

Adobe Connect Chat Transcript 28 June 2017

Marika Konings: Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of 28 June 2017

Marilia Maciel: Hello everyone

Susan Kawaguchi: Hello Marilia!

Marilia Maciel: Hi Susan!

Michele Neylon: afternoon

Marilia Maciel: sure, thanks James

Valerie Tan: yes, thanks James

Edward Morris: Hi Marilia. Welcome.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Ed

Nathalie Peregrine: Reminder to all, the coffee and pastries to the left of the entrance are for councilors.

Nathalie Peregrine: If you run out of water please let us know

Marilia Maciel: I support Rafik's comment. The group should be given time to come up with a model and a justification for it before all chartering organisations.

Marilia Maciel: The model should be proposed by the members of the CCWG-IG and reconcile concerns expressed here with the needs of the CCWG-IG to operate.

Keith Drazek: My understanding is the CCWG will continue with a minimum of 2 chartering organizations, and the ccNSO and ALAC are still chartering orgs at this time.

Marika Konings: @Marilia - the Council asked for a revised charter/format by the Copenhagen meeting.

Marika Konings: see <https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201611> for original motion

Marilia Maciel: Marika my recollection was that the revised charter was presented there. By Copenhagen that was not a clear request from council to change the model from CCWG to another model.

Marilia Maciel: *there was

Donna Austin, RySG: A revised charter was provided

Donna Austin, RySG: i did suggest during our last discussion that it would benefit from more specificity.

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): I believe we should wait for more squares in round holes to figure out a new structure that would better serve future projects down the road.

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): Using only the CCWG-IG might lead to a unique non-adaptable structure increasing our list of acronyms.

Heather Forrest: Let's not forget that one of the key concerns articulated this weekend is the need for formal mechanisms of accountability and transparency (feedback loop) for the community's involvement in IG activities

Donna Austin, RySG: i would find it difficult to support the Charter in its current form. Regardless of the fact that it doesn't have a beginning, middle and end, it is currently so vague as to be meaningless.

Heather Forrest: Sorry, not this weekend but on Monday (I'm on our old meeting schedule of weekend sessions)

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): Donna, so it's more about substance than structure.

Donna Austin, RySG: @Rubens, I think its both.

Marilia Maciel: The CCWG does not speak for the GNSO or any ICANN structure.

Keith Drazek: I got the sense from CCWG-IG discussions with the Board Internet Governance committee that the other chartering organizations may also recognize the structural issues and are open to re-forming the group with a different name and structure. Also, some Board members echoed the same.

Keith Drazek: We should probably circle back with the ccNSO and ALAC to find out what they're thinking on the topic. Ideally before our next meeting.

Marilia Maciel: There are no positions coming from the CCWG-IG to the wider world. Who speaks in IG meetings is usually either Nigel or Tarek.

Paul McGrady: @Keith - agree. Makes no sense to let this languish.

Philip Corwin: I understand the concerns about the optics of withdrawing as a Chartering Org. But we can't let that allow a nintenable situation to persist indefinitely. So let's aim to take the steps that lead to a decision by Abu Dhabi.

Marilia Maciel: By the way, the CCWG helps the comminity to have a channel to seek information on what staff is presenting in IG meetings.

Philip Corwin: [nontenable]

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I think the structure is one question, the "chartering" members a different one

Marilia Maciel: They have kept a good dialogue with the CCWG and shared the statements they make in ITU, UN, etc.

Paul McGrady: @james - I think we need a popcorn break...

Nathalie Peregrine: Notification to go out shortly but the date changes would be: 13th July 2017 at 21:00 UTC (new Council meeting date) with Motion & Document deadline being the 3rd July at 23:59 UTC. Special Issue Placeholder meeting on 20 July 2017 at 21:00 UTC.

avri doria: strawhorse is dead, long live strawhorse II, yet to be born.

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): This sounds like King Solomon's two mothers of a baby story, but differently from that reference, both mothers seem to be willing to let the baby die (i.e, prefer a possible TLD not being used anywhere)

Carlos Gutierrez: sorry. I was in the wrong adobe room

Carlos Gutierrez: i was in the Ballroom

Heather Forrest: Unfortunately some members of the community do not agree with GNSO's commitment to ensure that policy is consistent with and supported by international law

Marilia Maciel: Heather, this group did not include two letters in the second level. correct?

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): Isn't there a risk that countries start passing local laws just to fit that standard ?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): personally I am very comfortable with the Demonstrable Law approach Chuck is reminding us of...

Marilia Maciel: There is Rubens, but they are usually slower than our PDPs. Hope the newgTLD can shed light on this before countries regulate.

Carlos Gutierrez: I can't express my thoughts as well as Chuck just did. My intervention was in that direction and I beg everybody to re-read Chuck's statement

Heather Forrest: @Marilia - the CWG-UCTN only dealt with top-level. No link at all to recent decisions (or other) on 2-characters

Heather Forrest: at second level

Marilia Maciel: Thanks

Philip Corwin: Once ICANN makes policy decisions that are not based in international law it becomes a law-making body for the Internet and that is a very worrisome concept.

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): On 2-characters, ICANN Org blamed GNSO for something no GNSO decision whatsoever was done.

Carlos Gutierrez: the reference has to be external of ICANN and all of its SOs/ACs, if ever possible

Heather Forrest: +1 Phil - furthermore it weakens the legitimacy of ICANN policy development

Marilia Maciel: Phil, share this thought. Just not to miss the opportunity to say it, we should follow the same in other areas of international law, including privacy. Very happy with recent discussions in ICANN59 about that.

Philip Corwin: What Jeff is suggesting seems to be the creation of a CCWG within a PDP. Do our policy development rules permit that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): thumbs up from me Jeff

Heather Forrest: +1 Marilia - excellent to hear these concerns about law being addressed here

Heather Forrest: Brilliant idea, Jeff and Avri - great way to ensure and formalise inclusiveness in the PDP

avri doria: We've got a great staff that can do anything.

Heather Forrest: +1 Paul - we need to be a truly global organisation here

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): yup

Paul McGrady: @Avri - agree!

Paul McGrady: @Rubens - agree!

avri doria: and the full WG and the chairs of the full WG, still remain in the lead for the PDP and are responsible for the consensus, not the Work Tracks.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks everyone

Valerie Tan: Goodbye, thanks all