

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Council teleconference
Thursday 12 October 2017**

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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-12oct17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p4ha8n99jbc/>

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

Date: 12 October 2017

Coordinated Universal Time: 12:00 UTC:

<http://tinyurl.com/ya74wnq9>

05:00 Los Angeles; 08:00 Washington; 13:00 London; 15:00 Istanbul; 23:00 Hobart

List of attendees:

NCA – Non Voting – Erika Mann

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Michele Neylon, Darcy Southwell

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 Knoblen, Tony Harris, Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent, Stephanie Perrin, Tatiana Tropina (temporary alternate for Ed Morris), Rafik Dammak, Stefania Milan, Marilia Maciel

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

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr– ALAC Liaison

Ben Fuller - ccNSO Observer

Carlos Raul Gutierrez– GNSO liaison to the GAC

Guests:

Patrick Jones – Senior Director, Global Stakeholder Engagement

Carlos Reyes – Policy Support & Community Service Sr Manager

ICANN Staff

Markus Kummer - ICANN Board Member – (sent apologies)

David Olive -Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional

Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support - GNSO

Mary Wong – Sr Director, Special Adviser for Strategic Policy Planning

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director
Berry Cobb – Policy consultant
Emily Barabas – Policy Support Senior Specialist
Ariel Liang – Policy Analyst
Mike Brennan – Technical Support
Nathalie Peregrine – Manager, Operations Support
Terri Agnew - Operations Support - GNSO Lead Administrator

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 12th of October, 2017. Could you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you ever so much.
James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl.

Rubens Kuhl: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Keith Drazek.

Keith Drazek: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Darcy Southwell.

Darcy Southwell: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Valerie Tan.

Valerie Tan: Yes.

Nathalie Peregrine: Phil Corwin.

Phil Corwin: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Stephanie Perrin. Okay, we'll try to get a hold of Stephanie after the roll call. Stefania Milan. Stefania, you might be on mute? We see Stefania connected to the bridge, we'll try to get a hold of her shortly. Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Tatiana Tropina.

Tatiana Tropina: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Martin Silva Valent.

Martin Silva Valent: here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Marilia Maciel.

Marilia Maciel: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Julf Helsingius.

Julf Helsingius: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I believe we're still trying to dial out to Cheryl. We'll circle back. Ben Fuller. I see Ben is in the Adobe Connect room. Erika Mann. We're still trying to dial out to Erika. Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Present, thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Guest speakers joining us for an AOB today we have Carlos Reyes and Patrick Jones from staff. Staff present on the call now we have David Olive, Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Terri Agnew, Mike Brennan for technical support and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind everyone to please remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes, and also to mute to avoid any background noise.

Thank you ever so much, James, and over to you.

Stefania Milan: Hi, sorry to interject. Hey, can I say something? Sorry to interject, this is Stefania Milan. I had a problem with the microphone, I'm here. Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Stefania. We'll make sure to mark you as present. So welcome again, everyone, and thank you, Nathalie, for conducting the roll. I understand before we continue with our agenda that Marika has some announcement as well, so, Marika, if you're available and can speak, please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you, James. This is Marika. I just wanted to very briefly make everyone aware of some of the recent changes we've had in the GNSO team. As I think some of you may be aware, Amr on the GNSO team mutually agreed to part ways and as a result he's no longer part of the GNSO team. I think you already know that Mary is in the process of transitioning out of most of her GNSO duties as she's working to – or planning to head up the team previously known as E3 within the Policy Team.

But to ensure of course that there's sufficient staff support for all the GNSO activities, I'm very happy to report that some familiar names to you should – names that should be familiar to you are now fully transitioning to the GNSO team and Julie Hedlund, who has previously also been sharing responsibilities with the SSAC, and Ariel Lang, who we also had at part of the time as she was also working for the ALAC. But both of them will now be transitioning full time to the GNSO team. Of course this will be a gradual process but I hope you will all join me in welcoming them in their support for your activities.

And in addition to that, we also have a position currently open for a policy manager so if you know if any good candidates please direct them to the ICANN Website to find further details there. And that was it. And of course if you have any questions please always feel free to reach out to me. Thank you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. And welcome to Julie and Ariel and of course congratulations to Mary, we will certainly miss you. But thank you, Marika, for that announcement on staff changes.

Do any councilors, moving onto Item 1.2 of our agenda, do any councilors have updates to their statement of interest or their status as a councilor? Please raise your hand or get my attention. Seeing none, can we then take a look at our agenda, which is being displayed in the Adobe Connect room and along the right hand column of your screen and was also circulated to the Council list.

Please note that there was one or two items of AOB that were added for discussion fairly recently, but otherwise our schedule is fairly light in terms of voting items; only one item on our consent agenda and everything else is a discussion topic. So I think we have a fairly straightforward agenda, but does anyone have any updates, announcements, additions or amendments, please raise your hand. Okay great, let's move on then.

The minutes of the previous Council meetings have been posted as indicate there on the agenda on the 14th of September and the 8th of October. And we can then transition to our open projects and action item list. I'll wait for staff to load that.

Okay, let's make this a little bit larger here. And just scrolling through this very quickly, I don't believe we have any changes from our previous meeting in September. And I'm fairly certain that this is the status of the projects that we will carry with us into ICANN 60. I will report that while we were looking at PDPs and IRTs, that the GNSO leadership, myself and Heather and Donna, have been meeting with the leaders of the various PDPs to get status updates from them on the current state of their work as we head into ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi.

And that's something that we found to be useful in the run up to Johannesburg and it's something that we're continuing for this meeting. So that is ongoing and we certainly should have something to report there in the coming weeks.

Any questions or comments on our open project list? Okay. Thank you. If we could put this away and then move to our action item list?

Welcome, Stephanie. Someone's – maybe creating some background noise. If we could have everyone go on mute, please, that would be great, thank you.

Okay, just moving through our action item list fairly quickly, items that are in yellow are in progress; items that are in blue will be discussed as part of our agenda today; and items that are in green are completed and will not appear on future action items lists and we don't have any of those for this meeting.

The only items that we should be drawing your attention to now would be the blue items, community change process requests, which we will discuss later on, and I believe in AOB, and as well as our Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operations, which is also part of our AOB.

So that's the state of our action item list. Everything else is pretty much ongoing. Any questions or comments? Okay, nothing of substance in the chat except for welcomes and hellos so let's then move – put this away and we'll move to our consent agenda. Okay, thank you.

Our consent agenda consists of one item and that is the approval and acknowledgement of the appointment of Cheryl Langdon-Orr as the cochair for the New gTLD SubPro PDP. Cheryl will be replacing Avri Doria who beginning on – beginning at the end of ICANN 60 will take her seat on the ICANN Board of Directors.

I think we all are certainly welcoming of Cheryl and are familiar with her and her work and certainly are grateful for Avri's contribution to this PDP over the year. So this was tabled by Paul who is the GNSO liaison, and I would like to at this time give Paul and anyone else an opportunity if they'd like to discuss this item before we just put the consent agenda in its entirety up for a vote.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, James. I don't have anything else to add mostly because of the, you know, Cheryl Langdon-Orr is very well known to all of us course and of course Avri's wonderful work as a cochair of this working group is also well known to all of us. So I'm happy to field any questions on it if anyone has any.

James Bladel: Thank you, Paul. Any other comments or questions? Okay, then let's move to a vote on our consent agenda Item 3 on our agenda, Nathalie or Terri, if you would please, can we have a vote by acclamation please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Of course, James. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say your name now. Hearing no one. Would anyone like to vote against this motion? Hearing none. Would all those in favor of the motion please ay, "Aye."

(Group): Aye.

Tony Harris: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: No abstention, no objection. The motion passes, James. Over to you, thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. Thank you, councilors. And congratulations, Cheryl, and congratulations also to Avri and our thanks as she takes her seat on the Board. And we'll communicate that back to the SubPro PDP.

Okay, we're really zipping right through our agenda today. We'll move then to Agenda Item Number 4, and this is a discussion item. It is regarding the

Standing Committee on Draft Budget Cycle. This was raised in Johannesburg originally by Ed and the general thesis of this is that the Council – the GNSO – has a much broader role as part of the empowered community in reviewing and improving – approving or possibly rejecting the ICANN budget.

And while many of you are like, hey, you know, isn't that something we usually tackle in the spring and in the summer, you would be correct. And I think that is part of the reason why we're having this conversation now is to move that review and comment activity further up in the budget development cycle.

So what we're proposing is to form a standing committee of councilors to review – participate in that budget review process and get the Council's comments and feedback into that process at an earlier stage of the development.

This does not replace or supersede anything that's happening in parallel with the various stakeholder groups and constituencies. It's simply meant to formulate an equivalent process at the Council level.

Berry Cobb has very kindly put together some work on this and his thoughts on this topic and submitted around a draft budget – a call for volunteers and charter for this proposed group. This has been distributed to the Council list which also now includes incoming councilors who will be seated at ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi.

So that's the – in a nutshell, that's the topic. And I can see we have a queue forming of councilors who would like to discuss this. So let's has this out and I think we'll start off with Paul. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady here, for the record. I guess I have a question about what the scope of this budget standing committee would be. I think the current thinking is that it would be all councilors and would be the GNSO

Council's point of view. Of course the GNSO Council's remit is policy development management, so would the remit of this group be limited only to those issues that touch upon sort of directly to policy development issues? How do we keep the GNSO Council from creeping out of its role, I guess is Question Number 1.

And then Question Number 2, I guess – and I'm sure we probably had extensive discussions on this already, I'm trying to get my arms around the idea of this being a councilor-only activity. I will very accurately and humbly admit that the budget development – the skill set at least within my own constituency on reviewing these kinds of budgets, especially in relationship to nonprofits, resides with some of our members rather than necessarily with the councilors. Heather may have that skill set; for me I can think of several other people within my own constituency who would be better suited for that role.

So I guess two questions. One, does this proposed standing committee have a remit limitation that is parallel to the Council's; and two, why would we, you know, why would we necessarily limit this just to Council members? I guess those two things are related to each other. Obviously if the remit is very narrow then perhaps it's less important that it's limited to just councilors. Thanks. Sorry that was long and rambling, it's kind of early here in Chicago. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. No worries. And just as a quick response and then maybe I'll tag Marika or Berry if he's on the line, to respond as well. I think first off I should say that none of this is carved in stone; this is a draft proposal of an idea so if we want to table some of those questions and hash them out either here on the call or on the list I think that's fair game. But I think just to address your first question, if we scroll down to I think it's the third page, there's some bullet points there that would – that try to box in what the scope of the Council's participation in this process would be through this standing committee.

And it does, for the most part, limit the remit of the Council's participation to those types of policy development activities. An example from previous budget cycles would be the program that provided travel support to PDP cochairs – chairs and cochairs and sub team leaders. That's something that was fed back into the budget from the Council, not necessarily from any specific stakeholder group or constituency, and was done so to support and to, you know, kind of encourage the work of the various PDPs in the policy development.

So I think that's maybe one example that we can hold up where the process worked previously and it would be future things like that, I think the Council development session that occurs next January is another example. So as far as limiting it to councilors, it's a question that we can discuss and I think it is the Council that ultimately under the current structure, represents the GNSO in terms of either escalating a petition to reject the budget or a petition to consider the rejection request from other stakeholder groups or other SOs and ACs.

So that's kind of what we wanted to at least have the Council as the starting point but if we want to expand that that's a different question we can discuss. So let's see, we've got – the queue is changing as I'm speaking so I'm either doing well or I'm doing...

Paul McGrady: James. I'm sorry this is...

James Bladel: Go ahead, Paul.

Paul McGrady: ...Paul. Can I just do a – as a quick follow up on something that you said, which is, I mean, I understand that when it comes to objections to the budget by the empowered community the Council plays a role on that. But the Council isn't the starting point on that, right? I mean, the Council can't of its own initiative do that. Isn't that a – something that starts with the constituencies themselves? Or am I misunderstanding how it works? Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. No I think you've got it. I think it is a question of kind of – I think it's a question of semantics, because, yes, it would have to come up through one of the stakeholder groups and constituencies but it would also be subject to a vote of the Council. So I guess it wouldn't originate with the Council, but it would – but it would certainly flow through that. But when we look at the ICANN Bylaws, I think it's – well I don't have the bylaws memorized, I think we'd have to discuss whether or not it actually says Council – GNSO Council or just GNSO.

But that's – those are the kinds of questions I think that this start to touch on the broader discussion that we have about the implementation of the new bylaws whereas this standing budget committee would just be one slice of that or aspect or dimension of that. So but I don't want to take up all the time here.

I think Marika, if you have something to add on behalf of staff and then we can continue with the queue. So these are good questions. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you, James. Yes, just to confirm indeed that the scope is currently outlined on pages 2 and 3 of the charter. So again, this is a draft for your consideration. If you have concerns or any additions or any clarifications you think need to be added, you know, please let us know. Indeed, the intent is to focus on, you know, budget spend as it relates to the GNSO Council and GNSO as a decisional participant to the empowered community.

Having said that, I think as part of previous comments, I think the Council is also taking the opportunity to kind of reemphasize input that, you know, was seen across all stakeholder groups and constituencies on certain items. So again, this may also be something that the committee could do especially as – and this goes to the participation – indeed membership currently is foreseen to be limited to Council members only, again in view of that limited scope of this committee.

It currently does foresee that it's open to observers. And again, the committee has the ability to invite observers to participate as appropriate. Again, this is a proposal that's being put forward based on the discussions in Johannesburg. If you are of the view that this should be managed differently, of course there is a lot of expertise as I think several of you have noted within the different groups on the budget that I'm sure the Council would definitely benefit from.

So if there's another way in which that could be structured while at the same time still assuring or ensuring that the focus is on the Council-related spend or whatever would come within the Council's purview, I think that's what we're basically trying to assure. So again, I think this is what we've put forward.

One suggestion that the staff has made is in order to assess the interest on a Council level for this, you could already maybe send out a note to the Council and see who would be, you know, potentially willing to serve on this committee noting that, you know, formal consideration of the charter may only happen at the next ICANN meeting. But even with that, informal group yet or those that are willing to volunteer it may then be possible as well to, you know, maybe have an informal meeting with ICANN Finance Team.

As I noted in the chat, from their perspective, they're very keen to have a kind of partner to speak to and exchange information with. I think you've already all seen that, you know, the budget process is moving further up and up compared to previous years so the PTI budget is already out for public comment, I think other conversations are already happening in parallel. So if this is something that the Council wants to engage in, it may be something that, you know, better sooner rather than later as a lot of those conversations are already starting and taking place.

James Bladel: Thank you, Marika. And I think just to put a button on the response to some of the questions that Paul raised, it's early days; this is a very rough draft of a

proposal. If you have strong ideas on how this should look or who should participate it's a good time to get those ideas out in the open.

I will just point out in the past that this has just been something that we've tackled ad hoc and usually 11th hour when the budget is open for comment. So the goal here is just to get that structured and moved up on the calendar a little bit.

So let's go to the queue. Next up I have Rafik. Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay hello. This is Rafik speaking. So I understand that we are trying to be more proactive and plan beforehand with regard to the budget and to ensure that we get enough resources and budget for the PDP work. And I've (unintelligible) many times.

So I don't have concern about this even if we should I guess limit the scope to that, is in term of getting support for PDP work for special budget request and so on. One maybe with regard to – as participant that's a different matter. My question is more about the – not a concern but just wondering here is that we are starting to kind of delegate more and more tasks and work to standing committee, so we started with the Selection Committee, now we are creating this one – we are thinking to create this one. So I'm wondering if we are going to continue on this trend and try to set more and more standing committee?

And here the question is what does it mean for the Council? It's kind of we are delegating a lot of work and what we mean at the end. We are just going to be kind of approving whatever come from the standing committee? And what does it mean in term of participation. So I don't see issue for now but I think it's important maybe to raise this as a matter for discussion.

And with regard to the effort from the stakeholder group and constituency, I understand that the different group they have their own ad hoc structure and even maybe think of how level that it may happen. So I guess we just need to

clarify how all this will kind of coordinate the work and to avoid overlap and duplication.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rafik. If I can take a swing at addressing your question, the reason for a standing committee in this particular case is that the previous budget cycles we had difficulty getting volunteers particularly because it was always at the last minute or the 11th hour and it ended up last two years, quite frankly, being myself with – and staff reviewing the budget with an emphasis on staff doing a lot of the hard work. And I think the reason for that is just because it, you know, it always came up at the very end of the process.

So the goal here for a standing committee is just to have folks who are interested and perhaps possess those skills to take that burden for the rest of the Council, review the budget, review the – and participate in the process and then come back to the larger Council with their recommendations and not, you know, letting that fall through the cracks.

So it's different I think than the Standing Selection Committee where in that case we wanted to be a little more transparent and a little more structured and democratic and open in the selection process. In this process I think it's just a matter of making sure that the work is covered rather than trying to change the nature of the work itself. And I hope that's – I hope that's a helpful response.

Rafik, did you have a follow up or can I go to Michele? Okay, thank you. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. First off, I think your previous explanation there about where some of this came from I think is very, very helpful and would – and goes to support the creation of this. The budget process is something that is very important for the ICANN community as a whole. It has – with changes and how all the various bits and pieces fit

together, I think there's still kind of a bedding down period where people kind of get to understand exactly what's going on and how that impacts the overall scope of things. And I know there's another topic on our menu for today's activities where we're looking at things more specifically around travel support.

I strongly disagree with suggestions about opening up any of the standing committee for non-councilors. I mean, as a Council, we have certain responsibilities which is why we're elected to do certain things and so having a standing committee for the Council as a whole and as a body to make submissions on the ICANN budget I think is completely appropriate. I mean, as you and several others, including myself, have said down through the years, we've had concerns about the ICANN budget focus. I mean, ICANN as a policy making body had a pretty poor track record in terms of actually funding policy making activities.

And for us as a body to be able to actually put that kind of submission together makes a lot of sense. There are plenty of other avenues for stakeholder groups and for members of stakeholder groups to get involved in the ICANN budget process and I don't think it's appropriate for something which is meant to be a GNSO Council activity to be broadened beyond that. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Michele. And hope to see those comments on the list as we hash this out. Next up is Tony. Tony, go ahead.

Tony Harris: Hello? Can you hear me? Hello?

James Bladel: Yes, very well.

Tony Harris: Just checking if I got my mute off. Just a question about you've got a sentence here in this document that says, "Council leadership is placing this call for volunteers to Council members. Please submit your interest." Just

quickly in the ISPCP we have a new councilor who's taking his seat after the next meeting, and I wonder if he might be interested in applying for this, would this be accepted since he won't be sitting on Council until the end of the next meeting?

James Bladel: Hi, Tony. Yes, this was intended – this call for volunteers was intended for current and future councilors with the understanding that current councilors who are termed out, if you know that fits that description, would probably not be a good candidate for this.

Tony Harris: Okay, thank you.

James Bladel: So incoming councilors are welcome. Okay, that brings us to the end of our discussion queue, some really great questions and thoughts and contributions from Paul, Rafik, Michele and Tony. I will just emphasize once again that this is a draft – I hate the word “straw man” – “straw person” whatever, but it is just a draft for us to start to bounce some ideas against. So please look for the thread on the Council list and get your thoughts and contributions there, if you'd like to see this group take a different approach to this – to this committee or if you'd like to see the composition changed or whatever, let's get your thoughts on the record.

I will just state again that I'm encouraged that we're having so much of a thoughtful discussion about this because this is just an area that has suffered from a lack of attention and participation in the past and I put myself at the top of that list. And it's something that maybe just needs a little bit more of a spotlight as we go forward so thank you, everyone, for your thoughts on this.

Let's move on then to our next agenda item which is Agenda Item Number 5 and a discussion of future ICANN meeting planning. And I will wait and see what we have loaded here. And this is just a continuation of a discussion that was originally kicked off by Göran and a number of folks in the SO/AC Leadership and Planning Committee. And it really reflects on the idea that

ICANN is opening up its – or is willing to revisit its process for selecting and designating meeting locations and what the criteria for selecting those locations should be.

As many of you are aware, we had a very lengthy process called the Meeting Strategy Working Group a few years back that made the recommendations of the current A, B, C meeting format that we have today. We now have a couple of years which I think would be about two cycles under that new structure and I think it's time to take a look at what works, what doesn't work and what amendments we'd like to entertain.

Donna Austin has been very active not only in the past on the Meeting Strategy Working Group but also in the discussions for planning these last few meetings. And I think she has some thoughts on some possible changes or tweaks to the meeting structure that she might want to see. So I certainly welcome any comments from Donna or anyone else who'd like to weigh in on this particular topic.

But where do we go from here and what sort of method we'd like to take back to this planning team, I think all of those are fodder for this conversation. So I think that's an old hand from Tony but otherwise I'd like to go to Donna. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks James. Donna Austin for the record. In a recent call that we had with Göran there were two things that were discussed and one was, you know, ICANN will be putting out a paper for comment in the near future. I'm not sure of the timing of the paper. So we'll look at making some tweaks or what is – I'm not sure what tweaks means at this point in time but some minor changes to the current meeting structure.

And that may be something like reducing the AGM meeting to I think a six-day meeting rather than a seven-day meeting because it seems that there is a general sense across the community that perhaps seven days is too long.

So I think that's what they mean by "tweak." And I'm not sure when that paper will be coming out. Maybe Marika has a better idea of that. But I expect that it will be coming out soon.

So that's one aspect and I expect that the Council will take a look at that and maybe it's something that we as a group would like to comment on. We don't normally comment on things like that as a group but perhaps this is one time that we would like to do that.

The other opportunity that Göran spoke to is that if the community wants to make substantive changes to the current structure of the meetings or review the Meeting Strategy Working Group recommendations, and how they were implemented, then that is something that the community will have to drive.

So I guess, James, my question to the Council and it's something that we don't have to, you know, agree on now, but to give some further thought to is whether we would like to see substantive or – and I use that word loosely because I'm not sure what "substantive" means at this point in time – but whether we would consider, you know, developing a proposal that would make changes that we recommend changes to the Meeting Strategy Working Group recommendations and the manner in which it's been implemented with A, B and C proposals.

So – and, you know, for the record, if you haven't heard my broken record on this before, but I would like to see something that is more – that has two meetings – two policy meetings a year and one AGM. I think we would certainly benefit – the Council would certainly benefit from having PDP working groups have more face to face time for moving forward their efforts. So that's something that I would consider as a substantive change.

So that's kind of the background, James. And I guess it's just to put the Council on notice that if the community wants substantive changes to the

meeting – current meeting structure that it has to come from the community; that it's won't be something that's driven by ICANN. Thank, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Donna. And thanks for lending us some of your history and familiarity with this topic. And I think the key takeaway is that there is a paper coming shortly, maybe not before we start to head out to Abu Dhabi, but at least in the near future. And that staff is not going to undertake changes unilaterally, they're going to take their direction from the community.

And certainly when you ask folks, "Are they unhappy with the current meeting structure?" All kinds of comments come flying. But when you ask folks what to do about it to fix it, you know, that's when things – it's a little more challenging to get uniform agreement on what to do to fix it. So let's – if we have strong feelings on this let's wait for the paper but let's get our voices heard.

Okay next up is Tony. Go ahead, Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes, I've got two comments. Actually I don't quite really agree with what Donna just said. The midyear meeting, which is shorter, is not really my favorite type of meeting. I think the AGM format, having been to quite a few meetings since ICANN began, in my opinion accomplishes a lot more things at least that are important to our constituency.

And secondly, I think there's something we may need to factor in which doesn't have to do with the length of the meetings, but it does have to do with the sites that we choose. Unfortunately we have unforeseen events that come up and I don't think the two events that were canceled due to the Zika mosquito are a good example, but next year we have two sites that are under threat; one is Puerto Rico, unfortunately, it's a country I love, I lived there for years. But they don't even know if they're going to have electricity in a few months.

And the second one is Barcelona. I spent last week in Barcelona at the IoT World Congress, and there were general strikes, they're threatening to pull out banks, American Airlines is discontinuing their flights there at the end of the month. So that may be a site that will be – may be compromised depending on how much this conflict of independence scales.

So why am I saying these comments? I think we should have a Plan B, a set – when they fix a calendar of sites there should be a Plan B for every site. And the second suggestion there would be it should be in the same region and not bounce from – like we did last year from let's say Panama to India. That's just a couple of things I wanted to say. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Tony, for your comments and, you know, you're correct to note some of the changes that we've made last minute in the past and might actually consider again in the future. Next up is Michele. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. I think the – I think we all agree that there is a level of dissatisfaction with the current setup with regard to meetings. Just looking at it from a very kind of practical point of view, you know, there's one meeting which is ridiculously long; there's one which is impractically short; and then there's one that's kind of semi-okay lengthwise.

But when you start factoring in things like the practicalities of traveling to the meetings, there's a lot of issues that some people depending on which part of the world they're coming from have with visas and there's a whole load of other things that make it quite complicated especially when you're looking at changing the locations so often. And when anybody raises questions about moving to a kind of hub type system which was put forward in the past, a lot of people get very, very upset because they want to have the ICANN circus coming to a city close to them, coming soon.

And I suppose what it really opens up is the question of, you know, what purpose do ICANN meetings actually serve? And if fundamentally, for those

of us who are actively engaged in ICANN policy development work and who are impacted by its outcomes, you know, the ICANN public meetings are an important time for us to get together, have face to face meetings and try to actually move certain processes forward. It's not a kind of global – globe-trotting traveling circus kind of bringing the Internet to the various regions around the world.

So we need to look at this in terms of how can we make those meetings more effective for the people who are actually participating actively? And secondly, maybe, you know, there's an obvious question around how does one increase participation from those aren't active now? But we need to be practical about that and look at things like the costs associated with holding meetings in various places. There are other organizations such as RIPE, (ERIN), MOG and others that have been looking at, you know, criteria around locations for meetings to be held. I mean, you know, looking at things in terms of civil rights, human rights, travel restrictions, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

We need to be able to open up those discussions and have frank and honest discussions around this but not to have the choices being made – being made purely on a political basis because it looks good for ICANN to go to certain parts of the world. We need to be practical about this. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. And I echo your sentiments about being practical. I've never really seen any metrics that indicate that moving ICANN to a particular location results in sustained engagement in that location. And to your point about – I just want to make one quick comment, I remember someone during a meeting process saying that ICANN has become a container or an umbrella for a number of other types of meetings that all happen to take place in the same location at the same time. But different groups and individuals come to ICANN with different expectations for what they want to get out of it. And until we get some overlap on all of those expectations, it's going to be very challenging from a planning perspective. So good thoughts, everyone.

Next up is Rafik. Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, James. This is Rafik speaking. So the first question, can you elaborate more about what are the other requirement that were discussed? I heard about like regarding selection of the venue maybe included about human rights and how – the visa issue and so on. I'm personally every time impacted by the visa, it's time consuming and so on but just I want to know how it was discussed and what (unintelligible) the kind of agreement about that.

With regard to the format, I heard several people complaining about the current format and they find it maybe looks too crowded in particular, the policy forum. I would wait for kind of more wider consultation that we can get more input and not just kind of – I don't want to say anecdotes – but try to see more the different opinion to make one.

The question I mean, it's not question but maybe a comment I can add, sometimes I think that it's not really issue of format but it's issue among us in the community that we are still trying to fit the same meetings we had before in the current format. And so it's become crowded. So if like if a group to have so many internal meetings...

Erika Mann: Can you hear me now?

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: And try to do that...

Erika Mann: Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: ...trying to do that – yes?

Erika Mann: Can you?

James Bladel: I'm sorry, someone is speaking. Can we allow Rafik to finish please?

Erika Mann: Why can't you hear me?

James Bladel: Whoever is speaking, we can hear you but please allow Rafik to finish. Staff, if we can figure out who's line that is and Rafik, please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, James. So I was thinking so we are trying to put the same meeting we had before because the thought that they are useful, in particular like internal meeting and that's why it becomes so crowded. I mean, people start like around 7:00 or 8:00 am and finish at 8:00 pm in the policy forum and that's why maybe we need to some – so we may need kind of to need maybe to be more flexible and to rethink what we need as session.

So this is just a thought but I would wait for more kind of comments and opinion from the different part of the community and see how we – what we should do around tweaking the current format. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rafik. And noting that visa is always a challenge wherever we go. I think – before I go to the rest of the queue, I think it was Erika who was on audio only was trying to enter the queue to speak. Erik, if you're on the line, would you like the time? Hello, Erika? Okay, we'll try and come back to Erika, we're not able to hear her.

Next up then is Donna. Donna, go ahead please.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks, James. Donna Austin. So I just wanted to thank everybody for, you know, input so far and to the extent that we want to, you know, after we've seen what ICANN paper is with regard to tweaks then I'm happy to, you know, pull together a team to look at providing comments on that if that's what we want to do. And also after we've ahead the tweaks, if we want to – if

we think that there's enough interest in, you know, having a broader discussion maybe with the ccNSO or others about a more substantive discussion around meetings then I'd be happy to be involved in that as well.

But just, you know, just to bear in mind that I think while it's good to have an initial discussion we may be surprised by the ICANN paper, that the tweaks go further than we thought it was going to go, but if there is potential for further discussion about substantive changes then I'd be happy to be involved in that. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Donna. And good idea to flag this for discussion with the ccNSO and other groups, we'll note that. Next in the queue is Phil. Phil, go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes, thank you, James. I'll try to be fairly brief. And these are personal comments not comments derived from interaction with the Business Constituency. First point, I believe that the – there is a core ICANN community, I think that the interaction of that community with ICANN staff on a three times a year basis is an important component of accountability so I'd be concerned about dialing back to just two meetings a year.

Second, I think if we're going to have meetings of different standard sizes in terms of length of days, we ought to stick to that. With the upcoming Abu Dhabi meeting, I secured a rather expensive airfare based on several draft agendas, which showed substantial activity including I believe some GNSO activity, on the Friday the 4th or Friday the 3rd, and then after securing the airfare, the very final schedule published dropped everything on Friday and essentially made it a six-day meeting, not a seven-day meeting. And I found out that changing my departure date would be – involve a heavy penalty.

So I guess it's good that I'll have a day to rest in Abu Dhabi before I head home, but I might have made a different decision if the full schedule had been adhered to and that means everything is getting jammed together in six days when we would have seven.

And third, I think we need a really a transparent and frank evaluation in a world of political instability and a lot of other considerations. The meeting staff should I think, for each region should evaluate potential meeting places based on a variety of objective factors including nonstop or one-stop air connections.

This may be sensitive but political stability, adequacy of facilities, and whittle it down to a core number of cities in any given geographic region if we're going to keep the rotating between regions requirement where we know in advance these are the cities available because it's often a surprise to everybody when a city is announced and you kind of wonder why that one. And some work well and some not so well.

So I hope those are useful thoughts. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. And I actually had the same problem in the other direction as you described. I booked my flights and then found out there was an event the day before I was scheduled to arrive and it was going to cost more than my entire airfare to make that change. So it's a bit of a gamble, you try early enough to get a good rate but it's also – exposes you to changes like that and I think if we can start to nail down the schedule and – not necessarily the agenda but the schedule of what days we need to be there, I think the sooner the better for planning purposes.

So I put myself in the queue just to see if we can still reach Erika who I think was trying to get in the speaking queue. But we had some technical difficulties. And I'm just going to ask Terri or Nathalie, were we able to connect with Erika? Is she on the line? Okay. Still no Erika and apologize for that. If we can get her to send her thoughts in to us via chat or something we'll try and capture those.

So meeting planning, lots of great ideas. I think, you know, certainly no shortage of dissatisfaction but I think the good news is we've got a lot of excellent contributions coming from the GNSO and our Council and I'm sure even more out there in the broader community. So let's watch for that paper from staff and let's circulate that amongst our stakeholder groups and get everyone to weigh in on the idea.

Thanks, everyone. Okay, next item of agenda is from the general to the specific now talking about planning for ICANN 60. Probably we'll lean on staff fairly heavily for this agenda item just noting that the draft schedule for the entire meeting has been published and should be circulated. But we still have a couple of sessions or potential conflicts that we want to highlight for councilors. So let's go ahead and go through that. And I'm wondering if we can turn that over to either Marika or Nathalie to discuss the slide deck that we have in front of us?

Nathalie Peregrine: This is Nathalie from staff. Yes, so as you see it now we have the latest scheduled updated as of yesterday. Most of this is set in stone and we still have a couple of items mainly for the Sunday, for the GNSO Working Session. And that regards the – I think the lunch time slot so the preparation for the meeting with the GAC, the Board and the ccNSO. We're still waiting in part to see if this is something that can be discussed further on the list.

That will be I think pretty much the only item we have to update. Regarding other items, such as the Council dinner which is marked as tentative here for Sunday is confirmed. You'll be receiving information about that next week, I believe.

And next, which is set in stone too, is on Wednesday evening so there will be some manner of the Council development activity on that time. We will get back to you shortly regarding what form exactly this will take.

I'm not sure, James, if you want to run through from every single day of the meeting or just wanted to point out the items that are still pending or be concerned.

James Bladel: Thanks, Nathalie. Probably if we can just quickly go through the latter as well as highlighting any particular sessions where the Council in particular will need to be aware of like our schedule on Sunday you mentioned but also our schedule (A), I think that would be good. Thanks.

Nathalie Peregrine: Okay perfect. So regarding Saturday, as you can see from the slots in dark green, it's a day taken up almost entirely by PDPs with a couple of SG/C meetings on the side. So regarding conflict here, there's been extensive corroboration with the secretariats from the SG/Cs to pinpoint, you know, what elements of which PDPs are all right or the least worst to schedule against. That's why you'll see a lot of similar group SG/C meetings rather than full-member group meetings scheduled against the PDPs.

Moving onto Sunday it's the GNSO Working Session so that was (unintelligible) no surprises. As I mentioned previously, only the lunch break item might change. We'll of course circulate that if we have any updates for you. We have in the afternoon the meeting with the GAC and then slot which was requested by the SG/Cs to provide more meeting space. So the last block of the day the, 1700-1830 slot, will be taken up by SG meetings as much as possible.

On Monday we have the start of the cross community sessions with the – the cross community session in bold – is in bold because it's a, well, GNSO related cross community topic session. And there's also the ISPCP outreach event. This is an event organized by the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team. It's not GNSO-organized but it's the only main outreach event that we have during this session.

And it's also we have the public forum on the late block, 1700-1830 and that's followed by the gala which I believe will be a dry gala this time around. And it will be taking place, as you can see, fairly early on in the evening allowing for further social events afterwards if you so wish.

Tuesday we're moving onto the more traditional Stakeholder Day as this is – if you've attended an ICANN meeting previously, there won't be any surprises here. We have the meetings – the closed SG/C meetings, there will be open public ones and as well as most meetings with the Board.

Moving on to Wednesday, it's a mix of more PDP sessions. There were quite a few PDPs that got two different sessions spread over the week. And obviously the two different parts of the council meetings would be the chair election taking part and the new incoming councilor seated in the second part. Just an aside to this, we've reached out to the incoming councilors. They will all be attending Abu Dhabi and will also be able to attend all the council social events, so there will be a chance to mingle and to exchange with those occurrences too.

Thursday is the last day of the meeting, as pointed out for the GNSO. That's when we have the second round of the cross-community topics. So again, the one in bold is the GNSO adjacent one. And we have the second sessions of the - of one PDP and the two sessions of the cross-community working group on auction proceeds.

This end of day is the most recent change, where we have the ICANN recognition program. (Unintelligible) followed by the second public forum. And in the last - very last block of the day is the ICANN 60 wrap up cocktail. Before, this was day was due to finish at 6:30 and now has been pushed back to 8 o'clock.

I think that's pretty much a brief overview of what we've got here. I'll happily take any questions.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. Very kind of you to walk us through this. I think that as you can see we have a very busy week. No surprise there. But certainly we have a couple of loose ends we're still trying to nail down, particularly that lunch session on Sunday. Any comments from the council? Okay.

Thank you very much, Nathalie. And just a note. Sorry, I'm being pinged by staff to remind everyone the Tuesday evening after the end of constituency day we have an ICANN prep session which comes immediately before the Steve Crocker farewell that we will try to get that's I believe if you go up to Page 5 in the Adobe Connect, it's that little grayish-green box there at - from 5 o'clock until 6:30.

Understand that that's probably going to conflict with the tail end of constituency day and if folks can step out and join us as they are able, that would be fantastic. But we were out of, you know, respect for the event that honors Steve, we did not want to conflict with that farewell toast. So hopefully you can understand the rock and hard place that that puts staff in, and I think that they are doing their best to reconcile that. So everyone please make your best effort to attend those if you can.

Sorry, I had a hand from someone and then it disappeared. Sorry I missed it. I wasn't quick enough. Okay. If there are any other comments or questions, otherwise we can wrap up this agenda item and move on. Okay.

Next is item number seven, and this is planning for our discussion with the joint meetings for GAC, ccNSO, and ICANN board. We didn't receive a lot of feedback in terms of potential topics to discuss with these groups. I'd like to, and I think in particular the board, but we do have meetings scheduled with these folks for Abu Dhabi and I think it would be good to get some ideas or questions laid out in advance of topics we'd like to discuss. And then of course, if we'd like to identify speakers for those particular topics, we can get

a name attached to each one of those subjects for the conversations of those joint meetings.

I don't know if there's anything more to say on this except that we'd like to get this process kicked off in earnest. Perhaps we can reboot the discussion with a new thread on the mailing list and get everyone to please participate if you have comments for that. I think Donna raised a good example of that, which would be discussions with the ccNSO and GAC regarding the future meeting strategy or the meeting selection criteria.

I think that's very much fair game for discussions with other SOs and ACs if we have discussions about the budget process, review teams or any other - or the empowered community or any other items that transcend just the GNSO community and involve our engagement with other SOs and ACs. This would be a good time to get those on the list and tee those up for discussion in Abu Dhabi. Stephanie would like to weigh in on this topic. Go ahead, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, James. Can you hear me? Stephanie Perrin for the record.

James Bladel: Yes go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Great. I'm just wondering, I didn't weigh in on the discussion on the list so my apologies. Do we have any kind of session with the GAC to discuss -- and the board -- to discuss the GDPR? I understand that the business community is proposing some kind of a special session (unintelligible) eagerly awaited, but this does seem to be an opportunity to discuss what the board's strategy might be on this particular matter. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Stephanie. I don't know that that's on any of our current lists and while we were - and while you were speaking, Marika very kindly loaded the draft agenda for each of those sessions into the Adobe Connect. So that

would be an example of something that if we'd like to table it during sessions we can table it with whichever of the groups we'd feel is most appropriate and could be more than one.

But I think here if you can take a look at what we currently have and if you think something is too heavy of a lift to include in a short meeting for example with the GAC or the ccNSO, then please let us know. But if there's something missing, I think raise that as well.

Heather is noting that we should be prepared to discuss sub pro Work Track 5 I think particularly with the ccNSO and the GAC, who have shown some interest in that subject so we should maybe flag that one if it's not already reflected in this list.

Next is Michele. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record and all that. Just on the issue of raising GDPR with any group, this is something I think within our stakeholder group we have been discussing this and we have also been discussing that with others. While raising the topic of GDPR in and of itself is probably not a bad idea, there's two things to bear in mind. One, any conversation that involves GDPR in it becomes incredibly long and there are lots of rabbit holes, trap doors, and nebulous passages that will present themselves. So putting it as one of the first topics in any short meeting with any group is problematic.

I don't know, can you hear me?

James Bladel: We can hear you (unintelligible).

Michele Neylon: Sorry. We're getting a thing on the line. Okay. The second thing in raising the GDPR is if it is to be raised then we need to be quite specific about what we are asking like if asking, you know, "Hey what do you think about GDPR?" is

not going to give a particularly useful answer, if any answer. Whereas if we ask a quite specific and, you know, kind of almost surgical precision, drilling down into a very specific item or items, then we might get answers that are of some benefit to us. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Michele. And I wholeheartedly agree. Whenever we table GDPR we need to make sure that it's very narrowly focused and we have a specific and clear ask, and if neither - one or neither of those are true, then we should probably just reconsider bringing it up at all. It is, as folks on council are very much aware, it is an agenda killer and can eat up any amount of time that the meeting is allocated. So I agree.

Heather, you're up next. Go ahead. (Unintelligible)

Heather Forrest: James, apologies. It's Heather - sorry. That was terrible, terrible timing. In relation to the topics with the board, we have here on this summary of the workshop in (Montevideo) and I personally I don't know the rest feel, but I personally would like to say a little bit more than just, you know, have an ex-post summary of the workshop. In terms of transparency, that (Montevideo) meeting was really the bottom of the scale and I think it would be very helpful if we could understand in advance when those things are going to happen, what's anticipated to be discussed, you know, quickly get something out to the community as to what has taken place. So I think, you know, documentation and notice of that, not just an ex-post summary several months later would be preferable. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. I think that's a great example of something that we can bring up under that heading of a meeting with the board.

Okay, following up in the chat here, just catching up to see if there's anything here. Marika had something about talking about CCWGs with the ccNSO, and yes we could certainly could include the CCWG IG in its - and a progress check on that. Oh, sorry, I see your hand raised. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Something I noted in the chat as well and something we've done for a previous meeting to facilitate the council preparing for these meetings in advance, as there's very little time to actually do so at the meeting, would be to put all these agendas in a kind of wiki template.

They're trying to identify owners for each of these items and you see for some, you know, probably obvious owners, for others it's more dependent on volunteers who want to speak about the topic and then requesting you to identify the speaking points you think should be made on behalf of the council so everyone as well has an ability to look at that and then add suggestions to it. So again, everyone's on the same page doing it in advance of the meeting, as there's probably very little time to do it actually face to face.

So if that's helpful, staff is more than happy to put this in a wiki template and start chasing the different people for input on that. As I noted as well, if there any people that want to volunteer for any of these items, let us know and we can put your name down.

James Bladel: Thanks, Marika. And I think yes that will be part of the following call is to capture that on the list and get some names assigned to each of these bullet points. I understand that this is a new hand from Heather. So Heather, you're up. Go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James, very much. Another point that I think could be usefully added to the session with the board is -- and I don't mean to preempt the next agenda item on our own agenda here -- but to give the board some idea of what we intend to do with that opportunity that we have in January of the strategic planning session and specifically to let's say take the opportunity -- and I think is probably not just with the board -- but take the opportunity to note that we are going to give our GNSO new responsibilities under the bylaws as part of the empowered community a very close look in that community.

So that might put to rest any lingering perception in the community that we're dragging our feet on that. It's our opportunity to say that we're taking that exercise very seriously and will be forthcoming on that early in the year.
Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. A very valuable contribution, not only for the reasons you outlined but also because it shows the board what we're expecting in terms of advanced notice for their workshops. So I think it's a great addition, and if you don't mind, I think you just kind of volunteered for that. So okay. Let's then move on -- sorry for the fire truck behind me, it will be gone in just a sec -- let's then ask does anyone else have any comments or questions on this?

I think what we should do is we should circulate this list in three sections, ccNSO, GAC, and board. We'll circulate this draft agenda to the mailing list and staff will prepare a wiki. I would ask that folks who have additional comments or adds, please get them done here probably by the end of the day, let's say by the end of this week, and if you would like to volunteer to speak to each of these, please put your name next to it. Don't be shy. Otherwise you get to hear me more than you want to and none of us want that. So please sign up generously if you see something that strikes your interest.

So with that, we'll close this agenda item, which is agenda item number seven, and move then to AOB. And normally this is the part where we start to wind down but in our particular meeting today we have a number of substantive AOB items to discuss. So let's move then first to item 8.1, and this is the perfect segue from Heather's last comment, and maybe I'll put her on the spot here, as well as Donna and staff, to discuss the prep work that's going into the council session and the strategy session that will be happening early next year.

Heather and Donna, I should point out that those of you who aren't aware, I imagine it's fairly obvious but maybe I should go ahead and state the obvious, that Heather and Donna have taken the lead on developing this session along with staff, given that they will likely continue in the next council in some leadership capacity and I won't. So in reflection of that change, they've stepped up very generously with their time and their efforts to define what this prep session will look like and what will be covered.

So with that, if there's anything that Donna and Heather would like to say on this point, I'll turn the floor over to them and then we can take some questions. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. And apologies. That wasn't an old hand but it could have been a new hand too. Heather Forrest for the transcript. So thank you very much and thank you, James, as well for your input into the preliminary thinking. I know that staff are very keen to begin to plan the logistics, and planning the logistics also requires planning the substance. Let's say the two are somewhat intermeshed in terms of what we're doing at any given point in the time that we've been allotted.

So Donna and I have put our heads together and are working on a draft that we intend to present at Abu Dhabi in terms of what we might do with the day. Broadly speaking, we're thinking of, if you like, we have three days, we're thinking of three sort of buckets in terms of topics, one dealing with, you know, a better understanding of roles and remit, both of council and the GNSO more broadly in light of the new bylaws but also council leadership.

Now that we have a very active leadership team, we thought it would be helpful to start to formalize our understanding of or clarify our understanding of what it is that leadership does, likewise council liaison, so all of the roles, let's say, that flow out of council.

In the second bucket we're thinking about empowered community type issues and the GNSO's role in that. That is our opportunity - we've had some discussions on the list about whether to tackle the new bylaws in a webinar or in a face-to-face session. And I think after a great deal of discussion about this, and including James and staff input, I think, you know, the point that - there are two things to balance here.

One is we want to not rush this through. We want to take our time and understand the bylaws and understand what our roles, respective roles, under them are in a sense given they have quite substantially changed since last September.

And two is a point that I've made a number of times. Throughout the transition there are transcripts that which I and others stood up and said it's really a shame that we don't have time to give this more thought and more care and we're working to some external deadline, over which we have no control. So sure we'll vote now but it's really not our preference. And I think here's finally an opportunity where we can say we want to spend some time on this and do the job properly because we understand the import of it.

So hence I think we're proposing generally that we move that discussion of the bylaws and the redline changes that have been proposed and so on to the working session or the strategic session. And the third is probably the one that we were most thinking of when we asked for this private funding, which is the idea of what are we actually going to do with our time in 2018.

And Donna is the one who says this best I think. You know, we have three face-to-face meetings comprising 16 days in a year and what do we want to achieve with those 16 days, what do we want the outcome to be this time next year. So this is a unique opportunity to talk about, talk about things like the calendar, talk about things like communication and improving those, workload management and so on and so forth. So.

In addition I understand we have some money for I suppose a development activity of some kind and I think we'll also propose that that be the timing of the January council meeting so that we can neatly roll those things together, and having that late in January is not a bad thing for those of us in the southern hemisphere who don't get to benefit from the traditional council summer break in August. So that gives us a little bit of breathing space out to the end of the year.

So that's roughly where we are. Donna, what I have forgotten? What would you like to add, please?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Heather. I think you covered it pretty well. I don't know that I have anything more to add at this time but hopefully we'll have things scoped out pretty well by Abu Dhabi and we can have some good conversation there about it. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you very much, Heather and Donna, for not only teeing up the discussion today but also your past and ongoing work. I think this has the potential to be a very valuable session, and I say that as someone who, you know, as someone who has one foot out the door.

But just standing up the a council with new incoming councilors, and in this case and incoming leadership, will, you know, always involve a bit of a transition, and I think this will expedite that transition process and get it in the rearview mirror so that council can focus on its work in the year coming ahead. And I think that's - that alone will make it a very, very valuable session. So I hope everyone weighs in on that agenda once it's posted. So thank you again for all of your work on that.

I don't see any hands so let's then move on to AOB item 8.2, which is a discussion of community resources and a request for input from SO/AC on travel support guidelines. And I don't know, staff, do we have an e-mail that we circulated or that request that we can maybe get loaded into - I realize this

is sort of 11th hour asking you to load that, but I think generally the GNSO as well as other SOs and ACs are getting asked for feedback on revisiting refining, amending the travel support guidelines.

And I think that this is something that for most travelers we are - sorry, for most of the folks on council we are - we participate in travel support program, so we have some familiarity with this and certainly probably have some ideas on how this can be approved.

I believe we have some guest speakers as well while we get this - see if we have any materials to load. But (Patrick Jones) and Carlos are on the call and I don't know if you have some introductory remarks that might get the thought process moving for the councilors so we can start the conversation. So, (Patrick) or Carlos, if you're on the line and able to speak, please go ahead.

(Patrick Jones): Thanks, James. This is (Patrick Jones). I believe Carlos is on as well. Glad to have the opportunity to start this conversation with the GNSO Council and also to solicit the input from the various SO, ACs and stakeholder groups. As you can see from the document that we've shared, the community travel support guidelines were last updated in 2013 and those guidelines were developed before many of the cross-community working groups and reviews and the other cross-community processes had come up since the transition.

We though by having a more consultative process with the different groups would lead to a better process in updating these guidelines, which is why we're starting this now. And hopefully this will provide an opportunity for the various groups to discuss this and respond to the questionnaire we shared. We will be available in Abu Dhabi to answer questions and collect the feedback. And perhaps I should pause and, Carlos, do you want to add anything?

Carlos Reyes: Thanks, (Patrick). Hi everyone. This is Carlos Reyes. Nothing to add other than we really hope that this process is collaborative. As you know, the

organization really values the input of our community in person at ICANN public meetings, and that pressure on a finite resource continues to grow. As (Patrick) mentioned, we have cross-community working groups, review teams, obviously very intense PDP working group efforts.

And the organization would like to make sure that the guidelines are up to date and fit for purpose as the organization and the community evolve. So your input to the questionnaire will be helpful in helping us guide that process of improving and updating the guidelines.

James Bladel: Okay thank you very much, Carlos and (Patrick), for presenting this topic. I have just a couple of quick questions. The first one is -- and then I see Rafik is on the queue as well -- the first question is I see some dates mentioned in this for the consultation. What is the drop dead date by which you would like to receive feedback so it can be incorporated into the kind of review by the staff working on this?

And then the second question is would you prefer to see feedback from stakeholder groups and constituencies or from the GNSO Council as a whole or both? I'm assuming the answer's not neither. And which of those would be your preference? And I guess if you could address those fairly quickly, then I'll move on to the queue.

Carlos Reyes: Thanks, James. This is Carlos. So the deadline we're asking for feedback on the questionnaire by basically before Thanksgiving in the US, so mid November after ICANN 60. We wanted to allow the groups that we contacted time to discuss this obviously online and also in person in Abu Dhabi.

To your second question, we did reach out to the leadership of all the constituencies and stakeholder groups and RALO, so we're trying to cover all the different groups at ICANN. For the purpose of speaking on this call, we'd like feedback from the council specifically.

James Bladel: Thank you, understood.

Carlos Reyes: Yes. The date is 17 November, the actual date is 17 November.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. And given that a couple weeks there are going to be eaten up with Abu Dhabi and travel, it means we kind of have to get moving on this. So thanks for clarifying that on those two points. Okay three speakers here and then we'll see if we can move on to the next item. But first up is Rafik. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, James. This is Rafik speaking. And just a quick question. So I heard (Patrick) and Carlos that (unintelligible) review teams, cross-community and so on. So my question for the guideline, is it covering only, how to say, the PDP group, the support for the stakeholder groups and constituency and so on or also include other programs like fellowship, next gen and so on? So just to have an idea about what this call - what is covered by those deadlines and so we can, at least from our side, we can tweak our responses not just maybe regarding support we're getting for our stakeholder group and constituency.

(Patrick Jones): James, I can take this. This is (Patrick).

James Bladel: Yes please. Go ahead.

(Patrick Jones): Yes, so at this time we're looking for responses to the questionnaire but feel free to provide feedback and thoughts of your groups on the other areas where there are ICANN travel. So as you mentioned, next gen, fellowship, you could include that in the questionnaire but we're trying to solicit the feedback on the areas in the questionnaire at this point.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you Rafik. Thank you, Patrick. Next in the queue is Tatiana. Go ahead Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you very much. Tatiana is speaking. I had more of the same question as Rafik, because it seems that the questionnaire is more or less tweaked together information about the particular constituencies and stakeholder group and how travel support is beneficial for them and what they need or don't need. But I think that there is some growing concerns about the fellowship program, for example, the distribution of resources, and the assessment of the benefit that this program brings to the community.

My question was to Patrick and Carlos. So am I right that this questionnaire cannot be tweaked and any concerns or comments we submit about other programs then the travel support for our respective constituencies and stakeholder groups and GNSO would be out of this questionnaire and resubmitted just in a freeform? Or maybe there would be any kind of possibility to tweak the questionnaire and just add the additional questions so people can actually submit their comments? Or is it now carved in stone? Thank you very much.

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: This is Carlos, I'm happy to take that question. Tatiana, thanks for the points. So to sort of emphasize what Patrick just mentioned in the chat, this is really the start of a broader consultation process. So right now, we'd like feedback on the questionnaire just to help Patrick, and me, and the executive team orient how we're going to structure the rest of this consultation process.

Obviously, there are a lot of different facets to community travel support. But for the purposes of this step, we'd like feedback on the questionnaire and any areas where you would like to expand as the stakeholder group or as a consistency, that is completely acceptable. We'll take that feedback because as you said, there are other areas that should be addressed in this process. But we didn't want to scope it so narrowly at the beginning.

So we welcome the feedback. We hope you can provide some responses to the questionnaire and (unintelligible) some of the planning and thinking as part of this process.

James Bladel: Thank you Carlos. Thank you Tatiana. Next is Michele. Please go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. So Patrick and Carlos thanks for explaining some of this. I have a few questions and comments. The first question is in relation to the policies around this changing, when are we likely to see that happen? Are we talking about for fiscal year 2019, 2020? When is that likely to actually go into effect? My first question.

James Bladel: Patrick? Carlos?

Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez: Hi, Michele. This is Carlos. So to your question, at this point, so the goal is to have this feed into the annual financial planning process for the ICANN organization. We're starting that for 2019. To be quite honest, I think we have sort of missed that process of making any changes for the next fiscal year. What we're more interested in is ensuring this is very collaborative and deliberative and methodical.

So the executive team has asked Patrick and me to work with each community group individually so that we do capture the breadth of your feedback. And at this point, there's no hard deadline by when we're expected to give a report but I think we'll be able to get a sense of the pain point (unintelligible) community groups, what's working well, what's not working well. And then that will help hopefully guide us to set some sort of timeframe for this.

As Patrick mentioned, we haven't revised the guidelines since 2013 and the organization has changed a lot. And obviously, the community workload has changed a lot. So we want to be proactive in the sense that we can provide the resources and support necessary for all of you to do your work. But we

also don't want to rush it. So (unintelligible) at this point will really help us assess the next steps in the consultation.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thanks. The other comments I have would be primarily around, well, a couple of things. First off, the figures that you're presenting to us here, well, they're quite disappearing. The growth in the overall expenditure on this is, well, it's massive. But in common with several other areas of ICANN's expenditure, there doesn't seem to be any kind of uniform set of KPIs or any way of really measuring the overall return on investment.

Because if you're looking at travel support as a whole, you might, if you look at a specific subsection of it where, for example, you can say, well, X number of people needed to attend a particular meeting in relation to a particular specific project, fine, you can rationalize that and you can tie it back. But I think overall, there does seem to be a missing kind of link here in terms of how that's all measured and the expenditure keeps on growing, which is deeply concerning. Because ultimately, if you look at the sources of funding and the areas where funding might have come from if things had gone better than they had, those numbers are not moving in the right direction overall.

So I think this is something that we all need to be quite attentive to. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele, and not to preempt staff, but I think that's probably the reason and the impetus why conducting this review of the guidelines is to try and get a handle on some of the growth and expansion that you are outlining. So good thoughts, good (unintelligible) let's make sure we capture them as part of this feedback process.

So if there are no other comments, and I see the queue is clear, I guess we can say thank you to Patrick and Carlos. Sorry, Rafik, go ahead. Last word. Okay, Rafik, I think maybe change of heart. Oh, it was an old hand. Okay, sorry about that.

Thank you to Patrick. Thank you to Carlos. This is a good topic and as I think Michele and others have pointed out, overdue for a community consultation. So we have our assignments. We know that you need our feedback. We will put a bullet on this action item for Council attention and we'll also make sure that we discuss and circulate your call for feedback with the SGs and Cs and make sure that you get a fulsome response from the GNSO community. So thank you very much for participating in this call and teeing up this topic.

So then moving to Item 8.3, which is a discussion of the leadership change or, sorry, leadership development in subsequent procedures PDP work track 5. And for this, I will turn it over to Paul and see if Paul is willing and able to introduce this topic. Paul, if you are, go ahead please.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, James. So this topic is just an update from the subsequent procedures PDP working group in relationship to the leadership of the newly established work track 5. The co-chairs have selected Martin Sutton to serve as the co-chair from the GNSO to work track 5. He will be joining Christopher Wilkinson from the ALAC and Annebeth Lange from the CCNSO. So far, we have not -- at least as of my last update I have not heard if the GAC has selected a co-leader yet at this point. But hopefully, they will soon.

So the co-chairs asked me to let you guys know the status of that, specifically in relationship to the selection of Martin Sutton. As has been in the past, the Council has not voted on those selections and have left them to the co-chairs but they did want to make sure that the Council was aware and given an opportunity to have a discussion if they wanted to have a discussion.

I think just by way of background, Martin Sutton is known to most of us. He is the Secretariat or I'm not sure his exact title, but essentially he is the staff -- head of staff for the brand registry group -- has been around ICANN for a number of years in that role and also, prior to that, when he was in his role

with the HSBC Bank when they filed their .brand application. So certainly not a newcomer to ICANN and I think very well respected.

So I will leave it at that. Happy to field any questions although I'm not sure if I'll have answers, but I'm happy to try. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, Paul. And I think Martin is, as you pointed out, very well-known and respected throughout the GNSO community and would make an excellent representative to the leadership team that's forming for work track 5. I just want to note in the chat that (Steve Chan) has also given an update that the GAC has selected Olga Cavalli to participate as the GAC leader there. That is a bit of news that we did not have going into this morning's call so thank you very much for that update, Steve. But as far as Martin's selection by the GNSO, typically, the GNSO Council does not involve itself or approve leadership decisions that occur within a PDP unless it's the chairs of the PDP itself, as we did earlier with regards to Cheryl stepping in for Avri.

But in this case, work track 5 was garnering quite a bit of attention throughout the community. So it's good that we at least table a discussion so that the Council has some visibility to the composition and construction of that team. So thank you very much, Paul, for that update, and congratulations to Martin and the subpro PDP. And first in the speaking queue is Rafik. Rafik, go ahead please.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Paul for the update and it will be a really quick question. Can you give more background about the process that led to the selection of the co-leader? So just I'm interested to know how they proceeded, the working group, to do the selection and (unintelligible) appointment.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Rafik. Sure. So there was a call for interested participants, and I understand -- and again, I'm not a co-chair so I was not in the discussions. I'm just in my role as liaison reporting back. But there were four -- I understand there were four candidates that expressed interest. I don't have

their names. The co-chairs considered those four people who were willing to serve in that capacity and I think they reached the conclusion that Martin Sutton was their choice. And so they've put Martin Sutton -- they've essentially let us know that that is the selection that the co-chairs have made.

So there was a call for volunteers and a consideration of willing folks, and ultimately, Martin was selected. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Paul. And hopefully that addresses your questions -- Rubens -- on the selection process.

Rubens Kuhl: Thanks, James. Can you hear me?

James Bladel: Yes, go ahead.

Rubens Kuhl: Not as a GNSO Council but a member of the leadership subpro, because I'm co-chair of work track 4 (unintelligible) also represented here. The matter that was chosen to take the leadership was to mimic as much as we could the criteria for the standing selection committee. So while the selection was not made by SSC because Council declined that request to submit selection for SSC, what we made was built our own standing selection committee comprising of all co-leaders of all co-tracks in the subpro workgroup including the co-chairs and it was an objective decision from all co-leaders to support Martin Sutton.

So it was a consensus decision with no objections to Martin. So that's how the decision was made to reach Martin Sutton (unintelligible). Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, and Cheryl is thanking you as well in the chat. She's unable to speak on audio. Good and helpful background on the selection process. Okay, there are no other folks in the queue. About nine minutes remaining in our call and one additional AOB, which is the GTLD change request that was tabled during our last call by Craig Schwartz who was presenting that. And I

think Donna posted something recently to the Council list on behalf of the registries to clarify the context behind this request.

I'll turn it over to Donna but I think generally, they are asking for Council to formally endorse the registry requests to ICANN GDD staff that this is compatible with the policy and really more of an implementation consideration. And so that's I think in a nutshell what they're asking us to do, but I don't know if that was 100% clear from our call in September.

Donna, if you are able to speak with us, do you have any additional thoughts or clarifications on what we need to do for next steps?

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. So I think you (unintelligible) it off well. So I sent a letter to the Council list yesterday on Craig's behalf and it was a letter that was attempting to clarify when Craig spoke to the Council about the community change request process, there seemed to be some confusion about why this was coming to Council. So Craig's letter aims to explain -- provide a little bit more detail and explain the reason behind it. And James is correct, essentially, there's a group of community GTLD registries that have been working with ICANN to develop a process that would enable them to change specification 12 of their registry agreement. This was done on the understanding that it was an implementation issue and they're just seeking confirmation of that from the Council.

That's all I have to add, James. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna, and I apologize if it was already included in the letter, but do you envision that the next step would be a motion from Council or do we first want to put this process up for public comment? Or are all of those fair game for discussion? Where do you see this going immediately next?

Donna Austin: Thanks James. I think the next step has to come from Council. To the extent that that is potentially a letter back to Craig or if the Council wants to take this

to a motion then we take it to a motion. And when I say (Craig), it really is a working group of community GTLD registry operators that have been working on this. But some, I believe, some response from the Council is required in order for them to continue to move forward with the process that would include a public comment phase as part of the community consultation.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you (Donna) for clarifying. They are waiting on us. In any case, they're waiting for us to make the next move. Marika, go ahead please.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I just wanted to share a couple of points that I received my GDD colleagues in relation to this topic. So they had discussions with the FTLD registry and the community TLD working group that Donna was referring to regarding this proposal for a process in May 2016. The GDD received the proposal for the process in July of 2017. And the GDD staff also recognized the need for clarity or a remit mandate from the GNSO to be able to determine if this can be pursued as an implementation detail or whether it requires policy recommendations from the GNSO.

I think that's something they've also made clear to the working group and it's also was timely reflected in the letter you got. And I think from a staff perspective, we're realizing that it probably would have been more consistent with the GNSO policy and implementation recommendations if the GDD would have formally requested guidance from the GNSO on this topic to make sure that it can be considered as an implementation detail. Or whether it requires a policy recommendation and if from a GNSO perspective you think that it is needed, that is definitely something that staff could do.

Also wanted to know that in parallel with identifying the need for clarity from the GNSO, GDD staff did provide feedback as requested to the working group and that was also published as public correspondence. And I can post the link in the chat to that letter. And I think it was also something that we actually circulated to the Council list.

Even if the Council considered it implementation, I think from a GDD perspective, it would still require community involvement in the development of the process and the criteria to evaluate changes. And from their perspective, they would see the possible next steps following a GNSO confirmation as being implementation, as GDD to engage with the community TLD working group to further refine a proposal and criteria. If needed, it could also include a call for volunteers to ensure greater diversity in the working group, conduct a public comment on the proposal, and potentially more if there are multiple iterations of the final proposal. And then once that has been done and assuming then at that state there's still no concern from the GNSO Council that it has moved into a policy development area, it would then go to the Board for adopting the finalized proposal.

Again, I just wanted to share that on behalf of my GDD colleague.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you, Marika, for that bit of background. We have a couple of speakers and three minutes left in our allotted time. So first up will be Paul. Paul, go ahead please.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady for the record and thank you, Marika. I think you answered a lot of my questions. Since we don't have a final proposal to look at to determine whether or not we think it's policy or whether or not think it's implementation, is the takeaway here so that we can go back to our constituencies? Essentially the Council has been asked to greenlight a process that the people doing the process think is purely implementation. And so long as it stays within the realm of implementation then the (unintelligible) thinks that's fine? Because I think that's fairly easy to sell.

But if we're going back to our constituencies to ask for blank checks that this group, which is not part of the normal policy development process wants more latitude than that, then I think that that could be an issue. So I guess I'm just asking for clarification on what's the ask here that we should all be going back to our constituencies with. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. I think the first question is whether or not this is the policy or implementation and then based on the results from that question I think will determine what our next steps are. So no blank checks in this regard. I think the first test or the first threshold is to answer that question of what side of the line does this fall on. Next is Phil. Go ahead, Phil.

Phil Corwin: Thank you, James. I'll be as brief as possible. I'm going to air this issue with the BC so these are personal comments right now on the issue whether this is policy or implementation. But number one, I'm not sure whether the rules for community TLDs contained in the applicant guidebook are policy or implementation in the first place. But I would view the process for allowing a community TLD to make some narrow changes in its membership that are consistent with its original qualification at a community TLD to be an implementation matter than a matter that requires a whole new policy PDP before anything can happen on that.

But I did want to raise a related issue, which not for discussion now, but to make Council aware that here we have a situation where a true community TLD has proposed a very narrow modification of its membership that's entirely consistent in my view with its original purpose, which is just to add bank holding companies to the range of regulated financial institutions that can register domains in .bank and .insurance. And yet, I would refer to the BC comment that was just filed on the .museum renewal registry agreement.

In that case, you had a sponsored TLD on the old sponsored TLD program coming out of the renewal process re-designated as a community TLD. Quite frankly, it's not a community TLD within the definition that was created for the new TLD program, which is a very narrow definition with very high bar to establishing our bona fides if there's a challenge because .museum will henceforth be open to any user of a museums with no registrar validation. So you could have once visited the Museum of Clown Costuming and be a qualified registrant of a .museum domain. It would never pass CPE.

And the other thing is that expansion of .museum occurred in negotiations without any consultation with its sponsored community. So essentially, you have GDD doing -- and I know this is a sensitive subject for contracted parties but when GDD is in these renewal negotiations, some of what they do should bear some relationship to established policy -- to designate a TLD as community, which can never qualify as a community TLD on application or in CPE and to allow it to vastly expand its membership, when at the same time, GDD is insisting on a very laborious process for .bank and .insurance.

There's just a lot of disconnect going on. So I think that's something I wanted to put on the Council's radar screen. It's an issue raised in the .museum comment letter from the BC and it probably bears some future thinking. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thanks, Phil. I put myself in the queue really just as a timekeeper because we're three minutes over time and I think we have this AOB item has kicked off perhaps a more substantive discussion on the general nature of (unintelligible) implementation and what role the community has in contract negotiations. And all very big subjects and littered with minefields that we need to be cautious about.

So what I'm going to suggest is that we have a fulsome conversation on the list on this topic. I think we say that sometimes we'll take something to the list, but I think really these are good threads that we need to hash out, I think, in depth. So I would ask Paul and Phil, and noting that Rubens has put some other comments in the chat as well. So if we can get this discussion hashed out in a more comprehensive manner on our mailing list, maybe we can be in a better position to come to (unintelligible) with it as an agenda item, either as a discussion point or with some clarity on what our immediate next steps are.

So thank you everyone for that and for moving that to our discussion list. And we'll certainly have more work to do on this topic. So that brings us to the

end of our time. Are there any other AOB items for agenda item number eight? And seeing no hands, I think that means people would like to get on with their day or evening as ever the case may be. So with that, I will then move that we go ahead and adjourn for today, and close the call for October from GNSO Council. Thank you very much to everyone who participated, including our guest speakers, Patrick and Carlos and we look forward to hashing out some of these discussions on the list and of course, seeing everyone in a few weeks in Abu Dhabi.

If I don't speak to you personally before then, please safe travels and we'll see you in the UAE. And we can go ahead and stop the recording now. Thanks everyone.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for joining today's call. Operator, you may now stop the recording. Have a great remainder of your day.

END