

**ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO Council Wrap Up Session
Thursday, 02 November 2017 12:15 GST**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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. On page:

<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Heather Forrest: So good afternoon, everyone. This is the traditional GNSO Council wrap up session whereby we run through a list of items that have come out of our work this week in order to primarily assign volunteers or volun-tell people to these items. And indeed that is what most of the items on this list are is seeking volunteers for various efforts. And in some cases we have one or two people with their hands up but it's a good opportunity to make that more broad.

So the first topic on our list is – oh and I should say for clarification purposes, given that this is an informal session, we do not call the roll. We simply progress into our work and we had, am I right, Marika, one hour for this session now.

So first topic on our list is the GNSO representative to the empowered community administration confirmation. Now as I understand it, this is really one of the first things that we need to do in that – excuse me – the way that the SSC – the Standing Selection Committee has dealt with this matter is to ask that the Council leadership work together to identify the GNSO representative and with that in mind, Donna and Rafik and I met yesterday evening to at least give this some preliminary discussion.

And as I understand it, the way that it works is that we have the Council chair that sits in, in the interim until the decision is made by the Council leadership and put forward to the broader Council. To the extent that there are no objections with my doing so, I'm happy to sit as the interim for such time as it will take Donna and Rafik and I to discuss this properly. And we'll come back to you with our recommendation as to which one of the three of us should serve in this position.

I see nodding for the record, around the table, does anyone object? Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Definitely not objecting, but I just wanted to confirm so that the secretariat can go ahead and notify the empowered community administration of your interim appointment which is basically confirmed per the SSC procedures as part of the election and then indeed as soon as you have formally decided it can potentially be considered and for the upcoming meeting so we'll take that as an action item.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Marika. So again, just to confirm, so we're clear since we didn't jump on the gun on that item, excuse me, no objections to me serving as interim between now and our meeting at the end of November? No, fine, all right, excellent. Thank you. So that's Item Number 1, done. And Donna and Rafik and I have taken on Board that that needs to be one of the first things that we do.

Item Number 2, the GNSO review of the GAC communiqué, as is the case we seek volunteers to draft the communiqué. Have we – have we anyone, let's say, who would like to lead the effort? Michele.

Michele Neylon: Well I don't know – did you say lead, no I'm happy to follow. Sorry.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Michele is a volunteer. Keith is a volunteer. I think it would be helpful – one of the challenges that we've had in the past is, you know,

working together across time zones in a drafting team sometimes looks like a cobbled together effort where we have different tones and different voices and this sort of thing so hence I wonder if we can have a lead and to coordinate those disparate voices. Keith, you're volunteering, that's very kind, thank you very much.

So Keith, Michele, would anyone else like to join the drafting team? Susan.

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Thanks to Carlos. Thank you, Susan and Carlos for your action. And Donna, Donna and Tatiana. And Paul McGrady. Wonderful. I think that's probably a good start to the extent we don't want to make this everyone on Council so I think that's a good start. If anyone feels like we need extras that would be excellent. Paul, your hand is up, please. Are you – are you up to volunteer, Paul, or would you like to make a comment?

Paul McGrady: Yes just up to volunteer and to say good morning or afternoon or wherever – whatever time it is wherever we are.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Paul. And I'll say I'm not sure if it's on our end or yours, you were faint. We did hear you wish us good morning, good afternoon and good evening. But just so we make sure if you have an intervention that we hear you. Thanks, Paul. Brilliant. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika, if I can just confirm the names, I think I caught most but I think I may have missed one. So we have Keith as a pen holder, Michele, Susan, Tatiana, Paul and Carlos. One more person? Donna. Thank you. And staff will go ahead as soon as the communiqué is published, if it hasn't already been published, to put it into the template and we'll circulate it to that group so you can start working.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thank you very much. So that is Item 2. Keith, as the ringleader for that, let us know if you need any help, please. And just bearing in mind that the document deadline for the end of November meeting is the 20th of November. Cheers. Great.

Item Number 3 on our list is the schedule of GNSO Council meetings for 2018. This is really here as a placeholder to say that this is something we need to look into. It's certainly not something we'll solve for today. One of our first tasks as leadership is to work with staff to revisit meeting times, meeting rotation times, make sure that they work in light of the new composition of Council. You will have seen I hope the email that came around from Nathalie, Terri, suggesting that you email GNSO Secretariat to the extent that you have any issues in relation to timing of meetings.

Yes, there was a question, a query some folks like meetings at certain times. We'll do our very best to accommodate that. We have our own challenges on leadership given the very disparate time zones, so that is something that we will do. And we'll take as a formal action item, although it's one that we spoke about informally, if might ask Nathalie and Terri to help us with the production of that fabulous traffic light colored time zone matrix so that we can look for those spots of least pain. And for the record, Nathalie has thumbs up on that one. Yes, so that one's to be continued.

Anyone have any comments they want to add to that one before we move on? No, splendid.

Item Number 4, replacement of Council liaisons due to the departure of existing liaisons. And I do believe there are only two. And Marika, can you help me – I'm sorry, you're typing, I didn't mean to surprise you – could you help – the two it's Julf and...

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So there are two, one actually currently doesn't have a liaison but it may be good for the Council to have one, that's the protection of

international organization names in all gTLD PDP, the reconvened working group. And the other one where Julf is currently serving as the liaison, that's the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. What I would like to propose on this is given that – and of course we have this a bit later on the agenda, but given that one of the items that Donna and I would like to propose that we discuss in January in our straw person schedule is the role of the liaison and reporting of the liaison and capacity of the liaison role and so on. That perhaps we have folks, we have can do, to have interim volunteers between now and January and then once we as the Council have a better understanding of what that liaison role should look like going forward, to the extent that we have a discussion where someone in January says, you know, I think I would be very keen to do X job and would you, you know, would you, the community, be happy for me to do that, I think we do that.

So is that comfortable for folks that we put two interim people into those two slots in between now and January? Yes. So, Marika, tell us again we've got CCWG IG, and Rafik you're currently the liaison for that effort.

Rafik Dammak: I'm the cochair the liaison is Julf.

Heather Forrest: So – it's clear, Rafik, that you know that work program best, if you like. But I think it's probably unfair to ask you as the cochair also to be the liaison. Do we have anyone else that's participating in CCWG IG that would be willing just between now and January? Tatiana, wonderful.

Tatiana Tropina: Yes, I'm participating in CCWG IG, I'm not a member, though, but I can definitely take this role.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much, Tatiana, for volunteering. Are we all comfortable with that? Tatiana, I suppose you're an observer to CCWG IG, Tatiana? Staff, from procedural point of view, that's fine, excellent. Wonderful. Tatiana, we'll

put your name down to that and we'll speak more about that in January. And our remaining is the...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The reconvened PDP from the Red Cross names .

Heather Forrest: Good point. So I would be happy to do that if you want me to. I'm just thinking I've been following that session. I was not an original member of the PDP, but when that was reconvened we did take some time to discuss the importance of Donna, James or myself following that effort just to make sure that there was a direct link to Council. So I do attend that group's work and attended the sessions this week. I'm happy to do that in an interim basis until we figure out what's happier for folks, unless someone would prefer to step in. Nobody's ever going to stop somebody else from volunteering for a job they don't want, so there you go. All right, affirmation around the table. So, staff, please put my name down to that as the interim please.

Great. Item Number 5, the Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operations Charter, this is a follow up from our discussions earlier this week in the Council session Part 1. And at this point as I understand it, we have Wolf-Ulrich who volunteered for that. And Wolf-Ulrich is now no – oh, Michele, sorry. Was I...

Michele Neylon: No, just add me, that's all.

Heather Forrest: Super. Wolf-Ulrich, are you still keen in light of your change?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Are you talking about volunteering in general for this committee? Yes, so I'm not one. I think you know, it should be if there is – is very clear that this group is going to manage GNSO Council related budget matters, nothing else. So then I would like to suggest that Philippe Fouquart should join this. He volunteers for the ISPCP. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Wolf. Martin.

Martin Silva Valent: Martin Silva speaking. I also would like to volunteer for this group.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Martin. May I suggest given, you know, Wolf-Ulrich has made a very valuable point there, that we already have these efforts within our SGs and Cs, this is not an attempt to duplicate or supersede those efforts; this is merely a Council perspective on this. And I think given that we are missing a few – oh I guess we're missing Philippe who Wolf-Ulrich has just volun-told while Philippe is in the air, may I suggest given the importance of this to potentially our stakeholder groups and constituencies, that we leave the call for volunteers open on this and anyone else who might like to join afterwards we certainly wouldn't foreclose that. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. One of the things I think that was discussed yesterday and also suggested this as part of the wrap up item is there are currently two public comment periods open that directly relate to the budget. So the one on the PTI FY'19 budget and the other one on the reserve fund. So one suggestion was is to already get that, you know, at least the three volunteers now and we can also send the call for volunteers to the mailing list with that explanation that, you know, that group will already get – start working on that.

With the idea of getting proposed input to the Council in time for your November meeting which is a very short deadline. But again, it may give an opportunity to the group to start working together and then hopefully consider formally the charter at the next meeting. As you may recall, staff did make a number of updates based on the input that was provided and one of the proposed changes is to have members of the group indeed be Council members but to open the committee up to observers to participate and post to the mailing list.

But however, when it would come to any kind of formal decisions of what is recommended to the GNSO Council that would be a decision of the members, again, to allow as well any kind of participation from experts in the

different stakeholder groups or constituencies or others in the community that may have specific information or expertise.

And I think it follows a similar model as to what the ccNSO is actually doing with their SOP committee, I think they're also trying to open it up also realizing that there may be interest or value in having others participate in that conversation.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Marika. I think that's a very helpful clarification and it summarizes as well some of the points that – the salient points that came out of the discussion on Wednesday and previous Council meetings.

So let's take that back then. Thank you very much to those who volunteered. Do we have a record of those who volunteered here? Thank you. And we'll take that back. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. Just before we move forward, the – Rubens noted in chat that the two documents that are out for public comment, one is about the reserve fund, and I can't remember what the other one is, but it may – PTI – so it may not actually be specifically relevant to the Council. I think certainly as a stakeholder group we have some views on those things, but it might be something that collectively as a Council we don't – we might not be in a position to come to an agreement.

So I think we need to understand there are two separate things, whether we want to provide comments on these things and whether we want to set up the budget committee. But I think I agree with Rubens, I'm not sure that these two efforts are things that the Council will want to provide comment on.

Heather Forrest: Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I can understand why there might be concerns around the GNSO Council getting involved in this, but when the

CFO of ICANN tells us that there's no prioritization of budget allocations, that should concern us. The ICANN budget feeds into every single aspect of ICANN the organization from the bottom to the top or the top to the bottom, whichever way you want to visualize that.

So if we – if the budget isn't allocated in such a fashion as to prioritize the work that we feel needs to be done in order to support our communities and to support the stability and security of the Internet, then that's a bit of a problem. So I think as the GNSO Council we definitely do have – well we have a right – we have an obligation to have a say on that.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Paul, we have you remotely, followed by Marika.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady here. So I do think we need to remember the nature of the scope of the GNSO Council itself which is the policy development process. James said something yesterday that gave me a little bit of concern when referred to us going through this budgetary review process because the GNSO Council is a decisional participant. The decisional participation comes in discrete circumstances and is directed by the underlying community, it's not a standing sort of thing that is ongoing.

And if we look at the budget through that lens, then absolutely everything would come under our remit. But if we look at the budget through the lens of the outfit that sort of is the traffic cop for the policy development work, which I think is the real remit of the GNSO Council on a day to day basis, then that will narrow our focus and we won't be stepping on the toes of our constituencies and stakeholder groups that they do their own work.

So again, whether or not this is a good idea depends on how broadly we cast the net. If we cast the net narrowly, and we stick within the four corners of what the GNSO Council is supposed to be about, I don't see a problem with it. If we cast the net more broadly I think we are going to be stepping on toes and really going beyond what the bylaws had in mind for us. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, Paul. Marika, would you like to add something for this?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And I put it in the chat as well, I think the whole idea is indeed that at least some people look at it and can make a determination whether there's a need or relevance for the Council to make a comment, and you know, the outcome of that can definitely be there's no direct role for the Council here.

I do note however, that I think on the reserve fund one, it specifically talks as well about auction proceeds, and of course, you know, the Council is one of the chartering organization – organizations of the CCWG on Auction Proceeds so there may be a link there and any kind of input through a public comment as the Council as a whole may also help inform that working group.

There was one more thing I wanted to say. I'm losing track. Oh yes, one thing –one comment I wanted to make to Paul, the assumption is of course as well that Council members that are appointed or volunteer for this group are in touch or linked up with whoever is doing work in the stakeholder group and constituencies because the idea is not that this is indeed any kind of competing body, the hope is of course that this is a continuum and that there will be good understanding of those participating you know, whether or not whatever is being done at the Council level is already being taken care of or does not need to be done at a Council level.

So again, I would hope that this is not a kind of competition. And there's a direct link between whoever volunteers from the different stakeholder groups and – or from the Council with whoever is doing this work on a stakeholder group constituency level. And that's also why I think it's important or – to encourage observers from the different groups who do that work so they can also raise their hand and say hey, you know, we're already looking at this, we don't think the Council needs to do this as well.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. I think that's a valuable addition. And to further the initial point that Marika made, of course it's very much within the power of this group to have a think about what it should and should not be responding to. So that is indeed part of their efforts. And just by way of reminder, our next meeting is 30 November which means document deadline is the 20th of November, so to the extent that we want to put anything together in time for that, we are working to that timeline.

Our next item on the agenda is the potential response to the meeting strategy staff paper. Donna, you led this item for us on Wednesday. What do we need to do to follow up? What affirmative steps do we have as action items?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. Earlier this morning there was a – the planning committee for San Juan met, which is basically a combination of SO/AC leaders. During that discussion Sally Costerton wanted to talk to us about the paper that they had put to the group, which basically looking at two things. One is whether to extend the policy forum by one day so that outreach can be conducted; and whether to reduce the AGM by one day because, you know, there's been complaints about not using the Friday.

There were some differences of opinion amongst the group so what Sally agreed to do is that this – the paper and there might be some enhancements to the paper – will now go out for public comment. So I don't think that was the path that they were hoping to go forward on but it will now go out to public comment. So that will take some time to prepare. But once that paper is out there I think we can, you know, get back together and think – see how we want to move forward on it. Thanks, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna, very much. Any questions in relation to that that staff paper noting that we'll speak specifically to ICANN 61 planning as another agenda item. No seeing nothing, all right, we'll move on to our next item then, and noting by way of time we're doing pretty well.

Item 7, operating procedures for ICANN's specific reviews. So in light of the discussion that we've had this week on SSR2 RT this week, do we want to pursue this in terms of developing public – developing input into the public comment period? There is an opportunity to do so, I think it's quite lengthy, it's mid January, January 15 I believe, so not – again necessarily something given the timing that we have to decide today. But in light of the fact that we've had discussions in this area, I think it might be useful to consider.

And perhaps this a good opportunity for James and I to make a few points about- James is hiding in the corner – to make, you know, give an update on where things are in relation to SSR2, so we have not actually really progressed that draft beyond where it was yesterday. There are a few queries out about the draft letter from SO/AC leaders, a communication did come out from Patrick this morning to say are we able to agree on text in time for the public forum? And in light of our discussions on Wednesday, on the concerns raised by a number of folks in terms of refining the sort of nuanced language there, we're continuing to follow up with that.

There is a meeting at 2:00 pm today to address this a bit further. So what I think we would be best to do is update you immediately once we come out of that session to see where we are in advance of the public forum. Thanks.
Keith.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much, Heather for the update. I think it's important for a statement to be made at some point but I think we have one chance to get the statement right in terms of correcting the record and, you know, putting down some markers and essentially making sure that it's clear that the SO and ACs are not ceding any authority to the ICANN Board as it relates to these accountability mechanisms and review teams. So I think this is critically important that we get this right.

So, you know, I would ask that instead of perhaps, you know, as Patrick from SSAC suggested, try to get something out before the public forum, that

seems like an artificial and arbitrary deadline. I mean, you know, people might want to talk about it sure, but I think it's more important to take an extra cycle and maybe even just an extra day, make sure that the text is right. It'd probably be helpful if we could actually have a chance to look at it. But, you know, I just wanted to urge caution, thank you.

Heather Forrest: Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I do agree with what Keith is saying here because I think words matter and we've seen a lot of confusion you know, the Board suspend and now maybe there's a pause or, you know, the implications are tremendous. But I'm also really concerned about what are they doing tomorrow. I mean, if the SSR 2 can't do anything but sit in a room and sort of think about what happened this week, that's, you know, that's a consideration for the volunteers. So I'm concerned.

The other thing is, is I'd be happy to review the operating procedures and provide drafts for comment. I think we should comment as a GNSO Council. And I think we have a lot of input for them.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Susan. Tony, your hand is up.

Tony Harris: Yes, Tony Harris for the record. Yes, I'd like to support what Keith has proposed and also offer myself to assist in – if you're going to draft anything or if that's going to be decided, we'd be happy to contribute.

Keith Drazek: This is Keith. Thanks, Tony. My understanding is that there is a draft underway among the SO and AC leaders. And so, you know, we would, you know, hopefully see that at some point before it's finalized. But I think there's already a draft underway. I'm not participating directly in that. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. I think from a process and timing point of view, we should have a discussion about whether we think this statement is

going to go out by the end of tomorrow or next week and what the process is to make sure we have sign off from around this table at least. I think that could be particularly tricky to organize that. So maybe we should have a discussion around it.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. I agree. I for one don't want to get it wrong here, first thing out of the gate. So where are we? I mean, I understand that there are – you know, we do this with the GAC – our response to the GAC communiqué, we do this with other things. There's always a certain value in timing and timeliness. But as you know, based on my interventions from IANA transition and the huge amount of work that we did there, I tend to like to get it right rather than rush it through.

What – how do we feel about this because we do indeed, Rafik, Donna and I, need clear instructions for how we engage with the other SO/AC chairs. Keith, please.

Keith Drazek: Thanks again, Heather. Yes, this is going to be a tricky one because it's not just like, you know, it's a Council statement. This is a joint SO/AC leader statement or – and so, you know, we're not going to have final say on the – all the text, we're going to have our input. Others will have their input. So it'll be essentially a negotiated thing.

And, I mean, I don't think we need to overcomplicate this, it's a letter, it's essentially going to say something to the effect of we, you know, the community acknowledges that the Board has taken this action and we recognize it's the community's responsibility to restart it.

We will take this opportunity to review, you know, the concerns raised by SSAC and the Board and that, you know, we are – I would like it to say something to the effect of, you know, without necessarily determining whether the Board's actions were appropriate, because it's unclear that they actually had this responsibility or capability in the bylaws, you know, I'm not proposing

specific text here, but I'm just – so I think it's going to be something to that effect. And I think that's pretty straightforward.

So I don't – but I do think that we need to make sure that there are some – at least a strong statement on the points about we are not ceding any authority as it relates to those review teams to the Board on this one. As far as process, I would hope that if there's – sorry, let me back up. I do think it's important for whatever statement comes out, and I do think there should be a statement that it comes out quickly but not too quickly and that's the delicate balance, we just need to first make sure it's right and then get it out as soon as reasonably possible. If that's tomorrow, great, if it's the next day, great, if it's next Monday that's probably okay.

But I don't think it should go on longer than that because people outside of this meeting may react to the lack of a statement, and the fact that the Board made this decision and it's just sort of hanging out there, so I do think timing is important. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Keith. I have Cheryl and I have Susan and I'd like to make a comment as well. And we'll see where we get to there. I'll provisionally shut the queue there. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. My comment was specific to the public comment on the Operating Procedures for all specific reviews, not just SRT so you should probably put me later in the queue. Okay, if you want me to go now, I'll go now. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. With awful echo. I'll stand back at the other end of the room and talk.

If some of the procedures suggested in and now open for public comment, had been in place, more than hypothetically we may not have had some of the situations that we're currently in. And I think that's important to recognize. So to that end, I would love to encourage the Council to, as you said, put in a

public comment response, but be very aware that it is much more than just the matter of scope and who does scope and when.

There is a lot more in that document, that is why that document is open until the 15th of January. And because I've been involved in a lot of the review team stuff informally, I'm more than happy to help. I didn't realize Susan, wrote in chat but you're probably not in the pod, so if you want me to informally interact and fill in things I'm happy to do so.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Cheryl. Susan and then we have my attempt at shutting the queue wasn't good. James, followed by Wolf-Ulrich and I'll leave myself at the end to wrap up. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: So it's Susan Kawaguchi. And this is just to be abundantly clear, so I just don't want to make any assumptions about this letter, and then, you know, it only goes within the SOs and ACs and we don't get a chance to make sure. So the GNSO is agreeing that the SOs – if the SOs and ACs, but the GNSO's point in this will be to unsuspend the review team, allow them to move on with their work, but what are the conditions? I mean, are we asking is there any conditions, on, you know, we think you need to look at scope or you should ask for more people or, you know.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Susan. James, if you don't mind, I'm going to jump the queue on you just to be able to respond to Susan because I think it's going to be helpful. So what I was going to say in wrapping up, is we really have a higher level draft than that at this stage, okay, and maybe that puts everyone at ease a bit. But to Keith's point, it is only a letter, it's a high level thing. And what it does is it puts a marker down, it doesn't really commit us to anything, I would say if I had to characterize this, what we're looking at is something that acknowledges things.

Yes, so in terms of three baskets, number one, we're suggesting that the chairs of the SOs and ACs acknowledge the announcement from the Board

and we understand that that tasks us to address concerns raised by the Board. The OEC, the SSAC and initially that text was looking like it was going to say something like and others. And I commented I don't want "and others" because that suggests we're just listening to random hallway chat and acting on random whispers, and I don't think that's appropriate. Nor do I want there to be any insinuation that the GNSO has some way communicated authority for – or suggested that this action be taking place. So that's basket one.

That we acknowledge that it's the community that is meant to get this thing back on track or to get it restarted. I've asked that back on track be removed from the draft language, what we have is something about back on track, and restarted as expeditiously as possible. And I think restarted as expeditiously as possible is helpful in that regard.

And finally the concerns that were raised in our meeting on Wednesday, yesterday, about the overall impact of this activity, so this is a very high level communication. With that, that might open a whole new line of discussion.
James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. James Bladel for the record. And I was just speaking with Chuck, Chuck raised another interesting point so I'm going to give attribution to the former cochair – former chair section over here – that the letter should probably also thank the participants for their patience as we work through this process because I think there has been a bit of a chilling effect on either participation or again, not wanting to act on rumors as you pointed out, but there is a distinct undercurrent that some folks are becoming disillusioned with this, this being their first review team or even their first exposure to ICANN volunteerism, and we want to make sure that that's acknowledged in this.

I had a number of things to say about the content of the letter and Heather's graciously asked me to ride along in the backseat with this meeting here at two o'clock with the SOs and ACs. It is a negotiation as we pointed out. And

as far as content, I think Keith and others, your sentiments about the actual aspects of this are very pertinent and they've been heard loud and clear and I think we need to be taken into the conversation.

Susan, your point about what are these folks doing on Friday, also a valid point, that needs to be taken into these. But I do think, you know, and I'll say it because I can say these things now, is I think you just need to kind of give Heather the latitude to go into that discussion with the other chairs and work through the language. I don't think it's going to be the kind of document that everybody gets a whack at it with the pen or an early draft to be able to kind of circulate it around. It, you know, and sometimes you kind of have to choose, you know, do we want to formalize this and have it come out sometime in January, or do we want to move quickly while we're all here in Abu Dhabi and it's topical.

And I think for this particular thing I think that, you know, we want to get all that stuff on the record, on a marker like you said, Keith, but I think the goal is get some clear path forward to restarting this work. All of that other stuff, it doesn't (unintelligible) any of that stuff happening later on. So that's my thought there so trust Heather, just give her what she needs and then send her into the lion's den and she'll come out with a trophy. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks for over-promising there, James. Wolf-Ulrich, please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well I'm always – thank you – just a procedural suggestion well, because as I understand it's just in the drafting process so coming in with this volunteer team, Tony Harris from our side, so if you are in the first stage, you know, of drafting this thing and circulating that, it will be good, well, to circulate as well directly to the stakeholder group and constituency leaders as well. So because it helps, you know, to save time internally for discussions. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Wolf, we'll do that. I think what we can do is take the draft that we have now and circulate that around. I don't see – James, do you see any problem with circulating that draft? I don't – no, James is nodding no for the record or shaking his head no.

James Bladel: No problem necessarily, it seems like Wolf-Ulrich and I are looking at this as – from opposite sides of the spectrum. I don't see a problem necessarily except that it's – if it's circulated around then folks are going to say well I like this part or I don't like this part, or we should add this or take this out. And I think that's just going to confuse the thing and then, you know, I just – I think visibility and transparency absolutely but I think we need to move quickly on this. Thanks.

Heather Forrest: Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry, just to explain very – we wouldn't like to intervene there but just, you know, to discuss with our rep on the drafting team, you know, that's the matter. Thanks.

James Bladel: So long as it's understood the final product might be different.

Heather Forrest: Thanks. Let's- well Keith.

Keith Drazek: So what I'd suggest on the circulation of the draft is wait until after your two o'clock meeting because things might change during that meeting. Yes.

Heather Forrest: So thanks. Let me take the opportunity to wrap this item up then please. I've heard a number of things and I think it's a valuable point to thank participants for their efforts to date and thank them for working through the processes as we all do this as a community. I'm inclined to – I appreciate James's willingness to come along to make sure that we don't have any gaps in terms of what was communicated, you know, in the run up to this, let's say. And the letter captures things accurately.

I will say that in order to get a letter that we are going to be able to agree on, the SOs and ACs, it is necessarily going to have to be high level. This is not – we're not going to get agreement ever, never mind this week, ever, if we go too deep on this. I can, you know, I can assure you I will do my very best, I have heard very clearly the concerns that have been articulated as has James. I tend to agree with James, and I would also like to say while I'm a big fan of Keith's approach and not rushing this, so I travel by canoe back to Tasmania and it takes, you know, three or four days or weeks sometimes it feels, I would like to see that this gets done by Friday before we all start hitting planes, because I think once we lose that momentum so I'm not suggesting it has to come out now, but I think to the extent that we as SO/AC leaders can get this out by Friday I think that would be a sensible thing. And I'm seeing nods around the table, any objection to that as a timeline?

So I think you'll take in faith, James, and I will do our very best. We'll get a draft to you. Please don't pepper us with, you know, redlines, we're going to do our best, yes, it's only if there's something truly toxic. And I don't – based on that we have now I don't see anything there that is horrendous. So but to Keith's point, let's leave this to 2:00 pm because the draft could indeed change after we've spoken to – after we've spoken to the Board. Agreed? Excellent, thank you.

Next steps for the revised ICANN procedure for handling Whois conflicts with privacy law. So this was introduced on Wednesday, Michele spoke to it. And I added my support. I think it's not unfair of Michele to characterized it, we've made some good progress in this meeting just in understanding how GDPR fits in this environment or the fact that we don't understand how GDPR fits in this environment.

And I'm certainly happy – Michele, I suspect you are too – and I think Keith, you volunteered on the list I think, would anyone else like to volunteer for the drafting team – I see Ayden's hand, thank you. This is the drafting team to

respond to Akram's letter, and Erika has her hand up. What I might do as well is I've been very ably assisted by some of my colleagues here on the ground so it might be a bit of a team effort on my end. Yes? Okay, good. Excellent.

Again, let's – no need to firmly shut that door to the extent that others would like to join in the drafting efforts, let's leave that open. Everyone okay with that? Yes. Good, splendid. Would we like to set a – I imagine that staff would love for us to do this, so we'd like to set a tentative target for when we want to have that completed by? Michele, any good ideas here?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Heather. Michele for the record. The sooner we do it the better because obviously – but at the same time it isn't as pressing as some of the other items on your list here. So I'm open to whatever kind of suggestions anybody can make that make sense in terms of limited number of people, fixed number of hours in the day kind of thing. So chair – Madame chair, if you would like to – you've wanted to be call you that all day, haven't you? Admit it. Okay, so I'm making this easy for you. Madame chair, over to you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Michele. Can I suggest this, we already have a number of things that we've said let's have that done for our document deadline for the 30th of November. The subsequent meeting, our December meeting, the document deadline for that one is the 11th of December. Could I suggest we take that extra two weeks and devote that, let's say, to the extent that we can't pull this around for our November agenda that we make this for December, is that satisfactory to those that have volunteered? Yes, good all right. That means it's on our radar but it's no, to Michele's point, it's not the most burning item on our radar, yes, great. Thanks. Staff, have we noted that for follow up and the date? Yes, thank you.

Community travel support consultation and questionnaire we have a deadline on this and Mary's nodding assiduously. Mary, could you remind us please what's the deadline?

Mary Wong: This is Mary from staff. The deadline is 17th November so that's before your next Council meeting.

Heather Forrest: So what do we want to do with that in light of the fact that it is before the next Council meeting and there was absolutely no way we were dealing with in a substantive way this week. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. My understanding is that this indeed a first step in that consultation so they're asking for general input. So if there are number of volunteers that want to look at it and see if there's kind of general input they want to provide it may just be a question of turning that then back to the Council list and just indicating, you know, is there any objection to providing this input.

And again, you know, if any input is provided it can also be very clearly stated that that wasn't subject to a formal Council vote but it's just intended as feedback to move this so the consultation there forward.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Marika. I think that's a good idea and we use this maybe just as putting a marker down on things that they might want to follow up on in future rounds so this won't be our formal input, it will just be these are the matters that interest us. Do we have anyone that's willing to volunteer in this effort, anyone feel very strongly about community travel support and how it impacts our work here in the Council, because it is indeed the Council perspective. Michele, you're very excited.

Michele Neylon: Madame chair, I'm not sure if that's the correct terminology, but I'm more than happy to help other people provide some input on the community – on the travel bit. Tatiana I think had something to add.

Tatiana Tropina: As far as I understand we are now – are we now talking about the future efforts about 17th of November, if might clarify? Because I think I told them (unintelligible) Tatiana Tropina for the record, I told them the call that for

example in my opinion these questionnaire is not comprehensive, they should have added more questions. But I think we will channel these comments via NCSG in any case. But if, yes, please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Tatiana. I don't disagree with you, but we were asked to provide feedback. The questionnaire that we were presented with was a starting point, it wasn't designed to be the questionnaire to end all questionnaires. And if you've ever done any work around you know, how one designs questionnaires, the likelihood of coming up with a perfect set of questions the first time around is probably slim to none. So if you're interested in assisting me and other members of the Council on this I would appreciate it.

Tatiana Tropina: Absolutely as (unintelligible) volunteer. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Mary, please.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Heather. And Mary from staff actually now speaking in my other capacity as a member of the other policy support team dealing with this particular project. I just want to emphasize that this is something the Board and the senior executives are very interested in getting a lot of community feedback on. I think several people have said this is the first step and there actually is – I think part of the question that does allow you to make suggestions for you know, future questions and so forth. So to really encourage the Council as well as individual community groups to send your feedback in by the deadline it would be very helpful.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Mary, very much. To Mary's point, and also picking up on the comment that Rubens put in the chat, can we delay on this? Can we have let's say a solid sense here that first shot means first shot which means there will be a second shot at input. I don't want to pass up this now, and have it come back to sting us. Thanks. Mary.

Mary Wong: Mary from staff again. I'm still wearing the other hat. So I can't speak for the executives and the Board on this, but what – in terms of what form the next steps looks like but it certainly will be next steps whether that is a further consultation, whether there is a follow on questionnaire, whether there is going to be a public comment on something more solid, all those are possibilities. But it clearly is something that's intended just to gather feedback at the moment, that we actually don't have.

And in terms of the deadline, that really is to allow us to work on those next steps, so it would be probably unlikely if anyone has a question as to an extension because those consultation questionnaires were sent out a while ago. So again there will be next steps and the more feedback we have I think the more useable and, you know, relevant the next steps will be to the community.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Mary. Michele and Tatiana, can I suggest that in your efforts to respond to this that we request further opportunities to provide input with deeper consideration. If we put that down they'll have to respond to that and would be on record for having requested that. Michele. Please.

Michele Neylon: Heather, Michele for the record. Or Madame chair, as we like to call you. Maybe we can just move this forward a little bit faster by simply contacting the staff leading this and just asking for more time now rather than...

Heather Forrest: Mary said no.

Michele Neylon: Okay, I can still ask. But why are you saying no to me categorically, Mary? Why are you being nasty to me? What did I do in a previous life? Is it something I said?

Mary Wong: I would say, Michele, this is Mary from staff, that some enthusiasm goes a very long way. So it certainly is nothing that you did or did not say, at least not today. I will have to take that back to the senior executives. My gut

reaction, if you'll have it, is that they would prefer to have the feedback earlier but I will certainly take that back and let you know as soon as possible.

Michele Neylon: Thank you, Mary. That's much appreciated. And I will now have to spend some time reflecting deeply on how I harmed you in a previous life.

Heather Forrest: It's good that we're all laughing on Thursday. Well done. Are we comfortable with that item as comfortable as we can be for now? Yes, I'm just mindful of time too, we're down to a minute and we have a few more things to go. Item 10, response to the letters from the ccNSO, ALAC and GAC regarding Work Track 5.

I'm inclined to say that this has to be an effort that's either led by or at least very deeply involving the cochairs of the Subsequent Procedures PDP. Cheryl's nodding even though that means Cheryl is throwing herself into that. And in that effort, I think so that's Jeff and Cheryl as cochairs for that PDP. As I understood it in our conversation with the ccNSO, that the ccNSO would not be offended by a global response, that addressed these concerns broadly, let's say, I think that is a good efficient effort. Steve is nodding noting that, Steve supports that for that PDP.

Let me ask this, the letters that where Steve maybe you can refresh our memories, the letters from the ccNSO, the ALAC and the GAC, were they addressed to the Council or were they addressed to Subsequent Procedures PDP?

I put you on the spot, can we follow up on that? Let's make an action item because we need to carefully consider who this letter who this letter actually comes from. I don't see any problem with it coming from the Council given that we're managers of the PDP, but it might be that it's a joint – a joint effort of the Council and the – and the leaders. So let's put – Cheryl, could we make you are point person for this, yes, that you work with Jeff and would anyone like to up their hands now? I'm of course very happy to do that. I think

leadership – I'm going to throw us all in there just to make sure that we're comfortable with that and Darcy as well, that'd be great.

So we...

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Yes, Paul.

Paul McGrady: Hi, sorry. I raised my hand (unintelligible) liaison for the PDP I think it makes sense for me to be volunteering (unintelligible) Cheryl and Jeff (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Super, Paul, fabulous. Thank you very much, that was my next thought was liaison. Wonderful. So that means Rafik, Donna, Heather, Paul Darcy and Cheryl and we'll patch Jeff into that effort as well. Excellent. So we will work on that. And I think there again that's an item that if we're going to triage we probably want to have on our upcoming agenda so if we can work to get that done by the 20th of November, Cheryl is nodding her head, so Cheryl, over to you. Good.

ICANN 61 meeting planning so we had an SO/AC leaders meeting this morning at 8:00 am, a number of folks around the table were at that meeting because it's not simply SO/AC chairs, it's leaders across the community so I know there were folks there from registries and registrars and IPC and BC and NCSG. So I think what we do now is we have a look in a more detailed way, it was on the screen for all of 30 seconds, the proposed block schedule. And I think what we need to do, Donna, is – we need to respond to those two questions that were put to us looking forward, not so much about – not so much about 61, but about 62 and 63.

Donna Austin: I think that's the meeting strategy staff paper that's going to go out for public comment. Yes.

Heather Forrest: Excellent. Thanks, Donna. Good. So that takes us back to that item that was earlier in our agenda. So in terms of ICANN 61, we can say this, for those who weren't there, a number of us were fairly concerned and articulated our concern this morning that the deadline for suggesting cross community topics was proposed to be the 30th of November, at which point we said, we really don't know the environment we're going to be in, in March come the 30th of November, so that was pretty unrealistic in our point of view. How much leeway we're going to get on that is not really clear to me.

Donna Austin: So I think, having gone through a couple of these, you know, planning interactions, I don't think we need to get too hung up on the detail at the moment. It's good to have the deadlines out there, but I think as the SO/AC leaders we just need to come to an agreement that it's good to get the topics out there, have some flexibility to change those if things change over the next few months, but possibly the most important things at the moment is that there are four cross community sessions scheduled for San Juan and – there was something else I was going to mention. But I can't remember now. But it's – you know, we had a kickoff meeting this morning, it'll sort itself out along the way.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Donna. To be continued. Item 12, GNSO Council strategic planning session, so in light of the time, what I think we do with the help of staff, this is very much a straw person. We have a very high level block schedule, we love block schedules in this community, of what we could do with our time. We had a chance on Wednesday to introduce those three blocks and what they looked like. One was about scope roll and remit, one was about the GNSO's role in the empowered community and one was about 2018 planning.

What we can do is we can circulate that to the list after we're done here today and have a more fulsome discussion about that on the list and then in November and I'm conscious of the fact that staff will want us to follow up fairly quickly for logistics purposes, and so on to the extent that we need people involved.

Anything we need to further say about that? Any questions at this stage?

Marika.

Marika Konings: It is Marika. If I can just reiterate the request that Nathalie made as well, you should all have already received an email from constituency travel, please respond to that if you didn't receive an email, please let Nathalie or Terri know.

Donna Austin: I should also add as well that, you know, we are looking at three full days so we'll start about nine o'clock on the Monday and end about four o'clock on the Wednesday, so we, you know, we provided – we've been provided with the funding for the full three days, so I think we should use it.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Donna. And bearing in mind as well that we have been referring questions to our colleagues, our staff colleagues in LA to ensure that we have some opportunity outside of a windowless conference room to get to know each other. That, you know, often this session – the AGM is followed by a Friday get to the new Council together and we decided in light of the fact that we had this pilot money to do the strategic planning session that we would do our – if you like, social activities there. And we have some pretty cool ideas and we'll continue to look at those. So everyone knows we're not just there to be yes, grumping at each other in a room, yes.

Good, wonderful. We're at any other business, would anyone like to add anything before we conclude and wish everyone safe trip home?

(Sayed): Yes, thank you very much. I just updated my SOI. The current position that I am in (unintelligible) Telecommunication Authority, my contract will end on November 11, which is nine days from today. At this point in time I have not – no reappointment has happened and I don't have any (unintelligible) on what I'll be doing on November 12, probably unemployed. But I have definitely applied for a few positions and I will update my SOI and will also inform the

chair about my new assignment. And if there is any question you can talk to me privately or you can ask it now. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, (Sayed) very much. And it's a good reminder to me since this wasn't a formal meeting and we didn't start, surprise, surprise, I have changed my SOI to make a note that I am the Chair of the GNSO Council. So just so we're all very, very clear here. And I also notice I needed to update my participation in PDPs, so there we are.

It's a good notice, a good reminder to all of us, old Councilors cycling off, go back and check and your SOI, if you're even still in the room with us anymore and not sitting out at the pool. New Councilors, please update your SOIs. Any further business to discuss? It's going to be a great year. Everyone have a lovely trip home. Thanks for being here. Safe travels and we'll talk to you soon.

END