

**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference  
16 May 2013 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 16 May 2013 at 18:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20130516-en.mp3>

on page :

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

The Adobe Chat transcript is also posted on this page and can be directly viewed at:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-16may13-en.pdf>

**List of attendees:** NCA – Non Voting – Jennifer Wolfe

**Contracted Parties House**

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Mason Cole, Yoav Keren, Volker Greimann

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jeff Neuman, Jonathan Robinson, Ching Chiao

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

**Non-Contracted Parties House**

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Zahid Jamil, John Berard, Osvaldo Novoa, Brian Winterfeldt, Petter Rindforth

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Maria Farrell, Joy Liddicoat, Wolfgang Kleinw chter, Magaly Pazello – absent proxy to Maria Farrell, Wendy Seltzer – absent proxy to Joy Liddicoat, David Cake – absent proxy to Wolfgang Kleinw chter,

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Lanre Ajayi

**GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:**

Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Han Chuan Lee– ccNSO Observer - absent

**ICANN Staff**

Margie Milam – Senior Director, Strategic Initiatives

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director

Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director

Barbara Roseman – Policy Director

Berry Cobb – Policy consultant

Brian Peck – Policy Director

Steve Sheng – Senior Technical Analyst, Policy

Carlos Reyes – Policy Analyst

Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst  
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat  
Alexander Kulik - Systems Engineer

David Olive - VP Policy Development - Apologies

Guest: Naela Sarras- Manager IDN TLDs

Glen de Saint Géry: (Rebecca), will you tell us when the recording is connected?

Coordinator: Yes. Today's conference is being recorded, if anyone has any objections you may disconnect at this time. Please continue to hold; the conference will begin shortly.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Operator. Thank you, Glen and hello everyone in the various time zones. It's Jonathan Robinson for the record. And this is the GNSO Council meeting of the 16th of May, 2013.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Welcome everyone to the call. We have an agenda in place and so to kick things off Item 1 is our administrative matters. And we'll start off with a roll call which I'm sure Glen will take for us. Over to you, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Jonathan. I will do that. Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Mason.

Mason Cole: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yoav Keren.

Yoav Keren: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: Present. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thomas Rickert - has just joined the call.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Zahid Jamil.

Zahid Jamil: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: John Berard.

John Berard: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Brian Winterfeldt. I don't think he's joined the call yet.

Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Maria Farrell.

Maria Farrell: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wendy Seltzer is absent and has given her proxy to Joy Liddicoat.

David Cake is absent and has given his proxy to Wolfgang Kleinwachter. And Magaly Pazello is absent and has given her proxy to Maria Farrell. All the proxies have come through in good order to the Council list.

Joy Liddicoat.

Joy Liddicoat: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: And we have Brian Winterfeldt who's just joined the call too.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Lanre Ajayi.

Lanre Ajayi: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jennifer Wolfe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Han Chuan Lee I don't see on the call. And for staff, David Olive has sent his apologies; he cannot be on the call today. Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Margie Milam, Barbara Roseman, Lars Hoffman, Alexander Kulik, Berry Cobb, Brian Peck and we will be joined by our presenter, Naela Sarras.

Have I missed - Rob Hogarth, sorry, I've just seen you've joined, Rob.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Sheng: ...this is Steve Sheng.

Glen de Saint Géry: Ah, Steve. Thank you very much. So I think that's all. Thank you.  
Over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Glen. And welcome to everyone, councilors, staff, to this call. First thing we would like - we should call for is under Item 1.2 a Statement of Interest update. We haven't seen anything to the list but

if I could hear, for a moment, I'll pause to hear if there are any updates that anyone on the Council would like to make.

Hearing none I'll move on to Item 1.3, which is our opportunity to review or amend the agenda. Are there any comments or issues anyone wants to raise in respect to the agenda? Thank you. So we'll take the agenda as is.

One point four we note the status of the minutes for the previous Council meeting; that was our meeting in Beijing. And then we move on to review the projects list and actions list.

Actually these are both really covered under Item 2 which I personally, and I hope other councilors will agree, has been very helpful having this action list as a shorthand checklist for things we agree to do. It's been effective for me certainly has a management tool and I hope it's useful for all of you.

Like I said, you know, I'd encourage everyone to keep on top of this as much as possible. The projects list can be a little daunting; it's many, many pages as I found out when I printed it out earlier this week. But it's much easier at least to just quickly review the actions list.

So running over that we've been relatively productive I think. We've managed to settle on the language or - well working through it from the top down we'll come on to the IDN issue which staff proposed sending of a letter to the Board. And I think we'll come under that on a more substantial topic.

One of the areas we committed to do, I believe, in Beijing, was to write to the Expert Working Group on Directory Services headed by Jean-Francois Baril looking for confirmation that this was in no way working outside of the PDP process. So that is the one key item from Beijing that's still outstanding but I intend to pick that up and I'll sort that out in the next few days.

Wolf-Ulrich has got on with the Durban meeting planning and you'll hear more about that in this meeting.

We did talk about forming a group to look at - to start to anticipate what form the GNSO review might take place, how that might take place. And I think some of the key input we took there was from Bruce Tonkin's suggestion that we take initiative and think about some form of self review so there's some more work still to be done there.

We've closed off the item on GNSO motions and which is about a deadline and that's been completed and now posted for public comment. We've sent a letter out on the community working groups. We've written a letter on consumer metrics. We've communicated our intent out to other - to SOs and ACs and a team of volunteers is starting to come together on the issue of policy versus implementation.

The proxy and privacy work is likely to be delayed a little bit from our original deadline and we - staff are working, I know, in the background on a briefing paper on this - on the back of the now agreed - on the RAA - on the latest form of the RAA.

And then the request for input on IDNs is really part of that more substantial topic we'll come to later in the meeting. So I think we've

done reasonably well. Please keep an eye on that action list and if it does impact you at all or if you have any views on items we're working on I'd appreciate your input.

You will have seen that on the project list Glen circulated, and our collective apologies for that being only on the day today, but a redline and clean copy of an updated version of the project list. So let me pause a moment here and just hear if there are any comments or input on any of those items either the current activity on the action list and/or the project list.

John Berard, I see your hand is up. John.

John Berard: Thanks, Jonathan. I just wanted to let people know that the line of communication for a revitalized ccNSO Council, GNSO Council meeting for Durban is open. I forwarded a note two days ago based upon the meeting - the most recent meeting of the ccNSO Council.

My suggestion or request is that if you have suggestions for items that ought to be - could be discussed at the meeting in Durban if you would just forward them to Petter and to me we're the two people who are working with Roelof and Mary on the ccNSO Council. So thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. Appreciate your updates there. And can you just remind us who's on that group because - so that everyone's aware? I mean, I think it's two members of the ccNSO Council and two from the GNSO, is that right?

John Berard: That's correct. So it's Roelof - to tell you the truth I forget his last name - Meijer maybe?

Jonathan Robinson: Meijer.

John Berard: And Mary Wong who's the Nominating Committee Appointee to the ccNSO and it's Petter and I for the GNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. And I know we - that's something we've grappled with to try and make as productive and as focused as possible. So doing the preparatory work - and I think hopefully what that will also produce is people - councilors willing to talk to or lead particular topics by the time we get around to Durban and being well prepared for that should improve the productivity and feel of the meeting so thanks, John.

Any other comments or input on items that we've covered on the action items or projects list? All right well we'll close off that Item 2 then with that covered off and move straight on into - well there is nothing on the Consent Agenda this time so really we move straight into Item 4 which is our first of three motions that we'll be considering today - at today's meeting.

And the first one is to address the final issue report on the Uniformity of Reporting and the purpose of which is to form a working group - a non-PDP working group to consider additional methods for collecting metrics.

So I think we may as well proceed to the reading of the motion. Wolf-Ulrich, if you could be so kind as the maker of the motion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you very much, Jonathan. Well, as you explained the motion is based on a report of the former group called Registration

Abuse Policies Working Group and if - at least some of you can recall that this group came up with a series of items which have been worked on in the past already and this is one item which is still ongoing.

We had this discussion on Council I think last year because it was almost coming to an end but it was revitalized as well because it was seen as important with regards to facilitating the reporting.

So I wonder whether I should read all the others as well. What do you think, Jonathan? Because that was, you know, just I summarized, you know, the - what was happening in the past. I can do so, no problem, but...

Jonathan Robinson: You mean is it necessary to go through all the whereas clauses?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: I don't think so.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh I think - I suspect you can shortcut that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, okay. I will just read the very last whereas, that means the GNSO Council because there was a last action. "The GNSO Council has reviewed the final issue report of this Registration Abuse Policies Working Group and supports the staff recommendation to not initiate a policy development process at this stage but to wait the completion of the ICANN contractual compliance three-year plan."

And then, "Resolved the GNSO Council does not initiate a policy development process at this stage but will review at the completion of the ICANN contractual compliance three-year plan expected for - so the 1st December, 2013 whether additional action is required.

And then I read the friendly amendment because I accepted it as a friendly amendment. "Resolved, the GNSO Council further approves the creation of a drafting team to develop a charter for a non-PDP working group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from contracted parties and other external resources to aid the investigation."

So that's the motion about. And as you said it is about for helping to develop a drafting team for a charter.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And in order for the motion to pass we need a simple majority of votes as you'll see from 4.3 both the Contracted Parties House and the Non Contracted Parties House. However before putting the motion to the vote I'd like to call for any discussion if any councilors would like to make any remarks or comment or discuss any elements of this.

Hearing none I suggest we put it straight to the vote then. And, Glen, if I could ask you to poll the councilors for their votes please?

Glen de Saint Géry: Certainly, Jonathan. Yoav Keren.

Yoav Keren: In favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: In favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: Maria Farrell for Magaly Pazello.

Maria Farrell: In favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, in favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Mason Cole.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Joy Liddicoat for Wendy Seltzer.

Joy Liddicoat: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wolfgang Kleinwachter.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: David Cake - Wolfgang Kleinwachter for David Cake please?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Zahid Jamil.

Zahid Jamil: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Yes, in favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: Lanre Ajayi.

Lanre Ajayi: In favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Absolutely.

Glen de Saint Géry: Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: (Unintelligible) no doubt about it, I am for it.

Glen de Saint Géry: Pardon?

Volker Greimann: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Maria Farrell.

Maria Farrell: I'm in favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Joy Liddicoat.

Joy Liddicoat: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: John Berard.

John Berard: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: The motion passes - sorry, Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Have I called everyone? Yes, the motion passes unanimously,  
Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. Thanks, everyone. I know some of you feel it's a little tedious to go through it but it at least guarantees that we make sure we hear everyone vote rather than a voice vote, which I think can be a little confusing on the telephone; it's slightly easier in person.

Item 5 is the next motion of three so two out of three. Again proposed by Wolf-Ulrich Knochen to adopt the revised PDP manual incorporating the modifications to include the suspension of a PDP, which was something that was put through the Standing Committee on Improvements and has been through the appropriate process.

So I think it would be - I believe we have a second. Zahid, if you could just confirm if you are seconding the motion before we proceed to read the motion.

Zahid Jamil: Confirmed.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Zahid. Wolf-Ulrich, if you could proceed to propose the motion and then we'll take it to a discussion and vote.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. So in this case, thank you, Jonathan, I'll read the whereas because it shows what it was in the past and then maybe not all of us are aware of that. But it is related - the motion is related to the PDP manual, as is that. And there is one, let me say, one slight part of this PDP which is - which is related to so-called suspension.

We had a, already in the PDP, a - how to say that - to terminate a PDP - termination of a PDP by the case of suspension was not covered in that manual and that is related to this.

So, "Whereas having encountered the need to suspend a policy development process for a limited amount of time the GNSO Council realized that currently the PDP manual does not contain a specific provision on how to deal with that situation."

"The GNSO Council requested the Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation to review whether there should be a modification to the GNSO PDP manual to address the possible suspension of a PDP following its initiation."

"The SCI deliberated on provisions for suspension of a PDP and reached consensus on proposed modifications to be incorporated in Section 15 of the GNSO PDP manual which also is included as Annex 2 in the GNSO Council Operating Procedures."

"The revised PDP manual, including the proposed provisions for suspension of a PDP, was put out for a minimum 20 - of 21-day public comment period on the 6 March, 2013 ending on 6 April as required by the ICANN bylaws."

"And as a result of the public comment period no further changes were deemed necessary by the SCI. Now therefore be it resolved the GNSO Council adopts the revised PDP manual including the providing for the suspension of a PDP," see and link is provided.

"The GNSO council instructs ICANN staff to post the new version of the PDP manual and to include it as a revised Annex 2 in the GNSO Operating Procedures effective immediately upon adoption."

So that's the motion.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. I say - I suspect this is a relatively uncontroversial topic but nevertheless would like to offer any discussion or comment on the motion. Does anyone have any comment or discussion they would like to make on this motion?

Hearing none I will then ask if anyone is opposed to the motion? So I'm asking if we can potentially deal with this via a voice vote. If - can I just hear if any one of the councilors is opposed to the motion as it is formed and proposed?

Hearing none, can I ask if anyone would like to abstain from the motion? Hearing none, I will ask for everyone to give a - I will take it that the motion is therefore supported unanimously. And, Glen, if you could record that please.

Glen de Saint G ry: I'll do that, Jonathan. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much, everyone. Item 6 is the third of the motions we'll consider this evening - or evening in my time - and that is the initiation of a PDP on the translation and transliteration of contact information.

This - we have the final issue report, which the Council has seen and on the back of the recommendations that we should initiate a PDP. There was some discussion about whether we hold off for the output of the Expert Working Group but as I understand it we now intend to not let that delay our work at all and we propose to go ahead and the motion is proposed by Ching and seconded by Zahid.

So, Ching, if you could make any comment you would like on this prior to reading the motion, please go ahead.

Ching Chiao: Jonathan, thanks. Actually you covered most of the main points I would like to raise so I'll pass but thanks for - thanks again for bringing that up.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, Ching. If you could then proceed to simply read the motion for us and then we'll move to discuss and vote on it.

Ching Chiao: Sure. So, Jonathan, would you like me to read the whereas clause or simply read the resolve clause?

Jonathan Robinson: I think in the - I mean, the motion is published in all of the appropriate forms. It's available in front of the councilors on the Adobe Connect so I think, Ching, it's expeditious to simply go to the resolve clause.

Ching Chiao: All right. Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Ching Chiao: Thanks. So, "Resolved the GNSO initiates a PDP on the issues defined in the final report - final issue report, see link, on the translation and transliteration of contact information. And a working group will be created for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements of the PDP. And the GNSO requests staff to commission a study on the commercial feasibility of translation or transliteration systems for internationalized contact data which is expected to help inform the PDP working group in its deliberations."

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. And I know when we have discussed this in the past the view is that this is a relevant and important topic almost regardless of the forms or format of contact data in the future. So this work we anticipate and expect should survive changes or any prospective or potential changes to the format of contact data in the future.

So I see Petter, you would like to make a point. Please go ahead and do so as part of the discussion on this motion.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Well I went from being - it was ultimately recommended that the GNSO Council should delay a formal PDP on this issue until after the deliberations of the Expert Working Group. And this motion appears to disregard that recommendation and (unintelligible) the PDP prior to the conclusion of the Expert Group.

So I would say that to launch the PDP now will waste the time and energy of volunteers and undermine what the Board seems to be trying to achieve in packing in all these reform efforts through the output of the Expert Working Group.

So I'm not prepared to take the decision today. I request deferral.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Petter. Is there - in anyone - I see both Joy and Julie's hand up. Is anyone wanting to respond directly to Petter's point? I'm tempted to defer to Julie in case you have an explanation or any input on that before taking up the queue with Joy and Lanre. So, Julie, if you could give any input or information on this in anticipating that this might inform the discussion.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. This is Julie Hedlund. And I can address the question from Petter. And in fact this question also was raised in Beijing. While staff were in Beijing staff did have discussions with members of the Expert Working Group and also with Steve Crocker on the Board, who is also working with the Expert Working Group.

And what they indicated was that they anticipated that their work was going to take quite a bit longer than staff had anticipated at the time staff wrote the final issue report. And in fact the Expert Working Group

has indicated that they would find it extremely helpful to have the results of the work of this PDP available to them as they deliberate.

So actually the opposite of what staff had originally anticipated back when the final issue report was written. So that is why in Beijing staff suggested that the Council could consider initiating the PDP without a delay. And that was why staff worked with Ching to revise the motion to indicate that the PDP would be initiated without delay because staff anticipated that the information coming out of this PDP would indeed be quite helpful to the Expert Working Group.

Jonathan Robinson: So thank you very much for that additional input, Julie. We obviously have Petter's request for a deferral which in any event should not curve the discussion and so I'd like to proceed with the discussion and then ultimately refer back to Petter to see if that has influenced his request. But let's first of all proceed with Joy, Lanre and Ching in that order. So over to you, Joy.

Joy Liddicoat: Thank you, Jonathan and thank you, Ching, for your introduction. We had discussed this motion in the NCSG Policy committee and we likewise were of the view that the motion should be - not brought forward until the Expert Working Group work has been done.

To be honest it troubles me to think that the Expert Working Group thinks that their job will take longer. It troubles me in the same (set) if there are issues that, you know, they are concerned will need more time and take - and maybe more complex than have been cautious about a policy development process which didn't have the benefit of their input and their expertise.

So, you know, I'm inclined to support - we weren't proposing a deferral; we weren't anticipating there would be a deferral. We were rather thinking that the PDP itself should just simply be delayed until after the Expert Working Group has completed its work.

I'm not clear from what you've said, Julie, whether they have a timeframe in mind for their work or not; if you could clarify that that would be helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Joy. I think Julie's responding immediately to that so, Ching, if you'll forgive me bypassing you for a moment while we just hear Julie's response on Joy's direct question.

Julie Hedlund: Hello, Joy. Yes, this is Julie Hedlund. And the Expert Working Group, I think, had - and I cannot speak for them but I know that the information that they have on their Webpage indicated - and based on the Board's direction - that they would come out perhaps with some recommendation in May.

And I should clarify though that when I spoke of the Expert Working Group taking longer what I was referring to was not so much that the Expert Working Group - and I think I misspoke here - was saying that they needed more time but that when staff originally drafted this final issue report the staff was anticipating that the Expert Working Group would be complete with its work prior to - perhaps prior to the formation of a PDP on this issue.

Given the timing of this particular motion and the fact that it was first going to be considered in Beijing and then was deferred to this meeting now this work, you know, what I want to say is that the Expert Working

Group is doing its work but based on discussions in Beijing it looked as though it would be quite useful if both of these groups worked in parallel and could share information. Perhaps that's a little bit more clarifying.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Julie. Let's hear from you, Ching. Sorry, I've got Lanre ahead of you. I'm sorry, Lanre.

((Crosstalk))

Lanre Ajayi: Yeah, thank you, Jonathan. The outcome of this (unintelligible) and I believe (unintelligible) work of the Expert Working Group (unintelligible) the notion that (unintelligible) because this work is going to be useful for the Expert Working Group and is going to be useful for the (unintelligible) that followed the work of the Expert Working Group.

Jonathan Robinson: Lanre, the audio was pretty poor there. I'm not sure how it came across for others but I will try and summarize what I think I heard you say and I'd appreciate you confirming that.

I know you are a member on the Expert Working Group. I believe that my recollection is correct there. And what I think I heard you saying was you feel that the motion should be supported because the work is relevant in any event and will be - will work in parallel with the Expert Working Group. I hope I'm sort of summarizing that accurately but I really did struggle to hear.

Lanre Ajayi: Yeah, that's correct, Jonathan. In addition to that I say that even after the Expert Working Group completes its assignment that the (unintelligible) subjected to PDP process. This (body) is still going to be

relevant whenever that - another working group is working on this -  
outcome of the Expert Working Group job. I don't know if that was  
clear?

Jonathan Robinson: That's...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...a second point, Lanre, and that is that - that was the issue, in fact,  
I think that's really the substance of the letter we were planning to send  
to the Expert Working Group is confirming that this in no way was work  
being undertaken intended to bypass the work outside of, ultimately,  
the PDP process.

Lanre Ajayi: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Ching has been patient and I see Margie's hand has come  
up so I think we'll go to Ching, then to Margie and then to Petter.

Ching Chiao: Thanks, Jonathan. I think also thanks to Julie who's actually covered  
most of the point. I'd just like to raise two things here. First of all is the  
discussion of whether we should continue to move on the path of the  
PDP for this recommendation to from the final issue - the IRT final  
issue report.

This path we have already discussed in Beijing or even if I recall  
correctly in prior to Beijing in the Council call. We have sort of gone  
through whether we should wait for the outcome of the Expert Working  
Group. So I personally raised the same concern two meetings ago and

then in Beijing. We still haven't heard the Expert Working Group, their timeline and their process.

But after the discussion with the staff and understanding the staff and the working group their needs and the requirement of this working group being set up, the PDP to be moved forward in order to help them to complete their job. I think this is kind of (still) for the Council level. They need us to kind of - to initiate this PDP and the working group to help this work done.

And this goes to - this also leads to my second point is that I think the overall IDN program - I'm sorry, the IDN gTLD delegation is on the way. I know there is still several quote unquote missing pieces. There's several items on what I call the last mile of the IDN gTLD delegation still not there yet.

But one main item is definitely this - the outcome of this working group will definitely impact on the appropriate rollout - just let me put it this way - rollout of the IDN gTLD. So I would encourage others, especially Petter and Joy, your reconsideration of, you know, still help this motion to be put forward so the staff and the team can continue to work on the necessary requirement or the data collection for the Expert Working Group. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. And just to be very clear what we've heard so far.

We've heard discussions about whether or not this work should go ahead in parallel with and whether in any way it contradicts or shouldn't go ahead alongside the work of the working group.

But the key point from Joy was, I think, I heard an indication that her intention coming in to the meeting was to vote against the motion obviously prior to hearing this discussion. And that was what her prior discussion had covered and that Petter was proposing to defer.

So currently that is likely outcome but I think we should continue the discussion for the meantime and just hear from anyone else who has their hand up, which I've currently got Margie, Petter and then Jeff. Over to you, Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you. A couple points I wanted to raise that this issue of translation and transliteration is also directly associated with the Whois Review Team recommendations that were adopted by the Board.

And so as staff is in this parallel track of doing the implementation on the Whois Review Team recommendations and then separately supporting the Expert Working Group analysis of what may be the future generation of data directory services, the work of this PDP would be very helpful for staff.

Because part of what we need to do in implementing the Whois Review Team recommendations based on the current policy is to deal with the IDN issue. So I just want to echo everything that Ching had said and just raise that for Council's awareness.

And then with the respect to the Expert Working Group output they're looking at issues at a very high level. And really the detail involved and level of expertise for IDN issues is something that I don't anticipate them getting to very early in their process.

And even the timelines that Julie had mentioned as of May those have been extended. We have meetings set up for next week. We're hoping to have something to discuss in Beijing but it's certainly not - not Beijing - Durban - it's certainly not going to be anything related to IDNs because that's just - they're just not there in their deliberation.

So just to echo everything that was said by Julie and by Ching, having input from the community of, you know, the GNSO and the experts that know about this would be very helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Margie. Petter, I have you next and then Jeff.

Petter Rindforth: (Unintelligible) input just shortly wanted to say that I - we have an Expert Working Group and although I'm convinced that they know that they can't work slowly and that we have a certain time limit. So I just wanted to say that I have not been convinced by your others comments and I still request a deferral.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Petter. Over to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks, Jonathan. I'm not going to comment; every constituency has a right to a deferral so I'm not going to comment on that. But I'm a little surprised here and I think we're kind of - what's the word for it - we're - I'm just a little baffled by the discussion because for the last several meetings a number of us have been saying we're tired of things being done top down; we're tired of ICANN staff, you know, coming up with policies and we should only be working on implementation.

And yet now I'm hearing that a number of us are okay with the concept of leaving things to an Expert Working Group to determine. That to me seems kind of the antithesis of what we've been arguing for a number of months. So from my standpoint, you know, we never commissioned this Expert Working Group, it's not an Expert Working Group for the GNSO. It was commissioned by the ICANN CEO and that's great; they can do that.

But I don't think we should be deferring to any kind of non-policy making body to determine our policy. It goes against the whole bottom up model. And judging from the comments that were received to the GAC advice and others, you know, although unrelated, it's related in the sense of the GNSO is a policy making organization. So the whole concept to me of deferring to an Expert Working Group is just kind of crazy.

The second point I want to make is this is an Expert Working Group but they're not really experts in IDNs. In fact I don't know anyone on the Expert Working Group that has expertise in IDN issues. And it kind of tags along with what Ching and even Margie was saying about they're going to look to us, the people that have expertise in this area, to help provide them the data.

And so relying on this Expert Working Group again is just crazy. It goes against what we've been arguing. Again I'm not going to argue against the deferral because we (unintelligible) the deferrals. But I strongly suggest that everyone go back to their groups, discuss this issue and really reaffirm the GNSO's role in policy development.  
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jeff. I must say I'm trying to think about my perspective on this as both a chair and as sort of individually as a councilor. I think, at a personal level, I mean, looking at this it seems to be - the substance of the motion and the intended work coming out of it appears to me to be fairly universally useful.

This is about transliteration and - translation and transliteration of contact information. So my perspective is it seems to be a useful piece of work and a helpful piece of work. If I take that personal perspective and then apply that as Chair of the Council I'm concerned that the Council should be doing useful and effective work. And so for that reason I'm attracted to doing it.

None of this speaks, as you rightly pointed out, to a willingness or not to grant a deferral. If a deferral is required to have further discussions in the groups on this then so be it. But those are my - that's my personal perspective.

I see we've got Joy and Thomas wanting to come up with some additional points so let's hear from Joy and then Thomas.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Jonathan. And I just want to clarify that I didn't actually say, when I spoke earlier, that we were intending to vote against it. I think that what we were proposing to do was to ask questions about whether it should be delayed.

And, Jeff, just to pick up on your point, the concern I think in the NCUC policy discussion wasn't about policy making roles or the, you know, the fundamental philosophical point about deferring to expert working groups but it's just really purely a calibration issue.

You know, given staff resources and priorities whether or not, you know, we might be heading for a track where, you know, we begin the PDP process and then we end up somewhere down the track with calibration issues that the Expert Working Group has (meta) recommendations about things, you know, and so on and so forth.

So it was really more of that flavor antenna. And as I say I'm not either speaking to the deferral request. And I'm pleased to hear the responses from Ching and from others. And we're certainly happy to keep thinking about it. And that's why we wanted to have a discussion about the rationale for doing this outside the Expert Working Group. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Joy. And thanks to the others for the quality of the discussion on this. It is useful and it's the kind of thing we should be doing is talking through it properly. So let's hear from you, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And I just wanted to make a quick point that in addition to what Jeff said on top down versus community work - and I've written the comment to that in the Chat, in the Adobe Connect - I wanted to say that at times we've been criticized for taking too much time to do community work, to do PDP work.

And I just want to point your attention to the PDP principles or the PDP manual, which would allow us for the suspension and the termination of the PDP should we find out during its work that it's irrelevant. And I guess that these tweaks to the procedural documents have been made in order to avoid the Council and the GNSO community as such

spending time and efforts on work the outcome of which might be redundant or outdated.

So we do have the technical tools to put things on hold or even to stop the work. However, in this particular case, what we see is that it can't be expected that the work is redundant because the Expert Working Group itself has given us reassurance that they are eagerly waiting for the PDP Working Group to start its work and provide input.

So I fail to understand why we should hold up the train and certainly it is perfectly in each and every councilor's discretion to ask for a deferral. But I would like to understand why a deferral is linked to understanding or to being convinced that work is valuable or not in the case where the value of the work has even been confirmed by a concerned party. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got Jeff in the queue next off. Thomas, and thanks for those points. Thomas, I should just say that a deferral is something which is customarily granted and the - and it is ultimately in the discretion of the chair but it is generally on the understanding that a requirement for further discussion is required. So that's sort of principles on which we would normally customarily support or undertake a deferral of a motion. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. And I think just kind of to agree with that and just to ask that those that were implying that this meeting to vote against it - and, Joy, I heard what you said about resources, I would just ask that you - if you could go back to the group, explain to them what Margie has said and others about the Expert Working Group actually trying to rely on us for that work because they don't have the expertise that may -

that may change the mind of the people within the NCSG in starting this. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jeff. I think we can wrap this up now. I mean, my perspective is that we've heard some good and, as a chair, my perspective is that we've heard some good and useful discussion in and around both the content of the motion and its relative position to that of the work of the Expert Working Group.

Personally, I am - my thought is both at a personal level that - and I would like us to get on with this as quickly as possible. As a chair I'm mindful of our reputation as a Council to continue to do work and to get things done. But nevertheless I'm also mindful of our principle of accepting a request for a deferral in order to make sure that our groups, and that is mindful of the bottom up process, have the opportunity to thoroughly and properly discuss these things.

So prior to accepting that I'll just ask for a final confirmation with everything that you've heard, Petter, that you would still like to request a deferral and if so we should do that and bring this motion back to the Council for the next time. So, Petter, if you could just confirm that that request still stands?

Petter Rindforth: I confirm.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Petter. So we will defer this motion until our next meeting. And thank you all again for a useful and thorough discussion on the substance and content of the motion.

Joy, I see your hand is up still so just to make sure we don't close you out if there was something you still wanted to say.

Joy Liddicoat: Yes, I just had a point of order. I believe there was a request from Thomas for a further explanation from Petter in light of the discussion we've had about the rationale for deferral in particular there was a response from staff that the Expert - and I believe Jeff also made the point that the Expert Working Group won't actually be touching on some of the specific issues in the proposed PDP scope.

And so I think it would be helpful before we move on to understand whether or not - what the request for deferral relates to in light of the discussion. And then I think you should consider whether or not to exercise your discretion to accept it. So I think if Petter could reply I think that would help...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...that's a fair point. And to - as I said it's typically, although not absolutely universally the principle of the deferral is to provide for the groups to have more discussion on something like this. So, Petter, it would be helpful then to respond to Joy's request if you could please as to the sort of motivation for the request for the deferral.

And actually, I guess, it would be useful to know in that context if that's yourself or in your position as a representative of the IPC, yourself as a Council representative of IPC. So, Petter, if you could give us some indication of the motivation that will be helpful.

Petter Rindforth: Well first of all it's not my personal view and for the IPC. And but talking about the importance of making decisions as fast as possible I certainly does not disagree with that. But that doesn't mean that you should make pre-decisions when we in fact have a working group that deals with this.

So from my personal point of view - and, I mean, this is not a no; it's a deferral. So giving (both) these groups more time to work with this and come up with good suggestions.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, Petter. Well, I think if you could be mindful of the discussion that's taken place and recognize that there has been some strong motivations for why this work should continue in parallel. And if you could take that back to the IPC and to discuss that with them and be mindful of that when you come back I think we should respect the requirement to discuss this further and accept the deferral.

But like I say, mindful of the arguments that have been presented here as to why this work is both necessary and separate to that of the Expert Working Group.

Jonathan Robinson: Brian.

Brian Winterfeldt: Yeah. Well, hi, this is Brian Winterfeldt for the IPC. I just wanted to, you know, just confirm that that's exactly why we're making the deferral is to give us an opportunity to go back to the IPC and explain to them the conversation and information that we gathered from staff and other members of the Council on the call today. And we look forward to coming prepared to discuss and vote on the motion next month.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Brian. I think we'll also look forward to that then.

Appreciate you coming in with that point. All right so I think we will, as is customary, defer the motion based on the request from Petter and the IPC and move on to the next item.

So Item 7 is a - is in some ways connected by the issue of IDNs and is an opportunity to hear more on the report of - on the implications of active variant TLDs. And we're going to have some input from Naela Sarras as the starting point on the report. So, Naela, I believe you are online and available to provide this input as part of this topic. So, welcome, and over to you.

Naela Sarras: Thank you. This is Naela Sarras with staff. Thank you for giving us time on your call here to speak about the report.

So this is, here, a very short brief introduction to what this report is about specifically about the use of experience - focused on the user experience implications when activating IDN variants.

I should mention that this report or this study is part of multiple - is part of a (unintelligible) program that's currently undertaking - currently taking place at ICANN called the IDN Variant Issues Program.

And this program is in its third year of operation right now. It's operated several projects that are trying to understand the issues with identifying and delegating variants. This one is focused on the user experience. And it was released - completed in March 2013.

Marika, it doesn't seem to let me go to the next - oh, I got it, sorry. Okay so the scope of this study here is focused, as I said, on the small

section of IDN labels that have variants in them. So this is not on - it touches on IDNs in general but specifically we're talking about what happens when we activate variants.

It does take into consideration variants at the second level even though it's focused on the top level. It does talk about implications at the second level - second level and beyond. And then it's really mainly focused on user expectations. And this tries - we'll go on to that in a second - it tries to balance between security and stability versus user expectations.

Some of the inputs that were taken into account as this study was developed is the existing variant experiences at the second level that exist today. I believe for this data a number of ccTLDs that are currently offering IDNs, as you know, the ccTLDs have already been delegated IDNs. So a number of ccTLDs were contacted and they provided information about their experience in how they're managing IDNs at the second level.

So I won't go into details here because we do want to get to the point for the discussion. But it does talk about several aspects of managing the IDNs and then how it's handled. You will see the - it's not consistent - there is variation from one TLD to another in how IDNs are handled.

In order to - in order to focus the balance between user expectations and security and stability there were seven guiding principles that were accepted as basically guiding principles going into the study.

I'll just (unintelligible) here very briefly first one we call (minimality). (Minimality) here is talking about making the least amount of changes to the DNS with the introduction over the delegation of variants.

Security is the - we must minimize any risks introduced to the DNS by adding variants. Equivalency talks about reducing basically confusion to the user and directing users to related content managed by the same entity. If - when variants are delegated.

For the stability talks to the - that variants should behave and function as users expecting - expect them to. Consistency between - is another guiding principle here- consistency between the variants themselves and across TLDs that are supporting variants.

Manageability that the variants should be straightforward to visualize and administer to the - with supporting technology. And then at the end one last principle is the ease of use is that they should be easy to understand, manage for existing and new users.

So from these principles these basically were the guiding principles going into the study. The users - the user roles that were considered coming into the study were the end users themselves; those who are actually using the variants once delegated.

The registration users/managers those are managing the use so this includes the registrants, registrars, registries. And then the technical community those are dealing with actual - the back end, the configuring, the using of the variants. So this - when we - these users will come across - will, again, be impacted later when we talk about the recommendations coming out of this study.

So the issues that were discussed here were the use of variants, registration management and the configuration. So it's really focused on these specific categories that I wanted to talk about. And I'll go ahead and go into that.

Based on that there were several recommendations that were developed. And the reason why we're bringing this to your attention is that these recommendations touch on more than just a report to ICANN for recommendations to implement to improve the user experience when using variants.

The recommendations for ICANN, for the registries, for the registrars and the technical community. For - in the interest of time we won't go through all the recommendations; I'll touch on just highlights about some of these recommendations.

But one thing to remember here when you look at the report - I provided the link at the beginning - that these recommendations use language such as must, may - must, should and may.

And so some of them are worded pretty strongly that it very well could be picked up or if they were to be implemented under the must category they have some impact on the - on ICANN registries and registrars and that's why we were seeking further input on them.

So to give you a highlight about what some of these recommendations are one of them is a recommendation to ICANN to implement a well-defined and conservative variant TLD allocation process.

So here is to - to define the process for how variants are allocated, that it's not automatic that a variant TLD associated with a primary string that comes is - it's not automatic that it's approved. There should be a clear demonstration of why this variant is needed.

The variants should always be delegated to the same entity to minimize confusion. And then any requirements that apply to the main or the primary TLD should also apply to the variant TLD.

Another recommendation also to ICANN is to maintain the LGR repository. Now the LGR here is the Label Generation Rule set. As part of the bigger variant program that we're studying here is creating a master table, if you will, that defines what code points are allowed in the root zone.

So one of the problems we are having today was variants aren't being considered in the current applications from IDNs that are coming in - that have come in - is that there is no authoritative way to decide what's a variant and what's not.

So another part of the program - of the variant program is studying - is developing tools of how to create that master IDN table, if you will, that define what's a variant and what's not. So the recommendation is for ICANN to maintain this Label Generation Rules repository and to make it available to users and programmatically (processable) meaning there should be tools to be able to import that data and use it. So that's another recommendation.

A third recommendation also to ICANN is to develop simple, minimal and consistent IDN LGRs for the root zone. Again, this is the master table of IDN - better IDN table that will be used as the root.

So several - so this table would function - would serve two functions. One is the - what characters are allowed in the root and then any character - any of those characters that have corresponding variants should also be listed in that IDN LGR for the root. So this would be the master IDN table that's used for the root zone as the - for the root zone as a registry.

Other recommendations - recommend registries to apply relevant subsets of IDN TLD LGR (unintelligible) lifecycle for variants justify any deviations. So this is where we start touching on - this is where we start touching on some of the requirements that are coming to more than just for ICANN to implement.

So a second level - again, Label Generation Rules or a second level IDN table that confirms with the root - with the root table and if there's any deviation between those two it should be defined and justified.

Pardon me here. Let me go to the next one. This is - here is a sample of recommendations that are for the registries to register any second level variant labels on approval requirement.

Here I won't go into the details of this but this is where we need the input so registration of variants is not automatic, initiated by the registrant variants with the help of (unintelligible) default. The variant is registered to the same registrant. And any requirements that are

imposed on the TLD - the primary TLD also apply on the variants as well.

Uh-oh. Are we still on the phone? Did we drop off?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Naela, we can hear you okay. I think - you've reached - just to encourage you to try and bring it to key questions if you want help from the Council in terms of where we go and next steps but we can hear you okay.

Naela Sarras: Okay. Okay so why don't I step quickly through the rest of them. I'm towards the end here. The last set of group of recommendations are to the technical community. And here again it's about developing the tools that allow easier and user friendly implementation of the variant TLDs. And again this is speaking about the tools, what routers, email clients, etcetera.

This is what we're coming here with. This is the development since our meeting in Beijing. The Board passed the resolution in Beijing asking that the interest of Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to provide input and guidance about the implementation of these recommendations. And this input is requested by the - by July 1, 2013 so in about a month and a half.

And we sent a letter to all the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and specifically here we're asking for specific input about for each of these recommendations when you look through the report is a number of recommendations.

Which of these - which of these recommendations are prerequisites for us to implement before IDN variant TLDs can be delegated. So we cannot proceed with IDN TLD delegations until both the recommendations are implemented.

Which of these recommendations, if any, can be deferred until a later time so we don't have to take them up right now; we can continue to work on the IDN TLD delegation work and defer the recommendations until a different time - a later time.

And which of these require further policy work? I think I said in one of the recommendations, for example, I'm just giving this one as an example. It requires the master IDN table that we're developing for the root to be used at second level.

So if that's a requirement that ICANN must impose on the registries then is this considered policy work that we need to defer until later or is this something that ICANN can go ahead and implement? And this is really where we need the most input from you at this point on these three questions.

And this is our suggestion for what input we need. You're welcome, of course, to give us any other input that you need to give us at this point. And this is where I'd like to start the discussion. I don't have any further slides.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Naela. So I think we should keep that slide up. And thank you for your presentation and for bringing it to a head as requested. And I think this is a - I've had a look at the report personally

beforehand and this is a complex and a 68-page thorough report on this work. And I think it's a challenge for some of us.

So let me hand over to Ching to see if he can give us some thoughts and guidance in particular on where we take this next. I know we have an outstanding item on sending a letter to the Board to highlight the issue more generally but also specifically in response to this question for recommendations by 1st of July. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan and thank you, Naela for the updates. I see some of your updates are actually providing some progress. After the Beijing meeting I have the chance just to chatted with other staff members such as Steve Sheng about the Board request on the future guidance. So this is your last slide on the input and guidance on the recommendations.

I have one comment and one question, in fact, so let me start with my comment. And also a kind of a trying to help the - my fellow councilors to trying to capture what is being updated this time in our meeting. We have seen a user experience report to address how a TLD registry to deal with potentially IDN variant issues.

So this report is actually coming from part of your work, kind of a overall IDN VIP Working Group. So this is part of the work we have seen in general six different languages or community, they have put together a kind of a integrated report saying that ICANN, as indicated in your slides, should maintain a Label Generation Rules, an LGR.

But still we have six different languages to maintain so basically what this overall concept to the Council and to the overall community that, I

mean, even though ICANN is trying to establish one rule, one LGR rule, but still there are six different languages so there's still six different user needs to be fulfilled and to be implemented.

So I just want to - and wish to highlight that point is that in your report you say you - in your first two or three slides you indicated that the variant experience for the Chinese communities are actually different than the variant experience in the Arabic community. So I want to - I wish to highlight that so that's my comment.

And my question actually is toward to this input and the guidance on the recommendations that the question is about we have - and actually the Board of ICANN actually commissioned this VIP team to produce sort of a way and implementation methods for the IDN gTLD variant delegation.

This is kind of a long process that has been initiated since last year in the Beijing meeting we have repeatedly question about how we can actually accelerate the process because it seems that we are dealing with a more pressing timeline for the IDN gTLD process.

And based on your slides it seems that we are witnessing different user experience or at least an interim of - at least in the interim there would be different user experiences created for IDN ccTLD and to the IDN gTLD.

So I was actually having this question is that is the Board still considering to change the time to timeline? And is this input in the guidance that the Board or the VIP team getting will help the VIP team to change the timeline actually to accelerate - so the whole process?

So that's my question. So let me stop here so others can weigh in.

Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got Yoav waiting to talk but, Naela, did you want to respond to Ching's question first?

Naela Sarras: Yes, if I may. So on the comment just to qualify - clarify Ching is absolutely right that the variant program commissioned six different community groups to do reports on variants in their script. So these are - these definitely went into the - what was - what he referred to as the integrated issues report which outlined all the issues that were common to the six different groups and then which ones were unique.

One clarification on the comment, Ching, is that in this solution or in this further steps that we are taking it's not just addressed what was brought up in the six different script reports. It's even further - more complex than that, right, because we still have to consider everyone in the world that is eventually may request a variant. So just to put that on line there.

And then for the question about - just as - there are several projects that are going on at the same time with variants. So this one here is asking - this one is about the user experience and is asking what to do with these recommendations, which of them to consider for immediate implementation.

At the same time we're not just doing this work, we're also - a second part of the Board resolution in Beijing was to go ahead and start implementing the LGR, the Label Generation Rules process. So at the

same time we're also starting the implementation of that process that will create the master repertoire for the root.

And that's what's going to give us the tools to be able to evaluate the variants. Without that we have no authoritative or no deterministic way to evaluate those IDN - IDN variants.

So what I wanted to just say there is that we - just because this request for input is out there and it says please give us your input by 1st of July doesn't mean we're just sitting and waiting until 1st of July. Just wanted to put that out there.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Naela. Yoav, did you want to come in now?

Yoav Keren: Yes. What I wanted to say is mainly stressed my feeling is that most of the work that was done until now was related to the TLD level. And my feeling is that confusion - user confusion is much higher at the second level. You had that slide covering second level and you went quickly over it. I wasn't able to get all - a full understanding of what is the recommendation.

But as much as I know there are different issues that are still not fully resolved and did not get, I would say, the different stakeholders' opinion on the issues including the issue that we raised in Beijing regarding TMCH. And we were in contact with Fadi and other in the team to have some kind of further discussion on that and also other issues that are relevant.

So I would just say in general that while a variant of gTLD cannot be delegated without real process performed by IANA and ICANN in that

respect that's not the same thing on the second level. And if we don't have a very concrete policy on how this will be taken care of in the second level there's going to be a huge confusion among users.

So I just wanted - I think we need to do as much as possible to expedite work on that and maybe even stress this in our letter to the Board. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, Ching, I see you've come back with a response so - or further comment so let's hear from you again and then I think we've got to think about - start to move this discussion on towards the next steps where we're going to take it.

Ching Chiao: Sure. Thanks, Jonathan. Actually a follow up point here. First of all I think for this particular subject since we are learning experiences from IDN ccTLDs and from the ccTLD community in general so my suggestion is that for future GNSO and ccNSO, I mean, interaction I would assume that this is certainly a high priority topic to be placed for - or to be utilized as one important discussion - one discussion topic.

My second point still I wish to go back to the - so just let me stop here so we will have time to work on the next item which is the IDN - I mean, IDN letter, which is my second question will be more actually relevant to that letter so let me stop here.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so, Ching, thanks. I mean, you've suggested that this is something which is a critical and relevant topic for our discussions with the ccNSO so that's easy to feed that into the group that's dealing with that.

In terms of the two issues under this broader Item 7 here, I mean, I think we've really got - we may as well move on to your letter to the Board. I'm not sure, I mean, we have the request from Naela and the group working on this to think carefully about which recommendations are prerequisites, which can be deferred and so on.

This is complex. And I sense that I certainly could speak for myself, I'm challenged to get my head around all of the issues here. And I sense that other councilors may battle. I'm just wondering where we take this in terms of next steps between now and the desired input on the 1st of July. But it is something we're going to have to seek the help of the interested and knowledgeable councilors on.

I suggest we move on to this Item 7.4 and take your update as to where we are on this letter with the Board because we agreed in Beijing that this was something which we wanted to highlight. And there's probably quite a few areas in and around, I mean, Yoav touched on some concerns which were raised in Beijing in and around the trademark clearinghouse, as well and how that was going.

So let's hear from you where you think we're at on that letter to the board and then take it from there, Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thanks, Jonathan. And thanks for putting this one on the agenda. So as you may recall in the Council wrap up session in Beijing we did have - and also in the working session in - over the weekend - we spent a tremendous amount of time talking about the IDN issues.

I know many of us do need time to digest and also to understand a relatively complicated technical-oriented topic like this. However for, I mean, for both commercial and for noncommercial, I mean, interest.

At the Council level we have addressed this item - the IDN gTLD or the IDN variant gTLD implementation or delegation issue is something that the Council should look into as part of the Council really also have the responsibility to help or to monitor the policy implementation process.

So taken from this angle at the Council level I tried to capture some of the high level items. First of all is definitely the - how the staff is going to implement in terms of the overall new gTLD operational transparency. This actually includes both the variant gTLD delegation process and also how the TMCH can handle IDN variants.

So we are looking - we are actually suggesting that the staff - whether the staff can provide, for example, I mean, regular updates like this or even a looking glass so - for the Council and for the community in general can understand timely about the gTLD delegation process.

So that's the first item. There could be some fine-tune on the - I mean, so, I mean, on the wording of the letter. But in principle we're actually requesting or look - or actually looking for this type of looking glass to ensure that we understand the - I mean, the process. So that's the first one.

So the second one we have talked about in the previous item is that we understand the IDN ccTLD is - they have the capacity or the capability of the variant. So the user can type in whether it's in the

original form or the variant form if the ccTLD operators does have the - I mean, the variant delegated.

So - but for gTLD is based on the IDN VIP Working Group timeline. We would have a open window which the IDN gTLD would have a kind of a incomplete product for the IDN registrant, which from the delegation is this year, from the delegation they would not be able to set up or to use IDN variants.

So whether we should provide or offer a practical advisory to assist the registrants so this is coming from a registrant protection and security point of view. We, as a Council, to request some advisory timely to address this issue.

And third, of course, is a kind of a relatively longer term issue is that we should be ready to provide some guidance. And actually since we are in the process of developing this IDN variant mechanism for the gTLD so which means that eventually the AGB needs to be updated just to make sure that the content is updated for the future round of the application.

So we urge the staff - I mean, the staff to start to look into what are the areas in the AGB should be updated. So those are the three main points at the Council level which we would like to send those points to the Board.

So my final point is that although the Council still keep an eye on this particular issues the Board has commissioned this IDN VIP Working Group which some of the members are actually paid consultants. So the community, I mean, if I can use this term, actually have the

expectation that the experts and the working group come up with a solution for the Board to consider and for the community to use.

So I would really hope that the team - actually the working group does not shift too much of their responsibility to actually to the volunteers. I would rather see them to propose and also timely propose appropriate solution to resolve this questions or to those items. I mean, so rather than, as I mentioned, shift those, I mean, responsibility to the community, actually so, I mean, community volunteers. So...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Ching, that's helpful.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: And that's good guidance. So I hope I'm not cutting you short here but I am aware - I'm mindful of the time and the time, both recognizing the importance of this topic but also the time we've spent on it. And what I'm also mindful of the fact that this letter, this draft, that's been sitting around for some time so I think, you know, I need to encourage you to work with me and to get this before the Council and polished up and finalize this letter to the Board.

It's a little shame that we haven't got it to the Board before their meetings this week I think which would have been optimal. But nevertheless I think we need to polish this up, make sure it's on the agenda.

And I think we're going to have to rely on you on ongoing basis and Yoav and others who have got both an active interest and knowledge, as I said, of this to keep us honest in keeping track of issues like

you've just highlighted, that is to say making sure that if there are professionals working on this that the work is done in the way that we might expect and so on.

Is there anything else, Ching, that you'd like to cover now? Because I think we've spent some time on it and, like I say, I'd like to polish up and finalize this letter, get the Council's support for it. Are there any other councilors would like to comment or, Ching, is there anything you would like to close on this?

Ching Chiao: Thanks, Jonathan. I just - one quick point is that I really actually thank you and - for - and also the staff to spend, I mean, a relatively longer time on discussion or addressing the IDN issues. I know I kind of (express) my concerns in - during the Beijing meeting about kind of the lack of interest from the Council or from other, I mean, members in the communities that chose to - this more technical - or (unintelligible) questions.

But I would hope that by adding more time, for example, this time, Item 6 and Number - and also this item we can kind of to help to (arise) some interest not only for, I mean, contractual parties but also for the user, I mean, perspective. This is something important that we as a Council should look into. And thanks again.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks, Ching. And I think that point was well made in Beijing and underlined here. Steve, I see you wanted to come in.

Steve Sheng: Yeah, thank you, Jonathan. I think, as Ching mentioned, this is a very important issue. And as a staff...

Jonathan Robinson: Steve, please speak closer to the microphone, it's difficult to hear you.

Steve Sheng: Yes. As a policy staff we're happy to take up this request for regular updates on the call you made that internally. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank, Steve. We appreciate that. And it's something where it is technical, it is complicated but Ching's point is well made, that is has both an end user impact as well as an impact on the whole program in the - for a variety of reasons.

I think we're going to have to bring the topic to a close and move on. But, Ching, as I said I'd like to emphasize that we need to get this letter polished up and organized and in shape to send to the Board. Don't hesitate to push me and seek input on a draft from the Council as a whole and then we'll get this - I'll give you my commitment to work with you on getting this sorted out.

All right the next item on our agenda is an update and seeking some councilor input on the agenda for Durban. We had some discussion in our wrap up session in Beijing about elements of the format and content of the presentations at - format of our meeting and content of the presentations went into that.

I know Wolf-Ulrich has taken some of that on board already in the thinking. So I think this is an area we'd like to take a little bit more input as we start to shape up the discussion. And actually there has also been a request that you'll be aware of for carving out some of our time which has become somewhat traditional of the weekend sessions.

We're carving out some of that weekend session time for activity in the groups and for the Council to curb its meeting time to some extent. And so let me leave it over to you, Wolf-Ulrich, to provide us with an update and hear some discussion on how we might shape and form the meeting in Durban. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Jonathan. Well I have provided to you this morning - or this morning European time - a short list of items which came to my mind. I put together as a first draft a set of items, well, for the Durban meeting.

Then I started to, you know, I started immediately after the Beijing meeting and sent out a request to the leaders of the stakeholder groups and constituencies and also of the working groups to - and asking for any input with regard to the format and to the content of the GNSO meeting and the Council meeting in Durban.

However, so I got two replies for that but not content related just format related. One was that was replied was referring to what we have discussed already in the wrap up meeting with regards to the presentations to be given during the GNSO meetings that they should be - not to consume too much time for the presentation itself rather than to give more room for the discussion and to go more to the substance rather than to the general input.

And then the other request was what was, Jonathan, was mentioning was a request from the CSG with regards to giving some space during the weekend meeting to the stakeholder group or constituencies to convene themselves without interleaving or overlapping with the GNSO - the general GNSO meetings.

So these are the two replies I got. I didn't get any reply with regards to requests for specific content of the meetings. So what I put together in the list is then something which you know from the formal list here you can see topics which we have already had in formal meetings but which come again and again and they have to be filled up with content.

And I categorized - I try to categorize a little bit in - four categories in general; cross community items, working groups related items and then add-on specific items related.

So that is where I am at the time being, just the preparation of the agenda of the Durban meeting. And the plan is then, well, just to discuss it right today and give some time, well, to you and your related stakeholder groups to react on that coming back and then, well, draft it as it used to be in the past and also format it in a time schedule.

I think that's, so far, for me, Jonathan. Are you going to lead the discussion about the question of the CSG then?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, Wolf. Thanks very much. Either way - I think, two points, I mean, I see there's a comment from Maria on the chat saying that David Cake needs to get back into the Adobe room. I know some might have had a little problem hearing you, Wolf, so if you do come back that's - if you could just speak a little closer to the mic or a little more loudly that would be great.

So really I think there's two areas of - that - even if we don't finalize it now but certainly it would be very useful to get input - any input - on the format and content of the meetings. We've discussed separately a

little with John Berard's input the work we're doing to try and improve and develop the ccNSO work.

There's our meetings with the Board and the GAC potentially. There's our - the other format. And in particular there's this request from the CSG to - and what started to think about was if we are to change the shape of the weekend sessions and create this space for the CSG that they requested it seems to make sense to put it either at the beginning or the end of the Sunday sessions.

And I think in a prior discussion that we had, Wolf, we started to - it started to look like later on the Sunday. Was it - perhaps first thing on a Sunday morning? I need to be reminded on that.

But anyway let's stick to the principle for a moment and hear if there's any input or comment on whether we think we can compress the sessions and work within a slightly reduced timeframe in order to accommodate this request. Any comments or input on either the - the sort of (unintelligible) agenda so far?

I like the way you're separated out into the different themes, Wolf-Ulrich. Any other comments or input from the Council please? I'm thinking in terms of - in particular in terms of the request from the CSG I think this is somewhat urgent in that they were keen to hear back from us.

I'm just looking at when their request was. I think there was a desire to hear back relatively soon. So I'd very much appreciate any input on whether or not this is something we feel strongly positive, negative or neutral about. John Berard.

John Berard: Thank you, Jonathan. I'll just restate what I indicated in my initial email on this matter with a bit of further explanation. I'm in support of carving out that two and a half hours on the weekend session particularly because there is so much for the constituencies to chew on and digest.

And I don't think that waiting until Tuesday really gives constituencies - certainly my personal perspective from the Business Constituency - quite enough time to - it's not just the time but it's also the timeliness to make some - to get agreement so that decisions - discussions can be had and decisions made. So I would support the - carving out the constituency time on Sunday.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. Is there anyone else who's got a view strongly for, against or neutral on this particular request? One of the things we talked about in some preparatory sessions for today's call was certainly a consideration of the fact that we have, from a Council point of view, critical meetings with the Board and the GAC that we need to be mindful of their schedules.

And so I think what I'm - in the absence of dissent what I'm hearing is potentially - well let me hear - I see Maria's hand. Let me hear from you, Maria, before I try and capture where I think this might go. Maria.

Maria Farrell: Thanks, Jonathan. Sorry, I was actually just going to briefly say that the NCSG has discussed this and we think it's a pretty good idea so we support the proposal.

Jonathan Robinson: That's helpful. Thanks, Maria, that's good to know. The question then for us will be when - let me just - I see Alan in the Chat has

suggested something on Saturday. But the request is actually for time on Sunday. I think that some of the prior discussion I had with the vice chairs and some was that this is - that's not necessarily a problem providing it doesn't impact on other critical meetings.

So I think that currently what it's likely to be is that we should look at carving out time early on a Sunday morning or Sunday afternoon. But that's - we're doing a little bit of juggling to try and hear back from others as to - from the GAC and the Board in particular if we can nail down that.

So I think my sense is that I'm not hearing any opposition. I've heard some support so I think we should go ahead and aim to facilitate this conditional on the Council being able to get done its critical work.

Are there any other comments on the agenda as it's shaping up? I'd really encourage councilors either now or on the list to be as proactive as possible in contributing to this because the job - it's incumbent on us to produce productive and effective working meetings.

The face to face meetings are the most valuable time we can spend together. And so it would be great to hear any input whether it's on list, in the near future to make Wolf-Ulrich's job as simple as possible.

I think, Maria, your hand is up from previously. If not, yeah, so I see that's gone down. I've got Wolf-Ulrich and then Joy Liddicoat and then we'll bring this section to a close. Fire ahead - fire away, Wolf and then Joy.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Jonathan. Yes, just to repeat, well, with regards to the content of the items. You know, the most critical sessions to organize are the ones with the GAC and with the Board and maybe with Fadi as well because normally at least the GAC if you approach them, you know, and they - every time they ping back and ask, well what is this about? What are the issues you would like to talk about? And then it goes back and takes time to them, well, and coming back with an answer.

So it's not that easy we just fix it because we used to have a meeting with the GAC before so it's every time the same, you know, asking for the content. So what I'm asking you, therefore, is - and ourselves is, well, to come up as early as possible with items, with ideas, what should be discussed.

I understand as we approach - come closer to Durban, to this Durban meeting, the items will be more clear because each committee is dealing with those things and then it comes out, well, what is really the issue and what should be discussed. But it cannot be, let me say, cannot start just three or four weeks before the Durban meeting to try to get it fixed. So we should start early. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, agreed. Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. And I'm very mindful of the fact that I'd like to - I'd like us, as a council, to enter into those discussions in a positive proactive forward-looking way so to the extent that we can prepare in the way for those all the better. Joy and then John.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Jonathan. I just wanted to reflect on the meeting with the GAC that we had at the last - at Beijing. And it did occur to me that, you

know, I had some discussions with others - other councilors sort of after it by way of debrief.

It did occur to me that continuing to - while it's useful to, you know, remind the GAC members of the ways in which they can be involved in policy processes and policy development, you know, shaping and making, I'm really not convinced that continuing to rehearse that with them is the best strategic use of our very limited time with them.

And I would really encourage us to think about having specific, you know, topics or issues that we want to discuss with them or that they might want to discuss with us that are substantive that we can exchange views on and that it might be useful to be thinking about that and discussing that with the members via the (unintelligible), sorry, Jonathan, between now and Durban.

And also I was wondering about the follow up on the idea of GAC reverse liaisons and so on. I just wanted to flag that that's something that I've been mulling over and would appreciate feedback from other councilors about.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Joy. I appreciate that input and it's actually something - and I've very much appreciate being nudged on this. It's - I mean, I'll be honest with you, there's various dialogues go on at various levels at various times. But I haven't had follow up with the GAC post-Beijing so it is - it's - although I have spoken with the BJRC with Bill Graham and talked to him about getting the information that Marika kindly prepared in terms of the interaction points.

But I agree with you, we need to - although that was perhaps useful to reset the position in terms of the perspective interaction hearing that the GAC was concerned about how they might interact with the policy development process. I think we do need to move on and I'd appreciate if you and others help. And I will work as well to try and develop that further. So thanks for that, that's - it's a fair and good point.

We're coming up towards the top of the hour now so I think we need to wrap it up. But please keep this alive on the email list. It's something which is important to make sure we - I'm very mindful, as I'm sure all of you are, and I've heard now that in terms of making the best out of our face to face meeting. So whilst we continue with the existing work this is also something to keep an eye on for the future.

Under Item 9 then, Any Other Business, we have a couple of items flagged before I just check if there's anything else. One is there was an update to the dates for the Council meetings. I think we're taking that as read. They were really changed to reflect the actual dates that settled for their final meeting of the year, the Buenos Aires meeting.

In addition, as you may recall, we have done some work based really coming out of my feelings from I think Toronto but also looking further from our meeting that we had - planning meeting with policy staff in January thinking that when the Council changes it is very useful to have - which it will do in Buenos Aires, when the councilors step off and new councilors come on it will be very useful to induct the new councilors and to bring them together as a group with the - bring the Council together as a group.

So we are preparing for - and I'd very much like to ask you to diarize an additional day, the Friday. And I know all of us are tired. There is no easy option here for an extra day. We talked about and considered actually bringing the Council together physically separately but really the most practical solution is to try and tack it on to the meeting.

So that's where the dust has settled in terms of the plan; one additional day in Buenos Aires. So if I could ask you all to - assuming you - especially if you plan to be on the Council after the change that takes place at the Council meeting on the Wednesday of the Buenos Aires meeting to prepare a date in your diary to stick around for Friday.

And we'll attempt to make it as productive, interesting and interactive a session as possible to induct the new councilors and bring together the whole new Council at that time.

Any comments or questions or any other business that anyone would like to raise at this point, either comments or questions on 9.1 or 9.2 or any other points?

Hearing none I'll hope that that is then diarized for all of you on that Friday. Let's pick up on a couple of key points and active action lists in the meantime. Thank you, everyone, we've come in just on time. The IDN issue is alive and well and we need to keep active on that. And clearly the other topics we've dealt with today.

Thank you for your time. Thank you for your participation. And we'll look forward to seeing you on the email list and at the next meeting in approximately one-month time.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. Good-bye.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, all.

Marika Konings: Bye.

END