

**Transcription ICANN Helsinki  
GNSO Council Wrap Up Session  
Thursday, 30 June 2016**

Note: 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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Man: June 30, 2016. This is the GNSO Wrap-Up Session. It will run from 1:30 to 3:00 pm in Hall B.

James Bladel: Okay, let's start making our way back to the table for our wrap-up session, which is always a thrilling and exciting part of the week. If we could have Councilors and staff start making their way back to the table.

I don't know if we have a - I think Marika has like a laundry list of topics for our wrap-up session. And maybe we can just charge through these, and maybe dismiss a little bit early if possible.

Sorry, where's the - is this the same Adobe that we had? The same Adobe room or different? I guess B, Hall B? Okay. I don't have that. Helsinki Hall B. Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: No, I think we're just in this meeting room. It's - I'll tell you what it is here in just a second. It's [icann.adobeconnect.com/hel56-hallb](http://icann.adobeconnect.com/hel56-hallb), Hall B. And Marika is - yeah.

Woman: Are we still in the same room as before?

James Bladel: No.

Woman: No.

James Bladel: Marika put it in that - okay, we'll give everybody a minute to jump into that. I think I'm in there now. Great.

Man: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: I think so. Does it say Hall B at the end of the URL?

Man: Yes.

James Bladel: That's the one.

Man: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: Yes. Today's gone on long enough to where I'm actually in the right place. Okay. Do we have a document that we're working from? I just kind of see my shiny forehead on the - and this is an informal session, guys, so we don't have to stand on ceremony if anybody has any other topics they want to add, or anything they want to discuss.

But I think we're just - we're putting the laundry list of topics into the Adobe room now. And then we're going to use this to kind of generate an action item list for coming out of Helsinki. What? This looks formal. There we go. Thanks.

Schedule for Hyderabad. So I'll just jump into this if that's okay, Marika, and then you just kind of smack me when I go off course, okay? Okay. So I hope everybody had a good time with what we've affectionately come to call Meeting B with the policy forum. It's an interesting format change.

Please keep in mind our next meeting in Hyderabad, India, in November is Meeting Format C, which is also a different animal that we've never seen before. But instead of a shorter meeting and more compressed meeting, it's actually a little bit longer.

And so, you know, what we need to do here is at least get a rough idea of what we want to see at that meeting so that we can start planning, especially for those who have to turn in their funded travelers to different stakeholder groups, and constituencies have to make arrangements for their supported travelers.

We need to kind of start getting that nailed down because, you know, if we have a weekend session before, or Council Development Session after, which, you know, are all things that we've had in previous meetings, then we need to map that out.

Marika, you had a chart up. Can you load that, and we'll take a look? Because this is going to make a lot of determinations. And for folks who are, you know, making their own travel arrangements, you kind of want to know what day you have to be there, and what day you want to leave. And for Americans, make sure you get your absentee ballot.

Okay, Marika, go ahead. Or, Carlos, you wanted to say something while Marika's loading this? Or...

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Is she going to load the schedule?

James Bladel: Yeah. Well it's not really a schedule. It's more like a chart of what each day will be. And then...

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Well I have a very specific question about the previous days, working days of the Council, if they're going to show up or not, because the competition team is about to decide if we meet before or after the Hyderabad meeting. We're going to meet in Hyderabad, but I would like to know if the Saturday, Sunday are part of the official schedule or not, in particular. Thank you.

James Bladel: Yeah, okay. Yeah, Marika, go ahead. I mean, Carlos, that's a good question, and I think there's probably half a dozen if not a dozen other groups with exactly that question is, what does the schedule look like so I can start planning my group's schedule around it? And that's kind of what we're trying to get some clarity on here. So...

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes. In particular, if the Saturday - if the GNSO Saturday is the first day of the schedule, or it's two days before the official schedule starts. This is always very...

James Bladel: Yes.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: ...very tricky.

James Bladel: So if we can blow that up a little bit, I think - wow. Thank you. So instead of - so the meeting itself, I believe, starts on - yes, Marika.

Marika Konings: If I can maybe just provide some context for what you see on the screen, because...

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: I want to make sure that people understand. So what is here is the Meeting C, seven-day format, as was developed by the ICANN strategy working group. What you see in yellow is the boxes that were added then by the drafting team that was led by Volker, kind of mapping this to our normal meetings.

So basically I think the idea of - our original idea behind Meeting C was that it would be what we know as an ICANN meeting, with the add-on of a wrap-up development session or whatever kind of form.

And if you can go to Page 2, you'll see as well. So this is the high level overview. And then the drafting team also actually went into a more detailed block schedule approach. And what I've done - because on the top you see actually on Saturday, Sunday. But as the Hyderabad meeting doesn't align with that schedule, you see that at the bottom. So the first day would be Thursday. Second day would be Friday.

So this is what the drafting team has proposed. And it's really now up to you to discuss indeed does it align with the expectations of the experience here that you had with, you know, how sessions were run. Indeed, currently it's proposed here that there's a GNSO Council Development Session on the last day, as it has been in the past.

There's also the face-to-face PDP working group meetings that are usually added on, you know, basically Day 0. So those are some of the things for you to consider. And as James already alluded to, some of these decisions are time-critical, as many of you need to fill in your names for funded travelers, which may depend on, you know, what actually takes place.

And, you know, Carlos already mentioned as well, other groups at the same time are also already doing their planning. So although you may not be able to decide now, it is something that probably needs to be figured out relatively

soon to give everyone, you know, sufficient time to plan. And also from a staff perspective, putting in meeting requests and things like that.

James Bladel: Thanks, Marika. So I have (Yose). I just wanted to - maybe we can start with - well let's go with (Yose), and then I'll ask my question. Go ahead.

(Yose): Thanks. Just clarifying. So where it actually says Saturday there, we should read it as Thursday?

James Bladel: That's correct, because when they moved the meeting they also shifted the dates. And so look at the day on the bottom, not the day on the top.

So a question would be - and if I had a whiteboard I'd be scribbling at it. But the question would be, Council Development Session. This is something we've usually had at the last meeting of each year, and it's been a good way to introduce incoming Councilors.

And I think - maybe can we get a show of hands of the folks who are probably going to be termed out of the next Council? Well I mean some people just can't run again. So at a minimum we'll have, you know, two, three, four, you know, minimum incoming Councilors, and possibly - you know, possibly more.

So can we make any kind of tentative decision on whether or not we expect that a Council Development Session would be something we'd like to see in Hyderabad? Phil?

Philip Corwin: Yeah. I don't like to speak - this is a very long meeting. Longer than we've ever had before, the official term of the meeting. It begins Wednesday, November 3 and does not end - Thursday, November 3, and does not end till Wednesday the 9th. So it's already seven nights. So and it's quite a long trip, particularly from North America, to get there.

So I don't know if there's plans. If we were going to come in early, as we've done in prior ICANN meetings, we'd be spending not seven days in Hyderabad, but eight or nine, if we came in for two days ahead.

Now in Dublin, we did the Council Development the day after the official end of the meeting -- one, that it would also make it extremely long; and two, at least for me -- I don't know if there's other Council members -- this meeting was originally supposed to be the week prior in Puerto Rico, and they moved it a week back. And the following week is the INTA Leadership Meeting in Florida, from Tuesday the 15th to Friday the 18th.

So let's say it ends Wednesday the 9th. So even if we had the Development that day, the last official day, and you travel back to North America on the 10th, you wouldn't be arriving home probably till the 11th, after a very long trip. And you'd have to leave four days later for the INTA meeting in Florida, if we added the extra day after the official meeting.

Besides making it eight days in Hyderabad, you'd be narrowing that to three days after a very long trip back. So I'd urge that - I'm not against the Development meeting, but I'd urge we schedule it on the last official day of the meeting, and not add a day to the meeting.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. And you couldn't have said it better in your last sentences. Right now I think we're just saying, does this have value? And is it something we want to try and find a place for? And then where it falls is definitely a second conversation.

I think it actually - on the chart, the way it reads now, is that the Council Development Session would be the last official day, and not tacked on to the end. Another - yeah, Volker. Go ahead, Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes. I would just like to note that with this plan as it's outlined here, this is for GNSO Councilors, not a longer meeting than the last meeting of the year that we used to have with the Council Development Session included.

We would usually be starting on Saturday -- this has been shifted, but let's just look at this -- and end on Friday with the Council Development Session. This has now been included in the official part of the schedule. Therefore, for a GNSO Councilor, this meeting's length is not longer than the usual last meeting of the year would be. And I think it is wise to include this additional session into the official schedule, because it makes sense there.

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks, Volker. And I think to one other point, so does having this at the end of the meeting make sense, because we will have had our new Councilors come in and take their seats? So having it at the beginning, we don't normally have that. It would make less sense, let's say.

I have Rubens, and then I wanted to throw another idea out there, and then let you guys hit me with rocks. Oh, and Donna. Okay. So, Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. I don't know if staff in this room knows, but I would like to know how the leadership training program factors into that, because it usually happens in the same meeting as the (ATM). So we might have a week prior for it - well also be some incoming Councilors, or could be members of the (TPO) could be some Councilors that are restructuring the (TPO) facilitating the RTP. So how would that factor into this calendar?

James Bladel: Marika?

Marika Konings: It is Marika. I actually don't have any information on that, but it's a very good point and I will check back with colleagues who probably know the answer on what the plans are on that.



Donna Austin: Thanks. Donna Austin. So I wanted to suggest something that might be a little bit revolutionary. On the first two days where we usually have the Council sessions, I wonder if there's value in having half of the first day as a Council-only session. I think we've established that we can probably change the way that we do things a little.

But I'm very conscious of the fact that we rarely get in a room together face to face, and just have, you know - the GNSO Council Development Session, we do that once a year. But I just wonder whether there's value in getting us, you know, together for the first half-day at a Council-only session.

And if there's any topics - or maybe we can wrap some of the Council Development Session into that, and maybe get rid of the Development Session at the end of the week. Just an idea. And the rest, then we do in the day and a half what we'd normally do in two days. Just an idea I thought I would throw out there.

James Bladel: That's actually something very similar to what I was thinking of raising, Donna, which is if you noticed, we took our - for this meeting, we took our normal two long days, and we did 80% of that work in six hours.

So I feel like - you know, and I mean maybe you feel otherwise. Maybe you feel like we cut too many corners. But I felt like we did a fairly decent job on Monday, from 9:00 am until 3:00 pm, in what we normally would take two full days to do.

Now maybe we have to expand on it a little bit. But it seems like if we had - if we took our weekend session and boiled it down to one day, even if it was a long day, it would still be a day we didn't have to spend on an airplane. So that was just my contribution, very similar to yours, Donna.

I have Olivier and Avri. And, Volker, are you back in the queue? Okay, Olivier and Avri. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, James. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And just in response to Rubens' question regarding the leadership training program, I have heard rumors that it would actually be moved to the A meetings, so it might be a non-issue.

James Bladel: Thank you. Good bit of rumor. Maybe we can ask staff if you can confirm that that's actually happening, or just something proposed at this time. Oh, okay. Heather's corroborating that bit of information. Yeah, go ahead, please. Sorry? You want to be in the queue? Well we don't put you in the queue. You're Marika. You get to - okay.

Marika Konings: Okay, this is Marika. I'm actually responding to your point on compressing the weekend session, because one of the big differences here at this meeting is that we didn't have the regular PDP updates, which usually adds a whole day. I think that's usually the Saturday.

And we've had feedback before that, you know, those are maybe not necessarily done in the best way possible. So you may also, as part of, you know, thinking of rethinking how to do that, think if there's another way of doing it.

One way could be thinking of a more interactive format -- you know, we do send the policy briefings beforehand that have the details and status updates on those PDPs -- and get questions identified beforehand. And maybe just have - you know, schedule two hours. Have all the chairs of the different PDPs there, and do a kind of Q and A in between all the topics.

Trying to see if there's a different way of - because still as the manager of the policy development process, you still have an obligation to make sure that, you know, those processes are following along, and that there are no issues that the Council needs to be aware of. So you may think as well of a way of

integrating that without necessarily having it taking up the whole day, and being able to compress the schedule.

James Bladel: Yeah, point taken. And I think that was definitely implied. If I wasn't clear, it was the idea that, you know, we can probably incorporate some of the things that we dropped for this meeting back into a single day, even if we add an hour or two. We don't need that entire extra day, and we don't have death by PowerPoint. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. I wanted to speak a little bit about not so much death by PowerPoint, but perhaps a little bit of wounding by PowerPoint. I'm wondering whether every one of you -- I know I didn't, but I'm only an alternate, so perhaps I'll use that as an excuse -- read all of the reports that you would have heard.

And I'm wondering whether there's a balance somewhere between you don't need to hear from every group at every meeting, but you do need to hear from some of them periodically, to find a balance in terms of not doing the whole day of reports, but still allowing some time for some reports.

James Bladel: Yeah, thanks, Avri. That's a good point. And I think we're all kind of - it sounds like we all have the same goal, which is if we took that single day that we had on Monday, expand it a little bit, factor in some of these other reports, but do it in a slightly more efficient and focused way, then we don't need to come two days early. Maybe we just come one day early and still get more bang for our buck.

So, okay. I think we're going in the right direction here. Do we have someone else in the queue? Or that was the end? Okay. Oh, Susan. I'm sorry. I'm trying to follow hands and cards and...

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry.

James Bladel: That's okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I just wanted to say that I really think it's a value to new Councilors, because it was to me, to do that Development Session. So and doing it at the front would be valuable, unless we could bring them in, I guess - I don't know. Maybe they could participate before they're actually seated. But anyway...

James Bladel: Yeah, I think we want to have the Council Development Session, if I'm hearing those are valuable, particularly for new Councilors. I know for my first time - I think everybody's agreeing, for their first time on Council, those were kind of lifesavers.

I think we're just trying to make sure we find a place for it. I think we could - to your point, we could possibly find a way to do it at the beginning of the meeting. We've traditionally done it at the end because - to capture the incoming folks. But yeah, that works.

But I think if I could just kind of maybe bring this in for a landing, because we have some other topics, is we want to have Council Development Session. We want to explore new ways to cut the pre-meeting, if you will, from two days to one, even if it's a little bit longer of a day, and we have PDP updates that we didn't have at this meeting, but we try to work those back in.

And if possible, the Council Development Session would be at the end of the week, but we're open to trying something new and moving it to the front of the week. I mean it's not like we won't know who those people are that are coming in. So, okay. And one second. Stephanie and then, Marika, what other - Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. Just a naïve, silly question. Is it within our mandate to have implementation updates, too?

James Bladel: Absolutely.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay, because I really, really appreciate your attempt to cut the time down, but to do anything other than a fast skate-through of a slide deck on implementation, for instance, you know - I mean I would have loved a chance to brief the GNSO on the silliness of the conflicts with law implementation review. I mean that was - oh, a nightmare.

And the PPSAI promises to rival it for silliness, judging from what's going on in the communique drafting session, if I - Carlos? Where's Carlos? He's going to slap me again. Good. Yeah. So, you know, we might want to load some time in there to have a really serious review before the end of these things, so you don't have to be in the position of saying, no, that's not good enough. Out it goes. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. Marika and then David.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm going to respond because the implementation updates are usually part of the weekend agenda. So we have our colleagues from GDD that come in and provide - I think they first of all provide a written update, and then they also give a, you know, brief oral update and open it up for questions.

So my assumption is that maybe similarly, those updates would be provided beforehand, and we ask the Council to identify specific questions, to identify whether time is needed or who, as well, should be there. And of course we now have as well the liaisons to all of the IRTs, so that is also of course an additional avenue to get these updates and have conversations around those.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks, Marika. And I think I see where this is going is we want these things back there, but maybe we don't want them back the same way they were previously where we, you know, kind of had an hour, and 45 minutes of

that was sitting through slides, and 15 minutes of questions. We'd maybe want to be a little bit more focused and efficient.

Maybe another thought would be to collect all of these updates, the written updates, that probably no one will have a chance to read, and have a Webinar like we did with the Red Cross, where we kind of get the Council on a Webinar before anybody gets on any airplanes.

And that way you've got kind of a week or two to percolate questions and come to those sessions, you know, and hit the ground running. That's just another thought of how we don't have to spend another day in India. Really what I meant to say was in transit to and from India. That wasn't...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...ICANN meeting, James, not India specifically.

James Bladel: Hey, you know, and let me just say, as someone who doesn't eat meat, I'm looking forward to bringing all of you to India, and you especially, Michele. Okay, so we have David and Heather. David?

David Cake: Yeah. So I mean this may be sort of going against the general trend, and of course I won't be a Councilor too much longer and wouldn't need to suffer.

But I actually think that making sure that we do a reasonably thorough review of what PDP and review team work - implementation work is going on, is an important part of the Council's role, to not just lose track -- you know, that there aren't PDPs that just kind of are lost track of, because not that many Councilors are, you know, interested in that or are involved in that policy work or anything like that.

We (unintelligible) this at the Meeting B, that cutting it short in the Meeting B seems to me to be very final, because it's the policy forum, and we have

plenty of opportunities to have a whole hour - you know, you can attend a whole hour and a half outreach session or cross-community group.

But I do think that these ideas like instead pushing it out to a Webinar - or some of it out to Webinars beforehand, or revisiting the - how interactive and effective those sessions are are really great. But I'd hate to see us actually not go through every PDP, because, you know, some of them do kind of - it's important to keep track of even the ones that aren't contentious and are, you know, lurking cheerily for a while. Thanks.

James Bladel: Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. I think you're actually agreeing with each other. And I think it's down to - it's not so much the content; it's the presentation style. I've sat on both sides at various points over the last few years. And, you know, it becomes a death by PowerPoint with these incredibly tedious slides. That's not what you want.

What you want is a this-is-what's-happening, quick, simple, now-I'll-take-your-questions. Or whatever way you want to frame it. I think it's just trying to get that balance. And I love the idea of like the Webinar-type thing. I mean that can work really well. And, you know, there's so many tools out there. Why stick - you know, changing how you do it is a good idea.

James Bladel: Okay, so I think we've got a pretty strong sense of the room that we want to keep the Council Development Session. We want to explore new ways to get those updates -- PDPs and, to Stephanie's point, the IRTs. And, you know, I think that's something to work with. Oh, I'm sorry. Heather, did I skip you? I didn't write your name down. Sorry, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Heather Forrest. Just a few quick follow-up points. One, I think it would be very helpful not just to have slides, but if anyone has a written report for us, it's helpful to have that as close to our deadline as

possible, so we're not reading written reports on the plane. That pairs with the Webinar thing.

And I think one of the things that I found most valuable about this week and this format was the opportunity to engage in some legitimate substance, and not just in a 30-minute time slot.

If there's any way that we can replace some of this time in the weekend, if we condense updates with opportunities for PDP working groups to meet face to face, we have several large PDPs ongoing right now. And if we can build in some time -- real time, not just 30-minute, hour-long meeting slots -- for them to meet, I think that would be very helpful. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. One thing I wanted to flag as well, and it comes back to a previous point, is the face-to-face PDP working group meetings.

It's not on our pilot, but the ability that we have to - or that the Council has to select a PDP working group to make use of very limited funding that's available to have an additional hotel night if it's added on. But we currently have, you know, four PDPs that are ongoing; probably three of those that would, you know, probably be interested.

So a question is as well, is there any kind of preparatory work we can do in parallel to, you know, working out the schedule, to at least assess, you know, which of those, if any, would be interested if such an opportunity would exist, so that once we have some more clarity around the schedule, people can be notified, you know, sooner rather than later, because those are also people that are affected by the funded traveler schedule.

And just one point as well to - how there is something that takes one item off the agenda. Just to remind everyone that there is - this afternoon there is a



wrap-up session in which everyone's encouraged to, you know, share their perspectives and views on this meeting.

There is also a survey. And, of course, you know, from our side, we'll look at that as well for specific comments in relation to the sessions that the GNSO has led and organized. Because I think the hope, at least from a staff side as well, is that those things that people really liked are something also we can maybe replicate in the A or C meeting, because there's, of course, no restriction on doing so if something really worked well and was well-received.

James Bladel: Thanks, Marika. And I think you segued very nicely into the next topic, which is that the face-to-face PDP - I think, you know, let's just be blunt here. I think that we've got three active PDPs. And as a Council, I think we can expect that all three of them might have some degree of interest in having a face-to-face meeting in Hyderabad. And I believe the budget is for one.

Marika Konings: It's basically for three in the fiscal year.

James Bladel: Right. So we didn't do one here, so two?

Marika Konings: No. It doesn't carry over. I think that's what we make clear...

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...is while the new fiscal year is first of July - so you could do three in Hyderabad, but then you wouldn't have any for the...

James Bladel: Well let's remember this. There's a lot of overlap in the membership of these PDPs. So having all three of them in Hyderabad probably doesn't make a lot of sense. And in some cases, a lot of Councilors here at the table are also participants, in some degree or another, in the PDPs.

So I guess what I'm getting at is we're probably going to have to choose which one of our children we love the most for this upcoming meeting. And it's going to be - you know, that's going to be an interesting exercise, because I think they're all going to make a very strong and compelling case.

So we're going to have to take a look at where they are in their life cycle, where they are in their work plan, where - you know, which ones make the most sense to have a facilitated, face-to-face meeting. And as Marika said, unfortunately we're going to have to make that decision fairly quickly.

So I think the first step before we jump into that topic - and we can still discuss it. But I just want to put out on the table, maybe to pre-empt a long discussion about that, is maybe the first step is to ask staff to coordinate with the leadership of those three PDPs, to survey their membership.

Who's attending Hyderabad? Who would be interested and tentatively available to attend a facilitated, face-to-face? And not to say that, you know, whoever has the highest score wins, but at least that gives us an idea of, you know, whether or not there's one clear answer here, or if that, you know, muddies the water even further.

And that's just one thought of how we can - because I don't know that we can solve that at this table. I don't know that we have enough information. So, okay, hang on, Carlos, Phil, Stephanie. Okay, Carlos?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Just following your argument, it makes a lot of sense to make this evaluation, because probably the first PDP is the one that has most participants already going to Hyderabad. So this one doesn't need a lot of money. And you can use the budget for the second. So there you have two already.

James Bladel: Possibly. But without knowing, it's - yeah, it is one possible scenario. Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yeah. Just I want to ask some clarifying questions. And, Marika, of the three active ones, that's the RPM Review, the one I'm one of the co-chairs; the Subsequent Procedures; and the RDS. Are those the three we're talking about? And would that face-to-face meeting be on the day before the full meeting started?

Marika Konings: That's also up for discussion, but in our experience there's more energy in the room if it's before the meeting, compared to after.

Phil Corwin: Yeah, yeah. I'm not going to - I'll defer to members of the RPM Review. But I'm not going to be personally pushing to have the face-to-face there. And but if it is there, if somehow our group "wins," quote/unquote, then I would - again because of that INTA meeting, it would be impossible for me to stay an extra day at the end. Plus I think after a week it's just too much to ask people to engage in a face-to-face.

The one thing - the last thing I'd like to say is that I'm looking at the airline schedules right now for the Washington area, and it's a long, long trip. It's basically if you leave on the first, you get there in the middle of the night, early in the morning on the third. So it's a very long trip because of the distance and time.

So I'd urge that whichever one we're going to do, if we're going to do a face-to-face, if we decide there's going to be a face-to-face, and decide which group, that we do that real soon so we're not left to book our tickets in September. I mean let's get this done soon, and not at the end of the summer. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. That's exactly why we're tackling it today. And you never know. Maybe it's like golf. Maybe the highest score loses. So, Stephanie, you're up.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And may I just say before I ask this question, that if we have an award for the most diplomatic intervention,

Marika should get it for that last remark about the energy in the room being greater before the meeting.

I want to ask about the budget. What exactly do we mean when we talk about a budget for this? Because that particular one we're talking about, the RDS one, we're not going to fly 200 people in, right?

James Bladel: No. Typically it's one extra hotel night for a certain number of people, and it's much, much limited. It's not 150 airplane tickets. It's...

Stephanie Perrin: Okay. Then the next question is, how do we determine who gets one of those tickets? Thanks.

Marika Konings: So there's - Marika, if I can answer. There is indeed a process already in place that has been used for the pilot. And actually from the motion you adopted earlier today, you know, staff will kind of write it into guidelines.

But, you know, our assumption is that the same process we'd use - I think it's currently each stakeholder group is allowed to identify six members that would be eligible for - each stakeholder group, as well as each SO/AC, is allowed to put forward six that would benefit from that hotel night. But, of course, anyone else that is already there or is paid in some other ways is able to show up, and there's remote participation as well.

James Bladel: Yeah, and those are hotel nights, not air flights. So, and by the way for folks who are concerned about the transit time, I certainly am. I think Chicago, I have to cross two oceans and one of the poles to get there. I was just going to point out that Heather does that every time. So let's, you know...

Man: But that is...

James Bladel: ...all shed a crocodile tear today. She's on her way back.

Man: But, James, that is the problem with Chicago being at the center of the world, is that when we leave it, it's far away.

James Bladel: Exactly. Okay, so that's - I think we're kind of all in agreement here that, you know, with regard to the face-to-face, I think the first step is let's reach out to the leadership. Let's survey the members. You know, if one of them only has, you know, a smattering of folks that are even planning on attending Hyderabad - I mean it's a long trip. And it's coming at a weird time of the year.

And a lot of folks didn't budget for this change. I mean that's a blunt way to put it, but it is, you know, a cold, hard fact. So we may see reduced attendance versus what we expected for Meeting C.

Okay, so can we - I think we can kind of take that offline. I think we've got some action items we can work from. Please watch the list. And if you are one of the co-chairs or leadership of those PDPs, please help us out with that survey when it comes down in the next couple of days.

Okay, let's go next then to - I lost the agenda. Sorry. Or the topic list, or whatever we're calling it. Can you put that back up? Okay. Here it comes.

Chair election timetable. Another thing we have to do in Hyderabad is, you know, talk about nominations for chair and vice-chairs of the Council. And so I think Glen had a timeline, or Mary or Marika. Somebody had a timeline that we followed in the past, and how that shifted probably by a week due to the change in venue, and the change to the calendar. But - okay, let me see if we can - okay.

Marika Konings: Can we maybe just move first to the next item and then...

James Bladel: Yeah, sure. We...

Marika Konings: ...come back to it, so we get the documents ready?

James Bladel: We'll circle back. Volunteers for GNSO review, response, whatever we're going to call it, to the GAC communique for this meeting. We are expecting a GAC communique. I think we are - well, you know, who knows? My information's probably at least 12 hours old.

But I think we are expecting advice on a couple of issues that we have been following, particularly the IGO issue, and perhaps the privacy proxy issue. So don't know what it's going to say yet, but there's a strong possibility that at least one or both of those will contain - will be mentioned in the GAC communique. So can we put together a list of volunteers to - yes, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, just to add on to what the expectation is, so basically staff will provide a template. So we basically will plug in the GAC communique advice part in the template that has been previously developed. And the volunteers are asked to provide draft responses basically.

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks. And depending upon the nature of the advice, we may actually want to go outside of the template a little bit, you know, but certainly within our remit, if we feel strongly about something. So any takers? Any volunteers?

I think I want to volunteer this time around. I don't think I did enough heavy lifting last time. And Heather? Okay. So Heather and I are volunteering. Any other - oh, my goodness. Okay. Okay. And Donna. Okay. So the chairs will take first stab at that, but of course obviously whatever we come up with will be circulated to this group for approval before it's transmitted anywhere.

Okay. Number 4. Survey policy for a meeting. My understanding is that there is a survey coming out about whether or not you like this format. Spoiler alert, I had to talk to David Cake and his video camera, and I told him that we loved it. So, you know, I mentioned that, you know, a little bit of change - and there's always a little bit of growing pains and things.

But I think generally the feedback has been positive, anecdotally. But if we want to get something out of the qualitative and into some quantitative feedback, please keep an eye out for this survey, for feedback on the policy forum. And make sure you get your responses in.

And I think - is there a session, too, this afternoon? And what's that going to be like? Just more of like an open conversation -- what worked, what didn't?

Marika Konings: As I understand it, they're really trying to make it very interactive. So they have like survey questions and poll questions. And so I think they're trying to put some structure around it, and I presume there's a lot of kind open - but it's really trying to get - you know, by specific feedback.

James Bladel: Well, look. We live in a day and age where you can't buy a cup of coffee without somebody asking you to fill out an experience survey. And so I know that folks kind of, you know, tend to turn a blind eye to this.

But I think this is important. If you liked Meeting B, and you think that - or, you know, the policy forum, and you think that it worked, you should say something about it. And if you didn't like Meeting B, and you think it didn't work, then you should say something about it. But I think the key is, don't let this one go. Heather and then Stefania. Stefania, go ahead.

Stefania Milan: Yeah, thank you. Stefania Milan for the record. I also personally liked the short meeting. It was brought to my attention, though, that one activity organized by our stakeholder group, in particular the cross-community working party on ICANN's responsibility to respect human rights, did not get any time allocated.

So we were not, you know, a little randomly - there were empty rooms. So if we can make sure for next time that also cross-community working parties

are considered, you know, as much as working groups, that would be very good. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Stefania. I know that there were a number of groups that wanted to get some time that unfortunately didn't, and certainly we encourage them to continue to do that.

But the fact that you were able to kind of gather ad hoc is also a part of Meeting B. I know it's not ideal, but it was also foreseen that, you know, small groups could gather and join and discuss, and find an empty space and work on these things. Heather, did you...

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Hi. Just a related point -- related but unrelated, I guess -- is to say that we met, the three of us, with David Olive and his team earlier this week, to talk about efficiencies in the meeting as well.

It was really mainly nuts and bolts kind of thing, but I think it's good that everybody knows that we had that meeting, and we talked about how to run things more efficiently on our end, which is really all we do is sort of coordinate the meeting, and how we can communicate better with David and Marika and her team.

So if you have any thoughts on that, I realize it's very nuts and bolts stuff that you probably don't see happening behind the scenes, that makes these meetings happen. But if you have any thoughts on that, you can let us know. Thanks.

James Bladel: Perfect. Thank you. Any other thoughts on the survey for the policy forum? Or, as Heather noted, any other feedback for the chairs on staff? The meeting? Facilities? Lunch? Okay. Oh, Paul.

Paul McGrady: Just that I think that Meeting B went very smoothly for us. But I think we need one more Meeting B to find out if that's Meeting B that made us compress our



- get to work more efficiently or if we just got lucky and had some that the work before us was not terribly controversial. We just don't know yet. So I think that we, you know, to a certain extent we may want to reserve judgment until we have another 24 months or at least 12.

James Bladel: I think that's a prudent suggestion. Thanks Paul. (Neil)?

(Neil): Hi. This is (Neil) (unintelligible) the chair of the Cross Community Working Party on ICANN's Corporate Social Responsibility to Respect Human Rights. And I would like to reiterate Stefania's point. And by adding that outreach is a priority for the B meeting and therefore I do not think it's really helpful if we meet informally in an open room because that doesn't allow people who are actually very interested in this topic that is now all over the PDPs and the Cross Community Working Group on accountability to really get engaged in. So I think looking at this for the next policy meeting would be great to get at least a small schedule for the working party. Not two as normal but maybe at least one.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks (Neil). And two points. First I apologize if I implied that gathering informally on an ad hoc basis was an adequate substitute for having a meeting. I didn't mean to imply that. And secondly this is just a reminder to participate in the feedback session. This is not the feedback session itself. So let's, you know, it's - but I do apologize if I gave you the impression that everything was okay. I clearly hear the message that, that group - and there were other groups as well I think that also were - felt like they missed the boat on this particular format. That's the kind of thing that you should take to the survey for policy forum meeting.

Okay Red Cross, IGO I'm not sure how this one got on our list because what do we have to do on this one? What's our next step on this one Marika? Are we still waiting to hear from the board for the GAC or we're just still waiting yes?

Marika Konings: I think this item was here partly as a result of the meeting with individual board members. Just to see is there any follow-up that needs to happen from the GNSO side or just waiting?

Woman: I think we have follow-up we just don't know what it is yet. To a certain degree I think we're waiting for the communiqué. And we still don't know if it's in the communiqué. So that will be one piece in the puzzle not the only one. We've got Phil.

James Bladel: Yes Phil.

Phil Corwin: Yes I just -- and this is a point I made the other day when there was a discussion and Chris Despain and other board members were in the room. As one of the two cochairs for the working group on IGO curative rights processes we've been on hold the last year waiting for this legal expert opinion. We have the final opinion now. And we want to proceed and wrap that working group up before the end of this year.

And it's very difficult to for us -- and I made this point to the board members who were present -- trying to judge the need and what any curative rights, processes, adjustment should be. It's very difficult when we don't know what preventative rights the board is going to be agreeing to with the GAC and the small IGO group. The more - and I'm not advocating for specific result in those discussions and I may be approving personally or disapproving on what they finally agree to but it's kind of we don't know what might be left to be cured without knowing what prevention they're going to put in place. And it has been two years. And I think we need to convey a message come on already make a decision and convey it.

James Bladel: And Phil just to clarify you're talking about the small group that...

Phil Corwin: Well I'm talking about the discussions between the board, the GAC and the IGO small group on the GAC's request for certain preventative rights at the

top and second level. And of course our curative rights process group is looking at the second level not the first level protections at the registry level but at the domain level the second level domains. And it would be a lot easier for us to decide what's required and appropriate if we knew what if any preventative rights at the second level they're going to agree to.

And frankly we thought we had heard that they had met in Paris last July and we would probably see the results of that meeting and recommendations last fall and it's now nine months later and there's still nothing. So it would – it's really time for them to reach a - whether they can agree or not I mean if they can't agree they should tell us that too. But we can't for our working group it's very - it's a challenge to know what to do without knowing what they're going to agree to. And it's really way past the time when we thought we'd see the final results of those discussions.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Phil. And can I put you on the spot for when the communiqué is released and we start working on our response to make sure that that's captured or reflected...

Phil Corwin: Sure.

James Bladel: ...in our response?

Phil Corwin: Absolutely.

James Bladel: Okay.

Phil Corwin: I'm sure I'll be happy to contribute when we're composing.

James Bladel: Perfect.

Phil Corwin: I have a response and that we - whatever they recommend finally I'll be happy to finally see it in black and white rather than speculating for the past two years.

James Bladel: Okay. Donna is that on this point Mason because - okay so we'll skip we have Donna and Keith but we'll go to Mason first for a statement. Go ahead Mason. Okay Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Donna Austin. So on smaller group that's been meeting there was a meeting yesterday. And Mason and I kind of invited ourselves to go along. There is text that they've been working on for quite some period of time as a redline version I don't - it's been shared with Mason and I. I'm not sure it's for distribution yet so I'm not disclosed that we've got a copy of it. I haven't actually read it because I haven't had time but it's a work in progress.

I think what - how can I say this? The IGO seem to want some kind of notification if an IGO is registered at the second level. We're not sure how that would work practically but it seems like (Akram) was in the room yesterday too which I found interesting Mary was also in the room. So ICANN seems to think that they can develop some kind of process whereby the IGO would be notified in the event that the name was registered. I - it's not clear for what purpose.

And then there is an expectation that there would be some mechanism available for curative purposes if the - if they could prove that the second level registration was being used to represent the organization and it wasn't or some kind of fraud or whatever. So that's I think that's kind of I agree is but it's still I agree it. And I probably - the session we had with Chris here I came out more confused after that and then after that session yesterday I came out even more confused. So it's still kind of going around in some kind of weird vortex and I'm not sure how it's going to come out?

James Bladel: Thanks Donna. Mason did you want to add to that?

Mason Cole: Yes. So just thank you to Donna for that helpful summary. And that's pretty much where this stands right now. This is an unusual situation in my mind with I mean given whatever experience I've had in the ICANN process or on this council or in my role as liaison to the GAC I've never quite seen anything like this where you've got a long standing policy recommendation by the GNSO in front of the board with conflicting GAC advice where both were treated with a hands off approach for, you know, this is going on three years now.

I mean I was on the council when we voted on that policy and that was November 2013. So it's been quite some time. I - this is extraordinarily frustrating I know for the council because I mean eventually you look at the bylaws there's an expectation enshrined in the bylaws that the board will act on GNSO recommendations within something like two meetings of receiving the final report. And they haven't done that.

But they are all kinds of reasons being given that from all sorts of corners of staff and board and elsewhere that about why this situation exists as it does. It's very fluid I'm afraid. And, you know, Donna and I are doing our best to kind of sort out what this really means and see if we can arrive at some sort of actionable plan to get this done. You know, one of the more critical elements in our discussions with various players in this whole mix is to protect GNSO processes and make sure they're honored in much as they should be and still arrive at an outcome that's palatable to everyone involved in whatever, you know, whatever implementations this policy might look like.

So just, you know, by way of follow-up I've prepared a summary of the discussion that Donna and I have had with Chris since then. You know, I'm going to forward that to James as soon as Donna and I get agreement on where the content is. And then, you know, I think within a matter of days we've got some follow-up work to do with the board to see just where we are and what steps we could take. And I'm sorry this is so confusing but this is

again like I said this is unprecedented in my experience. So that's where we are.

James Bladel: Thanks Donna and Mason. Yes unprecedented is a word we keep using I think because yes I mean we're off the page I think in terms of process. So I have Keith and Stephanie. And then let's saw off underneath this one because I think I don't know that we're going to necessarily solve anything but we're capturing action items that what we want to look for. Oh Phil I'm sorry were you ahead of Stephanie or...

Phil Corwin: No I'll...

James Bladel: Okay yes. Okay so we'll go Keith, Stephanie, Phil.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks James, Keith Drazek. So I think, you know, following the conversation that we had with the board a couple of days ago now where, you know, Steve Crocker said, you know, look we're not the boards not in the position of making policy making these kinds of decisions. Chris came back and said well in this particular instance we sort of are in a position of having to make a call here make a decision.

I think that provides an opening for us as a council to send a communication whether it's an email, or a letter, or something, you know, in the coming weeks to basically memorialize that conversation acknowledge yes you do need to make a decision and to just basically put a marker down and say yes this needs to be done. Now that's just a suggestion. I understand that Mason, and Donna, and others have been, you know, having more detailed and, you know, sort of intense conversations around this particular issue but just as a path forward I think it makes sense to put a marker down and say look, you know, this is something that needs to happen, so thanks.

James Bladel: Yes thanks Keith. And I think heads are nodding all around the table. And I think my only concern is making sure that we tie all the work starts together

so that we're, you know, working these angles here but we're also talking with the board but we're also feeding this into our response to the GAC communiqué whatever comes out of that and all of those are coordinated. And that we keep up the pressure on multiple fronts too until we get to some resolution. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much Stephanie Perrin for the record. And in an effort of levity and diplomacy at the same time the good thing about this is we now have a precedent. So if this is going to happen to the PPSAI piece that is coming in that communiqué it's not unprecedented. What I'm worried about is how do we react promptly, diplomatically but with a certain amount of figure if something comes back at us and it's going to be a ping-pong as this one has been I gather. It's been a full ping-pong mind you. I suspect the PPSAI one will be a more rapid ping-pong. But it looks like it's coming back in a form that, you know, I mean we don't want to set up another implementation committee that is implementing something like the Whois conflicts with law policy and implementation. So I'm staring at Mason here hoping he has a strategy for this. (Unintelligible) and go for it.

Mason Cole: Well I admit I mean, you know, this council is flying blind a bit because we've never had board intervention at this level with policy development. I mean you're looking at a situation where at least some members of the board or some members of the GAC don't care for the policy as it's been output by the GNSO by the council. And so there's an attempt to, you know, through a side door or from a top down method modify that policy in a way that's more agreeable to the community to the broader community.

So, you know, the - as I said a moment ago this is unprecedented in my experience. You know, this council needs to decide how it wants to react to whatever comes through the communiqué and how the board wants to communicate with the council. So I think probably the communiqué is the first opportunity. Our reaction to the communiqué is maybe the first opportunity to formally put notice on record about how we might feel about input post

development of a policy. You know, I'll point out that for the past at least a year longer than that, you know, the since I've been in this position at least for two years we've spent quite a bit of time formalizing a formal method for the GAC to have input before the finalization of a policy on development of a policy.

Sometimes they take advantage of that sometimes they don't. Sometimes even when they do take advantage of it they don't care for the policy as its amended and they come back after the fact and say okay we didn't like that now we want a voice on implementation. So it, you know, I've been around ICANN a long time and I've not seen things develop the way that they have over the past year. So no there's no formal plan about how to attack this. But, you know, I'm here to cooperate with the council on a way to go forward and with the degree of assertiveness that the council deserves and the policy development role that it has within ICANN. So I'm at your service.

James Bladel: Thanks Mason. And I think you're preaching to the choir. You know, we all want to see this change. We're all kind of baffled that this model needs to be threatened internally right now at a time when the eyes of the world are on whether or not this can work vis-à-vis governments in particular, you know, it seems well it seems inopportune let's say to start making up new rules and new processes.

And it was one of the reasons why earlier we mentioned the response to the communiqué. And you mentioned being assertive. I don't think a personally I don't think that maybe in this particular case -- and I don't want to prejudge what's coming out of the communiqué -- but, you know, a chart, or a grid, or a spreadsheet may not be a strong enough message to convey what we want to convey. And we may have to take the template that we've used for previous responses and take a look at whether we want to try something else to really drive home the point that, you know, whatever it is is not sitting well with us. Phil you're up.



Phil Corwin: Yes. And just I say as a member of the council here we are the council where the policy development group for gTLDs the GAC still is advisory. It's secondary to our role. And there have been essential I'm glad to hear that you and Donna were in a meeting and that there may be some memo you'll be able to share to give us kind of a feel for where things are at. But I find it very disturbing that since the GNSO made recommendations and the GAC made, you know, gave advice that was to the contrary to those recommendations that the board has been meeting with the advisory group in closed door sessions with no one there to advocate the GNSO position.

And so which further complicates the situation for the working group I'm co-chairing because they may release recommendations that will not sit well with the GNSO community. And we're not quite sure if they'll ever be implemented. Let's not prejudge this but the whole situation is very disturbing I think. Let's wait and see what it says but it should not become a precedent for what happens when the GNSO says this and the GAC says no we want that.

James Bladel: Okay. I got - I have no the queue is actually continuing to grow. I have (Olivier) and Susan. And I know that we have a couple more topics so can we keep the interventions. I think we all are in strenuous agreement that the current situation is not acceptable and that we want to find a way forward so Olivier?

Olivier Crepion-Leblond: Thank you very much James. Olivier Crepion-Leblond speaking as ALAC liaison. I hear the GNSO saying they're not being heard. I've certainly heard my colleagues on the ALAC saying they're not being heard, the SSAC also saying the same thing. And the GAC oh yes many GAC members think they're not being heard either. Perhaps we should discuss this as a large group in the future in a future ICANN meeting. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you. I would make it I don't mean to say we're special but we're special because in this case we have done our job and created policy which

we are under the bylaws supposed to do. So it's not all about being heard it's about being thwarted in our ability to perform our function in the organization. And sort of...

Olivier Crepion-Leblond: But the ALAC is also saying that we're all saying...

James Bladel: Yes.

Olivier Crepion-Leblond: ...the same thing.

James Bladel: Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Real quick so Susan Kawaguchi for the record. I think this is more of a board issue than a GAC issue. And I think we need even though we could respond strongly or differently to the GAC communiqué this time I think really it's more of a letter or some sort of communiqué to the board saying we did our job, you follow process, do something and because the board has to make a decision. We may not like that decision but then at least we could do something instead of being in limbo. So it's really a boring issue for me.

James Bladel: Hundred percent agree. And just so we're clear our response to the GAC communiqué actually does go to the board. It's the - and Marika maybe you can help me it's the GNSO's response to the GAC communiqué our interpretation of what it means. And we are responding to I think we transmit that response to the board not to the GAC. Is that correct? Oh and the GAC is like ccNSO yes okay.

Yes. And I think that goes back to I believe Mason's point which is stepping outside of our traditional, you know, call and compare thing and really look at the templates to then make sure we're sending a strong as message as possible. So okay the next item is board finance proposal again this is something that I sent - Stephanie did you want to weigh in on the board finance proposal?

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you, Stephanie for the record. No I wanted to weigh in on the response to the GAC communiqué format as somebody who massacred one version of it. And I would have been lost without Donna bailing me out on all the stuff I don't know anything about. I think we should really respond with a communiqué that responds to their communiqué because that grid is just too, you know, condensed. It doesn't get to the nuance. So if we've got a legal opinion that basically says here's the legal opinion then we need to explain that not try to squeeze it into a teensy little box. There that's all I wanted to add. And we should all and we should obviously have experts in the different areas cover the boxes not ask me to talk about Phil's area. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks Stephanie. And okay let's take a look at Item Number 6 quickly. The board finance proposal for WorkStream 2 I think we just sent something around earlier today. I'm sure no one had a chance to review it. I think I just glanced at it before I sent it. But one of the questions that we had for the group -- and Marika help me I'm starting to lose the lose the handle on this one -- is that whether or not it would be worthwhile to ask either a member of the Board Finance Committee or one or more of the cochairs of the CCWG Accountability for WorkStream 2 who will now have this new authority to or responsibility of ownership of the costs associated with WorkStream 2 whether it would make sense to either even through Webinar or perhaps even better to invite them to our next council meeting to talk briefly about, you know, this proposal, what it means to them, what they need from us as the GNSO?

One of the questions I have is as one - as the charting organizations are being asked to sign off on this change which is a change to this working group giving it authority over its own budget I mean what if we say no? What happens then? You know, so I think - what's that? So, you know, would it be useful to, you know, I think Mary I don't know that we have enough - we've had enough time to kind of digest this issue to really think about it. I'm just putting it out. Let's think outside the box of ways that we could get people to

brief us on this particular topic and give us the rundown of why it's necessary, what it means, and what they're asking for us as one of the five charting organizations. And I've got Marika first and then Paul and (Ed). Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. And this is Marika. And I think one of the challenges well for everyone to get their heads around it I think the different communications that all relate to the same topic. I think there's an initial request from the chairs of the CCWG that are asking for, you know, validation of the budget request. And I think it's the email that James has shared as well on the, you know, project cost control mechanism or whatever it's called that.

And then there was recently as well an email I think from a chair to the Accountability Group where there's actually further breakdown of what is actually being asked for. And that maybe one of the things as well that would be - on behalf of the chair with (accountability) at least have all that information available. And based on that indeed it may be helpful to indeed to schedule some kind of meeting with all the people that you suggested too have a kind of overview and Q&A ability because indeed the idea is that - the request is that the council validates the budget requests. So there is some kind of vote required. And also your point, you know, what happens if there's no support or there's support with qualifications? I don't know if that's an option too?

James Bladel: Thanks Marika. Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thanks James. So I think there's one very fundamental question that needs to be answered so that I understand how to evaluate what they're suggesting and that relates to jurisdiction and whether or not the location of ICANN's formation is part of WorkStream 2. I'm assured by some that it's not and I'm assured by some that it is. And if we are going to look at the location of ICANN's organization we are talking about undoing and then redoing WorkStream 1 because WorkStream 1 was based upon the assumption that

it would be a California nonprofit corporation with the sole designator model right?

So if we are looking at undoing WorkStream 1 and then finding a new place to redo WorkStream 1 then we don't need \$8.8 million we need at least \$28.3 million because that's what WorkStream 1 cost okay? So we need early intervention on the issue of whether or not that item is a WorkStream 2 item under jurisdiction or if we're talking more specifically about what choice of law should be in contracts and, you know, those sorts of more practical aspects of the jurisdiction question. Otherwise I don't know what this means. So if we could get some guidance that we can rely on that would be terrific. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Paul. That's actually I think an excellent example of a question that we would need to have answered by the for example the leadership of the CCWG in order to determine whether or not we want to approve these cost controls or not because I imagine it also would really shift things in terms of their legal advisors,. You know, you maybe being kind by saying \$28 million maybe its \$80 million you know?

Paul McGrady: Exactly.

James Bladel: Okay, so but good point there. I have (Ed), and then Keith and then Wolf-Ulrich. (Ed)?

(Ed): Thanks James. At a first glance at what you sent - the cost containment proposal. It's a decent proposal. But there are questions. The question I have is between the how are we going to budget the legal expenses between Jones Day in independent counsel? That's still to be determined. So some of the questions I have are when are we going to actually have that information going forward? But I think getting a Webinar would be extremely useful. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay thanks. I have Keith, Wolf-Ulrich, Michele and Elliott.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks James, Keith Drazek. So I think Paul in response to your question I think obviously I agree with James that this would be good to hear from the cochairs as they're going to have the ultimate responsibility for these funds and they probably have the pulse of where the group is going coming out of the discussions last Sunday.

There's been a lot of discussion on the email list about this jurisdiction question. My take on the proposed budget is that the smaller number relative to the jurisdiction or relative to the overall legal funds is a bit indicative or instructive in that I think they think it is the latter of the two options that you described so not the incorporation, or headquarters, or location of ICANN the organization but rather, you know, choice of law related to jurisdiction issues. So I think there's been quite a bit of activity on the list on the email the CCWG email list this week following these Sunday discussions. And I think the strong majority of participants contributing see it as the more of the jurisdiction contract things like that not the incorporation. There are a couple of voices involved in the discussions that would like to see the headquarters or location of ICANN as an organization in, you know, Articles of Incorporation opened or reopened but I don't believe that that's likely to happen.

Man: And just to come clean I hope you're right.

James Bladel: Okay. Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thank you, Wolf Ulrich speaking. Well just I've been briefly through the document. One question is because there are question marks with regards to about the owners is that closed already because or is that still open about the owners for WorkStream 2 here they are two question marks in the paper. And the other thing is to add to Paul's and Keith's point I understood, you know, from that proposal that from the \$8.8 million in so we

aren't just talking about \$3.0 million which are allocated should be allocated from that \$8.8 million into the WorkStream 2. And from that this \$3.0 million are envision challenge between the community and the general council on - of ICANN. So which is also a nebulous area which has to be solved? So these are my questions. And also I'm not from that point on that paper I'm not clear about what our responsibilities in the end how and what kind of form it comes down to us as a council any question what we have to do, how we can get to the decisions about any budget questions here. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks James, Michele for the record. Look speaking completely in my personal capacity one of my – my main concern around all of these financial proposals is where's the money coming from and how that affects the reserves and how those reserves are going to be built back up again? There's been ultimately the financial stability of the overall organization is something that cannot be ignored. And if the money is if that - if those reserves go too far down then the money is going to have to come from somewhere else and that's going to impact most people around this table either directly or indirectly.

James Bladel: Thanks Michele. I think on Monday that was exactly the point that Lori Schulman was making in regard to what a typical or reasonable level is for a nonprofit and where we are currently and that the fact that there's no plan to replenish that. Elliott?

Elliott Noss: Thank you James. Elliott Noss, Tucows. I want to, you know, I fear that I've incited Paul on the jurisdiction question because I've heard him reference it now I think three times this week. You know, I made comments in the Sunday session where I was making some forward-looking statements that I'm going to try and really briefly summarize here.

First the US has done a fantastic job of getting us from A to B. Second the world did not have does not have other than ICANN really multi-stakeholder frames to consider. Third because of that no country in the world has tuned their legal framework to contemplate multi-stakeholder in an effective way. We are only today for the first time seeing some countries at the highest level, you know, in their constitutional or original con stating document trying to bake it multi-stakeholder.

Fourth this organization would of course benefit long term from locating in a jurisdiction that respected what I'm going to call for lack of a better term because we don't have frames for these things multi-stakeholder sovereignty over particular subject matter. We all know that locating in the United States as it would be with any jurisdiction in the world has complications. For instance, you know, the best example from you we are not allowed to utter the word regulator simply because of a particular application of California law. I understand that. I respect that. I didn't actually use the word regulator in the preceding paragraph.

But what is true is that in the longer term any multi-stakeholder process in general ICANN in particular would be best served by being located in the jurisdiction that explicitly respects its privacy in a particular subject matter. So what I talked about was potentially baking in WorkStream 2 a forward-looking statement only that contemplated and talked about something aspirational that countries around the world could look at and point towards. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks Elliott. And just personally I think those are interesting ideas but they sound expensive. I don't mean to make light but...

Elliott Noss: I could write the paragraph instead of Jones day and save the \$2-1/2 million.

James Bladel: I'm just lobbing you softballs. Okay well that was the end of the queue and really who could top that. So I, you know, I think that the key here is we've got a document. We need to read it. It sounds like we need we have a lot of



question. We have questions for the leadership of the CCWG, (SAT). It sounds like we have questions for the Board Finance Committee. It sounds like we have questions that we need to get answered before we can make any kind of an intelligent decision on whether or not we can sign off on this thing.

I can tell you that from my personal perspective I'm glad that we're having this conversation. We probably should have had this conversation before WorkStream 1. And maybe the budget wouldn't have grown threefold or the expenditures versus projection. So I'm glad we're at least talking about it even if we don't have all of the answers we're asking the right questions so okay. So we - did you guys come back to Glen's timetable on - okay because we have eight minutes left, so much for leaving early. Sorry. But we have a timetable for chair and vice chair elections which will kick off probably in the August, September timeframe if they haven't moved too much from last year. So Glen I'll just turn it over to you if you want to walk us through your chart?

Glen de Saint Gery: Thanks very much James. And I won't take the eight minutes. So by the 7 September all of the constituencies and stakeholder groups must have their council representatives chosen. The elections must be finished by then and the names must be known. The next date to have nominees must be known by the 7 October. And then from there we get the candidates submit the statements on the 20 October. This is presuming that the council meeting is on the 7 November in Hyderabad. But I think the most important date is for the stakeholder constituency groups to have their council representatives by the 7 September.

The other thing that I would just like to say too James is please, please provide the names of your travelers as soon as possible. The due date has been given as the 5 August but I'm afraid that that won't be my due date. My due date will be on the 1 August because I have to have a couple of days in case there are movements. And the meeting team has to have their dates by the 5 August.

And also you've probably all heard that the convention center and the hotels are all about 30 to 40 minutes bus ride apart. So please build that into any expectations that you might have about starting meetings in the morning or about anything else. They are going to be - there will be bus shuttles running all day but it is a 30 to 40 minute ride away. So with that James thank you very much and I didn't use up your eight minutes.

James Bladel: Thank you Glen. Wow can you see if there are any suitable campgrounds maybe nearby? Wow okay. So here's the timeline. And I think thank you for putting this together working backwards from the seventh. We're going to circulate this to the list I guess so that we can take it to the stakeholder groups and okay. And then you want discussions? Sorry I see people kind of folding up. Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well you may remember that from the last election so the SCI was tasked to come up with a revision of the procedures. And I think it could be concern from staff already that we are in time with that to come up with new procedures. I understand we are now in the phase before public comment period or just in public comment period for the addition of these procedures and this is in line with this schedule. Mary, is that okay? Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Wolf-Ulrich this is Julie Hedlund. Yes actually the schedule you see in front of you is the schedule that will go all for public comment. So we're assuming it's not going to change. This is the schedule that the SCI actually developed that will be incorporated into the operational procedures.

James Bladel: And Julie can ask another question to follow-up on Wolf-Ulrich's point? I understand the other change in addition to the schedule the other material change is that incoming councilors would also be eligible to run for chair or vice chair? That's something new that we're - we'll have that change in place in time for this round of elections?

Julie Hedlund: Yes that's correct. The procedures once they go through public comment won't be ready for with a motion for the council to vote on. In their meeting I think it's the 1 September in which case all of this would be settled in time for incoming councilors to be considered yes.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. Mary?

Mary Wong: Just to follow up on what Julie said -- this is Mary from staff -- as she noted that you have a council meeting on the 1 September. And that will be in time to have the public comment finished. If for instance at that point in time the decision based on public comment hypothetically speaking is that, that change proposed by the SCI is not acceptable. If you look at the timeline you won't - you have to submit your nominees on the 7 October and your elections are done on the 5 September. So you will know by then whether or not this SCI suggested change is or is not going to become the rule.

James Bladel: Thank you. That's over Labor Day weekend for the Americans. Is that right? I'm just saying as far as the timeline so okay. Any other questions on this procedure or the potential -- I don't want to presume the outcome that's presuming the public comment periods and we adopt it and all of that -- the presumed changes from the SCI?

Okay any other items of business? That took us right up against the very edge but there's two minutes if there's any other topics that folks would like to discuss in this wrap up session? What's so funny? What am I missing?

Man: It's time to go.

James Bladel: It's time to go okay yes. I thought you were laughing Stephanie said like lets solve privacy and jurisdiction? We got two minutes. We've got two minutes. What are we bums we've got two minutes now we got one minute? And so okay thank you very much everybody. Please make sure you keep an eye on

the list. We're going to circulate a new action list. Also (Heather) has reminded me that we forgot to adopt our minutes the meeting shame on me for that. We'll make sure that the next meeting in July that we adopt the minutes from this meeting and the previous meeting so apologies for that administrative oversight on my part. You know, enjoy the rest of the sessions. For those of you traveling home safe travels and we'll see you online and we'll see you in Hyderabad. Thank you.

END