

**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference
23 January 2014 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 23 January 2014 at 18:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20140123-en.mp3>

on page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jan>

[Adobe Chat Transcript](#)

List of attendees: NCA – Non Voting – Jennifer Wolfe

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Volker Greimann

Yoav Keren

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Ching

Chiao, Bret Fausett

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Mikey O'Connor, Osvaldo Novoa, Gabriella Szlak, John Berard, Brian Winterfeldt, Petter Rindforth

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Klaus Stoll, Maria Farrell, David Cake, Avri Doria, Amr Elsadr, Magaly Pazello – absent, apologies proxy to Amr Elsadr

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer- absent, apologies

ICANN Staff

David Olive - VP Policy Development

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director

Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director

Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director

Berry Cobb – Policy consultant

Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Cory Schruth – Systems Engineer

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect. All lines are open and interactive for today's call. If you'd like to self-mute your line you may press star 6. Thank you, you may begin.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Kandi Shall I do the roll call for you, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, please Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Bret Fausett.

Bret Fausett: I'm here. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yoav Keren.

Yoav Keren: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: Hello, everyone.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Gabriela Szlak.

Gabriela Szlak: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: John Berard.

John Berard: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Osvaldo Novoa. I do not see him yet on the call. Mikey O'Connor.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm here.

Glen de Saint G ry: Maria Farrell.

Maria Farrell: I'm present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: David Cake I do not see on the call yet either. We have apologies from Magaly Pazello and she has given her proxy to Amr Elsadr. Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: I'm here.

Glen de Saint G ry: Klaus Stoll.

Klaus Stoll: I'm here.

Glen de Saint G ry: Daniel Reed.

Daniel Reed: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Jennifer Wolfe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: And we have apologies from Patrick Myles, our ccNSO observer.

And for staff we have David Olive, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Rob Hogarth, Mary Wong, Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman, Cory Schruth our engineer, and myself, Glen de Saint Géry.

If I've left off anyone please let me know. Otherwise may I just remind you please to say your name before speaking and then it's over to you, thank you Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Glen. It's Jonathan Robinson. Welcome, everyone.

Welcome to the first Council meeting of 2014. Especially warm welcome to Brett Fausett who joins us for the first time from the Registry Stakeholder Group and who I'm sure you'll get to know and enjoy working with over the forthcoming period.

So let's move on with the agenda then right away. The second item, 1.2, is to call for an update - any Statement of Interest updates. You'll see we already have recorded Bret's Statement of Interest so really I think we're looking for any updates from anyone else. Is here anyone else who would like to bring forward any update on their Statement of Interest?

Maria Farrell: Jonathan, it's Maria here.

Jonathan Robinson: Maria, go ahead.

Maria Farrell: I need to update the Website but I'm currently doing a contract - a research contract for Oxford University on country code TLDs and cyber security. So I don't think it's going to directly affect the GNSO work but it's a new albeit temporary employer.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Maria. We'll look forward to that being formally updated but thanks for letting us know here as well. So our next item is to call for any review or updates to the agenda, which you've seen posted. There were a couple of later revisions although I think for the most part not particularly material; primarily a couple of additions to the consent agenda. But if I could call for any updates or amendments to the agenda.

Thank you. And then under 1.4 we note the status of the minutes from the previous meetings. Any comments or questions regarding those minutes? Okay, that closes Item 1.

Item 2 is an opportunity to review the current activity of the Council typically summarized by the action and the project list. I don't propose to go through the whole project list. And I think it's worth scanning over the action items that are running.

As we've done in the past couple of meetings to the extent that they are covered later in the meeting we won't pick them up here so just because I don't touch on them doesn't mean we won't deal with them. I guess it's probably sensible just to mention that we will come to them.

So there's planning for the Singapore meeting which we come to in the main agenda; there's further input on the prospective GNSO review,

which we'll come to in the main agenda similarly with improvements to the PDP process.

Moving through them the next three items are all complete now. The work on the SCI charter, the policy implementation and our input to ATRT2. So it's satisfying to be able to remove those items.

There is our interaction with the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel. I think I said in the December meeting that I had had a meeting together with David Olive and Marika Konings from ICANN Policy staff together with Theresa Swinehart so we did follow up and make sure she was aware of rally the prospective of the Council and those within the GNSO that were conscious of the work of the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel and its apparent or potential overlap or reference to key work that goes on within the GNSO.

And we have indirectly followed up with Theresa in the New Year. So to date we haven't, as a Council, submitted anything to the panel but we've indirect representation via Theresa who's the senior, you know, on ICANN's executive staff team responsible for that work.

We have also, as you know, two liaisons - two councilors responsible for tracking and monitoring the work of that panel to the extent that there are activities if they are able to. So let me create an opening here for either Jennifer Wolfe, who we'll hear later from on the GNSO review subject as well, and James Bladel, to potentially provide some input, if any, on developments or anything to do with their work on the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel.

James or Jen, would either of you like to comment? James, your hand's up; please go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi. James speaking for the transcript. And earlier this week I did go back and review the page that they have established. The report is current as of November 30. There have been some other videos and things, links, since then.

The timeline or the work plan - and apologize, I'm working from memory here - but I believe the timeline - the next milestone calls for the panel that you were mentioning to occur I believe in late January, early February with - I believe the next step was going to include a Webinar as well.

So, you know, it doesn't look, I think in the short - the summary, it doesn't look like a whole lot of tangible work, at least publicly visible work has transpired since our last meeting in December. But Jennifer may have some other insights on this. I was just catching up here earlier this week.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, James. Jennifer, go ahead.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, just to follow on James. There hasn't been a whole lot of development since our last meeting. The time table that they continue to have on the Website is that between January 22, which was yesterday, through February 22 they'll be evaluating the ideas that were submitted between November and the end of December.

So presumably they are developing some kind of proposal and will be putting it out for comment. So I've not seen anything posted as of yet

but once they do I will certainly make sure that gets forwarded out to the list.

If you do go - have a chance to go on the Website - and I'm sure we can send out the link - it doesn't look to me like in terms of volume they've had maybe what they expected in terms of ideas so I'm going to be curious to see how they weight the ideas and the comments when they don't really have a lot of feedback and a lot of commentary on it. So I think that's something we can just continue to keep an eye on.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jen and James. I mean, I'll add my own point as well. I went on it and also had a look in the past week or so in the run up to the closing of this submission period. And essentially it's a broad-based submission tool where ideas can be generated and then sort of voted on or supported and then on the basis of their weighting turned into some kind of further work.

But, I mean, I took the same point as Jen in that there doesn't seem - doesn't seem to have generated a lot of activity. So in some senses I'm not surprised because there's so much other activity going on.

I think the thing that we need to be wary of or aware of and conscious and alert to is that that thinness of response could use some, you know, if it's - some outcomes that don't represent a significant input or direction. So it's something - I think we've done exactly the right thing to keep a close eye on it and be prepared to interact as necessary as and when anything of concern comes up.

So I'm not sure there's a whole lot more we can do by putting it on the Council's agenda we make others more broadly aware of it and we are tracking it and ready to interact with it.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Just if I could remind people if you aren't actually actively talking to mute their microphones please. There's some background noise.

The next item is our early - our work with the GAC on the - on the GAC's early engagement in GNSO policy work. We'll come back to that as a main agenda item.

The next item, which was an opportunity to transmit the results to the IETF and the EWG of the Whois Survey Working Group. And unfortunately that's hung around for some time and I've managed to miss it so it's something I plan to pick up very shortly.

And then there's the final item on the Cross Community Working Group. And I seem to remember that there is nothing particularly open on this unless someone - this is forming the drafting team. Well I guess we are - can anyone - John Berard or anyone remind me what, if anything, is outstanding?

We've sent our letters, I mean, this is progressing. I see John and Mary, you've both got your hands up so let's hear from you, John, and then Mary.

John Berard: I don't mean this is any pun-like way but at this point there is nothing outstanding. You saw my note coming from the ccNSO Council

meeting this morning. Becky Burr has been appointed as the - as my co-chair on that drafting team.

And my assumption is that Mary, you will now move forward to try and pull a call together with - certainly at least the four of us, Jonathan, Mary, you and Becky, for what, the 31st of this month? I think that's where we are. And just try and quickly organize a group of people to begin to move on this drafting team. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, John. And thanks, Jonathan. That's exactly right that it might be to schedule a first meeting of the drafting team. And if we can get one together for the 31st, eight days from now, that would be great. I'll work with the ccNSO counterparts and with Becky hopefully and yourself. If not then it will be the week after.

If I could just ask councilors to have their respective groups check as to whether the listed representatives on the wiki as of now are going to continue on this new drafting team. Because many of those were on the old drafting team and so to the extent that there's going to be new volunteers or replacements it would be helpful if the GNSO secretariat were informed so that we can update the mailing list and let everybody know about the date of the first meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Mary, perhaps we could get a note circulated to the Council letting us know who's on that - on that list? Is that - on that group so that people can either reaffirm their commitment to it or ask to be removed.

Mary Wong: Absolutely, Jonathan. I think I sent that around a while ago but it probably got buried in a pile of other things so I will resend it and if that's not up to date I'll send an updated version. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. So, Mary, if I could ask you then to just update those as the kind of current actions relating to this work in that right hand column on the sheet so we just track this activity that would be great. Thanks.

All right I'll just create the opening - John, I assume that's an old hand?

John Berard: Yes, sorry, Jonathan. I'll take it down.

Jonathan Robinson: No worries. So moving on then to just make sure that there is an opportunity here to comment on the project - I'm not going to bring it up now necessarily but if anyone has any question or comment on the project list just to create that opportunity.

And for those of you who aren't fully familiar, I mean, this is a very useful document summarizing all of the activity - really the activity as far as the Council is concerned rather than the scope of the project under the Council's management is captured in the action list.

Right, let's move on to Item 3 then which is our consent agenda. And here we have three items in which there's been some minor discussion on the list which is quite helpful I think in clarifying particularly 3.1.

Are there any issues with these three items on the consent agenda then? Has anyone got any concern with them being on the agenda? Let me just make sure it's clear. One is to approve the Council

recommendations report on the protection of IGO/INGO names and acronyms to be submitted to the ICANN Board.

The second, 3.2, is to confirm the chair and vice chairs of the Privacy and Proxy Services Working Group - PDP Working Group. And the third is to confirm the chairs of the Translation and Transliteration PDP Working Group.

Ching, your hand is up.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. I just want to point out on 3.3 like to get everybody to support the nomination for Chris and Rudi to serve as co-chairs. The work has been, I mean, already started three meetings. And the working group expect to report back to the Council in the next meeting for updates so just wanted to give everyone notice about this. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. And I see you've got support in the meeting room from Amr as well for that suggestion. Good. So we will close off that Item 3, the consent agenda, and open up Item 4 which is the first and only motion on the table for this meeting.

Item 4 is a motion proposed by Mikey O'Connor and it deals with the metrics - the charter for the Metrics and Reporting Working Group. So, Mikey, if I could ask you to propose the motion via the resolve clauses just presenting the resolve clauses to the Council that would be great.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. The resolve clauses on this motion are as follows: "The GNSO Council approves the following charter for the GNSO Metrics and Reporting Non-PDP Working Group and appoints

somebody as the Council liaison." That could be me, I volunteered on the list to the GNSO Metrics and Reporting Non PDP Working Group.

And there's the link to the draft charter. The next resolved is, "The GNSO Council further directs that the work of the GNSO Metrics and Reporting Non PDP Working Group be initiated as soon as possible after an adequate duration to conduct a call for volunteers has occurred."

The next one is, "Until formation of the working group, the GNSO Council liaison would act as the interim chair." And finally, "The working group shall, to the extent that it is practical, follow the rules outlined in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines." And then a link to those guidelines follows.

Back to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. To the best of my knowledge you were the only volunteer as the liaison and providing there are no objections to that I think we should work on the assumption that you are the liaison. So essentially our proposal - the resolve clause is that - as it's been changed in the room now is if we appoint you as the GNSO council liaison.

Are there any comments or discussion relating to this motion at this stage? Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes thank you. This is Avri speaking. Yeah, I have actually no problem with voting for this I'm just not clear on part of the charter and so wanted to ask a clarifying question.

Where you have in the assumptions in the charter - this is the right time for this, correct?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Avri, it's great. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay so it says, if - it says it's a non PDP working group and is not creating new policy and that sort of confuses me but I accept that that was a decision that was made so I'm not really arguing that.

If it - if recommendations inherently contain new policy then a formal PDP policy - a formal PDP process should be recommended in conjunction with that recommendation. Okay, I understand that. This should not preclude considering recommendations that include substantive policy changes for consideration.

So maybe I'm just not understanding the language properly. But it seems that there's a tension between those two statements. And while I can see a path between them to say oh we're only considering it, we're not recommending it, it seems like it comes to a semantic fine point. So I'm just wondering if somebody can clarify me - can clarify for me what the drafting team was thinking of in just proposing those three particular sentences as assumptions. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Amr, unless you propose to answer Avri's point and - I suspect you may have an independent point - I will, with your permission, go on to Mikey and followed by Alan who appear to be responding to Avri.

Amr Elsadr: Yes please, Jonathan. This is Amr.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. So, Mikey, if we could hear from you please.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. Avri, you're right. This is not some of our most precise prose in this particular document. But basically what we were doing in the assumptions was saying in that first sentence, look, this is a non PDP working group so it's not going to create new policy, it's rather aimed at building best practices. So that's sort of the foundational point.

Then we went on to say as you do your work, working group, you may find things that should have - should become policy. And what you can do in that case, working group, is make a recommendation that a PDP be launched but that's as far as you can go because you're not a PDP working group, you're just a best practices working group. So I think that probably would have been fine.

The last sentence then says, this shouldn't preclude you from thinking about doing things like that. We want to encourage you think along those lines so that if you - if you, the working group, find something that feels like policy by all means put a recommendation in your report that a PDP should be considered for that. But that's as far as you, the working group can go, because you're not a PDP working group. I don't know if that wordier version helps or not, Avri. But that's my go at it.

Avri Doria: Yeah, as I said that was the semantic hole that I saw. And I think you having said that on this call and it being in the transcript it's probably fine for people to go back to this if they need clarification so thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri, for raising that point. Appreciate it. And I see James's hand is down no so let's - Amr, you are next with a new point. Please go ahead, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I have two questions on this charter; the first one being the second bullet under Mission. "How processes can be continuously improved, simplified and made more consistent for people wishing to either report a problem or learn about their options when their problem falls outside ICANN policy."

To be honest I don't think I understand this bullet point very well. And to me it seems a little bit out of place considering the rest of the charter, which is really giving the working group a mission of using fact-based reports as a means of creating policy. If I could get an explanation on this and how it fits in I would appreciate it.

My second point or question on this charter is whether - do you all think it might be worthwhile to include that the working group should also be chartered by developing some sort of mechanism for critical appraisal of any studies or reports provided to assist in creating policy or not because this is something that I believe is generally useful when dealing with what we call evidence-based policy making because it's always a good idea to just look at how this evidence has been collected and allow for actually using it. So those are my two questions, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Is anyone able to - Mikey, I see your hand is up. Are you able to respond to Amr's point please?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure. And, Jonathan, just from a process standpoint I was the chair of the drafting team so if you want to just throw those questions to me I won't keep sticking my hand up.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Amr, the first one, that second bullet, is essentially a nod to the history of this particular charter. One of the things - this goes all the way back to the RAPWG. And one of the things that came out of that working - also a non PDP working group, by the way, was a recommendation that we sharpen up how the processes by which people report problems or learn about their options - when those problems fall outside of ICANN policy. And that's a kind of a key phrase. That came out of the RAPWG.

And so it's an acknowledgment of carrying that little bit of a mission forward along with a whole bunch of other stuff that goes with fact-based - what's happened is that the reporting of problems and showing people about options when those problems fall within ICANN policy have improved a lot with the work in compliance over the years.

And what this one is doing is just saying, let's have this working group take a look at the things that fall outside and see if there are some best practices that can be suggested there. So hopefully that does that one.

The other one that you suggested, this notion of critical appraisal of reports, I think is certainly within the spirit of this charter. And I would think that the working group would certainly welcome, during that first round of public comments, a suggestion along those lines fleshed out just a little bit.

I'm sort of scanning to see if I can find a home for that idea in this charter. And I can't multitask quite well enough to do that. But certainly I don't think that the working group would be - should be adverse to taking a look at something like that because I agree that's certainly a part of the process of improving the information that goes into policy making.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for that input, Mikey. Before we go to Alan, just sort of thinking about a process point here. I mean, really - and this relates to your question, Amr, and any that might follow. I mean, given that we propose to vote to support or not this charter the issue that's in front of us is really whether or not we either support it, don't support it or request for it to be deferred or referred back to the working group to be refined.

So, I mean, clearly ideally we don't refer it back because it slows down the work of the group. But that's the thing for you to be thinking about I guess, Amr, in the light of these questions and the light of the answers and opportunities to resolve.

Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. It's not a statement on the content but on the title of the working group. The proposed title is both obscure and I think misleading in that this group is not looking at metrics for the GNSO or reporting for the GNSO. And it doesn't mention contracted parties or association with registrations therefore it doesn't convey to people what the group is going to be doing, who are the people who are potential members of the group.

And in terms of any future reports back it, again, doesn't catch people's eye or tell them what it is the report might be about. So I would strongly support - or recommend changing the name to something which is more meaningful both in terms of what are we doing and to people who will be seeing the name in the future couple of years. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. James, your hand is up.

James Bladel: Thanks. James speaking. And I'm just actually curious is if Alan has any suggested alternative titles or better adjectives that could - better describe the work of this group?

Alan Greenberg: Domain Registry Metrics and Reporting Group. Contracted Party...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: The charter implies it's not necessarily just contracted party but it's associated with the use of registrations or something like that. So I think it should be something like that. I haven't thought it through and I'm sure I can come up with a proposal as can other people.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay I'm a little caught on process here. Really, we've got a couple of issues. One is a suggestion on - some comments that Mikey's addressed from Amr and then this - the input from Alan on the prospective name change.

Mikey, I see your hand is up and you'd like to respond.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead and finish your process point, Jonathan. I was going to respond with an idea on that but I didn't mean to cut you off, sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem. I made the point, I'm not quite sure how we - I mean, we could refer it back to - in terms of the content of the charter I'm satisfied. If there were substantial concerns of the content of the charter we can refer it back to the charter drafting team.

In terms of the title of the working group that - I'm not quite sure how we fix that. That's where I was grappling. So I don't have the answer yet.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. As your newly named possible liaison I would be happy to take an action item to take instruction from the Council to the working group as it's formed to consider renaming it. Maybe the thing to do would be to go ahead and launch it under this name. I'm quite sensitive as well to the timing. And so I am hunting for something where we could go ahead and approve it as it stands and then tidy that up later and that might be a way to do it.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I don't like the idea of launching it and calling for members under the current name because I think that defeats one of the purposes of attracting people to the group.

I have no problem with Council approving this and a small sub group of Mikey, James and me if necessary because I raised the issue, to come up with a new name in the next day or two and then the announcement be made. I don't think Council really should care about the name as

long as it meets the criteria of being sufficiently descriptive. Marika also, I'm sure, has a couple of ideas.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a...

Alan Greenberg: No, I wouldn't delay launching it for the name. I wouldn't delay approving it for the name but I would delay launching it for the name.

Jonathan Robinson: So can I just make sure that we are - that there are no substantial objections to the content of the charter having had the discussion that we've had. In other words I'm assuming that we're going to be voting on the charter as it stands and then to move ahead as you suggest, Alan, to not - there'll be no further alterations to the content of the charter, simply the name of the working group to better clarify its scope and remit.

Volker, I see your hand is up.

Volker Greimann: Yes, I would just agree with Alan that we shouldn't delay voting on this but the name should be changed because one of the issues that we have been trying to fix was just to attract volunteers. And I think we have a better chance of attracting volunteers by making the name more descriptive of what's being discussed. This title is very, very generic and might fail to attract us any volunteers as a more descriptive title might.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks for those constructive suggestions. I think we have a way forward. I think that's probably sufficient discussion then providing - I'll just pause for a moment to make sure we have captured everything. But the understanding is then that we're voting on the

charter as-is and we have put on the record some clarifying comments and responses but we will revise the name to better describe the work of the group prior to calling for volunteers.

Great so let's proceed to vote then. My sense is that this may be sufficiently uncontroversial that we can just proceed with a voice vote. So let me ask all those who are not in favor to please say - to please let us - let it be known now. Anyone not in favor of adopting the charter? Would anyone like to abstain?

So I'm recording no nos and no abstentions. Could all those in favor say, "Aye."

Volker Greimann: Aye.

Oswaldo Novoa: Aye.

Mikey O'Connor: Aye.

((Crosstalk))

Maria Farrell: Aye.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Glen, if you could record that all those present are in favor of the motion.

Glen de Saint Géry: I'll do that. Thank you, Jonathan. And just for the record everyone is present. And the only absent one is Magaly Pazello who gave her proxy to Amr.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Glen. Thank you, councilors.

Right, we are on track then as far as our time is concerned. And the next item is Item 5, an opportunity to discuss the work that's been ongoing for some time. And I hope if we get this right that it will leave our agenda as a main Council item for a period of time. And this is the work that's gone on on the prospective improvements to the policy development process.

We've had some quite good discussion and revisions of this document in table form describing the improvements. All of these improvements fit within the - within the existing PDP. They are simply mechanisms by which we can seek to make more efficient or make better, if you like, and some way improve the way in which we undertake our work.

So there's been some most substantial changes to Item 1. And really this is an opportunity to accept the document as it stands now, I think, and also to agree to form a group to pick up on, in particular, on Items 3 and 5.

So here is generally an opportunity to comment on the document although as I say my understanding is we're pretty resolved on it. There are really two items which - well, there's a number of open topics within it that we'll have some ongoing work.

And I expect the logical thing to do is to have reports back to the Council and that'd work to the extent that staff is doing it. Perhaps at our next few face to face meetings so not at every - not have this on the agenda at every Council meeting but periodically review progress on this.

And in addition to that so periodic review and in addition to that have a group of volunteers who make attempts to make some further progress on Items 3, that is increasing the pool of working group volunteers, and perhaps Item 5, the improved online tools and training.

So I guess I'm looking for support for that way forward one - and - or any indications of opposition to that. And, two, probably we can call for volunteers online. So it's really just affirming that that's - and/or commenting on that way forward. Amr, I see your hand is up.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I just wanted to say that I attended the Webinar that Mikey held for new PDP working group members and it was really fantastic. And I hope it does go beyond the pilot phase.
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr, for that. And thanks, Mikey, for all the work that you do in this. I think it's - has many, many positive benefits in that sometimes the only danger is that you can leave those of us who are slightly less committed in terms of time or availability, behind. But really appreciate all the effort you've put into that sort of thing so I'll second that.

All right so I'm not hearing any substantial discussion on this. And just then to flag finally then on Point 1 the revisions that were made dealt with both the opportunity to include a draft charter but also to make sure that that wasn't - there were some quite careful revisions on how we handled that draft charter at the issue report stage. So there was always an opportunity for proper - and comprehensive development of

the charter and indeed the formation of a drafting team to deal with it as necessary.

So good, I'm pleased that we've got that. I think it's quite an important piece of work both practically and symbolically to be shown that, A, it should make some improvements and, B, shows the Council's willingness to respond to an area which is - I think there's some sensitivity about our productivity throughputs and performance and so that's great.

John and Alan, I see both of your hands are up so let's hear from you, John, first.

John Berard: So, yes, the - Patrick when he made his GNSO Council liaison report to the ccNSO Council meeting this morning made specific mention of this effort. And my sense of the group was that they were quite interested in some - in what the elements were. And Patrick agreed to keep them up to speed.

I see this perhaps as a possible agenda item for our public session in Singapore as we look to engage the community in more substantive and meaningful discussions at the public meeting. Perhaps that's something we can consider.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. Just to make sure we're clear on that. When you say the public meeting you mean the Wednesday public meeting as opposed to the sort of GNSO sessions on the weekend?

John Berard: Yes, the Wednesday meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Just for clarity I thought I heard you say the working group will focus on 3 and 5. The wording in the agenda says, "...particularly with a focus on 3 and 5," which implies to me not necessarily excluding the others. I'm just asking for clarity which - what is the working group limited to 3 and 5 or does it have the ability should it choose to look at some of the other items as well?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. I think there's two things. One, this is really - I guess we can call it a working group; I'm always conscious that by calling something a working group - I think it's more of a sort of taskforce group to make sure that this work continues.

I don't think it's necessarily, in my opinion anyway, exclusive to Items 3 and 5. It's just that those are areas where there is - there's obvious need for further development.

Alan Greenberg: Good. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...your hand is up in response to Alan. And then, Alan, if we haven't covered that by all means come back in.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think you already partly covered what I was going to say because indeed Items 3 and 5 specifically ask for some kind of, you know, review of existing mechanisms and tools. And based on that, you know, develop particular recommendations on how to possibly improve those.

Most of the other items actually directly relate to staff further investigating on those items and coming back to the Council or the group or both. And I think that's maybe at the point when we come back with the information where, you know, we may take it to the Council and the Council then may say well, we have this small group, maybe they should have a look first and come back to us with a broader feedback on it or next steps.

But I think it's maybe at that stage when we get further information on some of these things. And, you know, as said we provide an update to you in the next ICANN meeting.

That may be a point as well where a small group may already have some feedback on some of the 3 and 5. And maybe if they're already done with their work they may say, look, we're happy to take one some of the next steps and some of the other items so I think it's a - a flexible approach at this stage or that's what I would suggest of course with the regular checking in and feedback points.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. So for Glen and Marika then - well I think Marika, you probably hold the pen mostly on the action items list but for the staff who do hold the pen on the actions items list then I think what we need to capture here is, one, the formation of a group to take forward the key areas of this work that needs work in the interim, particularly Items 3 and 5.

And then, second, to ensure that this comes up for review at future face to face meetings. It may be premature to have it in Singapore but let's keep it generic at the moment future face to face meetings. And as

we get towards Singapore we can decide on how - whether it's relevant to have this on the agenda at that stage or whether we leave it until London when we've had a little bit more time to make some progress. Thanks.

Next item is Item 6. It refers to the work that's going on with the consultation group between the GAC and the GNSO. To remind those of you who may not be very closely tracking this this dates back as far as the previous ATRT. That's not the ATRT2, the work that's just been completed which recommended that the GAC find mechanisms to better or more early in the process engage with GNSO policy development work.

A number of other factors have conspired to make all of us recognize that this is desirable rather than policy development work going right the way through the sausage machine, coming out in a recommendation to the Board and then - I'm speaking slightly loosely here but just to illustrate the background.

And then the GAC putting its hand up and saying, we have an objection or a concern or there's a significant public policy concern at the - what is perceived by us to be the 11th hour. It's not - it doesn't feel like an efficient process.

So that's really the primary focus of this group is to get a group of volunteers together to try and work through how the GAC might better be engaged early in the GNSO's policy work.

Some of us have some trepidation as we go into that because the concern is that it could potentially further slowdown our work when

much of our efforts have been in terms of improving throughput and speed and/or provide a perceived early veto in the process and so on. So there are concerns and there's some sensitivity around the work

Nevertheless the group's been formed. It's got a very positive atmosphere. It includes myself, the two vice chairs and at least there other Council members and approximately equivalent number of GAC representatives.

We have, at this point, agreed - or almost agreed a charter which will be then referred back to the respective groups for comment and input. And we have identified two clear work streams for this group and sometime scales.

The two work streams are points of interaction with the policy development process and regular GNSO GAC liaison. And those are the two really clear areas where we think there's an opportunity to provide tangible change and benefit.

The time scales are reporting initially in Singapore, further in London and ideally concluding the work of this group by the fall - at least the Northern Hemisphere fall sort of October November ICANN annual meeting.

So I think that's enough of a status update from me. Welcome questions or comments. And to the extent that there are questions or comments opportunity for either my vice chairs or our Council vice chairs, colleagues on the group, and/or other councilors.

It's Brian, Amr, and Mikey who've all been pretty active and involved in this group. So any of those of you who would like to comment or provide any input or any councilors want to raise any questions, concerns or issues relating to this item?

Gabby, go ahead.

Gabriela Szlak: Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Gabriela Szlak: Okay so I was asking where can we get the list of the GAC representatives for the working group on that GAC early engagement.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm sorry, could you repeat? Is that...

Gabriela Szlak: The question is where can we find a list of the members that are participating now in this working group of GAC early engagement with the GNSO?

Jonathan Robinson: You know, I suppose I recall it's been published on the GNSO Council mailing list. We can double check that and resend it. There is an - I mean, one of the first things we discussed with the GAC - I mean, typically the GAC doesn't work in using the same mechanisms of openness as the GNSO.

And we talked to them about that, those representatives on the group, and we're running an open mailing list. So you can track the work to the extent that you'd like to readily by viewing the archive of that mailing list. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. Well Gabby sort of touched upon the point that we did raise of early on in the discussions with this group which was Web tools. And I remember - because I did recommend that we use a wiki space to - for example, to list the members of the working group - or the consultation group as well as post documents and any progress made just for easy access.

And we sort of, I guess, decided not to do that although it was - it was great that we (unintelligible) open mailing list. But I hope that as we make progress on this group and documents that are becoming more numerous that we will start using a wiki space. I think it would be great just to keep others informed on the progress that we're making.
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. That's a good point and I think you should obviously feel free to raise that with the group. And just so for the record, I mean, the lack of willingness to adopt a wiki I think was not about any desire to be not transparent as evidenced by the open mailing list but more about - I think it's like technophobia or lack of familiarity with the use and operation of a wiki in this context; I think that was the main reason. But there's no reason why I think, Amr, if - that that shouldn't be raised or opened up within the group.

Amr Elsadr: So, Jonathan, this is Amr. And, yeah, I did not mean to imply that there was a lack of willingness to be open. On the contrary, there has been a consistent willingness to be just that from the very beginning. And, yes, you are correct, it was more of a technical issue I guess. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah thanks, Amr. I'm just always conscious that these things, you know, if we don't explain it because of others listening or, you know, how it might be perceived so, no, I don't think you did imply it. I just want to make sure that we're thorough in covering that. All right, any other questions or comments on the work of this group? Great.

So Item 7 then is an opportunity to hear and update on the proposed forthcoming review of the GNSO. And this is in somewhat early phase of development in terms of the mechanics of how this might all happen let alone the actual work that's going to be done.

And if you recall we have engaged with Ray Plzak, who is the chair of the Structural Improvements Committee of the Board. And really I think our objectives are threefold in doing that is to make sure we are as up to date as possible with their intentions and to interact with them. To make sure that the GNSO is informed of what's coming down the track. And to prepare for any work that the Council might do in reviewing those areas of work under its remit.

Avri, I see your hand is up so why don't you go ahead and make the point and then immediately thereafter we can get our update from Jennifer Wolfe. Thanks, Avri. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. I can also wait. I just wanted to put my hand up for when the queue started so I'm fine with waiting or I can make my point now, whichever.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh okay. Well let's hear the update from...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: ...Jennifer and then we'll come to you first in the queue. Thanks,
Avri.

Jennifer Wolfe: So are - should I start, Jonathan, or you need to finish up/

Jonathan Robinson: No, I'm done thanks, Jennifer.

Jennifer Wolfe: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...hopefully and by all means you go ahead. Sorry if I sprang that on
you.

Jennifer Wolfe: No, no, no that's fine. So just as an update from a procedural
standpoint Ray and the SIC will be developing a charter for a
community advisory group to represent the community. I am providing
some input through this process.

Right now staff is working with Ray and the SIC to develop that charter
and then it will be put out for comment from the Council, from the
GNSO at large and from the community at large. So that's from a
process standpoint where this is headed.

They have given me just an update in terms of where the thinking is
about how the review is going to work. And so the concept right now is
that this community advisory group would be formed of 5-10 people
selected by the SIC to oversee the process from the community

perspective and ensure that there is transparency and accountability throughout the process.

They would be largely responsible for developing the scope of the questions and surveys that would be used in the audit. The SIC will be hiring or contracting out a formal third party objective auditor so they will have that responsibility to select that auditor who will then review both quantitative and qualitative information.

The idea right now is that there would be a survey prepared, an online type of survey that each AC and SO would complete formally. So that's where we would have the opportunity to have a formal position on many of the issues. But then anyone from the community will also be given the opportunity to complete that survey.

The thinking is it would be a rather in depth one-hour lengthy survey, not something you would fill out in a 10-minute, you know, online kind of quick survey so it would be something much more in depth.

From a timing standpoint I know the staff is working with Ray to get him a draft of a charter. And the SIC will be meeting sometime in the next couple of weeks. And once they have approved that charter it will then come back out for a comment and approval.

So I would hope by our next meeting, not guaranteed, but hopefully by our next meeting and certainly by our meeting in Singapore we have that to review and comment. So as soon as that is available I will make sure it's circulated. But that will be our next step in terms of formally commenting as to review that charter, provide feedback and comments

before it is finalized and then be moving towards the actual surveys and audits.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Jennifer, for that update. Avri, let's go to you first then for comment or question.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. This is Avri speaking. Okay, I'm beginning to realize and listening to Jennifer's report that it probably is too late for my comment but I want to get a clarification in any case.

I had the opportunity to be in the Council the last time one of these processes was started. In that case the process was a little different, there was no SIC at the time. And but the Council basically was the driver in terms of the terms of reference of the review. It then went to review with the board. There was a back and forth, etcetera and then consultants and all the stuff.

Now in this case we seem to have given up the initiation right of the term of reference on ourselves. So I'm wondering if there was a discussion on this top down versus bottom up process for this and what the reasons were from changing it to a Council-driven terms of reference/charter to a SIC-driven charter.

And so I was just really curious about that because it struck me that it was so very different from the last time the process was carried on. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. I have some thoughts and comments on that but let me defer to Jennifer who's hand is up, I think in response to that question as well. I don't know, I'll come in if no one else has.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure. And, Avri, I don't know that I have a direct answer to your question as why is the SEC driving it - or the SIC, excuse me, driving it versus the GNSO Council. I know that part of this is intended that the Council is very involved. And we've talked about once we see the framework, once we know what the framework looks like that we might in concert conduct our own self review so that we would have some means of comparing what their results are with what our results are.

So I think we are trying to be very active in ensuring that we are also driving some aspect of the process. And I think we will have the opportunity to provide comments on what does the scope of the survey look like? What does the scope of the research being done both qualitative and quantitative?

So I don't think the door's been shut by any means for us to have that driving force. But I don't know the answer. Maybe Jonathan, you have more historical context in terms of why was it started differently this time than the last time.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jenifer - and Avri for the question and the comment. I don't have full historical context but I'll give you a couple of additional data points that may - well at least is my 2 cents worth.

First of all, as I understand it, this is a - a sort of bylaw-driven, Board-initiated review. The Board initiates reviews - periodic reviews of the supporting organizations in some form of sequence.

This, I think, is the first such review since the formation or since the SIC has been in place. So the SIC to that extent is simply a

subcommittee of the Board under whose remit this particular part of -
this activity is - these activities take place.

When we discussed this with the Board as a Council back in Beijing,
from memory, Bruce Tonkin who is now our - one of the GNSO
representatives on the Board and was a previous Council chair said,
you know, you guys really should be thinking about a form of self-
review.

When such a review takes place anybody being reviewed should think
about its own self review. And, you know, the penny dropped and that
seemed to be a very sensible suggestion.

So throughout this process I think from that point on there's been a
recognition that both the - that the Council should be thinking about a
form of self-review. And really I think what the attempt here is to do is
to track closely and to the extent that it's appropriate, influence the
thinking of the SIC under Ray's chair - chairmanship and to make sure
that we understand that any form of self-review we do doesn't
necessarily go off under - with completely different set of parameters or
scope to that which they might do because really a primary objective a
self-review would be to be well prepared for the review emanating from
the Board.

So I think that's a sketchy insight into how we've got to where we are
now. So my understanding is that we haven't ceded any sort of bottom
up opportunity because we are more tracking the way that it's
proposed or been planned to be done. And to the extent that it's
proposed or planned to be done in a certain way, as Jennifer say, we'll
have an opportunity to comment on that.

And then there's the more tricky question which is the GNSO Council isn't the GNSO as a whole so to the extent that any sort of review of the GNSO and the work of the GNSO over and above the work of the Council I see our job in this, our role in this, is to make sure that through the work of the Council, through the work that Jen's been doing so far is to make sure the GNSO is informed and that we sort of track that in that way. So that's - I hope that's some clarity and further insight, Avri and provides...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: May I respond?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, please do.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, you're certainly right that historically the SIC came into being after our last review. In fact it came into being during the reconstruction of the GNSO.

First of all I want to put on record that while I acknowledge that the Council is not the entire GNSO, that's kind of a - that would be a logical fallacy - it is the Council of the GNSO. There is no other Council of the GNSO. And so I see the point responsibility for the GNSO being in the hands of the Council.

I know that there are people outside the Council that disagree with that. And that may indeed be one of the issue that will be discussed in this review. But at this point that division is one I find quite problematic so I want to flag that.

In terms of the other, obviously it's a done deal. It's going on. Yes, it is good that they let us comment on it. It is good that we can do our own self review and that we can even go beyond perhaps the category that they are reviewing, though, yes, that becomes somewhat irrelevant.

It does - it was also - it was always a Board bylaws mandated review even before the SIC. But, you know, that's - be it as it may it was bottom-up driven; it is now top-down drive. It's nice that they're letting us respond. So thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. And if the Council will indulge me I'll just make one other brief comment. Oh I was going to respond to one of the points you made. Oh, this is a distinction, I mean, we should talk about this offline certainly.

But I'm always sensitive as the Council to be aware that there are stakeholder groups and constituencies for whom the Council doesn't speak, per se, and who like to have their independent position.

So that's really what I'm sensitive about so I don't - I'm not making too strong a distinction between the - separating out the Council and the GNSO but it's probably something we should take offline and make sure I understand your perspective on this well because I'd very much like to do so.

Are there any other comments or questions on this work? It still seems early days but that's - you know, through input from Avri and Jennifer. Anyone else like to comment or question or provide input on this?

Okay, Amr, you put a comment in the Chat that you're not following my last - other stakeholder groups and constituencies not represented. Yes they are represented on the Council and they have an opportunity to speak on behalf those councilors of their stakeholder groups and constituencies.

But there's a delicate balance between the stakeholder groups and constituencies having their own chairs and leadership and some of them feel very strongly that the - some or all of them feel very strongly that those stakeholder group and constituency leaders need to have a voice, you know, in addition to that of their councilors and the work of the Council. Okay so that's the balance we tread there and that's probably as much as we can cover here.

Now moving on then to Item 8, which is the opportunity to discuss the International Internet Governance issues. I think it's - this is a challenge. And you sense from when this was proposed to be on the agenda that I had some reservations about it because it's a question of the relationship.

I guess I had two thoughts about this coming onto the agenda. One is this is a theme, a meta-theme, if you like, that seems to be sucking up an enormous amount of energy of - at all levels, Board, executive staff, ICANN staff, and community at large. So my concern is that this is all we think about, one, rather than all of the other valuable work we could and should be doing.

And, two, is understanding the relationship between this and the role and remit of the Council. So I don't have a clear view of the shape of this discussion but I'd welcome any comment or input from those of

you who raised it or support it being on the agenda what you would like to cover within the Council meeting and what you think we can usefully discuss here. So I'm open to hearing that. And I see your hand is up, Klaus, so please go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Yeah, my hand is up. Very, very simple straightforward comment. I would be really interested to know and to learn a little bit more from the other councilors how they see the role of the Council in this. I think this needs to be - needs to be, on one way or another, clarified so that we can actually know where (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: All right. There are others who want to come in on this as well so let me just defer to them. That is James next.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. James speaking. And I guess my desire would be to have a recurring update from staff perhaps or from whoever the appropriate person or group would be that is managing or coordinating all these different efforts that we see or at least that I see and then - and explaining in some respects how the different - or work products coming out of these different groups and efforts are expected to fit together into a cohesive approach either from ICANN or from the ICANN community or from ICANN the organization into some of these upcoming events.

I think right now it just feels like, as you said, there's a lot of - there are a lot of people engaged, there are a lot of resources being brought to bear but it seems like it all - at least to my perspective it seems like it's a lot of noise making at this point and I'm wondering where it's going and who, if anyone, is driving the boat.

Jonathan Robinson: So I'll respond to that because I think there's one potential action that others might want to pick up on that and that is to invite senior - one or more senior staff that are involved with that or make sure that ICANN policy staff are themselves. And but really I'm aware of probably Theresa Swinehart or Sally Costerton or someone like that who could explain to us how things are moving.

And just if that's the purpose of this agenda item a form of briefing and discussion so that the Council and the councilors remain tuned in and aware of it. That's one suggestion. So I'll defer now to the queue but that's what I'm picking up as a potential action item from your point, James. Go ahead, John.

John Berard: Jonathan, this is John. I think our persistent reliance upon the staff is not only unfair to them but I also think it's a bit of slippery slope for us. I would much prefer to hear from members of the stakeholder groups and constituencies represented on the Council who are actively engaged in any or all of the five Internet governance initiatives that are going on right now.

The reason that I suggested that this item be put on the agenda actually there were two reasons. One, it seemed as if there was less international business participation that there needs to be. And I thought perhaps we might want to have a conversation about what role the Council should play in helping promote international business participation. Maybe that is something that we could consult with Sally on as she's in, you know, she's got the lead on engagement.

But the other thing that concerned me is that Internet governance is sucking all of the air out of the environment. I mean, if you were on that

ccNSO Council call with me this morning they keep their calls to an hour, I mean, if there were 15 minutes for things other than Internet governance there was a lot.

And my worry is that as we move forward on policy versus implementation, as we get caught deeper and deeper into the tar of Internet governance that we, you know, that we're going to not do some things or do some things not as well as they should be done.

And so maybe it's a caution; some might say too early a caution, that some of the things on our project and our action lists are not getting the organizational time and attention that they might.

The other concern I have, a third one that is more recent, is that with all these initiatives moving forward, if you saw my note out of the Council meeting this morning, I mean, everybody is still in the organizing part of the program. And the - and Brazil - that meeting is coming at us like a high speed train.

So I guess my - I have some anxieties about not getting time and attention for things other than Internet governance, that business on an international basis is not going to be represented well enough in these initiatives, and that we might as well start planning for the 10-year retrospective of the Brazil meeting if this is how long it takes to prepare for the Brazil meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. I will try to be really brief. I kind of like James's idea a lot. I would love to have somebody - I'm not sure I care

about staff or committed volunteers, I sort of like John's idea of at least a mix to - that would just push out maybe once every week or two weeks a little email summary of where things are at?

I think you Council meetings are probably too infrequent for much useful contribution because things seem to be moving too fast for that. But it would be great to get sort of a status, schedule, themes, upcoming publications, summary that was - it could be radically unbalanced.

It could have all kinds of chunks from all sorts of different people but something other than the 50-100 emails a day that you have to wade through if you want to keep up on their lists.

And I'm thinking that this could be a terrific service not just to the Council but to everybody in the GNSO, you know, maybe we could just forward it to the Council and to the constituencies.

Because part of the problem with - I agree with John in terms of the oxygen problem but part of it is just that the information is so granular and it needs so much processing to get a sense of that it would be nice to have a few editors that could just keep us up to date. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Let me just make sure we get the full series of inputs so we'll go straight to Alan who's next in the queue.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I agree with both John and Mikey to a large extent. I like the expression of sucking the air out of all of our other activities. The danger, of course, is, you know, if ICANN doesn't - isn't

maintained as the policy organization for names and numbers then how well we're doing our job and the other stuff is rather moot.

On the other hand if we are successful and stick around we may find, a year and a half, two years from now, that we haven't kept up with work we're supposed to be doing. So it's a balance and I think it's going to be a real difficult one. And Mikey's suggestion of updates for those who don't have the ability or desire to keep up on all the mailing lists is probably a good idea.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Over to you, James.

James Bladel: Thanks. Just briefly wanted to belatedly agree with the statements made by John. I think my concern at this point is that from what I have seen in terms of the self-organization of some of the efforts to participate and represent this slice of the Internet in some of these upcoming groups it looks like as though the multi-stakeholder model is having grave difficulties in defending itself.

And most of the work I see or the conversations or the topics seem to be very divergent. And I would like, you know, as I think John and Mikey have pointed out, just to agree with the idea that we need someone to boil that down and to help summarize or provide a synopsis to the Council so that we can determine what our role should be in terms of managing whatever efforts are coming through out of the GNSO and then how that fits into, you know, a much larger picture for ICANN itself.

Because s I stated I'm concerned that it's just kind of - right now it's just a lot of wheel spinning and I don't really see it going in any one direction.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, James. And, David, I see you've got your hand up. Please go ahead.

David Olive: Thank you, Jonathan and members of the Council. If I just may comment is I do have the policy team supporting the various SOs and ACs, in particular the GNSO and its work.

To the point that there seems to be a lot of attention to Internet governance, yes that is true, that is an important factor of the environment of which we live the Internet ecosystem and what needy transpiring as future steps.

But let me assure you that in terms of the policy team we are fully committed in support of the work and the agenda of the GNSO and all the other SOs and ACs we support. And I of course make an effort to make sure that members of my team are informed about the developments of Internet governance and the debate going on.

But our focus is with your priorities and your agenda and that is important because the working, the effectiveness and the efficiency of the GNSO and our other structures, the workings of those show that the multi-stakeholder model can produce results, can come up with solutions and does work. That's the most important part that we need to show. And we thank you for your efforts to do that.

If indeed you would like a further briefing from someone like Theresa Swinehart, our Strategy head, or Sally Costerton, on the summary of things I'm happy to convey that message and have that as a briefing for the Council.

In addition the cross community working group does have a wiki that in particular they sent around some summary documents that show various timetables and events occurring including the Brazil meeting but up until other meetings after that.

And I'd be happy to share that with you. It's been shared in the community working group but I'll make that available to the Council for your advice as well. Thank you Jonathan for this opportunity.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David, and all those who contributed. My sense is that it's not necessarily a contradiction or a problem to have as much concise and effective input as we can get.

So to the concern about whether we over-rely by on staff I think we shouldn't solely rely on staff but, I mean, I think there's some senior staff members who are very plugged into this who could potentially - and my sense is we should perhaps take up David's offer to get a briefing from Theresa and/or Sally at our next meeting because I think even if there is - if there's more to the picture than that it very much will give us a sense of what - of where senior staff are with all of this.

In addition, I do see a slight contradiction between having the concern that it's sucking up all the - or sucking out all the air out of the process and having it as a recurring agenda item but perhaps someone can help me there.

And I guess a third thing is to the extent that there are digests floating around or readily available information maybe we could have a volunteer from the Council or - I don't know how we get that information to the Council because that seems to be a general call I'm hearing is where can we see a digest or track any more - in a concise form where what's going on here and where it's all headed.

Alan, I see your hand up - your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: No, sorry, that's an old hand.

Jonathan Robinson: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Jonathan, thank you. This is Mikey. I kind of want to re-amplify my call for a digest and preference for that over a recurring - I agree, Jonathan, that a recurring 15-minute slot on this is not very appealing to me. I'd much prefer a co-edited, low-volume mailing list that I could subscribe to that would give summaries that would be useful both from a Council perspective and from the perspective of a member of a constituency. But, I agree the oxygen is thin enough. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Could ask two questions. Is anyone aware of such a digest already? And, two, is anyone on the Council willing to sort of - willing or able to help with this in any way? Or, yeah, Avri, I see you say you can help. That's appreciated.

And maybe that's something - maybe that's the takeaway from this here that there's a pretty clear request - there's a pretty clear sense I'm getting that many of us feel, A, that this is tremendously energy-

absorbing and, B, that we haven't really managed to track it and follow it and understand the implications of all of it. And so I think any form of - so, Avri, I think that sounds like we'd welcome that with open arms.

Personally, and notwithstanding what I appeared to say about not having this as a repeat item, I think a briefing for the - in the Council meeting - we have one meeting, from recollection, between now and Singapore. My suggestion to the Council is if you want to know what's going on from people who are very close to it and plugged in would be do no harm to have either Theresa or Sally on for a genuinely short briefing.

We have to be careful it doesn't take up too much of the meeting. But I wouldn't mind knowing if there's - we've obviously got Avri's offer of help, which is great. And my second question is then can we settle this - do we or do we not want input from senior staff on our next Council call because I think the agendas are busy. You know, maybe I could get some hands up or some support for that war clear points against that.

And, Avri, just to your point in the chat, I don't think anyone - my senses no one's asking you to represent the Council; it seems to be going the other way. It's almost the flow of information just to understand where things are trending and what's happening.

Okay so I think we've got apparently some and possibly sufficient support that I'm seeing come up in the chat to hear from Theresa or Sally. So David, I would like to suggest we do take you up on that offer that you talk with Theresa and Sally and ask that one of them, as the three of you deem most appropriate, could be in a position to give us a

briefing at the next Council meeting - an oral briefing on, you know, the latest developments and where this is all headed and the implications. You know, try to link that in.

And we can take this off-line as well to understand the work of the Council and what we do and how that might - may or may not linking to it. But I think there's some general information required in understanding where this is all headed and if possible to link it into the work we do. Thank you, David.

All right I'll just pause for one moment to see if we're done with this topic for the moment. I think we are.

And so we then move on to our next item which is Item 9 which is the planning for the Singapore meeting. This now traditionally this is led by a vice chair. And unfortunately our vice chair in charge of this forthcoming meeting is David who happens to be on a horrible time zone for this meeting and I suspect that's the reason he's not on the call.

David Cake: I'm on the call.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Oh David, I'm sorry. I missed that. My sincere apologies. I thought - I must have - that's great that you're here. All right...

David Cake: Thank you for appreciating that it's a horrible time zone.

Jonathan Robinson: What time is it so we can have full sympathy?

David Cake: Actually it's 6:30 am. I'm in Sydney at the moment so it's not too bad.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh that's right.

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: Yeah. It would normally be 3:30 am in Perth.

Jonathan Robinson: That's what I thought, yeah. And so that's - all right, David, welcome. The way we, I think, are going to handle this is that we will end up with a form of planning spreadsheet. We've had some - already had some feedback and discussion which was on the list. I think Mikey was - led that. Some things are relatively easy to incorporate; some may be more challenging.

I think we're at a relatively early stage of the planning of all of this. Actually it's interesting because linking into the international Internet governance issues, I mean, this is certainly one thing which I would expect, given the topic that's just been on the discussion now, is something we might want to be discussing with the Board in Singapore and understanding, you know, how that links to our work and their work and so on.

Let me open it up to David, if you have any comments or thoughts on this at this - I know it's relatively early although we're going to get your skates on going forward. David, if there's anything you want to say and if there's any input from the Council as to structure and content of our meetings - our face-to-face meetings in Singapore. And indeed if

anyone's got any questions about how we work or how we've come to the current structure.

David Cake: Yes, thank you Jonathan. We are at an early stage of planning. I have certainly been following discussion from Mikey and others with great interest. At the moment I think we - considering the changes to the way we interact with the ccNSO last meeting to be very successful and are planning to continue that model.

There's quite a lot of questions about how do we interact with the SSAC. In general I think people felt that that was quite a successful part of the preparation that, you know, the way we interacted with the SSAC last meeting was quite successful but we've also had quite a lot of very good suggestions and questions raised so that might actually be a focus.

We've also noted - Mikey's suggestion that we have a couple of specific things, you know, things we want to accomplish in our prep meeting and so on that we focus on. We haven't had any suggestions for what those might be so open - be interested in hearing suggestions.

And also, I mean, Mikey's suggestion that we break up the long prep days of sort of simply sitting in chairs listening to reports was certainly a good one but again we need some more specific ideas on what we would want to accomplish by breaking up our activity in that way.

So very happy to hear from the Council any suggestions about what they think would be valuable ways to look at particularly what we need to accomplish in that prep meeting. Yeah, particularly looking at

suggestions about what would be useful - important outcomes from the todays - the day and a half of - Saturday and Sunday.

Jonathan Robinson: A couple of context points, David, and others is that first of all there's a point about - there's two things I suppose. One is that those weekend sessions are for the GNSO as a whole and so I'm very keen to - and I intend to reach out to stakeholder groups and constituencies and try and get as much participation from chairs, vice chairs and members of those groups.

So one of the reasons we're having things like the working group updates is - and opportunities is the potential - it's not really just the Council being updated it's an opportunity to have face to face interaction about broad work within the GNSO that the Council manages and have GNSO participation and interaction with it so that's point number 1.

Point 2 is on the interaction with particularly the Board and the chief executive. I think we've been very successful in our recent interactions with them by being - by planning in advance some behind the scenes discussion and making sure that I've, you know, I've forewarned Steve or Fadi that, you know, what we're likely to want to talk about.

And certainly it feels to me like we are doing better than when we simply sort of gathered together for half an hour and said right, what are we going to talk about and sort of tossed ideas over the fence.

So I think now would be a good time to hear, like I suggested the Internet governance issue, and any other really it seems to be most

effective if we can pick up on two or three key topics that there can be substantial discussion on, forewarn them, prepare them.

And either it's a request from them for an update, for example, we might say to Fadi, you know, where do you think this is all going and how is that going to impact on the ICANN model, the Internet governance side of things. Or, you know, there's a number of things we might want to talk to them about.

Is this - you know, what else is going on back at the ranch in terms of ICANN the operations and, you know, it's a real opportunity there. I mean, I find those very interesting and valuable sessions and I'm sure others do who attend with the Board and the CEO.

So I sort of break it down into those - and of course we've got the meeting with the GAC which I suppose will be driven by, to some extent, the agenda from the consultation group. Any other comments or input at this stage? David. David Olive that is.

David Olive: Thank you Jonathan and members of the Council. I just want to point out that because of the Buenos Aires session of the SO/AC high-level interest panel at the beginning of the ICANN conference we hope to have a similar session in Singapore. And we'll be sending a note around to the SO AC and stakeholder leaders to gather their inputs and interest in this as well as the topics that might be presented. So that's another thing I would like to just preview as we plan for Singapore.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi all. It's Mikey. I'm sort of responding to David Cake's request just with a few ideas. And I'd be happy to push these out to the list as well. But it seems to me that when I was thinking about identifying a few things that we wanted to get done.

One of the things I was thinking about was that planning session that we had after the Buenos Aires meeting where we sort of wrote down a bunch of stuff on the wall and talked a little bit about things we might want to try and move forward with. I think that might be a thing to go take a look at and identify a couple of topics from that that we want to move the ball forward on so that's one idea.

I think the fact that it's all GNSO and not GNSO Council could be telegraphed effectively if we were rearranged the room. And by that I'm saying, you know, instead of having a room that's sort of the usual tribunal where we have mostly councilors sitting around the table with microphones, if there would be some way to arrange the room so that it was just everybody who's in the room, so AC and SO leaders or constituency and stakeholder group leaders and others, could feel more of an equal role. I think that sends a pretty powerful message.

I think one of the things that I'm interested in from the standpoint of the GNSO is how the GNSO identifies policy issues that may warrant a PDP and has sort of a preliminary discussion about that before we go to issue report.

So another item in the 1, 2 or 3, big things to put on the agenda would be something along the lines of emerging policy topics or proto-PDPs or something like that. I think the thing that I react strongly against is

sort of routine pro forma, always on the agenda because they've always been on the agenda kinds of things.

And so to the extent that we could thin those out and get more focused on sort of where we want to really apply some attention and energy I think that would be fantastic. There you go.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Let's go straight to James who's next in the queue.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. I just wanted to touch on the last bit that Mikey pointed out - Mikey touched on which was the sort of routine items of business. And I'm going to pick on one in particular which was the updates of existing ongoing PDP working groups and other groups.

It feels like there's a lot of room for improvement and condensing of those reports. You know, I note that as a chair or co-chair or vice chair or participant of several of these working group it seems like we always have a 15-30 minute slot on the Saturday agenda. And we prepare basically, you know, the same structured slide deck each time sometimes to as much as 50% of the Council at those sessions and then fields maybe one or two courtesy questions and then move on.

So it feels like, you know, those things could be compressed to just focusing on those issues that are urgent or that demand Council attention or that specifically call for input or guidance or something like that.

And I think that, to Mikey's point, I think that can really help move those sessions along and open up the ability to include other types of discussions like the things that we covered in our developmental

session - our get to know you seminar in Buenos Aires and also help us maybe to better prepare for some of the meetings that we would have with other SOs and ACs and senior staff. So that's just one area I think that has a potential for improvement.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, James. Marika, I think your hand was up next.

Marika Konings: Yeah, thank you Jonathan. This is Marika. Responding to James - and I think actually over the last two meetings actually made quite some significant improvements to those updates. And I don't if you're maybe referring to how things were done, you know, a couple of meetings ago. Indeed where a lot of time was spent where working groups would just go over like, well, this is the background; these are the issues we're looking at; this is how we came to be.

Because we really changed that form drastically by basically taking out all the background information and moving that to the back of the slides so just have it in there should people ask about it.

And we prepare background briefing notes like one-pagers that we circulate before the meeting to all, you know, the Council and then that gets sent out as well to all the stakeholder groups and constituencies and posted on the meeting Websites really intended to enable people to get up to speed on the background of these issues.

And then we've encouraged and, you know, in many cases we support the working groups that provide update in developing their slides. So we really encourage them in that way, as well, to really focus on the substance and really highlight like what are, you know, some of the

major issues, you know, you're grappling with or dealing with or are there any specific issues you want the Council to provide input on.

Which I think has resulted indeed in shorter updates that are really focused more on the substance and have resulted, as well, I think in some better discussions.

It doesn't of course mean that there may be other ways we can improve it but I think we've already tried to tweak the working group updates in such a way that they're really focused on the substantive issues that make it more interesting for the audience to listen to and as well provide the audience and Council members as well with the relevant background material so they can actually prepare before they come and they don't need to sit through that part of the update in the session itself.

Jonathan Robinson: Right let's hear from - thanks Marika - from Mikey and James and then close the queue at that point. I think we've got some good suggestions so far but let's hear from Mikey and James.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I'm going to sort of hammer on the same nail that James just did. And one of the ways to think about this - and this is back to you, David, is you think about the cost per hour of the meeting on the weekend, you know, it's the cost of shipping the Council plus basically all of the leadership of the constituencies and stakeholder groups to a meeting two days in advance.

You know, mentally I'm coming up with a number that it's got to be on the order of \$20,000 to \$50,000 just as a guess. And you divide that by 20 and you come up with sort of a \$500 per hour minimum cost.

Maybe it's - I may have lost a digit in there. Anyway it's very expensive in terms of people's time, in terms of financial treasure, in terms of staff commitment, etcetera.

Let's make sure that everything that goes on during those two days really matters. And in terms of some of these working group updates sometimes it matters if we're at a tricky bit or we're stuck on something. But a lot of the times it doesn't.

A lot of times we're just sort of standing up and saying, yeah, it's going; here's our goodies and we'll be back at you with a report or we've got a report that - sometimes we have a report that the Council needs to vote on but a lot of times those reports come at different times.

So I'm not sure that working group updates need to take the percentage of time that they do right now and would just join James on that particular one. And as a chair, often, I'm happy not to give those reports. See you later.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. So before we go to James, I mean, I've heard you on this. I'm going to work with David on this. And, you know, I think what we'll do is we'll put together a schedule that emulates what we've done before then look to cut back out of it and see what we could potentially get rid of and then within that space create the openings for the kind of suggestions that we've heard.

So I feel I've heard quite a lot and some good suggestions just to reassure you and others. But, James, let's go on to you then.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. So very briefly to respond to Marika and to Mikey, I do notice and appreciate that we have made I think important strides in cutting the fluff out of a lot of those working group updates.

But I think, to Mikey's point, questioning whether we need to have them at all, you know, if the working group doesn't have all that much to report and the Council as is often the case doesn't really have any questions either the councilors or from the GNSO audience then I think I'd just kind of keep coming back to this idea of do those need to happen in person or can they just be, you know, submitted, you know, in writing instead or what other alternatives can those updates be provided. So more of what Mikey and I think as Jonathan are talking about. And I'll let it go. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, I see your hand is up for a last word. And we can - we'll take that and then really we'll close the queue and try and move on.

Marika Konings: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. To James's point and maybe going a little bit further down in memory lane because actually we did have, at a time, a request I think for working group to send written updates to the Council before Council meetings.

I think we did that for a while but it didn't seem very productive or helpful. We also had chairs providing updates during Council calls. Again, I think the feedback there was that wasn't really getting the interaction as people wanted or liked.

Hence I think the focus on doing that in the face to face opportunity. And that's really the only moment because, you know, in the end, you know, the Council is the manager of the policy development process.

It's often the only opportunity where working groups have a chance, indeed, talk about the issues and flag items and talk through where they're at and get feedback from the Council as well the broader GNSO community.

So, you know, I would be very hesitant in just saying oh just get rid of them, let's have them do written updates and when they get to the initial report or final report that's when we actually look at it. So I really would like to caution against that.

And just note as well that we've tried various formats and I think we're already at a - in away where we're, you know, trying to do it really focused, really to the point but maybe I think having that time for the Council to actually see what's going on.

And, again, the Council and the broader GNSO community as is over the weekend to focus on what are the policy items that are under discussion as that, you know, as we, I think, discussed before, that is really the core of our work and our responsibility as a community. So just scrapping them, I think, may not be the way to go.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so that's been a pretty balanced discussion. I think we've heard some good suggestions and some caution as to not throwing the baby out with the bath water as far as all that's concerned. So thanks very much.

You've given David, myself and the staff responsible for all good planning and organizing this some good food for thought. And rest assured we'll be iterating back to the council for more feedback over the next few weeks and I guess couple of months really ahead of

Singapore if - at a stretch we've got two months. All right, so that concludes Item 9 then.

And then our final item is Item 10 which is any other business. And it's an opportunity for anyone to raise any other business self-evidently. But we do have a prior item on that which is this point from Mikey regarding SSAC reports and potentially mechanism to review those.

And I'm not sure whether this has been addressed by the suggestion of inviting the SSAC to have a representative on the Council which I guess I wouldn't mind clarifying and getting Council support for doing so because that would create the opportunity to then write to the SSAC and invite that.

But, Mikey, why don't I let you make the point you perhaps wanted to make and then we can take it from there.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. I think that both of those can work in parallel. The thought that I had is that over the years the SSAC has produced a bunch of reports. Clearly they're an advisory committee so they're directing those reports to the Board.

But a lot of times the suggestions that they've got are back in that proto-PDP category that I talked about a minute ago. And I was thinking that it would be an interesting thing to do to get a group of people that just paid a bit more attention to the SSAC reports than most of us do and make a point of trying to identify things that the GNSO ought to take up.

And we can certainly wait around for the Board, although it appears to me that a lot of times the little teeny tiny things that are in the SSAC reports that are really of interest to us don't make it through the filter of the Board. And besides then it adds, you know, at a minimum, six months to the process, sometimes longer.

So I was curious if there - if we could form sort of a - either an informal or a semiformal group maybe go so far as to go crazy and create a mailing list forum and just encourage members of the Council and anybody in the GNSO, for that matter, who's interested in this topic to just read those SSAC reports a bit more carefully, extract the parts that might become proto-PDPs and bring those forward on occasion to the Council for clearly vigorous debate.

I mean, you know, I'm not saying that this should be a mandate that everything that comes out of this group should turn into a PDP. But I think there are an awful lot of opportunities missed because we don't sometimes pay attention to those reports.

So I'd be just tickled to death with a mailing list and a few folks that would like to join me on it. There you go.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm going to strongly support that. There've been lots of comments on things like how is it that the Board could have ignored statements made in SSAC reports about name collisions and things like that several years ago. But I think the same statements could be made about the GNSO of issues are raised by the SSAC and are not

pursued as much as they potentially could be. So I think what Mikey's suggesting is a marvelous idea. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, Mikey. So can I just make sure I'm clear?

Because this - what you're suggesting is that there is a mailing list for councilors that - who want to discuss the implications of SSAC reports? Or why shouldn't it just be on the main Council mailing list and those that want to pick up on it can? Or is it broader than the Council?
Question 1.

And Question 2 is I have another response to whether or not I should formally write to the SSAC and invite them to have - to take advantage of liaison to the Council.

Mikey O'Connor: Jonathan, this is Mikey. Let me respond to the first one. I think there's essentially sort of a birds of the feather group in the GNSO that's broader than the Council that's interested in SSR stuff. And so the reason I'm lobbying for a separate mailing list is because the Council list, of course, is restricted to councilors.

And I think it would be good to have a list that's available more broadly than just the councilors so that we can pick up those other folks in the conversation. So that would be my lobbying on that if that's helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I don't necessarily - I'm not sure you need the sort of Council's permission or support to do that. I'm just wondering how we achieve that. That's my - I'm not quite sure how practically that gets done.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey again. I think it would be nice if somebody sponsored it. And the reason I was thinking of the Council as sponsoring it is because the Council very much could become the customer of that community.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: If they knew that their conversation was not just, you know, cool stuff in SSR this week but rather it was a conversation where they were paying a special attention to the contents of the SSAC reports and trying to comb out and identify emerging SSR issues that might turn into PDPs then we as the Council could sponsor that list but have it open to anybody with an SSR interest in the community.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, a question and a comment. You're talking about a liaison from the SSAC onto Council or the other way around?

Jonathan Robinson: Specifically the former. Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I don't think the SSAC has done that before. We - the ALAC does have a liaison in the other direction. Now it's an interesting sort of liaison; it's a person nominally - not selected but identified by the ALAC but then has to be vetted by the SSAC to meet their normal rules of, you know, vetting their own members.

And that person is then subject to all the confidentiality issues which often surround SSAC investigations. So that person cannot necessarily report back on a regular basis as to what's going on but is a good

conduit for identifying issues that have been raised within SSAC discussions or reports and are then of relevance.

So I think if you want to have a discussion with the SSAC and with Patrick on that you may want to be open to both directions and investigate what might work better.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, Alan, we did have a very brief discussion on it and specifically for those reasons you've just outlined was the reason for considering it in the opposite direction because there was no - there's no similar qualifying criteria for an SSAC liaison to the GNSO. But thanks, Alan, that's helpful.

Okay so it looks like we have support for the mailing list idea. We can take that forward. So I think that covers that item sufficiently. Are there any other items of - other business that anyone would like to raise at this point?

Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I have a question actually. Does the GNSO Council confirm vice chairs and chairs to the SCI the same way that it does to working groups?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I think so.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...the question coming from, Amr? Has there been a change?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, we did confirm, I believe, Avri as the GNSO Council liaison to the SCI. And now, yes, the SCI does have a new vice chair. It wasn't on the Council agenda I guess but I'm not sure if that was because this was very recent or because it was just something the Council didn't necessarily do.

Jonathan Robinson: A comment in the chat that the - here's a response from Avri. That'll be helpful. Thanks, Avri. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I was in the deafness while they were telling me my line was unmuted. Is it for me to speak?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay thanks. Yeah, sorry I guess I was - in fact after I saw the example of the ccNSO liaison report I felt terribly ashamed for not having written one on the SCI and will try to do one in the future.

As far as I understood vice chairs did not need to get approved by the Council only the chairs was a vetted position. But, yes, Cintra Sooknanan from NPOC and the NCSG has been chosen as the SCI vice chair. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. Maria.

Maria Farrell: Hi, Jonathan. Thank you. Sorry, my hand was actually up for another topic which was a quick update on the Whois Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Working Group so maybe I should wait until this discussion finishes.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I think we are done. I mean, we will - Avri commits to update us on the work of the SCI. I'm not sure we need to - I think I understand that we don't need to ratify the chair of the vice chair; that's a job for the SCI. We simply need to be informed.

And then I guess we've got a couple more minutes as we head up to the hour so why don't you go ahead, Maria?

Maria Farrell: Okay thanks, Jonathan. So this is an item that Mary Wong very kindly added to the consent agenda I think. And it was I had been appointed the GNSO Council liaison to the working group on the privacy and proxy accreditation services PDP just before the end of the year.

And one of the working group meetings they appointed a chair and two vice chairs. And so my job is just to let you all know that there is now an actual chair, not just an interim chair, and that is Don Blumenthal of PIR.

And the two vice chairs are Steve Metalitz of the IPC and Graeme Bunton of the Registry - sorry, Registrar Constituency so they are now the leadership of the group. So I'll still be the GNSO Council liaison to the group but I'm no longer the interim or acting chair. And that's the update.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Maria. So that's - that's good to know. Is there anything else before we bring the meeting to a close? All right well at just two or three minutes before the top of the hour. Thank you very much, everyone. I think there's been some productive and interesting discussions. We'll try and capture as much of that on the action list to the extent that there's work to be done or to be taken forward. And

there's been a lot of good input on various of the items. So much appreciated.

Thanks, everyone. Have a good rest of your day or evening depending on where you are. And we'll be in touch on the list and of course at the next meeting in February.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Bye-bye, everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Jonathan Robinson: You can stop the recording now.

END