

**ICANN  
GNSO Council Teleconference  
Thursday, 01 December 2016 at 21:00 UTC**

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: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-01dec16-en.mp3>

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

Date: 01 December 2016

Coordinated Universal Time: 21:00 UTC:

<http://tinyurl.com/zqkas4h>

13:00 Los Angeles; 16:00 Washington; 21:00 London; (Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> December) 00:00 Istanbul;  
08:00 Hobart

**List of attendees:**

**NCA – Non Voting** – Erika Mann (absent- apologies)

**Contracted Parties House**

Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell (absent - apologies)

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Donna Austin, Keith Drazek, Rubens Kühl

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Hsu Phen Valerie Tan

**Non-Contracted Parties House**

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Philip Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Tony Harris, Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Amr Elsadr, Stephanie Perrin, Stefania Milan, Edward Morris, Marilia Maciel, Rafik Dammak

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Julf (Johan) Helsingius

**GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:**

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer - absent

Carlos Raul Gutierrez– GNSO liaison to the GAC

**ICANN Staff**

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and General Manager, ICANN Regional Headquarters- Istanbul,– absent apologies

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director

Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director  
Julie Hedlund – Policy Director  
Steve Chan - Senior Policy Manager, Policy Development Support  
Berry Cobb – Policy consultant  
David Tait– Policy Specialist  
Emily Barabas – Policy Analyst  
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat – absent - apologies  
Nathalie Peregrine - Specialist, SO/AC  
Terri Agnew - Secretariat Services Coordinator, GNSO  
Josh Baulch - Senior Manager, Meeting Planning Operations, Meetings Team

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (James). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. And welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 1st of December, 2016.

Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it now so we know you are able to speak especially for the votes that we have during this call? We'll therefore know you're on the line and that you have no connection issues.

James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Darcy Southwell has sent her apologies and given her proxy to Michele Neylon. So Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Valerie Tan. I believe we're still trying to dial out to Valerie. Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Nathalie, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Heather might run into connectivity issues later and has therefore given her proxy to Paul McGrady should she be unable to vote.  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Stephanie Perrin. Hello, Stephanie, can you hear us? Edward Morris.

Edward Morris: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Marilia Maciel.

Marilia Maciel: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Johan Helsingius.

Johan Helsingius: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Carlos Raul Gutierrez. Carlos, can you hear us? I believe Carlos's line has dropped. We'll be dialing back out to him immediately. Patrick Myles. I don't believe Patrick has joined us right now.

From staff we have Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, David Tait, Steve Chan, Emily Barabas, Terri Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. Berry Cobb is also on the line with us as (unintelligible). And we have received apologies from Glen de Saint Géry.

May I please remind everyone to state your names before you speak for transcription purposes? Thank you very much and over to you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yes.

Stefania Milan: This is Stefania Milan. You forgot to call my name. I'm here. Hello?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Stephanie. Thank you, we can hear you now. Thank you very much.

Stefania Milan: great.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Nathalie and thank you, Stephanie. So just to note here that if you're not speaking please mute your line. We had some background noise during the roll call. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay let's take – sorry, go ahead. Was someone trying to speak?

Valerie Tan: Hi, this is Valerie Tan here. I've just called in.

James Bladel: Oh fantastic. Thanks, Valerie. I'm glad that you were able to get connected. And could we amend the roll call to note that Valerie has joined, Nathalie?

Nathalie Peregrine: Noted, thank you.

James Bladel: Okay fantastic, thank you. And welcome, Valerie. Okay so moving on then to Item 1.2, updates to any Statements of Interest. Do any councilors have any

updates or amendments to their Statements of Interest or their status as a councilor? If so, please raise your hand in the Adobe room or otherwise just speak up on the bridge.

Okay, seeing none we'll then move to a review of the agenda. I think we have a couple of potential amendments to the agenda. The first one being – and I'm going to put a couple of folks on the spot here but I think potentially in a good way. The first item that we probably should discuss is Agenda Item Number 5, which is our response to the Board on the policy matters contained within the GAC communiqué from Hyderabad.

Just checking in with the group that was led by Paul and includes myself and some others that I think that we're probably not ready to discuss that item today but we will potentially have something ready for the next meeting. Paul, is that correct? Go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Yes, thanks. This is Paul McGrady for the Paul McGrady for the record. Since I'm the maker of the motion, I would like to seek a deferral to the next meeting and our little group should be ready well in advance of that to circulate a draft so that we can discuss it in the December 15 meeting. Thanks.

James Bladel: Perfect. Thanks, Paul. And we'll not that deferral from Item Number 5. The next item was Item Number 6, which was a discussion of the draft letter that was circulating on Council. There was a placeholder motion here made by Darcy, who is not on the call and has given her proxy to Michele.

In the interim time between that first motion, there was some discussion with some groups who had raised some concerns about the approach in the letter. An amendment was worked out in the last 48 hours or so. And I think that we still have general agreement that it's probably not necessary to subject that to a vote. And in the interest of time we can proceed.

I just want to give everyone the opportunity to either silently approve of that course of action or if they have any further objections or concerns that we can go forward, otherwise, I would ask Michele if he has any interest in continuing this or removing the motion. I see Phil. Go ahead, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Thank you, James. Phil for the record. I have no objection and support sending the letter without the necessity for a motion. I just want to note though, that the problem addressed by the implementation of IRTP-C by the letter is just one of many problems.

I think at some point, I don't know how we learn from this experience, but there's considerable distress within the domain investment community, and I know within registrars that serve them, about the effectiveness – about how this came about where an exercise that was supposed to improve domain security against theft and hijacking is now going to cause so much illiquidity in the domain marketplace that many professional investors are going to use registrar furnished forms to opt out of the protections, which seems to defeat the whole exercise.

So there seems to have been a gap between a policy recommendation that was viewed as effective and noncontroversial in its actual implementation and I would hope we could in some review what happened with the point of avoiding that in the future. I don't know if there's any way to redress the effect on the marketplace. But it's a – the implementation of this particular iteration of IRTP has been problematic. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. And I think your concerns are noted. I would point out that the new version of the letter really doesn't commit us to any particular course of action except we're asking the Board for more time to discuss potential paths forward. And I think what you've raised should certainly be fodder for that conversation as we hammer out, you know, hammer out the path forward on this one. So I would ask you to continue to raise those as we go forward.

Heather, you're up next.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James, very much. I just wanted to express the IPC's support for the approach that you have described. And the constituency was really happy with the constructive dialogue that was able to happen before the meeting that was able to pull this off of our working agenda for today. Not that it is problematic but it's on the working agenda or was on the working agenda. But great that we've come to a solution that everyone can agree to. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. I agree. And I think it was a good conversation. We have a better result coming out of that so thank you for that, and thanks to folks on the IPC who participated in that conversation.

Michele, you're up next.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. Based on the conversations that were had both on the list and elsewhere, I'd like to withdraw the motion as we're going to be able to send that without putting it to a vote.

James Bladel: Okay, sounds good. Thank you, Michele, for offering that withdrawal on Darcy's behalf. And before we completely close the door on this discussion it looks like Amr would like to get in the queue.

And I just want to point out, again, that this doesn't end the conversation. I think the letter simply asks for a bit of forbearance and a little bit more time from the Board in staff's implementation of this policy so that we can hammer out what we want to do including, you know, possibly revisiting some of these implementation issues.

Okay, Amr, and then Stephanie and then we'll bring this one in for a landing. Amr.



Amr Elsadr: Thanks, James. This is Amr. Well first I just wanted to say that I think a second draft of the letter, the changes that were made were I think will be rather helpful in terms of opening up possibilities for a way forward and not being restricted to recommending one course of action right now.

But I do have a question, and this doesn't in any way effect my position on whether we should send this now or not, but it's just a question in terms of what we're actually saying in the letter because in the first draft it seemed clear to me that we are asking them to halt implementation on the compliance part of the policy. Are we still doing that, the amendment to the letter changed what we are asking be done in terms of implementation or are we simply just saying well you and go ahead and start implementing but we're not going to – we would prefer that compliance is not enforced at this time. If this could be clarified I'd be grateful. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Amr. My understanding is that the first letter specifically requested a pause in the implementation and a referral of the issue over to the implementation team for privacy proxy accreditation. It was that second part that raised some concerns throughout some of the different stakeholder groups and so instead we've simply asked for the pause while we consider further options.

And that would be among the potential outcomes, but we have a couple of other avenues that we could explore as well. So but we are still asking for this particular element of the policy to be placed on hold while we address those open questions. I hope that that – I hope that clarifies because I think it was the specific bit about referring it to another IRT perhaps an IRT that wasn't adequately prepared to take on a new task that was causing concern.

And so we haven't closed the door to that but we also have opened a couple of other doors that probably also need to be looked at so that's the plan. Okay, I see in the chat that that's good. And then okay thank you, Amr, good

point there. And I think for those who didn't have a chance to track the amendments I think good to at least highlight the differences.

Stephanie, you're up next. Stephanie, if you're speaking we cannot hear you. Or maybe it's just me.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi, James. Can you hear me now?

James Bladel: Loud and clear. Thank you very much.

Stephanie Perrin: I just got a dial-out. And I do apologize for that hand, I put it up several minutes ago and all of a sudden it popped up. I have the usual connectivity issues and I didn't want to say anything. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, Stephanie. Thanks for that explanation. And we'll disregard your hand for now until you tell us in the chat that we need to pay attention to it again. Okay so that kind of takes a couple of items off our agenda. I think there's one other which is we should also potentially have a discussion about Item Number 10, which is a discussion of the selection of representatives to the SSR Review Team.

Let's leave that where it is for the time being and we can have a discussion about our approach to that, although I can tell you that we're not – not at a place where we can necessarily transition that to a motion where we can discuss candidates. And that's – if there are no other comments or questions that makes – that ends the amendments to our agenda.

Item 1.4, noting the minutes for the previous Council meetings, I believe the last update from Glen was that the draft minutes of Part 1 of our Council meeting in Hyderabad are ready to be reviewed by the Council, and that'll be going out here shortly to the list. And I believe Item – Part 2, which was the part where the new councilors were seated, will also be posted here shortly. So we have a couple of minutes from one meeting but minutes in two parts

that will be circulated here in the next few days, so please keep an eye out for those.

Okay we can move then to Item Number 2. I'm seeing in the chat the echo, is it me? Am I the one that's creating the echo? No, okay. No echo now, great.

Okay, moving on then to Item Number 2, we have the review of our project list and our action items. If we could ask staff to bring up the projects list first or whichever one you have handy we'll just take a quick review of those and note any changes. Oh, so small. My eyes are not able to do that anymore.

Okay, okay, thank you for loading that document. And as you can see, we have no issue – we have one issue in identification of the action item list, we have no issues in scoping or initiation Phase 2 or 3. As far as working groups, those are the active working groups including our PDPs and our GNSO participation in CCWGs. I don't note that there were any changes here.

The GNSO Review Working Group and the GNSO Rights and Obligations to the Bylaws Drafting Team are both on the Council deliberations. And I believe they come up in our agenda today. We do have a couple of items up for a Board vote, which is protection of IGO names in gTLDs and the GNSO review – or sorry Geo Regions Review.

And then we have a number of items also in the implementation phase including, as we note, the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy – IRTP-C which involves our letter that was just discussed a few moments ago. Marika, I don't know that there were any significant changes on this list from our discussion in Hyderabad, except perhaps that we may have moved something, I believe, from – we probably added a working group on – we extended I guess – provisionally extended the working group on Internet governance.

And I don't see the adoption of the charter for the Cross Community Working Group on Auction Proceeds, but that's probably because we haven't approved our slate of members yet. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Actually, that one is there, it's the first one on the working group so just note indeed that was one that moved from initiation to working group as that as now in the formation stage. And then the GAC (unintelligible) from Council consideration to implementation and it was adopted by both the GNSO and the GAC. So those are the main movements when it comes to (unintelligible) in the different stages of their lifecycle.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And I see it now and I'm sorry that that one escaped me. Maybe for future lists, and I don't know if this is helpful for others, if we can clearly indicate in the first couple of letters whether it's a PDP or a CCWG, that might, you know, that might make this a little bit easier to follow some of those as they move through. But thanks for that clarification. I also remember that we did adopt the recommendations from the GAC GNSO Consultation Group so that is great.

Any comments or questions for staff or myself on this project list from anyone or? Okay great. And as I noted, there are a couple of other items that will show up on our agenda later.

If we can then move to the Action Item List? And we'll wait for that to be loaded. I'm just following the chat as well. And it looks like we're also noting that there are some incorrect dates on the Website for those action item lists. So okay just scrolling through and noting that items that are green have been completed; items that are blue will appear on our agenda for today's call; and items that are white are ongoing.

ICANN 58 meeting planning, there's been a vigorous thread on the Council list, so thank you to everyone who has contributed to those specific

questions. And thank you to Emily for keeping a running score of all the contributions to date.

I will report that there was a meeting earlier this morning, this morning in the US, with myself and all of the SO and AC folks, as well as – and I believe Donna and Heather were there as well along with the SG and C chairs. And I think that there was some good exchange of views on the topics of whether Constituency Day should be a single day and how we would allocate and identify high interest topics and what the right number of high interest topics will be.

So the short story here, though, is that ICANN 58 meeting planning for Copenhagen is well underway and we are I think endeavoring to not repeat some of the experiences from Hyderabad where things were very fluid there at the very last moment and certainly encouraged to see the community and staff getting out in front of – out in front of planning for ICANN 58. So that's well underway.

I don't know if anyone wants to discuss the IGO INGO PDP recommendations. As you can imagine, there were a number of conversations in Hyderabad and those conversations are ongoing on potential paths forward in addressing both the existing PDPs, the proposal from the small group, and what to do relative to names associated with Red Cross.

And all of those are ongoing. And I think we should see some movement on that between now and our next Council meeting – well I would say between now and – because our next Council meeting is coming so quickly it would be between now and the next month.

The CWG on Internet Governance, nothing to report. PDP improvements, we have asked staff to go ahead and proceed with that. Conflicts with national law, I think we had some progress coming out of Hyderabad to report on that

as well. There's a small group of folks working on a revised motion that we hope to circulate soon, if not for the next meeting. And I think that that will address some of the concerns and some of the – I want to say divergent opinions that were expressed the last time this came up for a vote.

We filled all of our liaisons so thank you for everyone who's volunteered to be a liaison to the Implementation Review Teams, and in fact, ongoing PDPs as well. We have adopted the Auction Proceeds, and I think we're now in the position where we are soliciting volunteers.

Marika, did you note that there were some questions on the list about – I thought I saw some questions back and forth on the selection of volunteers for the Auction Proceeds Working Group. In this particular case, we've adopted the charter and I believe, if I'm not mistaken, that we are looking for each stakeholder group to put forward a volunteer member. But the CCWG would of course be open to participants as well for anyone who'd like to join. And then the remaining task for Council is to select the GNSO cochair from that slate of volunteers. Is that correct, Marika? Am I missing a step? Please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So each chartering organization has the option to appoint between minimum of two and maximum of five chartering organizations appointed members. As I shared on the mailing list, those appointed members have a specific role. I mean, everyone that participates at an equal level, you know, members and participants, but appointed members have also the responsibility to kind of take back and forth, you know, what is going on to the chartering organizations and (unintelligible) and in the because of consensus calls, you know, they're expected to express the views as, you know, expressed within their respective groups.

So indeed in this case, you know, I think as in the motion, the thought – the practice has been followed as in years for previous CCWGs where basically each stakeholder group is asked to identify one member. But that indeed

leaves, you know, potentially one slot to be filled. And as I noted in the response to Donna, you know, it's really up to the Council to decide how you would like to do that.

You know, for example, for the transition (unintelligible) I believe that the fifth slot was basically filled by the GNSO chair to the CCWG. As well, there's actually no obligation for the chair to be a member so potentially you do have another, you know, slot that you could either assign to one of the stakeholder groups.

I note as well that one of the Nominating Committee appointees has expressed interest. So it's really up to you to decide how you would want to fill, if you want to fill that fifth slot at all because there's no obligation either to appoint five members if you would only want to appoint four, for example.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika, for that recommendation. I think the takeaway from councilors is that we are still awaiting that list of names from each stakeholder group. We are looking for – I believe the deadline for that was Monday, the fifth of March, yes. And correct, Rubens, thank you for possibly – if the NCA's NomComm appointees would like to volunteer they can do so as well. And then it will be the role of the Council to select their GNSO cochair from that group.

And just to reiterate, make sure that – make sure that anyone who is interested in stepping forward for this fully understands the proposed conflicts of interest. We certainly wouldn't want that to be a point of confusion for anyone who's participating in this particular cross community working group and yet later on perhaps has a proposal idea for a use of auction proceeds. And I would just recommend just a refresher on that for any volunteers. Thanks.

Okay, as we note here, we have improvement of – approved of appointment to – of an interim GNSO representative empowered community. We are still

living with our interim appointment, which is myself. And I can report that there's been no action on this front so the interim solution is still in place.

We are now looking at the review of the GAC communiqué, which is, as we indicated, will be forthcoming for our next meeting. The SSR Review Team is on our agenda a little bit later today. We filled the GNSO liaison to the GAC in Hyderabad. Thank you, Carlos. And we have since sent formal notification of Carlos's appointment to the GAC Secretariat. And for that we say thank you to Glen and staff.

We have a motion on the agenda to discuss the recommendations from the GNSO Bylaws Drafting Team, that's coming up later. We have the letter from the Board on the IRD Expert Working Group. This came up in Hyderabad. This is – that question from the Board that was referred back to the PDP that addressed this issue.

We had a response from Jim Galvin, which seemed to answer in the affirmative. And I think that we now have a draft response coming from us that would essentially relay the response coming from that group back to the Board in response to their original letter.

I don't know that we need a motion to conduct this exchange of correspondence. So I will work with Marika and Donna and Heather to get a draft of that response, including the message from Jim Galvin. We'll get that synthesized into a response to the Board and we'll get that circulated to the Council list here in the next few days and we'll get that hopefully posted to the Board by our next meeting. But just wanted to give you an update on that particular action item, which I believe is currently buried somewhere in my inbox, but is on our plate.

And then we have a discussion about the limitation – the proposed limitation for the RDS Whois Review Team too. Any other comments or questions? We tore through that fairly quickly so any other comments or questions on the



action items list? Okay seeing that the queue is clear, we can close off Agenda Item Number 2 and return to our main agenda with Agenda Item Number 3, is our Consent Agenda. There are no items up for consideration on our Consent Agenda so we can check that box.

And move then to Agenda Item Number 4, which is our first item and issue – topic of any substance, which is the consensus recommendations from the GNSO Bylaws Drafting Team. Now this is something that we worked on fairly extensively in Hyderabad. And we had numerous discussions both in our public meeting as well in our working session.

And as a result of things kind of happening on the ground, I believe it was Ed Morris who had asked for a deferral so that the NCSG, and in fact really everybody, could take this back to their constituency for further discussion and evaluation. And so that has been granted and the deferral was moved until this meeting and we're discussing it now.

I made the motion, I believe Rubens seconded the motion, and I can present that now. But I think that there has since been an amendment to the motion. So here's what I'd like to propose. I'd like to read through the motion as it exists today and we'll catch the redlines that have been offered by Amr.

And we'll discuss those – the motion and the amendments and see if they are indeed just I think as I expect fairly cosmetic changes. So I'll go through here, the motions.

The first part – I'll just read through the whereas. "On 30 June 2016 the GNSO Council approved the creation of a Drafting Team that was to work with ICANN staff to "fully identify all the new or additional rights and responsibilities that the GNSO has under the revised Bylaws, including but not limited to participation of the GNSO within the Empowered Community, and to develop new or modified structures and procedures, as necessary, to fully implement these new or additional rights and responsibilities."

Two, “In creating the drafting team, the GNSO Council requested that the drafting team provide the GNSO Council with an implementation plan which will have the consensus of the Drafting Team, including any recommendations for needed further changes to ICANN Bylaws and/or GNSO Operating Procedures to enable effective GNSO participation in ICANN activities under the revised ICANN Bylaws, not later than 30 September 2016.”

Three, “During the course of the drafting team’s work, differing views were expressed on the role of the GNSO Council in the Empowered Community, leading to the production of a Final Report, which included a minority report on the role of the GNSO Council.”

And I will note here that the original language said, “strongly divergent views,” as opposed to “differing views.” I believe, and I’ll tap Amr here in a moment, but I believe the concern here is that the word “divergent” is used in the GNSO Operating Procedures as a term to characterize level of consensus.

So it’s not – to avoid confusion I think we were looking for some synonyms here to get the point across with some different language. And then I believe the role of the GNSO Council was perhaps an addition.

Whereas 4, “The drafting team submitted its final report to the GNSO Council on 12 October. And the GNSO Council has reviewed this report.”

Then moving into the resolved clause, I’m sorry, Amr, did I do justice – I put you on the spot here, because staff indicated earlier that they were not able to put both versions up at the same time. So just before I move on can I capture – did I accurately convey the sentiments behind your proposed amendments in Whereas 3?

Amr Elsadr: Hi, James. This is Amr. Yes, you said it pretty well. The change in Whereas 3 specifically, strong divergent change to differing views, was because of the level of designation given to working groups in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines. And divergent I guess diverging views is a sort of technical term in those Guidelines, which presents a sort of a specific consensus level which was not the one here. So I thought it a good idea to change that word just to avoid confusion and for anyone reading the motion. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Amr. I'll continue then with the resolve clauses. And if I start to go off the rails please feel free to jump in because I am including or incorporation your amended language in as I go.

Resolved 1, "The GNSO Council accepts the recommendations in the drafting team's final report as submitted."

Resolve 2, "The GNSO Council directs ICANN Policy Staff to draft proposed language for any necessary modifications or additions to the GNSO Operating Procedures and, if applicable, those parts of the ICANN Bylaws pertaining to the GNSO. The GNSO Council requests that ICANN Legal evaluate whether the proposed modifications are consistent with the post-transition Bylaws and report their findings to the GNSO Council."

Resolved 3, "The GNSO Council requests that members of the drafting team make themselves available for consultation by ICANN Policy Staff as needed."

Resolved 4, "The GNSO Council directs ICANN Policy Staff to post the drafting team Final Report, including the minority report, and all proposed modifications or new procedures for public comment for no less than 40 days. The GNSO Council expects that any comments received will be given meaningful consideration."

Resolve 5. "As resolved previously, the GNSO Council intends to subject the adoption of the proposed modifications to existing procedures and/or ICANN Bylaws to a GNSO Supermajority vote."

And, item 6, "The GNSO Council thanks the drafting team for its collaborative effort, especially in view the limited time frame available."

In here I would not that small R report was modified by Amr to final report with capitals. And that we again struck the reference to divergent views noting the concerns about using the word "divergent" which could create confusion being used as a label to designate consensus level within the Working Group Guidelines.

So that is the motion as it stands. It was proposed by me, seconded by Rubens. I am inclined to take Amr's amendments here as friendly. I understand the intent behind striking "divergent" and I agree with his intention to clarify and avoid any confusion there.

So I guess the first order of business we would ask if Rubens accepts this as a friendly amendment? And I see in the chat that he does. And so in that case we can open the queue for discussion of this revised motion. And I would note that this – I would note – I believe it's correct that this motion is also one that we had committed to subject to a supermajority vote of Council. And I'm sure that – I don't know if Marika can give me a green light if that's the correct – or if I'm remembering that – yes, okay thanks, Ed.

Okay, first in the queue is Heather. Heather, go ahead, please.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James, very much. I wanted to follow up on some of the references that you made to the amended language specifically around divergent and so on and so forth. And you and I had worked in Hyderabad to try and come up with some text that would agreeable to all. And just to clarify for the record that there was no – there was no hidden agenda or anything in choosing the

word “divergent” so I wasn’t particularly troubled to see that – to see that change. It expresses the sentiment and avoids the concerns that are raised by Amr. So thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. And I think – I don't know – my memory serves, I think I was the one that came up with the word “divergent” and probably because I’m not that bright and I heard it used somewhere else probably in a working group and just borrowed it there. So I concur with you that there was no intent to borrow a term from one context and apply it here, it was simply just searching for the right word. And I think Amr has – yes, yes, Paul, we were all thinking of the movie.

But that’s helpful context and I think – and I think Amr’s amendments address that confusion very nicely with some synonyms there. I see an empty queue. And given our history with this motion that astonishes me. Would anyone else like to offer any comments or statements relative to this motion?

All right, Susan, go ahead, please.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you, James. I just wanted to thank you for bringing us home on this motion and adjusting the wording accordingly. You know, this is definitely a different motion than the original one we saw. And we really appreciate the – that you took input from all of the stakeholder groups and made sure that that was recognized in the motion. So thank you for that hard work.

James Bladel: Thanks, Susan. And I’m sure that it was a group effort and the cocktails and wine that was served in our working group probably helped grease the skids as well. So but, yes, I’m also pleased at how well this came together in the end.

So and I think as we noted here, in Resolve 6, I think the real heroes of this effort were the folks who participated on the drafting team because that was a

lot of work to do in a very short period of time. Any other thoughts or comments?

Okay, then we can proceed to a vote. And just as a reminder that we have asked that this be subject to a supermajority vote. So I guess I would ask – and we're going to have to give staff a little bit more latitude this time because I think Glen usually handles the votes and I think it's going to be a collaborative effort now between Nathalie and Berry. But because this is a supermajority vote, if there are no concerns I'd like to proceed with a roll call vote just so we can make sure that we hit that kind of unusual definition and threshold that we have for supermajorities. And I don't know that I have a running scorecard here in front of me so I think it would be much easier from a staff perspective if we just go ahead and go through a roll call vote.

So, Nathalie, if you don't mind could you begin the roll call vote please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, James. Wolf-Ulrich Knob. Wolf-Ulrich, we cannot hear you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knob: Oh sorry. Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Anthony Harris.

Tony Harris: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon for Darcy Southwell.

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon for yourself?

Michele Neylon: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Stefania Milan.

Stefania Milan: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Ed Morris. Thank you, Stefania. Ed Morris.

Ed Morris: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Stephanie Perrin.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Marilia Maciel.

Marilia Maciel: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Valerie Tan.

Valerie Tan: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Johan Helsingius.

Johan Helsingius: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl.

Rubens Kuhl: Yes.



Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. So with – for the Contracted Party House, seven votes in favor; for the Non Contracted Party House, 13 votes in favor. That gives 100% pass rate for both houses and the motion passes.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. Nicely done. And thank you, everyone, for your support on this. I guess unanimity certainly crosses the supermajority threshold so that's a testament to all of our work on this. And I would ask staff to please communicate the results of this to the cochairs of the drafting team.

And then also, as we move this then through the process, I think that we should also do a comparison of the – the interim participation in the empowered community and make sure that we have a appropriate timeline within that to get a permanent designee installed because it certainly – would be one less thing on my plate even though we're not currently doing anything in that context. So thank you, everyone, for that, and we will work through this with staff.

The next item on our agenda is Item Number 5 which has been deferred. And we'll look for that to come up on our next meeting. And then Item Number 6, as we noted, was the letter, which has been withdrawn, so thank you to everyone who worked on that.

We then move to Item Number 7, which is a vote on the adoption of the implementation plan for recommendations relating to the 2014 GNSO review. And just as a reminder, the implementation – or the team that was drafting this implementation plan was tasked by the Board to provide them something by the end of the year. So once the Council has approved that we can transmit this to the Board. And I certainly think that we owe a debt of gratitude to the folks who were able to turn this around so quickly.

So if you don't mind I'd like to ask Wolf-Ulrich to introduce his motion. And I don't know, are we awaiting a seconder as well or do we have one? Oh okay, right, before we get to the motion, just a refresher on the GNSO review

implementation plan. And I think Wolf-Ulrich is going to present on the highlights and make himself available for any questions.

So with that I'll turn it over to Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, James. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, I would put it that way so we – just to introduce a little bit on the motion and what is it about, and then let's talk about – the process itself so how to deal with that motion. That's what I would suggest to do.

So just briefly, giving you some three or four slides, well, to remind you of what we have done, and that was a mandate, well, the mandate for this group was, well, to come up with an implementation plan with some specific points. We should come up with a realistic timeline for the implementation of these recommendations.

We should come up with a definition of desired outcomes, and also try to find measure – or to find a way how to measure the current state and the progress to be done and going forward, how to decide outcome for these recommendations. So that is more or less the target.

And we had several meetings. I've – I came up with an update during the Hyderabad meeting. In between we had two further meetings, one in Hyderabad and one in – one in between here, a telephone call where we could finish what we had in mind, well.

Next slide please, Julie. No, no, next, the next one please. Had a shorter version of that. You can skip that, please go to the next one. So we had structures, our recommendations, in terms of prioritization and dependencies between the recommendations themselves and also with dependencies on other activities going on within the GNSO.

And then we came up in our plan also with the kind of suggestion of a methodology how to deal with that plan, how to put that plan in place and how to deal with the recommendations. And in the end with a first draft of a timeline. The timeline was, well, not easy to develop in terms of estimating, well, the amount of time we would need for every recommendation, well, to deal with that.

We did our best, well, to try to put that together. And we batched it here in three batches. The first batch is related to recommendations where work is already underway, so which came – which was ongoing work and which was put into the recommendations as well. And that is the batch we are going – we are planning, well, to start with at first.

And then we have a batch with high priority recommendations in that which is, will need roughly our estimation one year to deal with that. And we have another batch then with the rest of the recommendations which are not a high priority.

In the end, so we came up with a plan which may lead us until the end of 2018, which is reasonable, I would say, and which would lead us directly into 2019 where the next review cycle is planned according to the (unintelligible) recommendations.

Next slide please. This is a breakup of the timeline of the three batches with regards to the different motions – different recommendations. You can see on the left hand side the recommendations itself. We had an estimation how long we would need, well, to deal with that depending on the dependencies, depending on the amount of work and of man work to be done. And so that was our estimation with regards to these recommendations. And that is the outcome of it.

Recommendation by recommendation, it is in the plan itself explained in detail who shall be responsible for the implementation. It could be staff; it

could be the working group itself; it could be the working group and staff together depending on what type of recommendation it is. For example, if it's recommendation which deals with stakeholder group or constituency-related items, so that's clear that is up to the working group together with those constituencies and stakeholder groups to oversee and to implement those items whereas in other cases, well, it could be done by staff or together.

Next slide please. Okay this is for Phase 3 for the non priority recommendations, same as we have been trying, well, to find out the estimate, the time we need. We made also had a discussion about potential budget impacts on that. But came to the conclusion at this time being it is just possible to allocate the possibility that there may be impacts to allocate that to several recommendations but not to detail the budget at this time.

So we suppose that during the work we are going to do recommendation by recommendation, so the budget estimation can be done and we can – if there is a lot of budget needed, if that would be, so for example, so we can come up with that in time in order to be – to fit into the budget plan. So that is at the time being, so that is the status. And that is the status of the implementation plan.

We think it is solid, it is – we did our – the best guess with regards to the timing. And the next steps would be after the Board has approved that implementation plan that we immediately start with this work and we have to then to start and to think about whether we could do something and how we could do the recommendations in parallel, for example, you see there is a lot of work to be done in parallel.

Shall we do it in subgroups, for example, and how, well, shall we establish the subgroups and all these things, well, should organize our work then directly. And so we are confident that we are – that we can fit to that plan.

So that's to the content and where we are at the time being. We should then discuss I think so the process with regards to the motion. I have learned during the – in the preparation phase of this that there may be some requests from some side, well, to have some time, well, to dive in a little bit more deeper before mid of December our next Council meeting.

And I have heard as well that there may be a plan of staff, well, to come up with a webinar in order to provide more detailed information to those who are interested. And then we should, well, I would like to hear from staff as well whether this is feasible, what the plan is here and if that could fit to a, let me say, a vote on this motion by December 15. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, for working through that slide deck and giving us the highlights of this, as I think everyone can see, a very complex plan that stretches well over the horizon into 2017 and beyond. To your last point there, I would note that there is correct, that given the scale and scope of this material, we anticipated the possibility that not everyone has had enough time to review it and/or might have questions.

We're fortunate to have you on the call. I note that Jen Wolfe also wanted to be here but her schedule didn't allow it. And so one of the backup plans that we have been discussing is the potential for a webinar to discuss this information for councilors or in fact anyone from the GNSO community that would like to participate.

So I guess I would put the question to councilors, I don't know if anyone feels that they're in a position where they can actually prepare to vote at this time. If so, great, you're further along in your homework than perhaps the average student at this stage in the game. But I would also be interested in hearing from folks who would like to perhaps take a little bit more time. And then in that latter case, if folks are requesting a bit more time if they are open to the idea of a webinar that would give us an opportunity for a little bit more Q&A with the group on the subject of this implementation plan.

I have – I'm noting some folks in the chat. And I have Paul. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, James. Paul McGrady. Yes, I would be very happy for a webinar to help me understand what we're voting on and a little more time for those within our constituency who participated on this to read through everything and, you know, brief us on where we are. And so I'm very glad to hear that we are aiming for the 15th for a vote. And if staff is willing to do a webinar that would be very welcome. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. And I note that Heather and Stefania are also in favor of taking a little bit more time and weighing in in favor of the webinar as well, and as well as Keith as plus one-ing that.

And to that end, I think we should probably, as councilors, we should, you know, count our good fortune and thank the folks who worked on this, including Wolf-Ulrich, and Jen Wolfe and all the others, for giving us that extra time. I mean, certainly they could have delivered this report a week from now and then we would kind of be up against a wall. But they've given us some cushion that gives us the luxury of studying this a little bit further and conducting that webinar.

So I see Wolf-Ulrich is in the queue. Wolf-Ulrich, go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks, James. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, just a question, well, because time is running so we have just two weeks, well, to the next Council meeting. The motion deadline is the 5th of December, you know. So we will – I will immediately, well – if it's just deferred so it's automatically coming back next time. The question is, do we have a time already fixed for that webinar?

James Bladel: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich, I think that we are tentatively working out the dates on that one. And I see Julie has her hand raised so, Julie, maybe you could fill us in? Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Hi, yes. Thank you very much. This is Julie Hedlund. Yes, in anticipation of this request, I hope it's not a problem, but I did get in touch – staff did get in touch with Jen Wolfe to check on her availability. And the idea is to try to have a webinar as soon as possible but to give enough time for folks to get it on their schedules as well. It looks like the best time that worked for her to do it is next week, Thursday, 8 December at 1400 UTC.

So you should see an invite going out to all councilors shortly on that. And then also I will note that if there are others other than Council members who you know of in your community who might be interested in joining the webinar, you're welcome to pass on that invite as well. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Julie. And so that's the date, one week from today at 1400 UTC. And watch for the invitations there. And please circulate them within your stakeholder groups and constituencies. And as Marika is noting, if you're not able to attend, the meeting – the webinar would be recorded and transcribed. So we can share those materials as well.

But I think that that is – that still leaves us sufficient time because as I would note that the Board – the original Board request gave us six months or roughly to the end of the year to approve and submit this implementation plan. And I think that as many have noted, giving a little bit more time to thoroughly consider these issues and an opportunity to raise questions is probably welcome at this point.

So I guess all we need at this stage is for someone to formally request a deferral and it sounds like that's the general consensus of the group today. And I – and Paul is the first one up so, Paul, you get the headline on this one, thank you, Paul.

So we'll go ahead and defer this until consideration for the meeting that's scheduled for the 15th of December. At which case it will probably be – that

will be the last opportunity we'll have to consider this and still be within the deadline that was extended to us by the Board so it will definitely be up for a vote on the agenda next time around. And in the interim time, we will have that webinar next Thursday so please watch for invites on that. And thank you, again, to Wolf-Ulrich and now Rafik who has seconded the motion for taking a leadership role on this piece of business.

Okay if there are no further items there, I would just note that we're slightly past our halfway point and we are moving then to Item Number 8 on our agenda, which is a discussion of the proposed scope of the upcoming RDS for Whois review.

I can kick this off with a little bit of context as well as a mea culpa. This document was submitted to a list of folks that weighed in on it right as I was getting on a plane to go to India and it came up in Hyderabad before I had an opportunity to circulate it to the Council and it caught a few people off guard. So please accept my apologies for that and for the confusion that that created. And I apologize if anyone felt like they were blindsided by this because, you know, that was on me.

But, going forward, I can tell you a little bit of context is that there was some discussion when we looked at the calendar of upcoming review teams. And this started, I think, in the CCWG on Accountability and also included some discussions amongst some of the leaders of the stakeholder groups and constituencies and SOs and ACs, that a lot of the upcoming reviews scheduled for early 2017 were on a – had a potential to overlap with existing work.

For example, the fact that ATRT 3 was going to launch in conjunction with the completion of Work Stream 2; or the fact that this Whois review or RDS review was going to launch in parallel with the ongoing PDP on the next generation RDS.



And I think the concern, as expressed by myself and many others, was that we would be duplicating some of the work, covering some of the same ground in terms of material, and also potentially borrowing from the same pool of volunteers that might be forced to choose which of the different work streams they would like to participate in or which would be more effective.

And I think in light of that, there was some discussion about moving the calendar for these reviews. I think there was some concerns about that approach. And then what was presented back by ICANN staff was the idea that we would instead limit the scope of the upcoming reviews so that they wouldn't collide with ongoing work that was in the PDP or other cross community working groups.

And so that's kind of how we – how this document was born in an effort to keep those two trains on separate tracks. I note that in our meeting in India, and I hate to put you on the spot, but I note that Susan, in our meeting, and I think since then on the list has noted that she had some questions or concerns about this approach. But otherwise staff and the review team staff in particular is looking for our feedback on whether or not we think this proposal to limit the scope of the RDS is acceptable or whether we would have any questions.

So I don't know if folks have had an opportunity to thoroughly digest this and circulate it amongst our stakeholder groups and constituencies, but I'd like to table this proposal and this issue for discussion. We have a little bit of time here to mull this over and identify what our next steps will be. And first in the queue is Susan, go ahead, Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, James. So I did have some discussions with staff about this. And, you know, I'm probably fine with the language as long as it's interpreted in the way I interpret it. So one of my concerns was I think the Whois Review Team could comment on the PPSAI; they could look at cross validation; compliance actions and transparent data steps relating to Whois. So as long

– and, you know, in a discussion with staff they felt like those would all be included as open topics partly because some of those came out of the Whois Review Team, the first Whois Review Team.

So as long as there is a little wiggle room if people are not reading the language as, you know, absolutely it was not in the Whois Review Team report so therefore we're not, you know, those words were not there, we're not looking at it then if there's some little – some flexibility I'm fine with moving forward with this language. But if people view that language as very, very strict then I guess I'm not comfortable.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Susan. And just one thought off the cuff would be if you would be willing to take a stab at some altered language that would enumerate those ideas or at least, you know, I wouldn't want to assume anything I guess is my immediate response...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

James Bladel: ...if we want to see something in there that we should probably find a place to add it so that it's clear. And then if there are some like just off the cuff personally I might feel like there are some things that you mentioned that should be in there and some things that might be open for more discussion and, you know, we should hash those out either...

Susan Kawaguchi: Right.

James Bladel: ...in the Council or submit them back to the review team. But would you be willing to take a shot at capturing those in an amendment or in some sort of a comment that we could send back to – send back to staff?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I could definitely do that.

James Bladel: Awesome, perfect. Thank you – thank you for volunteering to do that. I think that’s an excellent point. And next in the queue is Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, James. Keith Drazek for the transcript. Yes, I’d like to support most of what Susan just said. I think a extremely narrow interpretation would be probably unwise at this point as much as I agree we want to try to streamline efforts not duplicate work, not have too much overlap and generally try to be as efficient as possible.

I think we need to be careful about too narrow limitation of the scope. You know, if you go to the ICANN bylaws related to this review team, it is in fact more than simply an assessment of the implementation of past recommendations. There’s more work that is actually included as required by the bylaws in the, you know, in the RDS review team scope. So I think we do need to be careful there.

I’d be happy to volunteer with Susan and anybody else that’s interested to try to come up with some amended language. But I think that just a second thought, you know, there are so many different work streams and efforts going on in the Whois or RDS space right now, we all know this has been going on for years, but it’s only getting worse. And it seems to me that this review team could actually be a possible facilitator or a coordinating group to help try to bring some, you know, sanity or some at least more clear understanding of the various work streams where the overlaps are and to try to use this opportunity to, you know, to, like I said, bring some sanity to the process, just a thought. Certainly interested in what others have to say.

James Bladel: Thanks, Keith. And I think that’s an excellent proposal. I think, you know, speaking as an employee of a company that has to go off and write code to a lot of the changing, you know, rules and regulations around Whois, I think we would also welcome sort of an overarching perspective or strategy that synthesizes all the different work streams that are currently underway and that are possibly planned. And I think that would be a good use of this.

And I just would note, thank you again for volunteering. I have Keith and Susan volunteering to take a swing at capturing the comments here. Next up is Carlos, go ahead.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Yes, thank you, James. For the last two years I didn't have a vote so I don't even know if I have a voice. But I want to comment as an alumni of previous review teams and member of one ongoing review team, two short comments.

I mean, I think we should not preempt the chartering exercise that each review team does at the beginning of the review. So I don't know how would you transfer whatever the Council decides to the actual review team. And the second comment, in the line that Keith just mentioned, during Hyderabad (unintelligible) very interesting session on getting feedback of previous review teams for future review teams. I was invited but I couldn't make it.

But staff is seriously thinking in terms of helping and facilitating these processes according to the new bylaws of course, as Keith said, we have a new ground but in any case I would recommend to go back and try to find the commentaries or resolutions for recommendations of Larisa Gurnick's meeting in Hyderabad on this matter. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thanks, Carlos. And good ideas as far as consulting with previous review teams. And I say that a couple of us being on – alumni from the previous Whois review team, even on this call. So we'll try to capture that in the feedback as well. So good interventions, thank you. Amr, you're up next.

Amr Elsadr: thanks, James. This is Amr. Yes, I just wanted to say that personally I think the suggested scope seems fine. And what I've been hearing from Susan and Keith also sounds quite sensible. I do have maybe just one bullet here that I would like to flag and it's just the first bullet – the first sub bullet I guess, which is sort of recommending what the composition of the upcoming review

team may be. And what I'm seeing here is that it looks like it's suggesting that it be rather limited to folk who may have been on the previous one.

And although would be fantastic to have as many of those as we can on the upcoming review team, I think it may be helpful to the review team to also not limit membership to previous review team members. Just as Keith has pointed out, there's been a kind of work on Whois done between the last review and the upcoming one, and having some fresh new members who have been participating in those policies it may also be helpful to consider including them. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Amr. That's a good point. And if there are no objections then maybe would just note that for Susan and Keith to capture in our potential comments that we would add to this.

The queue is clear. And so I think we've got some good thoughts here. I would ask – first off, thanks to Susan and Keith for volunteering to come up with a draft comment here on this. I guess my first request would be what would be a realistic timeframe for that to be done? I don't know if it's too soon to ask by the end of day on Monday because that's the motion cutoff and this could be considered then in our next meeting.

I don't, you know, and I guess I'm looking to Marika now. I don't know that it's necessary for Council to vote on this. I think they are, at this point, at this stage in the game staff is simply asking for feedback and so I think if we capture feedback even if, you know, even if it is not necessarily in line with this original proposal that we could simply get that relayed back in our response to staff. I think that that would be a good, sorry, that would be a good approach.

I would note that we're kind of – they are asking us to get back to them as soon as possible so if there's any possibility that we could get this turned

around relatively quickly can you give me an idea of a timeframe, Susan, Keith? Hate to put you on the spot.

Susan Kawaguchi: I don't know, Keith. I don't think it's going to take a lot to revise this. You know, I think we could add some language and just a little more detail. But what do you think, Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Susan. This is Keith. Yes, I agree, I think we ought to be able to come up with some new language fairly quickly. And so I don't know if Monday is doable but I think – is Monday a deadline, is that what I've heard or is it not a deadline? I think we can certainly get something next week.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Keith and thanks, Susan. If you can target it at all for the end of day, you know, Susan's got the most agreeable time zone so if we can target it for closing of the day on Monday then we'll relay that back to the team that they can expect a response early next week. You know, that'll give us a time to post it to the Council list and everyone have an opportunity to weigh in for a day or so.

But if you can target as soon as possible with the goal of early next week then we'll get that circulated. And then we'll just – we'll reach back out to the staff folks and just say that we just need a little bit more time to make our modifications to it. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Keith, I'll send you something tomorrow morning.

((Crosstalk))

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks, Susan. And I'll turn something around by the end of the day.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay perfect. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks.

James Bladel: That is fantastic. Thanks, guys. Okay any other thoughts on Item Number 9? I'm sorry, Item Number 8? Okay, then moving on to Item Number 9, another request for feedback. We had requests from the cochairs of the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 to submit – I don't know if I'd call it a survey or to answer some specific questions on how the GNSO, and I think that means Council and also stakeholder groups and constituencies, how we are internally accountable.

And so we've put together a draft of this potential response here. And by "we" I think, you know, staff took first stab at it and Heather and Donna and I have been tweaking it a little bit over the last couple of days. I believe at a similar if not identical request was also shared with the leadership of all the stakeholder groups and constituencies so this is not – this is not in any way Council intercepting this request; it has been shared throughout the GNSO ecosystem.

But what we'd like to do is take a look at what we had put together, what staff has put together and see if we feel that we are getting close to something that we can turn around and send. I just lost connectivity. I don't know if it's me or if it's everyone, but I lost the Adobe room. Is it just me?

Michele Neylon: It's just you.

James Bladel: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Maybe I could ask Marika or – I know Heather was getting on a plane. Maybe Donna could potentially tee this up while I try to reconnect to the Adobe room. I apologize for that, folks. My screen just went blank.

Heather Forrest: James, it's Heather. I'm just going to interrupt quickly. If Donna or Marika is willing to go over this one, after it's gone over I would like to make a few comments on it so if you can put me in the queue for when we're ready for the queue. Thanks.

James Bladel: Noted, Heather. We'll hold the queue for you as soon as I can get into the queue. But I don't know, Marika or Donna, if you're in a position where you can actually see the document and can tee it up for us while I try to reconnect that would be great. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks James, and Heather. It's Donna. I guess Marika, I don't want to put you on the spot, but Marika was responsible for the primary responses to the questions. And I think Heather and James and I – as James said, we just tweaked rather than made substantive comments. So, Marika, would you mind running through the responses?

Marika Konings: Sure. So this is Marika. So basically this is a request from the CCWG Accountability Working Group survey I think that has gone out to all the different SOs and ACs requesting further information in relation to accountability and transparency matters that are in place to facilitate participation in relation to outreach and other aspects of the work of the different groups.

So basically what we tried to do in this survey is to provide a response from the Council's perspective. And that mainly refers to how we conduct our meetings, you know, what requirements exist under the GNSO Operating Procedures and Bylaws, and provide relevant references.

As we pointed out as well, and I think as you all know, you know, the Council is of course, you know, only one part of the GNSO spectrum so I presume that the CCWG Accountability will look forward to hearing as well input from the different stakeholder groups and constituencies on how these different



aspects of your – of accountability and transparency are covered in your respective meetings and dealings.

So what you see here, again, is relatively short. You see in redline the proposed responses. This is really intended as a draft so if anyone believes there's anything missing from here, any further information that should be added to it, you know, this is for anyone to comment on. And as said, you know, probably a lot of the information that the group is probably looking for may come from responses that are being prepared by your respective groups.

And I actually note that Cheryl has her hand up as well. I believe she's actually active in this group so she may be able to provide further context or tell us that is missing from what we've provided so far.

James Bladel: I'm back in the room and I have my hand raised to hold Heather's spot in the queue. So I don't know, if, Cheryl, if you want to continue with setting the stage before we bring Heather or Heather may be in the process of boarding an airplane so if you don't mind can we get her question or comment on the record before we lose her?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Let's hear from Heather before we lose her.

James Bladel: Yes. Okay.

Heather Forrest: That's all right, thank you very much. This is Heather. No, not to worry. I've got a break of time here so I'm more than happy for Cheryl to go first with the context and then I'll pop in after. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Heather. Just a bunch of Australians being nice to each other. It doesn't happen often, people, you should make a record note of that one. And yes I am active in this group. I'm one of the three co-rapporteurs so I feel

very responsible for getting this set of questions out to the GNSO and its constituent parts.

Notice that terminology, the GNSO and its constituent parts, because in fact, our mandate was to send it to the ACs and the SOs, in other words, the advisory committees and the support organizations. We are delighted to hear, and I am channeling my other two co-rapporteurs here, we're delighted to see that as of now all of the SOs and the ACs are well progressed in their responses including the GAC, to our few questions, and we are delighted to get whatever we can back from the Council supplemented with of course whatever you can collect and collate back from the constituencies as well.

Can't tell you that there's any more or any less, because it's your self review. So there's no requirements as far as we're concerned other than a self review and getting it back to us in a timely manner. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Cheryl. Glad to have you on this call and weighing in. So, Heather, you're up next.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James, very much. It's Heather. And as Cheryl will perhaps know and appreciate, it takes approximately two minutes to go through Hobart airport so I'm – hence I have a bit of time to spare.

I wanted to make – to follow up on James's introductory remarks which is to say that James, Donna and I did have a chance to take (unintelligible) with the draft that was initially prepared by staff. And simply to specify that my comments were mostly form rather than substance.

The only response on which I have a substantive bit of input is on Question Number 1. I think as it's currently drafted, the response goes beyond simply identifying who is involved, who can participate through the GNSO and goes into how the GNSO is structured and how we conduct our business in the Council and so on and so forth.

In my mind that response goes further than it needs to. I understand it quotes the Bylaws but I think maybe we haven't given as targeted a response as we can. And I would also like to express support for later questions where we describe the PDP and how the work of the GNSO is undertaken, in other words, how bylaws mandate of developing policy for gTLDs is carried out.

And I think herein lies another opportunities for us, we've been trying to seize these wherever they arise, to invite the community to make it very, very clear, very explicit to invite the community to participate in GNSO PDPs. There is a need to fight this, if you like, perception that GNSO PDPs are only for the GNSO. And this seems to me a good opportunity to do that.

So those are my two substantive points, James, thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. And I'm glad that we were able to get you into the – get your points captured before we lose you to the airlines. So I think just to summarize Heather's first comment is that the response to Question Number 1 is perhaps a little bit too verbose and could even – even though it is lifted directly from the bylaws we could perhaps shorten that to the key elements.

And then the second part is noting that the GNSO PDPs are open to all interested participants, come one come all. And also I don't know if I heard you say this, Heather, or if it's just something that popped into my head while you were speaking, but also if there's anything to note the distinctions between the GNSO PDP and the cross community working group or maybe I'm introducing more overkill as well.

But those were Heather's comments. I see Marika has her hand up. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted to clarify that on the first question, one of the reasons that the draft includes a kind of copy paste from the bylaws is that in the section description is actually referring to as defined in the bylaws and it

quotes a sentence that's even, you know, between quotation marks, which seems to apply from the bylaws, but at least I haven't been able to find it.

So that's why my initial reaction was to put what is there in the bylaws. But again, you know, this is of course open to rewording. So I think it's just important to make clear whatever we write there it's clear whether it's a direct quote or whether it's a summary version or an interpretation so that leaves clear what is being provided.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika. And I think we certainly welcome your – doing the heavy lifting and coming up with the first attempt at addressing some of these questions. But to Heather's point, and I think to those who are perhaps seeing this for the first time, we probably need to spend a little bit more time making sure that we are addressing what is asked in the most targeted way as well as drawing distinctions wherever they are necessary.

I notice that the queue is clear. I think that as far as next steps for this particular document, I think as I indicated, it just, you know, just kind of came through the first pass where Marika has drafted our first response and heather and Donna and I have tweaked it a little bit around the margins. So I think the next step is we should circulate this to the Council. I think it has been posted to the list but only recently.

So I would ask councilors to take a look at this and let's see if we can get this finalized and sent out in the intervening time between now and our next meeting. And if it starts to look like it's something that's going to require a little bit more of a formal endorsement then we can certainly wrap it around a motion and get that submitted.

The other step that I would ask is for staff to send out a note to the SG and C leadership and check in on the status of their responses, whether they intend to submit those to the GNSO for us to relay, which seems a little clunky. It would be great if they could submit their responses directly to the CCWG

cochairs and the rapporteurs of this particular work stream. But I think that first up we would need to make sure that they are clear on that – on this request and what their expected responses should look like so if we could take that away as an action item as well, that would be fantastic.

Any other thoughts or comments on this particular – on this particular item? We've got it circulated on the list but if we could get it reviewed here in the next few days and get it finalized here for our next meeting that would be great. Okay thank you.

Then moving on to Agenda Item Number 10, and this is selection of GNSO representatives to the SSR Review Team. I'll just kind of set the stage here, this review team was – it wasn't clear whether this review team was going to be constituted under the old method, which was in the Affirmation of Commitments, or under the new method, which was in the new bylaws – the post-transition bylaws.

The call for volunteers was put out I guess over the late summer. We have a slate of potential volunteers. As discussed, because the transition did in fact occur on October 1, we now have the new selection method in place which is painfully vague in terms of simply kicking this to the SO and AC community leaders to make the selection.

We have a slate of I believe nine – I think the number was nine individuals that are seeking GNSO endorsements and/or nomination to this particular review team. We, under the structure of the new selection process, we can submit three names that are – or up to three names that are essential to – will essentially be guaranteed inclusion in the review team.

We can submit an additional four names that would not necessarily be guaranteed but could be used to balance the ultimate slate of members for diversity, gender, region, language. And then finally, the GNSO would have to, I believe, adopt the slate of all the final slate of members of the review

team. So it's a complicated process, and I think that we're trying to get our arms around it.

In the midst of all of this, we had a discussion in Hyderabad, and I think Susan and Ed very graciously asked to raise their hands on this, about putting together a more programmatic approach to not only to filling these slates of review teams but also filling liaison roles and roles like the CSC liaison and all these kinds of open position that are very frequently dropped on our laps where we have to call for volunteers and evaluate candidates and ultimately make a recommendation to Council that somebody should be adopted or endorsed.

And the only question that I – or concern that I have at this stage in the game is that those two efforts are occurring in parallel and will we have a standing process and a group in place to consider this review team? Do we have to work at – through a more ad hoc process while we build that standing mechanism or where do we go from here?

And of course, the other members of the community would like to get started on this in January which I think we acknowledged as perhaps a bit ambitious. So with that I see Susan has her hand up and Susan, please, the floor is yours. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, James. And I need to stop putting my hand up obviously because I did not, you know, do the work on this in a timely manner, and I apologize for that. But Ed and I – I think we've made good progress this week. And I would view it, and Ed can give his opinion on this, but I would think we're like at least 75% there with some very good guidelines and a process.

And I must give Julie Hedlund credit because she put together a process for the Customer Standing Committee and Ed and I were both part of that to select a candidate. Of course we only had one volunteer so that was easy.

But I do think that we need to standardize the approach to any selections we make and be very thoughtful about it. So we are developing that. And I think we could possibly get something out next week to the whole Council.

And so that would allow us to, you know, provide the best candidates from the pool of GNSO candidates. So that's my thought process but I see Ed's got his hand up so I'm sure he has other comments.

James Bladel: Thanks for the update, Susan. And I'm actually encouraged; I think you guys are a little bit further along than I had thought particularly given that, you know, we're so shortly removed from Hyderabad and a holiday week here in the US so that's good news. Thanks. Ed, go ahead.

Ed Morris: Yes, just to give a bit ditto to Susan. She's been tremendous to work with. I should say, this has been a fun experience. And I think that, yes, I mean, it was a meeting of the minds and I think you'll – I hope everyone likes what we come up with but it's a process that will be designed to get the best candidates from the GNSO externally and for internal appointments as well, transparent. I'm excited. I hope folks like what we come up with. But, yes, next week should be fine.

James Bladel: Okay so wow, thank you, Ed, thank you Susan. It sounds like you guys are a little bit further ahead than I had expected so thank you for your efforts and you certainly didn't let any moss grow around your feet on this one so that's very much appreciated.

It sounds like between – so if you're able to get something circulated to the Council by next week that would be perfect because I think really everyone on Council sees the value of standardizing this process and certainly – and I don't mean to put words in Donna's or Heather's mouths here but I think speaking from the Council leadership and the staff perspective, it's like we would certainly like some sort of a routine and predictable method for addressing these requests when they come out because they are coming up

more and more frequently and we just – it feels like we're constantly scrambling so thanks for that.

But it sounds like between this accelerated timeframe for this process and the fact that we are likely going to push back on the original timeline that was put in front of us, we can probably use this process to fill this slate for this particular review team or at least have a – you've given us a fighting chance to do so. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Just to support you and thanks to Susan and Ed for picking this up because I think any process that can add some predictability and efficiencies to the way we do our work is greatly appreciated and there's, you know, it seems that we're in this never-ending cycle of trying to find or appoint volunteers to various efforts. So I think this is great. If we can set up a process that is going to suit us, you know, suit us and serve us in a longer time I think that will be terrific so thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And I guess wholeheartedly agree. This is something that's just coming up more and more frequently and we need a process. So okay the queue is clear. I think the last I heard from Ed and Susan was that they feel like they're well on their way to producing something for Council review sometimes next week.

I guess the next step then we will look for that document and then we will hopefully employ that process or, you know, some reasonable – something reasonable variation of that process to fill out the slate of GNSO members to the SSR Review Team and with the goal of getting that done probably early in the next year. So thank you very much for your work on that and for that update.

Then moving to Item Number 11, which is planning for ICANN 58. Status summary is – I think we touched on this a little bit during the discussion at the beginning of the call that we had this meeting earlier today. We took the



consolidated feedback that was received on the questions of Constituency Day and high interest topics back to staff. I can report that I think that our concerns and our proposals were well heard.

There is – I think there is this natural asymmetry in the fact that the GNSO community values Constituency Day almost as paramount whereas outside of the GNSO it's almost, you know, folks don't have any strong opinions at all on single day Constituency Day so it does appear to be somewhat asymmetrical when we look at it and we get these groups together and start hammering out the schedule.

But I think that next up we're going to see some revised block schedules that will also include a process for identifying and selecting high interest topics. I think the other proposal was – that was heard loud and clear in Hyderabad and was relayed to the staff in this morning's call was to reduce the number of high interest topics. I think that the number that we had in Hyderabad was, you know, determined to be pretty much unworkable. And I think that the consensus of the call today was that that number probably needs to be capped at around three or four and possibly even less.

And then there was some discussion around scheduling those particularly in light of other active policy development work like PDP face to face meetings. That's my synopsis of the call today. I don't know if, Donna or Heather, who were also on the call, if you'd like to weigh in with your thoughts?

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. It's Donna. I think you're putting a very glowing light on what happened on the call this morning. But good for you. I would just like to suggest to the Council that perhaps, you know, what we might want to consider doing is a kind of baked in block schedule for the GNSO itself. I think this was something that Tony Holmes raised during a conversation with the Council and also I know he raised it in the public forum.

But I think it would be particularly helpful if we could, as the GNSO, perhaps come to a – an understanding at least of, you know, the sessions that are important to our respective SGs and Cs and also understand, you know, what are the – from a Council perspective, what are our priorities. So I think that, you know, progressing PDPs is probably important and also some of the work of the IRTs are probably important as well.

So it might be helpful if we could prioritize some of that work as well to understand what we would like to give priority to in terms of timing and allocation (unintelligible) during – we're talking specifically about Copenhagen. So that might be helpful to do as well.

One of the interesting things about the HIT is – the high interest topics – is I don't think there's a common understanding of what those sessions are supposed to be. I think the only criteria that we had around that with the meeting strategy working group was that they were supposed to be non conflicted sessions.

So they were supposed to be topics identified more or less by the community as a whole that we saw value in getting everybody in a room and having some discussion. So for Helsinki that worked well because we – because the meeting itself had a policy focus, we could, you know, make sure that the PDPs that we currently have underway got some good air time so that there was single cross community discussion during that – the HIT sessions.

Probably didn't work so well in Hyderabad because we didn't have that perhaps, you know, laser focus on what we were doing for Hyderabad. So just, you know, just as a takeaway maybe if, you know, within your respective groups if we could give some thought to, you know, A, what you think, you know, what are the sessions that you really want to see happen from your SG or C's perspective in Hyderabad that would enable – sorry, in Copenhagen, that would enable you to get through your particular work?

And then perhaps from a Council level, if we can elevate that and identify what are the, you know, the PDP efforts or the IRT efforts that we want to see make some significant progress? You know, I think it would be really good if we can, you know, we now have, you know, in the – ICANN meets three times a year, which equates to 17 days of face to face time.

And I think we sometimes miss an opportunity to progress some of the PDP work at those meetings because we just – we go into a cycle of doing this three times a year rather than perhaps looking at it on an annual basis and seeing how we can get the most out of those 17 days, and perhaps, you know, do a little bit more planning on an annual basis as well as the meeting itself.

So that's just, you know, something that I think it would be helpful if we as the GNSO or representatives of the GNSO at the Council can think about how we can make better use of our time. And in my mind, if we can identify what that kind of baked in schedule looks like that Tony was talking about and then kind of take that up a step further and identify what the priorities are for us as a Council in terms of managing our priorities I think that might be helpful as well. So sorry for the long-winded answer, James, but that's kind of my thinking on where I think we should go with this. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Donna. Appreciate your insights on this and your take on the meeting. I agree, we probably should, and I think it was a good suggestion from Tony, to start looking at what a fixed GNSO calendar looks like or schedule looks like for each of the three meetings, A, B and C, and that we simply put that out to, you know, bring that to each of these planning session and say this is where we want to go.

To that end, just another note is that we usually ask each of the PDPs to identify which ones are interested in having a face to face meeting at an ICANN meeting, and last couple of times around we got lucky because not all of them were in a position where they could – where they felt that their work

would benefit from a face to face meeting. I don't think that's going to be the case going forward. I think all the PDPs are now sufficiently in a mature-enough stage in their development or their lifecycle that they will all be asking us for face to face time in the upcoming meetings, and so we should just be prepared for that when we come up with our block schedule.

And then the final note, when you were talking about HITs, I do want to mention that Michele offered feedback that the HIT sessions should have some sort of a clear outcome, that having HIT sessions that don't necessarily have outcomes start to look like we're just all gathering in a room to have a little bit of a chat and they're not necessarily the most efficient use of time. And so that was also captured in the feedback and relayed into this group so thank you for raising that point, Michele.

Next up in the queue we have Susan. Go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks, James. I don't have any answers to Donna's questions or recommendations at this time. I just wanted to bring everybody – make sure everybody was aware that European Data Protection Authorities are looking at the Copenhagen meeting as an opportunity to, you know, meet and discuss the issues mostly surrounding the Whois but data in general.

And have proposed that we allocate a whole day to that and, you know, an hour and a half meeting with the Board, an hour and a half meeting with the GNSO Council. And, James, I think you've been in the loop on those emails. Because I'm Vice Chair of the RDS Working Group, you know, he included me in the emails. And I did chat with him a little bit at the Hyderabad meeting.

But that would be problematic to getting all our other work done, though I have no issues with talking to the – to Data Protection Authorities either. But I'm not sure that, you know, sort of an outside influence coming in and saying hey, we want a whole day of your meeting is appropriate either. So I just wanted to make sure everybody was aware of that.

James Bladel: Thanks, Susan. Thanks for raising that. And I apologize, I think I do recall seeing some of those messages but maybe I just didn't go over them as thoroughly as I needed to. I'll go back and take another look at those.

Okay, Paul, save us a piece of cake. Happy birthday to your daughter.

Okay the queue is clear on this. I think the message here is that we're – the good news is – I think the encouraging news is that we're starting this process early. That we are getting well out in front of this to avoid a repeat of the experience that we had in Hyderabad and a recognition that, you know, folks are going to disappear, you know, for holidays and the end of the year for a couple of weeks.

And so we actually need to get out in front of this. And I think if you can continue to submit this sort of feedback, I'm not sure when we have our next SO/AC meeting to discuss this, but I think as a takeaway I think – I haven't heard any objections to the idea that we work on some sort of a template or a standard block schedule for GNSO events for each of the three meeting structures and that we start working from that as a starting point when we get into discussions with these other groups.

And that we then tailor – frankly just say, you know, tailor around this because this is kind of what the bulk of our community is coming to these meetings to accomplish. That plus the PDPs.

So we have two minutes remaining, we – one open item for AOB, which is the meeting calendar for 2017. And I just want to note, I don't know if staff can load that fairly quickly, and we'll go over that fairly expeditiously here. But the meeting calendar follows pretty much the same scripts that you all have come to know and love in 2016 in that we have two rotating time slots.

We try to hit Thursday each time. We try to avoid major recognized holidays where folks would be likely to, you know, not want to participate in ICANN meetings. We also tried to avoid the month of August entirely, but I think that started to bunch up the meetings to the point where we had – because of the way the ICANN calendar fell we had a number of meetings in September and October that were kind of right on top of each other. You know, and that also is not necessarily a good – an efficient calendar.

So what we'd like to do here is we had some thoughts and folks with in with their views with their proposals to move a couple of things around so that we didn't conflict with holidays. And I thank everyone for their input on that. But here's what we have for the proposed meeting calendar for 2017.

Not going to ask anyone to offer their thoughts not but if you could please, in the next couple of days if you could and certainly before our next meeting, if you could please weigh in with your – if you spot any particular conflicts here or anything that you believe would – not just your own schedule but if you believe it would significantly detriment any councilor's ability to participate please flag those for us. But I think we've got something pretty close here with a healthy interval in between each meeting.

That is all I wanted to offer under Item 12.1 for AOB. Any other items for discussion?

Heather Forrest: James, this is Heather. Could I go in the queue just to make a comment on the AOB?

James Bladel: Yes, Heather, you're in the queue and then we also have a question for Rafik on the schedule, Rafik, did you want to raise the question about the time slots?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Yes.

James Bladel: Go ahead, Rafik. Or I could read out your chat. Rafik is asking if we only have the two time slots? And the answer is we had three previously, we consolidated it down to two. I don't know if that's posing a problem but please...

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so that's why I was asking. I mean, well personally okay it's 6 – like for this like 6:00 am. But, I mean, I think I can maybe live with that. Just I was wondering if what was the rationale to reduce to just two time slot? I think three maybe can offer some flexibility. It's hard to accommodate different time zone but just was wondering what was the rationale to narrow it down to just two time slots?

James Bladel: I think we can – we can discuss that now that we have some new councilors, although I don't think we've necessarily changed our spread, if you will, from our most extreme time zone. But I think primarily we were looking for simplicity. We were trying to share the pain as much as possible so that folks who were inconvenienced for one time zone found a more reasonable time slot for the next meeting and then just rotated around like that.

It's certainly something that we can revisit. Glen has a nice spreadsheet that she can put together as a time zone review tool that we can reopen that and just kind of take a look at just how ugly some of the proposed time zones are for each. I think that we have – we can certainly take a look at that for 2017 as well, Rafik. I would note that we captured or at least thought we captured your time zone in this rotation, but we can take another look at that.

I'm sorry, Heather, you've been patiently waiting so, Heather, go ahead before we lose you. Go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Yes, thanks, James. This is Heather. This would be my last intervention before they tackle me. So I wanted to express support unsurprisingly for the idea of sharing the pain. I think it's a great idea if we don't, you know, privilege any time zones over others to the extent that we can help it while

also bearing in mind that James, your job is pretty difficult and we need to try and keep it within, you know, reasonable hours for sure for the chair so that that's not a problem.

And I recognize that we have a meeting coming up next that has West Coast US in a pretty poor spot. So to the extent that we can, you know, make that as seldom as possible for any time zone that's a good thing. And I also wanted to express support for the comment that was made in relation to being mindful of not having meetings too close together. I think we've had in the latter half of this year several instances where we've been sitting at the Council table or on a call like this and noting that the deadline for motions for the next meeting is within hours or days.

And to the extent that we can avoid that, because it's really impractical to go back to SGs and Cs, brief them on the results of this meeting and discuss future things and try and do that over the course of a weekend, it's just not reasonable. So we need to do what we can to avoid that too.

And with that I'm afraid I'll sign off and thank everyone and see you all on the 15th. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. Great thoughts. And please don't get tackled by security, please tell them that you're saving the Internet and they will have to deal with all of us. But...

Heather Forrest: I always do, James.

James Bladel: Have a good flight. And...

Heather Forrest: Thanks, bye.

James Bladel: ...that is exactly the point we are trying to avoid not only having one time zone privileged but also to avoid those really short intervals that we saw in



September and I think that we have right now. I think, you know, the lesson there is that that doesn't make us more efficient; that just kind of leaves us with, you know, scrambling to hit another document cutoff.

So we are five minutes over our time so I thank you for those of you who stuck with us. Do we have any other new items of business that folks would like to raise before we sign off for the – for this particular call? Phil, go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes, just quick question. What is – okay I see Mary 15th at 1200, okay that's 7:00 am Eastern. All right, I'll be up bright and up early that day. That's it.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil.

Phil Corwin: You'll be up even earlier, James.

James Bladel: A little bit, a little bit earlier. And headed your way, but that's a topic for another discussion. Okay so thank you very much to everyone who participated and of course thank you for those of you who volunteered for various action items and takeaways from this call. And we certainly appreciate everything that you do. ICANN runs on volunteers and the GNSO is no exception.

With that we'll go ahead and close the call and certainly appreciate everyone's efforts between now and we'll talk to you in a couple of weeks. We can stop the recording.

END