

**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference  
27 February 2014 at 11:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 27 February 2014 at 11:00 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-20140227-en.mp3> on page:

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

Adobe Chat Transcript

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-27feb14-en.pdf>

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

**Contracted Parties House** Registrar Stakeholder Group: Volker Greimann

Yoav Keren James Bladel absent apologies proxy Volker Greimann

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Ching

Chiao, Bret Fausett - absent

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 present for part of the call, proxy to Maria Farrell, Amr Elsadr, Magaly Pazello

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed - absent

**GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:**

Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer

**ICANN Staff**

David Olive - VP Policy Development - absent apologies

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

Eric Evrard– Systems Engineer

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This morning's conference call is now being recorded.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, (Tim).

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. Welcome everyone to our GNSO Council call on the 27th of February. Especially warm welcome to those of you who are suffering from the very cold weather and particularly those probably on the West Coast who've had to get up very early. I'm not sure if John Berard is on the call yet or anyone else who's...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes he is.

Jonathan Robinson: Welcome, John and good morning. Glen, if you could proceed right away to take the roll call then. We've got Sally Costerton going to join us at 10 past so we'll work through our preliminary items in the first 10 minutes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Jonathan. I'll do that. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. On the call we have Ching Chiao.

Ching Chiao: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: We have apologies from James Bladel and his proxy has been given to Volker Greimann.

Yoav Keren. I don't think he's on the call yet. And I don't think Bret Fausett is on the call yet.

Volker Greimann. Volker might be on mute.

Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Gabriella Szlak.

Gabriella Szlak: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: John Berard.

John Berard: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Mikey O'Connor.

Mikey O'Connor: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Maria Farrell.

Maria Farrell: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Avri Doria is absent and has given her proxy to Maria Farrell.

Magaly Pazello.

Magaly Pazello: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: We have not yet Klaus Stoll on the call. Daniel Reed. I do not see him on the call either yet. Jennifer Wolfe?

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes, present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Patrick Myles.

Patrick Myles: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. And for staff we have apologies from David Olive who is traveling and we have Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Rob Hogarth, Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman, our Systems Engineer, (Eric Evrard), myself, Glen de Saint Géry. And have I left off - and Rob Hogarth. Have I left off anybody or has anybody joined since the roll call?

Volker Greimann: Yes hi, Glen. Volker here. I needed to step off for just a second and of course I missed my roll call.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay, Volker. Thank you very much indeed. And may I just remind you please to state your name before speaking for the transcription purposes? Thank you, Jonathan and over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Glen. It's Jonathan. Welcome, again, everyone. Also a reminder to please make sure that your microphone, your audio is on mute if you're not actively contributing to the meeting at the time. So we will proceed immediately to 1.2 which is an opportunity to provide Statement of Interest updates. And I see, Maria, your name is up there with an indication that you do have a Statement of Interest update which is available to us all online.

Would you like to say anything or add anything to that, Maria?

Maria Farrell: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Maria speaking. Yeah, just to say - just for people who don't - you know, who don't check it out online, I started a new full time position with Interconnect Communications which is based in Chepstow in Wales. I'm actually working with - for Mark McFadden who people who know Mark. And we are doing kind of Internet governance and infrastructure consulting.

And I've taken the position on the understanding of my new employers that I am on the Council, which they're very happy about, but I cannot and will not enter into any consulting work with ICANN because that would be a conflict. So that's all well understood. And so I don't expect there will be any problem. That's it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Maria, and congratulations. So we should then go on to 1.3 which is an opportunity to comment or review or amend the agenda. I'll just pause for a moment and see if there are any comments on the agenda.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan, sorry, this is Glen. Just to let you know that Sally Costerton is on the line with us. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Glen. Welcome, Sally, we'll get to you in just a minute or two.

Sally Costerton: Thanks, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so under 1.4 we...

Ching Chiao: Hello, Jonathan, this is Ching.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...of the minutes for the previous - I'm sorry, Ching, your hand is up.

Ching Chiao: Thanks, Jonathan. I'd just like to point out for the items on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Info Working Group I believe that Julie has sent around some updates and we - this is the update

that we plan to have the co-chairs of the working group to provide update so just like to point this out. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. Under the next item, 1,4, we note the status of the previous Council minutes, that's the 23rd of...

Amr Elsadr: Jonathan, sorry to interrupt you. This is Amr. I also have a question I would like to, if possible, add to any other business at the end of the meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Would you like to get that on the record now or are you happy to hold off and just make sure...

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, it's just a question - a clarification I would appreciate regarding the process of the post Expert Working Group PDP.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Amr, well I've made a note of it. And let's make sure we cover that under AOB.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So we normally would go through the action items now under Item 2. And I will just cast my eye over them briefly. Many of them come up under the main agenda in any event so that is - we will cover later in the meeting planning for the Singapore meeting any relevant discussion on the perspective review of the GNSO, the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel item we will come to. There's a number of completed items.

We've got data and metrics for policymaking, the working group on that. A second announcement was sent out. Is there anything that we need to add under this item? Are we - have we received a call for volunteers? Or do we want to remind people? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. We're well underway. We've scheduled the first meeting. I can't recall exactly but soon. We got a pretty good response from the call for volunteers although there's always room for more. And so the train is leaving the station.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. It's just that my notes on the action say it's - will be announced at the February Council meeting to attract additional volunteers. So we know you're on the way and if anyone would like to join you they can get involved now. Good.

We have an item on Internet governance and we agreed there to invite Sally and of course Sally is on the call so we'll come to that in just a moment. We - there's an open item for me to continue to explore with Patrick the relationship with the SSAC and that remains open.

And then we will come to a newly added item which is related to whether or not we should prepare a comment for submission on the work of the ICANN Future Meeting Strategy team or group. So that's a whistle stop tour of the action item list.

I will just pause a moment in case there's anything else or any comments on the projects list. I'd encourage all councilors to just keep a regular eye on this, if you could somehow diarize it just cast your eye over the action items.

It keeps a very good track of what's going on and in particular the project review as well just at least prior to the meetings. I'm sure you probably all do that but just a reminder it gives a very good summary of what's going on and you'll feel close to the landscape of activity if you do do that.

Good. So seeing no additional comments or input I think on the Items 1 and 2 - and I note that we have Yoav Keren in the Chat so, Glen, just take a moment - Yoav, are you on the audio at this stage?

Yoav Keren: Yes I am, sorry for being late, yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Welcome, Yoav. And we will accordingly mark you as present.

Klaus Stoll: Hello. This is Klaus. I'm also just joined.

Jonathan Robinson: Welcome, Klaus. And we'll do the same with you.

Item 4 - there's nothing under Item 3, the Consent Agenda, so there's nothing to consent to there.

And then under Item 4 we moved this up the agenda, and just to remind you all why this is on the agenda, this was recognized the issue of international Internet governance as a topic of significant interest and activity. And that's pretty much self-evident by virtue of all the traffic on our mailing lists - our various mailing lists, the number of items in and around the ICANN Website and My ICANN and so on.

And so the Council really decided to put this, for the moment, as a standing item on our agenda to make sure we tracked it, remained informed and responded to any areas of activity.

One of the requests that was made, or of the - within the Council, was that if at all possible we'd like to receive some form of update and descriptive update for input into that continuing awareness from someone who was well qualified to do so. And it was suggested that we invite Sally Costerton to join us who's someone who's likely to be very close to what's going on.

And so Sally very kindly agreed to join us and is on the call. So I think with that very brief background, unless you need more, Sally, we should hand over to you and ask you if you'd be so kind as to give us really a sketch update as to where we're heading with all of this.

And I suppose the final comment I'd make is there were some questions or issues suggesting that this was sort of - being distracting and taking a lot out of it. So what we really need to know is what's going on and be well informed so that we know as far as the Council is concerned what, if any, action we should be taking from - as well informed a position as possible.

So let me hand over to you, Sally, now and thank you again for joining us.

Sally Costerton: Thank you, Jonathan. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Sally Costerton: Good, just checking. Thank you and thank you for inviting me to talk to you today. And I'm happy to answer questions as well, whatever is helpful. Let me just give you a bit of an update from my perspective.

I am personally more familiar with some of the details than others but I can certainly give you an overview and I can tell you if it's not my particular area where I'm actually managing the program I can tell you who is and how - and help to be - Glen and her team pointing in the right direction if there are any gaps because there's absolutely no reason why this group or anyone else in the ICANN community shouldn't be completely up to speed with these kinds of activities. I think that's very desirable so thank you very much for taking the initiative.

Okay let's deal with the - there are three main (streams) that ICANN is engaged with right now around the Internet governance arena. In terms of setting it in its strategic context so I think you probably all are very aware of that and you've all been very - and (unintelligible) participating in the discussions around why ICANN needs to engage with it at all. We covered that extensively at the Buenos Aires meeting so I'm not proposing to go back to that today.

And the three streams that are involved are the 1net initiative, the high level - what we've called the high level panel. When we were in Buenos Aires this has been referred to as the Fifth Panel and it's now being referred to as the High Level Panel, which is an ICANN panel, the Fifth is a strategy panel.

And the meeting in Brazil in the third week of April which, as such, been called the Brazil meeting and is now being referred to by its correct name, which is NETmundial.

So I can go through each one of those internally if that's helpful. Would that be useful, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: I think so, Sally. I think it'd very good to get any of your highlights of sort of recent developments and any sort of key context-setting as to, you know, the...

Sally Costerton: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Sally Costerton: Well okay just to (unintelligible) in that case so when we were in Buenos Aires it was very obvious to everybody in the community that things were moving very quickly outside ICANN, this immediate ICANN community sphere as driven by a number of (unintelligible) which we're all very familiar with to do with the changing profile, should we say or rather the greatly increased profile that the question of well who runs the Internet? And who do we go and talk to if we're a government or we're a business leader?

And much of that had been triggered by the intense amounts of coverage that had been - we've been exposed to throughout the end of the summer and into the autumn when we met in Argentina around the revelations around the (unintelligible) issues.

But the question of Internet governance, of course, had been very close to the ICANN heart for a long time, long before that. So what changed during the summer was really suddenly it was as though the rest of the world had woken up and realized that oh my God we need to think about it.

We've been kind of - we've been - either we don't know how the Internet is organized and run or we know that we don't - we're not very interested in it; we think somebody else is looking after it. And so in the developed world the question was well, oh, okay we need to pay attention to this. We need to think about this. We need to understand it better.

And of course it also brought up many of the issues that had shown themselves at the WICT, the previous year around the great polarization between different government positions about how Internet (unintelligible) managed in the future.

Set against that was the extremely full calendar of events the year as in 2014 which we've, you know, you've been seeing moving around the community a series of graphics. One particular one that indeed the CCWG group have been using showing the enormous amounts of different meetings in different fora and different parts of the world that are examining this question.

Coming from a slightly different perspective but all really focusing on similar things which is what kind of frameworks, what kind of principles should be - should the community look at for the future in terms of how do we deal with not just what we have today, the issues we have today, but the issues that we seem unable around the world to find any

way of resolving which has been referred to sometimes as orphan issues which is a rather nasty expression.

And the perception being, in many quarters, well, you know, these just can't be fixed, issues like spam, issues like cyber security, they have nothing to do with the existing sort of mechanisms for resolving - for governing Internet resources.

And there's kind of no sense that anybody understands or thinks about how that might, you know, think about the intensity whether they're sort of solutions coming. And this breeds a lot of frustration particularly in most governments. We really want to try and find some answers to those.

(Unintelligible) there's the other issue playing in the background of course it's the UN agenda and the march towards the meeting in October in South Korea looking for - looking at the renegotiation of the discussion at the ITU and the mandate, the scope, if you will, of the ITU and the - so existential question is the ITU going to start to try to redesign its mandate in order to take over control - or take control some or all of the resources that are governed on the - make up the governance of the Internet of the current mandate which is very telco-focused.

And everybody on this call will know that this topic is creating an enormous amount of debate, a lot of heat in our community. There's a meeting going on for example at the moment which some of your colleagues are at in Geneva looking at this from a (CSTT) perspective and so forth.

So that's the background. You say well why should - why should we be spending our time and energy on it? And I think we touched on this a lot in Buenos Aires. The view collectively is, well, we can't afford not to be. And if we don't collectively engage in this debate then others may do it for us. And we may see a future that we don't feel comfortable with.

So what happened after Buenos Aires? In particular there's two things - three things that have kicked off really. The first thing was that 1net in a way was kind of born in Argentina. And 1net isn't an ICANN initiative; it is many people from the ICANN community participating in it but it goes beyond the ICANN community.

And 1net has become, I think, so far a discussion forum where these kinds of issues are being debated in a great deal of detail especially starting to look at the question of frameworks and principles trying to understand well what did we do in the past? This (space) has been rolling for more than 10 years. How do we consolidate some of our thinking as we come into this long stream of events this year?

The second thing that happened is that the community - the ICANN community itself formed a cross community working group to collect, I think is the best word, to discuss and collect input to these processes the first one of which being the NETmundial meeting in April but not limited to that to ensure that the ICANN community is being really coordinated and has the opportunity to discuss in a very bottom up way how it feels these things should be represented. And that's being co-chaired by Rafik and Olivier Cr pin-LeBlond.

That group is now reaching a point where there's, I think, meeting every week. And it will put forward a submission to NETmundial by the 8th of March which is the deadline for that which I'll come back to.

1net has now got a steering committee. It's meeting regularly. It's quite - it's establishing itself quite nicely. The Website we had a few glitches to start with because the - there was a - it took quite a long time to cross over from the List system to a Web system which has now happened quite well I think.

And there is still discussion happening on the 1net list but most of that discussion is now happening actually on the site in a curated form so people can follow discussion strings by topic rather than having these very, very long email trails that are taking up lots of storage space in everybody's inboxes.

1net is the partner for NETmundial. And let me move on to that now. NETmundial is taking place in Sao Paulo on the - I think it's the 23rd and 24th of April. It's immediately after Easter. As you probably know we have a very late Easter this year.

It is being hosted physically by the Brazilian government. But it is (unintelligible) not the Brazilian government it's being hosted under her auspices. The - it now has - the meeting has four co chairs representing the multistakeholder model so Virgilio Almeida, Professor Virgilio Almeida who many of you may know who's the Minister for Science in Brazil and also the Chair of CGI representing governments and also he has been asked by President Rousseff to oversee this event.

Jeanette Hofmann from the civil society grouping, Fadi Chehadé from the - I think you all know who Fadi is - from the technical community. And (Dillon Cabo) who is from the business community from South Africa who many of you may know, very (successful) Internet entrepreneur so in an attempt to represent different geographies as well as different stakeholder groups.

The committees, and there are two main committees involved, there's the Executive Multistakeholder Committee which is the operational group that is looking after the organization of the event itself. Again, a multistakeholder group co chaired by Raul Echeberria and Demi - I forgot Demi's surname, also part of CGI from the academic community.

And this group is meeting I think every week to 10 days at the moment to look at issues of who should be invited, what's the process, how is the content put through, you know, really managing the process around the event and overseeing it in a consultative way.

The High Level Committee, which is chaired by the Minister of Telecom for Brazil, Paulo Bernardo, met for the first time this week just gone in Brazil at Mobile World Congress and they had a face to face meeting and (unintelligible) access.

And this is a combination of high level government representatives and also some participants that have been invited by Bernardo too. This is really a - this is really an oversight group. I don't anticipate that is going to have a lot of executive activity or even to meet that frequently. Its primary goal is to reach out into the embassies of governments worldwide to make sure that there's good attention and good

attendance as well as the - there's a rest of the attendance from other stakeholders which I will come on to.

So it's not just about reaching into governments to invite government representatives, it's reaching into governments to make sure they bring their communities and they take this opportunity; not physically bring them in a delegation but that they raise awareness of the need to register for the community - for the event, I'm so sorry.

The other thing you should be aware of is that they - you probably know this but there is now a full concept (unintelligible) which is being done on (unintelligible) CGI on the (unintelligible) run by somebody called Daniel Fink who is also Brazilian.

And is based in Sao Paulo - actually physically running the event so he's running the secretariat. There's one more committee which is the Logistics Committee which is looking after the issues around the venue, related access and so forth.

They - key dates that you should be aware of, I think most people do know this but I'll repeat them. The last date for registration of interest to attend the event is tomorrow, February 28th. So if you would like to go to the event or anybody in your community would like to go to the event and you think they may not have registered please do ask them to go [netmundial.org](http://netmundial.org) and register.

They don't have to go but if they don't register then the organizers won't know that they want to go. It's free entry for - anybody can register. If it is over-subscribed - there is a capacity limitation in the venue of around 900 people - then they will the Executive

Multistakeholder Committee will take a look at the list and make some recommendations.

So for example if organizations have applied for many, many people to come they'll probably - I would imagine they would go back and make some suggestions that they might (unintelligible) but really it's at that kind of pragmatic level.

At the moment the registrations are running in the high 400s. I don't know whether there'll be a sudden rush sort of midnight tomorrow night. But as things stand at the moment - and I saw (Daniel) he was at Mobile World Congress, I was there this week with Fadi, it's looking reasonable. It looks like we shouldn't have too much of a problem with over-subscription which is obviously much easier for everybody.

The other date you should be aware of is the deadline for submission. Now on the NETmundial very critically submissions are being asked for from anybody who would like to submit ideas on either principles or frameworks and there are two different sections to do that and instructions on how to do that on the Website. It's very simple.

Those - the deadline for that is March 8. That's been extended; it was March 1, it's now March 8. So seven more days to make sure that everybody gets - has the opportunity to put their submissions in. And there's (unintelligible) they will all be made public and you're starting to see some sort of interesting ideas emerging there.

The final agenda will be published - and this I'm making an estimate, I'm not officially - I'm not in charge of this. But my expectation is the agenda for the meeting will probably be published in the early part of

April, maybe the end of the first week so quite close up (unintelligible) because all of the committee was going to have a look at all the submissions and work out how best to tackle those during the event itself.

The final thing I'll touch on is the High Level Panel. This, I think most of you know, is (unintelligible) having three face to face meetings. They had before Christmas in London. They're having another one today, in fact, and tomorrow in California, (sunny land), and they're having a final one in May in Dubai.

So the purpose of the High Level Panel is they are looking at principles and frameworks, they will make a submission to the Brazil meeting but their remit will extend beyond the end of the Brazil meeting. And that submission is likely to - and so you'll be able to see that submission when it's sent in.

Last point on the Brazil meeting, which I hope is helpful, is scope and focus. The purpose of this meeting is not obviously to fix spam or cyber security issues; the purpose is to look at is there a way in which the world can come together to agree principles and framework of how those issues might get looked at in the future, not fixing them.

And I think it's very helpful and it would be very useful for the people on this call to do a couple of things; one is to make sure that communities are aware, that they ought to register by tomorrow if they're going to. The second is to raise awareness of submission of ideas and - of principles and framework and the third is to be prepared to answer any questions about scope.

So being very, very clear this is going to be an event to look at getting hopefully some agreement around principles and framework, not to solve the problems itself. And that is important to be clear about I think.

I think that's probably the key points I was going to raise, Jonathan. I'm happy to take any questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Sally, thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. That's really excellent. And I think the key point here is there is massive traffic around this and it's very hard for some or all of us who aren't solely or significantly preoccupied with it to see the wood for the trees. And I think you've done a very good job of bringing those key points to us so I think that's very useful.

And more than that we can make available, and we'll let people know, this is an open transcript and recorded meeting so we can get this information out and I think others beyond - and that really from a GNSO perspective and perhaps even beyond is particularly useful.

I think one of the things that struck me very, very strongly was that you also have put in the position that you felt that - and reiterated what's probably been said before that ICANN cannot afford not to participate in this because there's clearly - one of the questions I hear asked is, you know, why did we - you know, how necessary was it to have got involved or as involved as we are or appear to be.

So I think that's an important point to make whether others agree with it or not, I mean, the position is, from your point of view, that ICANN could not afford to have not got involved. And then having taken that premise you've done a very good job of setting the scene for us so thank you very much.

Sally Costerton: You're very welcome, Jonathan. There's probably a couple of other points I should make just on the Singapore meeting if this is helpful, one of the - we are making sure that - this is from an ICANN staff perspective now - we're doing our vest best to maximize the time that we all have together in Singapore and be quite close to the run up to the Brazil meeting, the NETmundial - the Brazil meeting.

And there are a series of events that are going on in Singapore which I think probably this group is aware of but just in case they're not Bill Drake and the NCUC are having a full day event on Friday, the 21st. I recognize this is before the official start date of the conference itself - of the ICANN meeting.

I had a look at it yesterday. I will be there and make some introductory comments and take any questions much like on this call. I'm hoping that Daniel Fink will be there who's the Brazil secretariat NETmundial secretariat head. There is a very full list or a very full agenda, some very interesting panels. I noticed that Larry Strickling will give a summary address at the end.

So I'm pretty sure that for anybody who is going to be in Singapore that - just before the meeting starts this is going to be a pretty much (unintelligible) up view of the issues including some of the really

difficult issues that inevitably come up when we get into this discussion.

And I'm not doing a sales job for Bill, I'm just saying that that is now in place and the agenda is up and I think that - that's one of them. The other immediate sort of public opportunity will be on Monday the SO AC Chair groups have very kindly ceded their slot to the CCWG to allow an open session on these topics in - on the first official day of the Singapore meeting much as we did in Buenos Aires.

So there will be two or three I think significant kind of bites at the cherry for the community to really get their teeth into and engage in where we are now and for everybody to debate that a little more and I think just to make that clear.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Sally. I think we're keen to get some Q&A in. And I'll just note for the record that when Fadi gave a recent update to the chairs of the SOs and ACs he highlighted the importance of this issue at Singapore. And as you've clearly indicated there'll be time for it but also that there are a couple of other...

Sally Costerton: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...critical themes to Singapore and he was very keen that this wasn't the only theme of the Singapore meeting. But let's not get drawn into - all on the Singapore for the moment. I see John Berard has a question and so, John, let me let you go ahead and ask that.

John Berard: Sure. Good morning, Sally. It's nice to have you with us today. The - I have two questions really. One is a fairly tactical one; you may not be

aware, Sally, but I serve as this Council's liaison to the ccNSO Council. And they had a specific question about NETmundial and I wonder if it's the kind of thing that rises to the level of being addressed.

The three categories of participation did not seem to make room for ccTLD managers. I asked the question, you know, this is government, business and civil society and they didn't really know where they fit in. I wonder if that tactical question from the ccTLD managers is a metaphor perhaps for other ways in which the ongoing Internet governance discussions, in all of its form, are not leaving room for - or making room for the individual community members of ICANN so tactically and then leading to something a little bit more strategic.

And then the other thing that - a little higher level and I ask only because you say, you know, you do travel with Fadi and are with him in some of these conversations about Internet governance. It has struck me that the Snowden revelations have provided excellent cover for political intent to gain or - gain advantage where none had previously existed.

And I was just curious does Fadi see a link between the role of the US government and the management of the domain name system and the ability of the US government to surveil? I mean, quite honestly it really wouldn't make much difference who manages the IANA contract, hackers and government agencies are always going to be involved.

And I was just curious as to where he - what public position he takes in those meetings. Thank you, Sally.

Sally Costerton: Okay. That's a very good - two very good questions. I just want to make sure I understood the first one clearly. I just really understand the second one. But the first point you were saying is that you don't - there's a perception there is no space or opportunity for ccTLD managers to attend NETmundial, is that what you're - is that right?

John Berard: Yes, that's the tactical...

Sally Costerton: Yeah, okay.

John Berard: That's the tactical question and it leads to a broader question of is there room or the community in all of this?

Sally Costerton: Okay got it. Got it. Okay. So the - let's take the first one first and this is a, you know, a personal - an observation from my engagement with this. In the early stages of the formation of the Executive Multistakeholder Oversight Committee, NETmundial, there was a lot of debate about, you know, how to create an invitation structure for the meeting, a lot of debate.

And a lot of to and fro about who should do it and how they should do it and who should be invited and what kind of buckets and so on and so on. And they came up with this idea that it should be an open registration meeting and they are - they have been very keen to reinforce that point that there is no barrier to entry; everybody is welcome.

It's really a, if you like, a kind of a first come first serve process in terms of the registration. And they've been very clear that there is a capacity

limit at the venue, there always is. I mean, the IGF we have the same issue, apparently ICANN would have the same issue, as you know.

And there is a very, very comprehensive remote access process being put in place to allow for anybody who cannot or doesn't want to attend in person. So I would say from my observation there is absolutely no restriction on anybody attending or participating in the meeting.

Quite the opposite, there is a very strong desire coming from the NETmundial organizers that, you know, they want to hear from everybody's voices partly because they - it's great for better input and partly because of course it will increase the legitimacy of any outcome - output if you like. So I would very much encourage that to happen to your liaison - not just with the ccNSO or indeed any other community at ICANN.

To the second question, what is Fadi's position on - is there a link between surveillance issues and the US's oversight of - stewardship of the (unintelligible) signature on the AOC, which I think is your second question, well, yes, you know, it will not surprise you that this question comes up a lot.

Fadi and I have just been in Barcelona together at the Mobile World Congress and he addressed the Board, the Board of the GSMA in a private session and we also had a whole range of bilaterals with governments and private sector, including mobile operators but not - but also other organizations. And he also addressed the - did a keynote at the ministerial meeting.

And we got asked a lot of questions about the longer-term plans for the globalization of ICANN. And people have very strong opinions about this as you might expect. I would say that the - our view, and therefore Fadi's view, ICANN's view, is not - doesn't really - we don't have a particular view in the way you framed it.

But I think there is a realization inside the US that clearly the resolutions have, you know, dented the credibility of the US government. And there's just no way that can't be seen to be the case.

So if you look back to say the WICT where the US was taking, you know, a very strong view about how the future structures would work, in fact the sort of existing structures should be kept exactly as is, without any real, you know, changes, and the enormous frustration that came away, you know, there's a sort of huge polarization that came out of the WICT and a lot of frustration being expressed with the US.

Now, you know, after Snowden that inevitably shifts a bit. So I wouldn't put it beyond that other than a - you know, certainly, you know, he analyzed publicly that this is clearly, you know, changed the - to some extent the US government's ability to be perhaps as strong in its argument about the existing model as they might have been in the past but this is not necessarily all bad because it ensures that we need to - and reinvolve other voices at the table even more so than before.

So I hope that's helpful. But there's no - we have no sort of formal position on a particular link to anything like that or certainly not one that I've been made aware of.

John Berard: Yeah, just a point of information. You should get your hands on the transcript of the remarks made by Richard Clark at the RSA Conference in San Francisco this week. He addresses specifically the fact that the two issues are as far apart in practice as one might find. And Richard Clark of course being a former cyber security lead for both President Bush and then President Obama.

Anyway, thank you, Sally. Appreciate it very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks John.

Sally Costerton:

Jonathan Robinson: I've got Maria with her hand up next for a - with a question relating to this.

Maria Farrell: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Maria Farrell here. Sally, this is kind of the only opportunity I think we'll have the moment to - I will have at the moment to express a certain concern which is with the Board's resolution last week regarding globalization as you know the non commercial committee - constituency has generally been very, you know, supportive of Fadi's initiatives in that regard.

But I think we're not alone in having some disquiet at the top down nature of the decision making, the lack of consultation, the lack of discussion with the rest of the community and the appointment of yet another CEO determine set of committees or panels to go away and talk about something. There is, you know, an awful lot of CEO-led activity going on.

An while some of us are very sympathetic with the, you know, the overall aims; others aren't. And I think the Council has had some discussion, you know, one, about what if anything we should do; and, two, whether it's the Council's role.

So, you know, I really wanted to express to you the disquiet that there is amongst many people in the community about this continuation of ad hoc processes of CEO-appointed panels and the lack of consultation and genuinely substantive discussion rather than process-oriented discussion with key people in the community.

Sally Costerton: Okay, Maria, thank you. I'm glad you gave me this opportunity actually because the - first of all just I notice that the Board Chair, Steve Crocker, sent out quite a long email on one of the lists this week on this first question. I don't know if you've seen it and I can't remember which list it was on. I think it must have been the one 1net list. Because I saw it in my inbox so that tells me it's on the 1net list.

So I - Jonathan, I can ask Glen or the team here on the call from staff to make sure that your group, the Council, have all seen that email from Steve.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Sally Costerton: It covers - it's quite a long email and it was from...

Jonathan Robinson: Two quick comments for you, Sally. One, that we haven't seen that email so ye it would be great to get a hold of that and make sure the

Council has seen it. I take it that's addressing these Board advisory committees...

Sally Costerton: Yes, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Second, I mean, Maria is accurate in representing the disquiet and it sounds like you are willing to discuss this and that's great if you are. But, you know, I should say that we did ask you to talk specifically about sort of Internet governance landscape so I would understand if you weren't as well.

((Crosstalk))

Sally Costerton: Well thank you. I was just going to make one comment which I hope is helpful. The - so first of all I think it's a good idea to read Steve's email because he lays out the Board's view about this in quite a lot of detail. And I personally think it's a very helpful clarifying note.

The second point is that in my understanding, and this is for me with my - my engagement hat on - is that the Board will - the Board grouped their - my understanding is they are there to facilitate the discussion that you described. That is their role.

Now that may not have been as effectively communicated as it should have been in the announcement of the Board resolutions. It may be for some people, it may not be for others.

But I would take this opportunity to say that, you know, they will be in Singapore. They will be given a public slot which Fadi has asked me to organize with the meetings team.

So it's very, you know, it's very important that you know that the - their role is there to facilitate community discussion and debate at a substantive level as possible. That's my understanding. And as I say, I've been asked to facilitate that process in Singapore with the usual remote access translation, scribing and so forth.

Maria Farrell: Thank you, Sally.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Maria. Thanks, Sally. Just to make a note for the record that Avri Doria, who's a councilor and very involved in this, I think she's at the Geneva meeting at the moment or meetings, would very much like to have participated in and contributed to this discussion. So I think it's worth recording that and noting that she unfortunately had to give that.

But I'm sure she'll be coming in and there are some proposals to - that she's working on and making sure that some of the divisions and segmentation that's been done may need further discussion. And, you know, I won't speak for Avri but I'm sure she'll contribute on list and bring in the very valuable contribution in the future as well.

I'm not seeing any other hands up and I am mindful of the time whilst, you know, we've got this sort of contradiction whilst this is an important and critical overarching issue it is not the only issue on the business of the Council or the community at large.

So unless there are other questions or, Sally, you would like to make any other closing remarks, I mean, let me just pause for a moment and

just see if there's anything else you feel you'd like to say before we wrap up this part of our agenda.

Sally Costerton: I just want to thank you for giving me this opportunity. Look, I think this is moving very fast. There are many different moving parts. The most important thing, from our perspective, is that there is really good quality engagement and that we strive to achieve that to the very best of our collective ability and that we hear as many voices as possible and that we listen to each other. That is not designed - it sounds a bit trite hearing me say it but it really, really isn't.

It's really important. So I hope that anything you can do to help me and my team and Fadi do that in the most effective possible way whether it's on calls, whether it's on list, whether it's at the ICANN meetings or other meetings, please let me know. My door is very much open to that as well as I know Fadi's is. And thank you very much for this opportunity. And look forward to seeing, I think, most of you probably in Singapore. I hope so.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes so thank you very much, Sally. I think David Cake - his hand has come up at the last minute so let me just in case David, you would like to talk let me just pause one moment and if I could ask you to keep it brief - but be brief, but go ahead, David.

David Cake: My question was really just to Sally. There's plenty of us who are involved as individuals here. But is there anything specific that you think would be valuable for us to do as a Council or as, you know, stakeholder groups or whatever?

Sally Costerton: That's a great question. I think the most important thing is reach out to your communities and encourage them to register for NETmundial if they want to be there in person but also to know that they will have a good opportunity to engage remotely.

And encourage them to see this as something that is additive, that is important. And, you know, everybody wants to make sure their voices are heard. That's probably the most important thing.

The other thing I haven't mentioned today, but I'd just leave as the final thought to you, and again, Glen can make the links available to you, if you haven't read it, take a look at the report that we just commissioned that's being published by the - by Boston Consulting Group on - which contains the (unintelligible) index.

In it you will find all sorts of useful ammunition to help you in your outreach to different communities, in the business community, in the government community (unintelligible) but not exclusively demonstrate for the first time the GDP cost or indeed opportunity of the open Internet, of the Internet that we enjoy today and the risk to that of fragmentation.

And I hope that you'll find it useful. And there are 65 separate country dashboards as well as an overall report which is very much put in your bag in read on a plane kind of Harvard Business Review style, not too hard and quite a good read. So let me know if you - what you think of it and if you want hard copies to use with your communities, again, let me know and I can make that available to you. It is a download of a PDF on the ICANN.org Website as well. So I hope you'll find that useful.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for that, Sally. That is helpful and actually in fact, you know, my view, David, for what it's worth is that part of what we have done as a Council here is assisted Sally in her role as engagement and communications but also the GNSO by getting this distillate, I hope it's just a - a sensible contribution we can make.

Ching, I see your hand has come up and I'm just mindful that we should - if you could keep it very brief. Oh your hand is now down.

Ching Chiao: Sure, Jonathan, I'll - Jonathan, I'll be very brief on this one. And I'd like to also praise for Sally's update and the engagement team especially my personal experience in the Asia-Pac. They have done tremendously a good job trying to engage the contracted - I mean, especially the newly contracted registries and registrars.

But I actually also like to offer the suggestion is that the engagement actually it means to us is that not only just to engage people and to - and we actually like to be more, you know, engaged to actually participate on the actual meetings, for example, I mean, the one next month, I mean, sorry on April in Brazil.

So my point is that engaging is not - I mean, does not mean only that you talk to people in the region and you can speak on behalf of them but we're seeing that engaging means that you really bring the people to the meeting table in Brazil or in any other meetings that ICANN or - I mean, other organizations will be hosting will be, you know, to be there and, you know, actually to contribute. Thanks.

Sally Costerton: Okay. Absolutely. Again, please register. Please engage. ICANN is, you know, this is why I'm on this call is to do precisely what you just described which is to let you know that it's happening, to let you know how to engage and how to register so that you can participate and to encourage you to do so. So, yes, you're completely preaching to the converted. And thank you for your kind comments about the Asia engagement team and I'll share that feedback. Much appreciated.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. And I think we really should draw a line under things then now. But, you know, I'll voice my thanks, Sally, my personal thanks and also on behalf of the Council. It's really great, it's very useful and I hope we'll - we will - this will help propagate the message or messages that have been discussed here. So wonderful. Thanks very much.

Sally Costerton: Thank you. Okay. Bye-bye, everybody. Thanks a lot. See you in Singapore. Okay bye.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks a lot. All right, everyone, well I hope that met the purpose that we intended it to. I certainly feel it was informative and potentially very useful. I'd encourage you to make your respective groups and communities aware of this content within the Council meeting and therefore that the groups can be - use this as part of being informed.

Moving on then to our next item, Item 5, and just to remind everyone that we obviously have time constraints. This has been normally allocated 10 minutes so if we could keep it reasonably tight that would be useful. This is an opportunity to receive an update from the PDP working group on translation and transliteration. It was specifically

requested by a councilor, that's Ching Chiao of the Registry Stakeholder Group and I believe working member of this group.

But in addition we have the privilege of having the co chair of the working group here to provide that update. So, Ching, if I could ask you to just briefly introduce the item and of course if both of you could be aware of the time that would be great.

Ching Chiao: Sure, Jonathan. Thanks. This is Ching for the recording. So this working group has already launched its work since our last face to face meeting in Buenos Aires. And so one of the co chairs, Chris, very generously he's able to make himself available to share the updates with us for the work.

So without further ado let me pass the mic to Chris. Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much, Ching. This is Chris Dillon for the recording. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Hearing you loud and clear, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Okay well let's just go through this presentation quickly. And I'll just highlight various parts of it. So the PDP working group began its work in December last year. And at the end of January we sent out a request for input on various issue questions which I will bring up later in the call.

The deadline for the input is actually tomorrow but, well, I don't think we're going to turn it away, you know, we would still be grateful to have

it. Could I have the next slide please? Thank you. These are the - sorry actually it's slide, - yes, it's Slide 3, thank you.

These are the main questions that the working group are addressing. So it's, should local contact information be translated into one language or should it be transliterated into one script? And then who should decide who should bear the burden either to translate or transliterate so (unintelligible) really supports that.

Could I have the next slide please? There are several other relevant groups that we are constant contact with. I won't go through them now because we don't have the time. Could we have the next slide please?

There will be information about what we're doing on the wiki which we, you know, we really use as away for other people to look at what we're doing and just get into it quite quickly without listening to all of our telephone calls. I'll give the address for the wiki on the last slide.

So the questionnaire that we sent out - and we've had replies - very, very good replies, in fact, from the European Union and from Thailand. We would really welcome more replies - addresses these questions. So it's, you know, the first one is very similar to what I was just mentioning, you know, but also what are the benefits of transliterating or translating?

What should be mandatory here? You know, who should it be mandatory for? Are we only talking about certain scripts or is it all scripts? Could I have the next slide please?

Then, you know, what impact this may have on validation on the current and future versions of Whois or similar systems? When would policy come in to effect? And then obviously the cost questions that I was mentioning before.

Could I have the next slide please? The next pieces of work we will be doing are reviewing the answers to those questions that we've just sent out, also looking at work in other groups. And here we have, at the end of the slide, is the link to really more or less everything we're doing which is the wiki.

I think it's probably time to ask the questions. Is there anything anybody would like to pick up?

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Chris. It's Jonathan. That was very succinct, very clear and useful. I know Ching is particularly keen that we retain a strong awareness of this item and the work of this working group so it's relatively unorthodox for us to have an update, you know, during the course; we normally - on this kind of meeting, we normally have them at the face to face meetings. But very much appreciate that you managed to keep it...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: So are there any comments, questions or discussion points on this? Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thanks, Jonathan and thanks, Chris. I would just also like to thank Chris for the update and for his hard work with Rudi. And just to let you

know that the Registry will be submitting the comments but we just need, you know, some extra days to work on this.

I will also encourage other constituency and groups to submit comments on this. Actually the questions that the working group helped put together actually deepen the original IRD report so it's now at the stage really to find out these solution for the contact info in the internationalized format. So I would like to encourage everyone to go back to your constituency and then to provide input. And thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. And make no mistake this kind of work is - it's the bread and butter work of the GNSO policy process. And the work that the Council is primarily in place to commission and manage. So it's a timely reminder of what we could and should be doing and in fact are doing. So that's very useful. Are there any other comments or questions for Chris or Ching on this?

Well thank you very much both of you for keeping your hard work on the agenda and in the front mind of the Council. And as Ching said there, there's some Registry Stakeholder Group comments in the pipeline so any others of you who are in a position to influence input from your groups to the request for input from the working group please do take this as a reminder to do so.

Good, thank you again, Chris. I think we'll draw that item to a close unless there's anything else you need us to be aware of?

Chris Dillon: No, it's all been said. Encourage people to, you know, other groups to send in answers to the questionnaire. We will hold the, you know, we'll

hold off that deadline at least for a few days but we would be very grateful. And thank you very much for this opportunity.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Thanks, Chris. And I know what it's like, you need to have some input and there's nothing as disheartening as putting out something like a questionnaire and then seeing the responses not come back so please do, councilors, take this as a reminder to your groups to contribute if at all possible. Thanks, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right good. Our next item is Item 6 then which is an opportunity to get an update and have some additional discussion on the GNSO engagement with the work of the ICANN strategy panels. And probably whilst this remains a generic item it's clear from both our discussions on the list that this is an item that causes some levels of interest and in particular that of the work of the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel.

So a couple of remarks from myself to kick this off. You will notice a few things that have happened. There's been a news alert come out from ICANN in the last couple of days indicating that there is a public comment period now open to comment on the output of the strategy panels.

With - I guess there is also - in the interim there has also been a meeting held by Fadi Chehadé and David Olive where this is a periodic update that's now starting to take place where Fadi gives the direct hour of update and discussion with leadership of the SO and ACs and that includes, as far as the GNSO is concerned, the stakeholder group and constituency chairs as far as I recall.

And it's important there to - I think Fadi touched on this, from memory, in that meeting. And I've encouraged those of you that are interested in hearing more the transcript and audio is available from that, but on the role and how these panels will be input - and their role inputting into the strategy process.

So I'm aware that many of you question or have concerns about, you know, this context that Maria mentioned earlier of the top down, you know, or the lack of ability to have influenced the inception of these so in order to be as well informed as possible in critiquing that I'd encourage you to hear what Fadi said on that call if you haven't already. And so that's a point to note.

As far as the multistakeholder panel itself is concerned there were some additional proposals from their work. I mean, their work contains some 16 proposals for potential consideration and so there were additional proposals posted today.

As directed by the Council and on the back of our discussions I've reached out and attempted to engage with the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel. And that did get off to a little bit of a slow start but recently, as in two weeks ago, and yesterday, I've had two meetings with Beth Novak, who chairs that panel, and yesterday with a couple of members of her team.

And really the meetings, I think the content of those meetings can be divided into two components. The first was in a sense a little bit of - to paraphrase - a little bit of flag-waving and say hey, we're the GNSO Council, we're also the GNSO and we would like you to recognize that

your work feels, from our perspective when we look at the way it was framed and we look at some of the outputs, to be very close or very strongly overlapping with our remit within the ICANN multistakeholder model. Therefore we are attuned to and very sensitive to the work that you are doing.

So that was really, I think, the primary goal of the initial meeting. And the output of that was possibility of some kind of interaction. And Beth offered, in fact, to do some form of interview with me or some kind of mechanism where we got into a dialogue.

I wasn't 100% comfortable, that could have been one method of going forward. But I felt there was some possible others that we needed to explore and I wanted to digest those and come back to. And of course we've had subsequent dialogue on the list which has helped inform that as well.

So at yesterday's meeting we talked a little more. And I think we got to the point where they haven't made a commitment yet at this stage. I think there's a good chance that we will be able to meet with one or two members of Beth Novak's team that actually undertook much of the work from the governance lab, not from the strategy panel but did the underlying work.

There's a prospect of meeting one or two of those people in Singapore to hear directly from them. And the engagement they've offered, which is something for us to think about is - and I will forward something in writing to the Council list on this as well - that there is an opportunity to perhaps home in on one - instead of the 16, which is a pretty broad range and as many of you have noted, very wide ranging things they cover

and, you know, thanks to Klaus for forwarding that very helpful information as well on this.

It may be that the Council is better off focusing in on a lesser group of those that might be more closely related to the work - the policy work within the GNSO. So that's the point then.

And I just think in my mind I've separated out - and I'd encourage you all to think separately about this, there are two issues here really as far as I can see. One, is a concern with the strategy panels, the way in which they were initiated, the sort of top down concern, to paraphrase it. And I think that question or discussion to the extent that we propose to have it, is really one to have with Fadi and/or Theresa. It's, you know, that's the - that's not the conversation to have with Beth Novak, the strategy panel and/or the governance lab.

I think from their point of view our engagement is with their content and to the extent that it impacts or is relevant to the work of the GNSO. So that's my two cents work and a status update. I see John Berard has got his hand up.

But I am conscious that we appointed two councilors to sort of track and keep an eye on the work of this group. So - yet and they haven't had the opportunity to hear this update that I've just given you because it was so sort of hot off the press from yesterday. So, John, I'm aware your hand is up but I'd just like to defer to and/or remind Jen and - James isn't on the call - I think - James Bladel - is James on the call?

Volker Greimann: No, James is absent for this call. I have his proxy but...

Jonathan Robinson: Proxy. Okay so James isn't available. So, by all means, John, ask your question. But, Jen, please put your hand up if you feel I've missed something or you'd like something to be covered. Let's hear from John, your question or comment. John.

John Berard: So this is John Berard for the transcript. My anxiety - my anxiety is driven by the fact that this call is 3:00 am but that's neither here nor there. Even the way you've put it, Jonathan, that this is something that we should talk to Fadi about, reinforces, in my mind, the continued, as I said maybe a year ago, the (exectification) of ICANN.

I mean, it's bad enough that those of us who do not have full time jobs focused on the buying or selling of domain names or responsibility for Internet governance, I mean, it's really hard for a part time person to stay above the raging water at this point.

And as the staff grows and the focus becomes more top down there's going to be even less opportunity for the community to participate because the community - as the community becomes more professional.

And so the - it's my ear when you say we probably should wait to talk to Fadi, you are, in fact, reinforcing the very characteristics that are driving some of our community members mad.

Anyway I offer that up. I apologize for a rant at this hour but I think that the more we can do to foster discussion at the very broadest level of the community is really a noble purpose at this point. So I'll shut up now.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks John. And I too share your concern with the raging waters, if you like, or the massive of activity and the overwhelming nature and try to keep on top of it. As to the other component of it - and that's the talking with Fadi, I was really - I'm not suggesting that that is in any way exclusive; I'm just suggesting that it's a different - it's not an issue for the panel, per se.

To the extent that we want to engage with the panel and/or Beth and her team, it's about the content of their work. To the extent that we want to engage with the commissioning of the panel in the first place I suggested we go to the commissioner. I'm not suggesting that's exclusive but that's just to try and separate and make clear the points I was making.

I see Amr's hand is up. Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I have a thought specifically on this panel, the one for multistakeholder innovation. And, well I guess I'm relatively new compared to the rest of the folks on Council. And please correct me if I've missed something.

But I'm - generally, you know, I think the commissioning of these panels is a bit odd. More than a bit odd considering that it was a very top down initiative and it is still unclear how that will affect the GNSO PDP in any way. But clearly there is work being done to that affect.

And - but still I would - I would still like to think, at least, that there are processes in place within the GNSO on how the PDP might change one way or another. For example, there is a Policy and Implementation Working Group which is a non PDP working group going on. There is

the Standing Committee on Improvements which is also a GNSO Council-chartered standing committee.

And so more or less that's where changes will probably take place and whether we get requests or ideas from a panel like the one Beth Novak is chairing or whether we get them directly from (unintelligible) the Board eventually they would have to go through the processes and they would have to go through the community with public comments and - the whole series of events that normally take place.

And so for that reason I just don't feel as concerned as others are. But if I am missing something I would love to be enlightened on this.  
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr, for that input as well. I mean, frankly I think that that helps frame our potential responses as well. I mean, my - where I think this is going - and I'd like - this is really, I guess, what I'd like to understand and, Mikey, I see your hand is up - input from the Council is I think we have the opportunity to engage in a number of ways here.

And maybe - don't forget at Singapore we have the opportunity to engage with, for example, the Board, the CEO and potentially this panel. Where I'm thinking we're going from a Council point of view is potentially a written response to the panel perhaps both indicating our responses to their work but also highlighting to them where we are already doing this kind of work as you rightly highlight, through the SCI throughout our process of continuous improvement.

And maybe that's a drum we need to bang in the various fora with - in Singapore as well. But the question I have for the Council, before

going to Mikey, is - and to just - is would you like me to continue down this path of getting this multistakeholder panel or at least representatives of those that did the work, which is really what it looks like we'll get from the gov lab point of view, to meet with us in Singapore and engage with us as part of our weekend sessions where we have a potential slot available for doing this.

Mikey, I see your hand up has turned to a checkmark of support. But your hand remains up as well. So go ahead, Mikey, and then we'll hear from Klaus.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. There's a lot of plus ones for John in the Chat especially about the raging waters comment. And I'll just add my support for that. It's crazy right now.

In terms of this one my approach has been to engage with them as actively as I could and so I engaged on their Website, I prepared a diagram that I shared with you all on the list recently. My sense is that their work has been done largely in a vacuum. It's based on a very narrow group of people submitting comments in a not-too-very-populated forum.

The crowd of the crowd sourcing was quite small, less than 20 people really. And I think that one possible approach, not to be - not to leave any others out - is just to sort of outperform them. And so I really support the idea of comments from us, comments from our constituencies, substantive comments with material that can influence their direction.

I'm with Amr in that I think that in terms of the PDP what I've been stressing with that group is be very careful what you do to the PDP. Try your experiments in lower-risk places. And that's been falling on receptive ears. So I think there are a number of things that we can do both as individuals and as constituencies and as the Council to influence this work. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Points well made. Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you, Jonathan. Klaus for the record. I think it is important that we make it really a distinction between the groups and the people who commissioned the groups. I think these groups see themselves in a position where they are - are the PDP-making process.

And I think it - Jonathan, instead of we need to engage with these groups directly and tell them this is the role of the GNSO Council and this is where things are overlapping. But I really think it should be the role of the GNSO Council to engage with the Board and to be engaged with Fadi and say, look, what - this is going on. And this is our role. And we need to be engaged more to the process.

I think the role of contribute and substantively to these groups and commenting needs to come from the constituency. And thank you for mentioning NPOC making substantive comments. But all I can say to that similar experience to Mikey, you've put in a comment and it disappeared into a black hole.

And also don't forget that we are engaging now in ICANN in these groups, for example, with the governance lab and this is a very specific group of people, a specific group of people which has - which has a

specific approach and also needs to paint itself which sometimes it (scoots) over into the way they're working.

So I would be very, very careful in the engagement with these groups and really make it clear first this is the role and this is their limits because sometimes also reading the reports and reading the language in the reports I've got the feeling that these groups expecting okay we made a decision, now implement it. And by the way, implement it tomorrow and if you are - if you are talking to the community about it that's a bad thing. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Klaus. I'll take all of that on board. And I think that my two quick remarks, one is that we should target them very carefully how these different responses, you and Mikey and Amr and others have talked about, to the different groups and opportunities we have to meet with either Theresa, Fadi, the Board, etcetera, in Singapore.

As to the implementation of these things, I should just add for the record that in the discussion I had with Beth and her colleagues yesterday they were very, very clear and did stress that any implementation should be done experimentally and in a laboratory-like context, not on the real live work in process. But I think that concept theoretically, for my two cents worth, but may be more difficult in practice to achieve.

Let me not hold up the queue now and go to Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. I would like to weigh in with my two cents actually, and actually two points. One is that as John mentioned that a

lot of volunteering hours putting to a large chunk of the work  
(unintelligible) right now on the Internet governance issue.

I would just also like to point out the same issue that the Registry in the last Buenos Aires meetings a group of smaller registries also get together talking about - for the new gTLD program how ICANN has created us besides our full, I mean, operational load we will have to deal with a lot of changes and also missing deadlines, also a lot of policy requirements from ICANN even lots of new gTLD - they are still small, they are probably most of them still in debt. And also they are still taking their baby step to grow the business.

And now with the Internet governance issue that puts a lot of smaller new gTLD registries there (unintelligible) in a question mark. So I would simply like to point this out, it's not just an issue for a lot of - a lot of committed, I mean, volunteers in our community but also for the registries and the smaller registrars, I sure you mean as well. So that's one.

The second point I would like to make is actually so, I mean, so actually we've - now we are actually seeing is that ICANN is really, I mean, representing all our voices should other people outside ICANN talk to - or would they have chance to have a dialogue within each individual constituency or group.

I think in the last few months we - some of us in the community and probably some of you have shared these same concern is that ICANN is trying to represent all of us here in one voices. And the fact is that from time to time we take different angles, we have different thoughts and through ICANN as a platform we reach a consensus.

But still it is different groups and constituency to enable ICANN to become a diverse and more inclusive, I mean, organization. But I would like to actually point one thing is that - and the message is that I believe that this is - it is time that maybe for many of our constituency to maybe to engage - I mean, taking the ICANN bigger umbrella out but trying to engage with the out side world, I mean, if we can just so we can ensure that our voices are heard.

We are not, I mean, I mean, probably really want to do so but because at this stage ICANN put us in the position of this kind of awkwardness. So maybe it's time for us - some of the constituency to voice in the individual capacity. That's my two cents. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. I've got Volker and then Alan coming up after Volker. And I think we'll have to close this item at that point. Volker, please go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Jonathan. Volker speaking. I would like to blow into the same horn that Klaus was blowing into earlier with regard to strategy panels. I believe that the subject matter of the strategy panels is well worth discussing. ICANN probably needs reform, needs to evolve, needs to adapt and at least needs to look at itself to find out if there's anything that can be changed.

And I also think that it might be helpful to have an out side influence or an outside voice doing that analysis at least preliminary so ICANN can have a bit of a view of how the outside sees it self, sees it.

However, I think this effort should have come in the ICANN way as a multistakeholder bottom up process and therefore strategy panels as they exist today, have a bit of a birth defect because of them having been birthed by a CEO initiative.

That does not mean that we shouldn't work with them. I think the work that is being done is valuable. And now that they exist we have to arrange (unintelligible) but we shouldn't be differential to them. We need to be assertive of our role and be very clear about what discussion points we think are actually a mandate of the GNSO or the GNSO council.

And when we give advice that should not be seen as a simple public comment from any other stakeholder group but rather that's comparable to that of the GAC when it comes to our mandate. That's my two cents.

Jonathan Robinson: That's helpful and a timely reminder, Volker, for me as well it helps in terms of prefacing any input we might give. And I see a checkmark from Amr in respect to that as well. It's high quality contributions from all of you so it's much appreciated and it helps guide I think the Council and me. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. My comment is not all that far away from Volker's. And the comment it's specifically with regard to the Multistakeholder Strategic Panel. I think it's important to remember that they were put in place to make suggestions about the multistakeholder model and about the ICANN model.

So we need to be careful not to focus comments on, you know, essentially don't mess with the GNSO; this is our role and this is how we do it or the ALAC or At Large, whatever, because they've been asked to, you know, suggest perhaps alternatives to what we're doing.

Unfortunately they've done this in a rather uninformed way in my mind and, you know, invoked their - the current poster child crowd sourcing for everything.

So I think we need to make sure that we're not coming off as defensive and that we cannot change because they were asked to suggest change or possible change. But it has to be done in an informed way and it has to meet the ultimate needs of why the GNSO, for instance, is here today. The current model may not be the one we want in the future but we cannot dispense with the motivation and the requirements of what the GNSO or its replacement must satisfy. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. And thanks all of you, that's very, very high quality contribution. And it's something that I've been grappling with as well is how to provide critical input at all levels without appearing to be defensive and I think that's a challenge that remains but certainly I'm very encouraged by the quality of the discussion and the contribution here so that's helpful.

And I think we'll pick this on list. I will let Theresa Swinehart know, who's really the key coordinator on Fadi's staff, with respect to these strategy panels, that, you know, the discussion that's gone on with Beth, the discussion that's gone on with the Council, and, you know, maybe there'll be some further dialogue about how we most effectively

engage with both the panels and/or the Board and/or Fadi on issues of their commissioning and future work and indeed our own willingness to evolve and develop. So that's all very helpful.

So fortunately for you and possibly for me as well Item 7 is an item which I was - spoke with - much as I'm very involved in the work of the GNSO engagement with the GAC and this engagement group on policy development processes, I specifically asked Amr, who is one of the group members, if he would be so kind as to give you an update as to where this is going.

And this is really just an opportunity to make sure the Council remains engaged with this important piece of work. And you will be well aware that this is about ensuring that the - in so far as it's possible GAC advice and GAC input doesn't come too late in the process and the early engagement of the GAC in the policy work of the GNSO is taken as early as appropriate and possible and this really stems from a recommendation of ATRT1. But I think is connected to probably output of ATRT2 and indeed something which many in the community would likely see as important and/or necessary.

So let me hand over to, Amr, to give a sort of status update as to where we are and where this is likely to go and then we can take any Q&A on that.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I'll try to go through this as quickly as possible and still try to give a good idea about where we are. This group, which we are calling a consultation group, was formed directly following the Buenos Aires meeting. It consists of six councilors and six members of the GAC.

And right now - as of now we have finalized the charter for this consultation group which is posted on the - the Adobe Connect room in front of you. And this charter basically spells out what the problem is when it comes to GAC engagement with the GNSO policy and why it is a problem and how it's - it could be a problem for gTLD policy and ICANN in general and what are the steps - the broad strokes so we as a consultation group agreed to take in order to address these issues and encourage earlier engagement in the PDP process by the GAC.

Two documents pretty much came into being as a result of this charter and addressing its issues. One covering possible inputs by the GAC within the process at large which is to say sort of a mapping out the GNSO PDP and the different points within the PDP in which the GAC can engage.

And I'm guessing we need to pretty much work out mechanisms by which that can be made possible because the option was always present just it was never used. And GAC have mainly resolved - mainly reverted to providing advice to the Board after policy has been made - has been developed through the GNSO process.

The second track is more focusing on the day to day operations and day to day interaction between the GNSO Council and other members of the GNSO so like members that we discussed and the GAC and how that can be done. And I think that's worth taking a closer look at right now because there are six main points that were described in this.

One of them is the actual - is having a GNSO liaison to the GAC that would sort of - that would be able to participate in the GAC meetings

even as an observer but still have the right to ask for the floor to have interventions or just give updates or feedback on discussions going on in the GAC meetings.

And this liaison would also be pretty well suited to record back to the GNSO Council on what the GAC is thinking regarding certain policies especially those that the GAC see as issues with public policy implications.

Another point was regular calls - monthly calls between GAC chair and the GNSO chair so this would be up to Jonathan and the GAC chair to organize and see if they could get that done.

The third one would be what we have called topic leads buddy systems which is basically you have two leads, one from the GAC and one from the GNSO identified for each GNSO PDP which would - which might have some form of interest to the GAC whether because of public policy implications or otherwise. And it was also suggested that this GNSO counterpart could also participate in GAC meetings on demand.

Rethinking the actual substance and joint GAC GNSO meetings is the fourth item outlined in the day to day operations. And this was just sort of to also have the liaisons present and have the groups both available to discuss ongoing PDPs and upcoming ones where there might be an interest for the GAC and sort of just have the dialogue going on between the two groups. And also have topic leads in the buddy system that sort of give updates on the activities that are ongoing.

The fifth point would be to further develop and expand early awareness and notification notices. Just this would be some sort of a way to

address the other track, which is the overall mapping of the PDP and where GAC could interact more actively with the GNSO PDP and try to just make sure that they know, okay, this is where we are with this PDP.

Do you want to submit a comment on the issue report? Do you want to submit a comment on the initial working group report or the charter drafting? And just make sure they know that this is going on and they could provide input they need that could be taken into consideration during the process.

And the last point on the day to day operations would be a group of existing PDP liaisons interacting with GAC and sort of having perhaps a joint mailing list between the liaisons of the Council to the different PDP working groups and making sure the GAC also has access to them and they have access to GAC and what their perspectives are on different policies and just another way of bringing the Council and the GAC closer together.

So these are basically the two - the two tracks we discussed and thought might be worth getting deeper into. And the first item, I guess, that we will probably take action on is deciding on how and whether to appoint a GNSO Council liaison to the GAC.

And I believe that we have already submitted a request for funding in case this is someone who is a former GNSO councilor rather than a current one in order to increase the likelihood of him or her being able to actually participate in GAC meetings.

And there will be a presentation of what this consultation group has done and achieved in this period in Singapore. So this is just (unintelligible) the meeting on what we're doing and where we're going with this and what we've already gotten done.

Apart from that I'm not sure if there's anything else, Jonathan or Mikey or Brian or any of the other folks or David would like to add? A few days ago I did post a request for renewing - trying to renew interest in developing a wiki page for this group and so far there doesn't seem to be much disagreement on this and hopefully that will be a good resource to also allow reporting on both sides, both within the GAC and the GNSO. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. And as far as I know that wiki page is now going ahead and I think Marika can confirm that in the chat that will - I mean, I expect that it's likely to go ahead in any event.

Are there any other comments from those in the group? I think that was a good summary and really this is work in progress clearly. And the idea being that it's just sufficiently critical and important track of work that the Council needs to be apprised of it and ensure that to the extent that the group appears to be going off track or that there are any comments and input on it.

And I guess we're working on a slightly unorthodox way; this isn't being run via a standard PDP process so I'm conscious that therefore that it's very important has the Council is continuously apprised of the work and it naturally is, by virtue of the fact that there are - a representative and significant number of councilors on the group and we will keep you

informed. But any questions, comments or additions to that which Amr has said already?

Marika points out that just an important but subtle point here is that the application for funding of a perspective liaison from the GNSO to the GAC is a preemptive application in the event that the group does decide to - that this is the bet method and that's then ratified by the GAC and the GNSO.

So it doesn't prejudge that outcome but simply prepares for that eventuality noting that in essence the funding request could be withdrawn but it's rather better to put it in preemptively than to not have done so at all and then find a - Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. I wanted to thank Amr for a great summary. But I also want to point out that Amr ran through a lot of proposals that are in front of this committee but those proposals are being evaluated right now. So just to sort of amplify what Jonathan and Marika are saying in the Chat we have a firm charter, that's in front of you in the Adobe room. We have some pretty good in progress work but we do not have proposals yet. We have ideas that we are refining. So don't come away with the sense that this is all done. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes good point, Mikey. And that goes to this point of keeping the Council updated perhaps in a more granular way than we might otherwise do with the work of the normal working group or similar but, yes, thank you for emphasizing that.

All right I think we've got a little bit of time constraint, it's not desperate but seeing no other hands I think we can draw a line under this item

and know that the Council and the GNSO, by virtue of the recordings and transcript of this, is informed of the work of this group.

Our next item is another standing item which is this - or it has become somewhat of a standing item, this forthcoming review of the GNSO. Now I'm not sure that there is any particular update ahead of more discussion in Singapore on the back of any sort of written output that might come out from the Structural Improvements Committee.

But let me give Jennifer Wolfe, who's tracking this for us, the opportunity to just either confirm that and/or provide any additional update we might need. So let me hand over to you, Jen, without further ado.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you, Jonathan. You're right, there hasn't been any updates since our last meeting. We're still waiting for Ray and the SIC to report back on what the official procedure will be, whether they will be officially forming this advisory group and how they'll be selecting membership for that group.

The only update I think that we could report, Jonathan, was that we did receive a copy of a letter sent by the Brand Registry Group to Ray asking that if there was such a Council or advisory committee appointed that they would have the right to participate in that.

But again, nothing has been formalized so until we see something more formally submitted I don't know that there's a lot for us to do. Once that happens of course we'll ramp up and be prepared to look at our own self review running in tandem with the external audit that will be started hopefully sometime in the next few months.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jennifer. Yeah, and so do you have - is there specific knowledge that - or input that we're expecting any form of document to be published ahead of the Singapore meeting by the SIC? Are you aware of a confirmation of that or is that something we just might anticipate? Just wondering what we'll have to get our teeth into by the time Singapore comes along.

Jennifer Wolfe: I don't know if will be out before Singapore. I just reached out again yesterday to (Larissa) on staff who's coordinating this. And I didn't get a response back from her so I don't - I expect that she doesn't have an answer yet. But so we don't know definitely but, yes, I would think some time either right before Singapore or during Singapore we should have something more formal.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Jennifer. I see Marika has her hand up so go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I also checked in with (Larissa) and the latest I heard that they don't expect anything to be published before Singapore. You know, we keep on checking in with them to make sure once we have a date or a more clearer time line that we can provide that information to the Council but at this stage it's not the expectation that anything will be published for public input prior to Singapore.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so let's - given that there doesn't seem to be a substantial update on this at the moment let's not spend any more time on it unless there's another comment or question. So I don't see at this stage so I think that gives us the opportunity to move on then to Item 9

which is an opportunity to discuss our planning and latest draft agenda for Singapore.

So I think this is really being led by David. So let me hand over to David who seems to be doing a good job of pulling together a schedule at this point and then we can come I with any questions, comments or refinements, although there's - that has been active on the list as well so thank you for that. David, I'm not sure if you want to make any remarks prior to us opening up for questions or comments on this?

David Cake: Yeah, thank you Jonathan. Just initially...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, please go ahead if you would like to if you have anything to add.

David Cake: Yeah, main thing I want to say is I really - please imagine that the draft is in big capital letters. This is - is very much, you know, we can still move things around. Pretty much the interaction with senior staff is probably difficult to change much at this point or rather they might change it but it's probably harder for us. But I - very much are open to discussion on everything else.

One of the issues of course is that once we even allocate even 15 minutes for each working group, which isn't a lot of time, that does fill up a lot of the - particularly the Saturday schedule.

But I'd very much like to hear some comments and not just on - what's there but also suggestions for the, you know, to go - dig a little deeper and say what people would like to discuss in particular topics and should we give guidance to senior staff at this point and so on.

I'd also like to just - take this opportunity to - I've had the question John Berard posed on the list about was, you know, he specifically asked for some interaction with the multistakeholder - the panel and was his suggestion sort of considered. And, I mean, the answer essentially is - I did look into it. When on discovering that the panel would not be there and we would really be interacting with them on a very limited way I then would just - we decided to move - to basically have that session centered around Theresa Swinehart.

But if you would like to and try and see if we can get particularly Beth Novak in for - to talk to the Council directly it's certainly not too late to do that.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, David, just to come back - come in that so a couple of key points there. First of all, with respect to Theresa's session and the strategy panels and so on, just I mean, I think there's clearly two key areas that we'll probably be wanting to talk to Theresa and Fadi. It's pretty clear to me that those are already coming up and that is, you know, the strategy panels, their role and their future input and to the extent that we wanted to look backwards, any issues in and around their commissioning.

Beth is definitely not going to be there based on my conversation with her last night...

David Cake: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: ...but I have flagged with them our 11:30 Sunday session and that is where we have the opportunity to engage with...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...of her team on specific suggestions that came out of their work for the panel. With regard to content with - in our meetings with, you know, the Board and with Fadi, that's something I'll be picking up with the Council and driving and making sure that our strategic session, our content with the Board and our content with Fadi is...

David Cake: Oh yeah, absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...communicated.

David Cake: I thought - we already have on the schedule discussion - as normal that we'll discuss, as a Council, how we talk to the Board. And, Fadi, I was thinking more if people would like to give some guidance at this point for what, you know, specific things we might get Theresa or Cyrus or for that matter there has been some - was quite a bit of discussion early on about our interaction with the SSAC for example and...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

David Cake: ...would people like to have discussions about who that - just how we should handle the format for that - that role - that meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. So yes, so, I mean, certainly on the list and to the extent that it's possible - I must say what I've typically done prior to the meetings

has also reached out to Steve and - Steve Crocker and Fadi and I'll definitely communicate with Theresa over, you know, my discussions with Beth yesterday. So, you know, I'll keep you as the Council, posted and of course we can pick these things upon the list.

I did see Mikey's hand was up. Mikey, I don't know if you wanted to comment or come in on anything that David had said there or if that's now dropped?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Just very quickly a couple of ideas. The IRTP-D session is a half an hour. If you need a little time, David, I think we could easily shorten that to 15 minutes because we've got a public forum for that working group that will be quite a bit more extensive.

And the other one that you could probably drop from this is the Data and Metrics for Policymaking, there's 15 minutes at 11:00 on Saturday. We're just barely going to be off the ground; we may have a chair, that's about it. So if - there won't be much of an update for that one so there are a couple of slots that you could play with if you need the time.

David Cake: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right noting the response from Marika in the Chat there, Mikey too, that as well so we just need to balance those things. But I think that's the kind of trimming we can do on list and that's very helpful because, you know, David's rightly pointed out that that's a full day.

And I know there've been concerns running up to this point by Mikey, yourself and others, that we don't simply want to pack this full of working group updates for the sake of it; we need to make sure that is

of value to the working groups, the Council and the GNSO attendees at the session so that's useful.

Any other comments or questions for David or for the Council or suggestions as we work towards this, you know, interactively work towards nailing down both the structure and content of the Singapore agenda?

All right good. Well, David, I'm pretty encouraged. I hope others are as well. I think it's taking shape. And I'm sure we're going to get there to have a productive and well-structured meeting so I'm pretty positive about where we are at this stage so thank you very much.

David Cake: Yeah, well thank you. I'm certainly looking in, I mean, certainly - even I think we could certainly - there's a lot to talk about in the strategy panels area so we might - if we do- that's certainly one area we might still add a bit more but I'd like to - and also - and I really, I mean, Mikey has said quite a lot of good suggestions early on.

And including trying to find some things where we don't just sort of - we may not end up sitting down for the entire day as Mikey has complained of previously so we'll see what we can do.

Right, thank you for everyone and said, it's definitely a draft and we're still - certainly can move around these sort of internal - the items that mostly involve the GNSO itself at this point quite a bit so feel free to comment.

All right, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David. Right so closing off Item 9 then we can move on to Item 10 which somewhat unusually has a number of points in it although hopefully they won't take too long to go through. The first is a reminder that we - and this Item 10 is Any Other Business. And I know, Amr, you've put something onto that as a bullet - as an item early on in the course of this meeting.

So the first is to remind you that we have in train a couple of community budget requests for which there is a deadline of - Marika just reminded us in the Chat - of the 7th of March one of which was what we discussed under the Item 8 which is this preemptive application for travel funding for a reverse - or a liaison from the GNSO to the GAC.

I'm not sure if there's anything else to be said about this. I'm struggling a little bit on this. Are there any other comments that someone can help me with either from - struggling a little bit. I don't want to create radio silence on this. So I may come back to the community budget requests if there are any comments or issues on that. I'm not certainly sure how much we've discussed this.

The second item on our Any Other Business items is that the Non Contracted Parties House is, I believe, in the process of working through a selection procedure for ICANN Board Seat 14. To remind those of you the GNSO nominates two Board members for the ICANN Board. And these need, as part of the process, a Council ratification.

Now it appears that this is not going to fit in with our regular Council meeting schedule so we may need to have an additional meeting. And

really what the purpose of this item is is to create a placeholder for that and ensure that this is in place.

So I guess what the request here is - and we should complete this additionally on list, Glen, is to make sure that you're aware of why this meeting may need to take place and the proposed timing of it. So, Glen, if we could make sure that we do communicate this in writing on the list as well that would be helpful.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes I'll do that, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Glen. The next item is really just that we've - could someone help me with this, Root Server Advisory Committee presence in Singapore. I know the Root Server Advisory Committee has reached out and indicated that they will be present. I don't believe, David, that we've got them scheduled or have we got them scheduled? I'm just trying to remind myself if we've already got some kind of interaction...

David Cake: We have not scheduled any specific interaction with RSAC, no.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David. So really...

((Crosstalk))

David Cake: I mean, there is - they do have a session for the community. If anyone does want - I mean, that's one of the things if anyone had suggested that we should meet with them we would try and put it on the schedule but no one has so far so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, David. I think the primary point here is to note that they are present which is not necessarily guaranteed and there is a session. Marika, I see your hand is up.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. That was indeed the RSAC meets for the first time, I think, since I don't know how many ICANN meetings at an ICANN meeting together. So they've basically reached out to the different parts of the community to see if there's any interest in having a face to face meeting. But apart from that they are having a public session on Monday afternoon. And I want to say I think 1:30 to 2:30 but I think that's something that's to be confirmed.

So, you know, there is that opportunity as well to interact. It's basically for the Council to decide whether you think there is a need or a desire to have a face to face interaction with the RSAC at this stage or, you know, whether it's sufficient to just, you know, encourage members if they're interested to have a dialogue to attempt that open meeting on Monday.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. Now that's helpful so that's really an information point. Next point is, under this Any Other Business schedule is that the Meeting Strategy Working Group has prepared their recommendations which are now available for public comment.

And to the extent that, you know, the Council clearly meets at each ICANN meeting and indeed facilitates the so-called GNSO working sessions over the weekend ICANN meetings are pretty important to our working.

And so I think there's two points here. First of all encourage you all to have a look and make sure you're familiar with the working group recommendations and to the extent that you feel it's appropriate to then advocate for and contribute to any Council response we may want to make to that.

So I think what we'll do is send a reminder to the Council that this is available and then we'll ask you to pick up on that and decide whether it makes sense to respond to the public comment request here on behalf of the Council.

Final point then, Amr, you wanted to raise something at the outset so let me just hand it directly over to you then, an item under Any Other Business.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. This is Amr. I was just hoping for some clarification regarding the gTLD registration - or gTLD Registration Services Expert Working Group. And what a - the post-Expert Working Group PDP would entail.

I mean, particularly the issue reports for that PDP. Is the issue report going to basically be the final report of the Expert Working Group? And if so will there be an additional chance for public comments on an initial issue report before there's a final issue report or not? Just that that process is unclear to me and I would appreciate any feedback I can get on that. Thanks.

Sorry, this is Amr again. I would also like to ask whether this would be just one PDP or are there thoughts on maybe more than one PDP coming out of as a result of the Expert Working Group's work? Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. I believe Marika may be in a position to answer that.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this I Marika. I think it's important to separate out the two things where on the one hand you'll have the EWG report or final report or whatever they're going to title it which they are working on and I think the expectation is to have that, you know, by London timeframe. Which presumably at that point may also go out for another round of public comment before that is submitted to the Board who will then consider it.

Then the idea is once those recommendations are done and the Board says, yes, this is we intended to be part of the PDP it will then go back to the GNSO Council where there is already actually a preliminary issue report that has been prepared and published some time back.

So the idea is, at that point when those recommendations are final, they will feed into that final issue report which will then be submitted to the GNSO Council. As this is a Board-initiated PDP there is no intermediate vote. However, you know, it's at that stage up to the Council to decide how to divide that work.

If you would decide that, you know, there should be maybe some parallel tracks looking at these issues or, you know, whether it's all one package but in principle it's one PDP at this stage. But of course it doesn't prevent you from, you know, splitting up some of the work within the PDP, for example, through the charter development process.

But I think that's where things currently stand. So I'm hoping that that answers your question.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Marika. This is Amr. So just to be clear once the final issue report does come to Council there will or there will not be an opportunity for further public comments?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. In principle there is no public comment on the final issue report but obviously I think if there's a, you know, desire from the Council to do so it can be done. But, you know, just to point out the issue report itself is not about, you know, debating whether the EWG recommendations are right or wrong or whether that should be changed. That's something that will happen in the PDP itself.

You know, the issue report is merely about making sure that we've gathered all the information and have laid out all the issues that need to be considered. You know, but the Council at that stage may want to discuss or consider is, you know, once you start a PDP and you believe that indeed input on the value or the information provided by the EWG is needed as part of the PDP that you do a public comment forum at the start of the PDP process as the working group has already been formed for example.

But again I think that's something at the time when, you know, EWG finalizes its report and as well the direction that will come from the Board in that regard I think at that point, you know, staff can discuss as well with the Council what would make the most sense if we just, you know, integrate it into the final issue report and, you know, move ahead or whether there's, indeed, an intermediate step that is considered helpful, you know, before it launches into the working group phase.

Amr Elsadr: all right thanks, Marika.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks. Sorry to cut across you, Amr, there. That sounds like you've got the answer you needed? Thank you very much, Marika. I'm just remembered the - going back to the community budget request item under this AOB. And really the important thing here was to make sure the Council was updated. But there are a couple of requests that I'm expecting that we will submit and those relate to two points.

One, we have the Council development session, which was an induction for new councilors and a development and session that we held in Buenos Aires. The feedback from you all was universally pretty positive. And I think the likelihood is that that could potentially become an annual item. In the absence of it being a scheduled and funded regular item we need to make a budget request for that so that is one item that I propose to submit and plan to do so unless there's significant concern or opposition.

The other is that both as a suggestion from the - I think it was from ATRT2 and also indeed it's something that I think we're considering within the PDP improvements is to look at either facilitated - well face to face PDP meetings which potentially should they be intractable or difficult issues involve some form of facilitation.

There's the face to face and potentially facilitation and that's really an experiment. This is not a decided point but in order to undertake the experiment to try it on a - within a working group we need to apply for funding for that.

So that's a second, if you like, ad hoc or community-based funding request that I propose that we make. So that's really for your information but also an opportunity to, I guess, comment or give feedback on that if there are any concerns.

Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Just a reminder of the placeholder for the GAC GNSO liaison slot, does that go into that request as well?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, each one of those - I mentioned two items, Mikey, and that would be a third which, yes, there would be a third submission so that they wouldn't all get rolled into one, there will in effect be three community financing - community budget requests.

Mikey O'Connor: Right, that's all. I just wanted to get that one in there too.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, great. Hasn't been forgotten. Right, well just - oh, my - my sincere apologies. I have been relying on a clock which is on my PC which has suddenly updated; it was running two minutes before the hour and it's suddenly taken an update and told me I'm eight minutes past the hour.

So normally, as you know, I would be diligent in keeping us to time so sincere apologies that we've run over. That's just one of those things. I apologize. It looks like we've come to a natural end anyway. But I'm sorry that I let it run over. My clock was out of sync for some reason.

Thank you all. We'll see each other face to face in Singapore and no doubt be in touch online in the meantime.

Volker Greimann: Thanks, Jonathan. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Bye.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, everybody.

Maria Farrell: Bye to everyone.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Jonathan. Bye.

David Cake: Bye, everyone.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks again.

Jennifer Wolfe: Bye all. Thank you.

END