is nearly completed its efforts.

And we're planning to take the new site live by the end of next month. But given that the new format is, you know, somewhat different from the present site and that we've got a substantial quantity of new content prior to going live we're planning on an internal ICANN staff review and we're also expecting to provide an opportunity for all of you as well as leaders of the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies to review the new site before it goes live.

So the purpose of this update was just to let you all know that around the second week of May you should expect to see a communication from us about a ten day or so review period.

And that communication is going to include the new data site link short presentation to guide you through the new site particularly the new site design and also for those of who we view as power users areas of interest that we want you to focus on and it will ask you, you know, to look at some specific areas you consider some specific issues about the new site.

And we'll also provide a feedback channel probably a new link or email address where you can send your comments to.

And so I just wanted to give you all the heads up that we were going to be doing that. Shortly after that review period concludes we'll take the new site live after making any corrections or anything like that.

And then once that new site is up as I reported in Costa Rica we'll then be able to move forward on the Web presence efforts for the individual's stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So please keep your eyes open for that communication. It will be coming in probably three or four weeks and we're very excited about the progress that we've made.

I'd like to express some special thanks to Berry Cobb for a tremendous amount of leadership and work that he's exercised on getting us to this phase of the project.

And that's all I have to say Jeff thanks.

Stéphane van Gelder: Rob thanks very much. I'm back. Once again and Jeff thanks for stepping in.

So with that thank you all for your participation in today's meeting. Sorry once again to Marika we will you will have priority at the next meeting and speak to you all very soon.

Thank you once again, thank you, bye.

END