

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Council Teleconference  
Thursday, 20 April at 21:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20apr17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p69sq1e81he/>

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

Date: 20 April 2017

Coordinated Universal Time: 21:00 UTC:

<http://tinyurl.com/lvs7vaf>

14:00 Los Angeles; 17:00 Washington; 22:00 London; (Friday 21 April) 00:00 Istanbul; (Friday, 21 April) 07:00 Hobart

**List of attendees:**

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

**Contracted Parties House**

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

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Donna Austin, Keith Drazek (absent – apologies sent, Proxy Rubens Kühl), Rubens Kühl

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Hsu Phen Valerie Tan (absent – apologies sent, Proxy Donna Austin)

**Non-Contracted Parties House**

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Philip Corwin (absent – apologies sent Proxy Susan Kawaguchi), Susan Kawaguchi, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Tony Harris, Paul McGrady, Heather Forrest

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Martin Silva Valent (NCSG replacement for Amr Elsadr), Stephanie Perrin, Stefania Milan, Edward Morris (absent – apologies sent, Proxy Marilia Maciel), Marilia Maciel, Rafik Dammak (joined but Proxy to Stephanie Perrin due to audio quality issues)

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 – absent – apologies sent

**ICANN Staff**

Markus Kummer – ICANN Board Member – sent apologies

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

Marika Konings – Vice President, Policy Development Support - GNSO

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

Julie Hedlund – Policy Director  
Steve Chan - Senior Policy Manager, Policy Development Support  
Amr Elsadr – Policy Manager  
Berry Cobb – Policy consultant  
Emily Barabas – Policy Analyst  
Nathalie Peregrine - Specialist, SO/AC  
Terri Agnew - Secretariat Services Coordinator, GNSO  
Josh Baulch - Senior Manager, Meeting Planning Operations, Meetings Team  
Sara Caplis - Manager, Meetings Technical Services, IT Infrastructure

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kristine). Could you please start the recordings?  
And let me know when you're done. Thank you ever so much.

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may now proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening,  
everybody. And welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 20th of April  
2017. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it for voting  
purposes later on? 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: Thank you. We have received an apology from Keith Drazek and he has  
given his proxy to Rubens Kuhl. Darcy Southwell.

Darcy Southwell: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: We received apologies from Valerie Tan. Her proxy has been given to Donna Austin. And we also have Phil Corwin as an apology and the proxy is given to Susan Kawaguchi. Susan Kawaguchi?

Susan Kawaguchi: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Paul McGrady.

Paul McGrady: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I don't see him in the Adobe Connect room. I'll come back to him afterwards. Rafik Dammak. Rafik had sent his apology in prior to the call with a proxy to Stephanie Perrin but I have seen him appear in and out of the Adobe Connect room. Rafik Dammak, can you hear me? All right, we'll know to turn to Stephanie Perrin for voting purposes. Stephanie Perrin.

Stephanie Perrin: I'm here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Stefania Milan.

Stefania Milan: Here. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Heather Forrest.

Heather Forrest: Here, Nathalie. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: Here, present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Edward Morris has sent his apology and has given his proxy to Marilia Maciel, so Marilia Maciel?

Marilia Maciel: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Martin Silva Valent.

Martin Silva Valent: Present.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Johan Helsingius.

Johan Helsingius: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez has sent in his apologies for today. Ben Fuller.

Ben Fuller: Here.

Nathalie Peregrine: Erika Mann. I believe we're dialing out to Erika, we'll see if we can get hold of her after the roll call. So just to flag the apologies and proxies for voting purposes, Keith Drazek's proxy is Rubens Kuhl; Valerie Tan's proxy is Donna Austin; Phil Corwin's proxy is Susan Kawaguchi; Rafik Dammak's proxy in case of connectivity issues is Stephanie Perrin; and Ed Morris's proxy is Marilia Maciel.

So from staff today we have David Olive, Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Steve Chan, Amr Elsadr, Emily Barabas, Berry Cobb, Terri Agnew, Josh Baulch and Sara Caplis for technical support, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much, James, and over to you.

Johan Helsingius: Just a quick one. This is Julf. I think Erika also sent a proxy in case she couldn't be here in my name.

James Bladel: Thanks, Julf. That's noted. And thanks, Nathalie, for taking care of that. And just to confirm, Nathalie, despite all of these absences, we still have quorum in both the Contracted and Non Contracted Parties Houses, correct?

Nathalie Peregrine: That is correct.

James Bladel: Thank you for the record, okay excellent. Okay, welcome, everyone, to the Council call for the 20th of April 2017. As per usual, does anyone have any updates to their statements of interest or any other items of note that would affect their status as a councilor, please raise your hand.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Okay seeing none...

Susan Kawaguchi: This is Susan. I am having trouble getting into Adobe so I'm raising my hand virtually - or on the phone I guess, not virtually.

James Bladel: Understand, Susan. The floor is yours, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: James, to SOI, which I've updated on the ICANN Website. I'm no longer with Facebook, which I've - some of you I've told that was going to happen. Ad I am acting as a consultant and Domain Name Management Services.

James Bladel: Thank you, Susan. And we will follow up with that as that SOI, but no change in status in your capacity as representing the BC on the Council, correct?

Susan Kawaguchi: Correct, I'm a member of the BC as a consultant - in my consulting services, and they agreed that I would stay on as a councilor.

James Bladel: Great, okay. Thanks for clarifying. And we are all fortunate to have you continuing with us here. So any other statements of interest updates or changes to status? Okay seeing none, then we will move on to Item 1.3, the agenda was circulated earlier and also appears in the right-hand column for this - for the Adobe room for this particular meeting. Does anyone have any comments or suggested edits for the agenda?

Okay, seeing none, then we will dive in. As we noted, we have a number of absences. And I think just looking over the agenda list we also have a number of issues that are going to go a little rusty today so let's just charge ahead and we would get through this together.

First up is a review, I'm sorry, a notice of the status of the minutes from our two previous meetings, one in 16 February and the other on 15 March, those were posted to the list and I believe we can consider those adopted. And then Item 2 is we move into the review of the open project and action item list. And I know we have a couple of points to discuss here so let's let staff load up that document. We will take a quick look.

Okay, first up is the open projects list. And while we have a number of active PDPs and implementation review teams in progress, I just want to note that following up from our discussions in Copenhagen, the Council chairs and staff are reaching out to the leadership of each of the active PDPs and I believe also now the IRTs, to schedule some informal discussions with them on the progress of the PDP.

And I think this is primarily meant to check-in with these groups in between each of the ICANN meetings to ensure that they are on track for their deliverables, that their plan is still valid, that we are able to provide them with any necessary resources or addressing the challenges that they have been executing their work. The goal here is not to wait until each of the ICANN meetings in particular, since we have pared down the PDP update section of our weekend agendas at each of these meetings, and in fact eliminated it entirely for the policy forum.

So that is ongoing, and a staff is working to schedule those, and I believe we have a full slate of those discussions beginning next week, so that's just something we want to reach the Council on and we will certainly follow up if there are any action items resulting from those conversations.

Aside from that, we're looking at the remaining PDPs that are active. We have some of the IRTs, and I believe in particular the one of which is - and we will get to that in the consent agenda as well, one of which is seeking a Council liaison which is the Translation Transliteration IRT. And then we also have a number of items relative to the formation of the Standing Selection Committee and the standing up of the - or the ongoing work associated with the CCT.

Does anyone have any questions or comments relative to our open projects list? Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, James. Paul McGrady for the record. So I think sort of goes back to the meeting with the leadership of the PDPs, I just think it's important that we convey to them that nobody is in trouble and that we don't think anything is off the rails or anything like that, that we are just, you know, as Council trying to make sure that we, you know, look and remain interested in these moving forward, but that these calls are not remedial in nature; they're just, you know, trying to find a way to stay connected with the PDPs in between meetings especially with the policy meeting causing a big gap.

So I think that's what these are meant to do but I just - I would hate to, you know, send the wrong message to the cochairs of these PDPs who, you know, are volunteering an enormous amount of time. And so I guess all I'm saying is hopefully those calls are kind of gentle. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Paul. Yes, you're exactly right, the intention here is to check in because I think that the calendar doesn't really facilitate those regular checkups anymore. We have also had some turnover I think in a slate of liaisons of councilors that are involved in these PDPs. And so the goal here is to check-in, be constructive and collaborative and make sure that they have everything they need as far as the conduct of their work and not let that go too many months down the road without, you know, without touching base. So exactly where we were headed with this, and we will make sure we reinforce your message in those conversations. So thank you for that.

Any other - I know Rubens is asking a question in the chat, and relative to, "Is there a reason IGO INGO appearing both in Board vote and implementation?" That's a good question, Rubens. I see Marika is typing so we'll give her just a second to open that. But any other questions or comments relative to the active PDPs? Okay, and I see Rubens's question was addressed by Marika. Thank you.

Okay, then let's move on to the action item list. And I think we have a couple of items of note here as well, and I'm just going to skim through them fairly quickly here. Liaisons to the SOs, ACs, PDPs, IRTs, and working groups, that is I believe Agenda Item Number 3.

The fiscal year '18 operating plan, we have a comment pending on our agenda, which I believe is Agenda Item Number - what is that - Number 6? We have the charter for the cross community working group, which is also an agenda item on our discussion - a discussion item on our agenda for the meeting today. We've completed the process to address the procedure for

resolving conflicts between Whois and national law. And hopefully folks saw that there was an announcement from ICANN GDD staff on that this week.

We have, just scrolling down here, the response to the GAC communiqué. That is a sore spot on today's agenda, and we will get to that here in just a moment, because we do not have a draft for review on that and we have an open amendment on our agenda.

We have created the SSC, and we have a slate - a motion with a slate of candidates for the next review team, which is RDS, and that's on our agenda little bit later.

And then I wanted to point out as well, I'm just scrolling here, we have some follow up work with the Red Cross protections for the Red Cross Red Crescent names. We also have a - and it's not on this list but we should probably capture that the Customer Standing Committee has also met recently, I believe yesterday, or perhaps it will be meeting here I think in the next couple of days, and I've asked James Gannon to prepare a report as the GNSO liaison to that customer standing Customer Standing Committee and then we will certainly circulate that to Council for your review.

Any other comments, questions, or in particular if you see anything missing from this action item list? Marika is telling me I skipped one here, just a moment, let me scroll back up to the thick Whois letter, Marika, can you point to me - I'm not seeing it here. The letter from Thick Whois IRT on privacy issues. Is this a discussion item as well? This is where our meeting in Copenhagen kind of went off the road, if I recall.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I believe the action item from Copenhagen was that Erika and Keith, I believe, both volunteered to look at the latest version and come back with potential revised draft. But as nothing was received I don't believe that was included in the agenda. So it's still here as an open action item so at some point you'll need to consider whether that is still forthcoming or whether

it has been overtaken by events or just be longer necessary and it can be removed.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you for refreshing my memory. And I note that I have not seen anything from Erika or Keith on this point. And both of them are absent from today's call so there's nothing on our agenda. I guess my message to councilors would be to stay tuned on this particular issue for further developments. I think that, you know, clearly we can't afford to stand still on this one for too long but I think that there are some - some work perhaps that we could report on at our next meeting.

Okay anything else anyone - spot anything any items that you'd like to add to our action item list? Okay, so then let's move on to our consent agenda which is Agenda Item Number 3.

Primarily we have noted in our discussions in Copenhagen that we had a number of vacancies in terms of Council liaisons to PDPs and IRTs. We had a few folks volunteer but I think we still have some gaps that we need to fill.

So, Marika, I don't know if you're in a position where you can run us through who volunteered for what fairly quickly here and make sure that we reconfirmed that those folk are still on board and willing to serve as liaisons for those groups. Just looking here that, let's see, the Thick Whois IRT is Susan; GNSO Rights and Obligations for the Bylaws is Ed, who's not here. The CCWG on Internet Governance is Julf. And there is an open spot relative to translation and transliteration. Any others, Marika, or is that the list?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe that is the list.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. Okay so I guess Ed is probably not here in a position to reconfirm that he's still interested but I think we can confirm with Susan and Julf that they're still willing to serve as liaisons?

Johan Helsingius: Sure.

James Bladel: Correct, thank you, Julf. Susan, your hand is raised. Go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I will continue as the Thick Whois IRT. But if there's no one else for the Translation and Transliteration I'll do that one also unless, you know, somebody wants to trade Thick Whois or something. But it's all registration data so it is easy for me to follow.

James Bladel: Thanks, Susan. I just see in the chat here that Rubens is volunteering for Translation and Transliteration. And he also has hand raised...

Susan Kawaguchi: Perfect. I didn't see that, sorry.

James Bladel: So, if you want to stay where you're at...

Susan Kawaguchi: ...Rubens would be much better than I.

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay, okay fantastic. Rubens, thank you very much for volunteering there. We'll put your name down for the Translation and Transliteration IRT. So then our slate of liaisons is Susan for Thick Whois; Rubens for Translation and Transliteration; Ed, who is not here, for GNSO Revised Bylaws; and Julf for CCWG IG.

Anyone else like to comment on the consent agenda item and the slate of liaisons or can we move to adopt our consent agenda item? Okay, the queue is clear so, Nathalie, if you don't mind, can we just go with a voice vote by acclamation here on Agenda Item Number 3?

Nathalie Peregrine: Of course. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say your name. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Hearing no one, would all those in favor of the motion please say "aye"?

(Group): Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Donna Austin, proxy for Valerie Tan, please say "aye."

Donna Austin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi for Phil Corwin, please say "aye."

Susan Kawaguchi: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Marilia Maciel for Ed Morris, please say "aye."

Marilia Maciel: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Stephanie Perrin for Rafik Dammak, please say "aye."

Stephanie Perrin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: And Rubens Kuhl, proxy for Keith Drazek, please say "aye."

Rubens Kuhl: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. No abstention, no objection, James, the motion passes.  
Thank you.

Johan Helsingius: And I also say "aye" for Erika.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, everyone. And thank you to our new slate of liaisons and we appreciate your volunteering to coordinate with these groups. Next up is a trouble spot in our agenda which is the approval of the Council review of the GAC communiqué from Copenhagen. And I say that this is trouble because while I think we have a draft of a response, we don't have what I would consider a final draft. So I don't know that this is something that we can vote on today because I don't know that we've had the chance to review the comment itself.

I note that the motion was raised by Stephanie and was seconded by Michele, so I would certainly ask either of them or any of the folks who were part of the group that was putting that together if they have any thoughts or if they have any comments or questions. Otherwise, I think I have a couple of ideas as far as brainstorming on what we can do to move forward on this, noting that our liaison to the GAC is currently unable to attend this particular call. And that we also note that the Board and the GAC are scheduled to meet I believe it is a week from today on the 27th.

So we are kind of between a rock and a hard place here but I'm open to ideas on where we can go forward. I don't know if Stephanie or Michele if you'd like to weigh in on this. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: So I see that the text of the motion there is also - can we see the text of the substance of the motion? Can that be put into the space as well, because I think that there is - I don't really know how much of it is going to be controversial. We may be able to work this out on a call. I just don't know how much time you want to allot to it.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. Sure, we can certainly ask staff if they have the latest draft of the comments. I think there was one open question. Most of the comments, and I'm probably not going to do it justice, most of the comment referred back

to previous comments. However there was I believe, one new element which was regarding the GAC's advice to consult individually, that the Board consult with individual GAC members on two letter codes.

So we will get downloaded. And while that is happening Stephanie would like to weigh in. So Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wanted to say I'm a little uncomfortable with Phil not being here because I know he has some comments on the section on the NGOs INGOs. And I don't know whether he's happy with the final draft. I mean, I must admit we kind of let this go into the Easter holiday without making sure that we had white everybody was happy with. So I personally couldn't put up my hand and say this is ready to go. If we could beg for more time I'd appreciate it. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Stephanie. And just to Paul's question, I'm kind of - got a little bit of a side channel going with Mary and Marika, we are trying to find the most appropriate draft text that we can post here. But Paul, I see you want to get back in the queue. Go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks, James. Paul McGrady again. I have no problem with trying to work this thing out on the list instead of on this call over the next couple of days. I was not aware that there may be something in here that Phil was not 100% comfortable with yet. And given the circumstances of Phil's family this week, I mean, I don't want to rush something through with him unable to comment, if we can get it done, you know, within a couple of days in advance of the next call.

So I guess I'm just raising my hand to say I'm happy for this to go however everybody else wants it to go, either to try to get it through today or to do it on the list. But I do want to be sensitive to Phil's issue because he can't be here. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Paul. That's a good point. And one of the items that we are also kind of kicking around is the idea that we would potentially move this to the list but also have an email ballot. And I don't know if our bylaws allow us the time to do that but it would give us perhaps an expedited way of reviewing and approving the response before and asked meeting in May.

Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Just one problem we have here is the one around the timing. At Heather points out in the chat, if we don't get this done by 27 April it will come after the Board meeting and we really need to get this to the Board before that. I'm not familiar with the inner workings and machinery around how we can have a vote via email but I'd be happy to do so if that's the best path forward. And just echoing what Paul said, if Phil needs to weigh in on this, giving him the opportunity to do so would be preferable.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. And just noting that we are also kind of chatting about this potential path forward as a potential - and it still doesn't get us to the 27th but it might get us there a little bit faster. Another option would be to - and again, I'm just continuing to brainstorm some path forward here is that we could notify our GNSO members of the Board, Becky and Markus, we could prepare the document. We could brief them and then adopt it at our earliest opportunity and just essentially call it a pending comment.

At least that way they would have something to take to that conversation between the Board and the GAC on behalf of the GNSO. And we wouldn't be completely empty-handed on the 27th. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks James. Donna Austin. I think to the extent that we can get the most up-to-date draft on the list as soon as possible so that we can start the discussion, I think that's really important as a first step, we need to do that.

So it would be useful to understand what the status of the current draft is and when we are likely to have that circulated to the list.

And in order for us to be able to even provide this to Markus and Becky as even a pending document, we need to have some kind of evidence that people are supporting this on the list even though we haven't voted on it. So I think it's really important that we get this to the list as quickly as possible and that there is a conversation on the list that supports at least in principle what the current document, you know, the current text that is in - the text that is in the response to the communiqué.

So I think that's really important. Yes, an email vote might be the way to go but if we don't get the draft to the list as soon as possible so that we can start the discussion, I think we're going to be close to not being able to meet, you know, even a seven-day vote period. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. Okay, I see Susan and then I think we can kind of start to stitch this together into an approach. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Hi. Unfortunately Phil and I had not discussed the language of the document concerning IGO INGO. So I can't weigh in on that right now for him. But, you know, when I read the draft it seemed okay to me. But I am not in depth in that matter. So I would like the opportunity to wait for Phil's input. What I could do is hopefully get - I'm not sure I can get a hold of Phil, since I think today or tomorrow is his mother's funeral, but I think Steve DelBianco could probably - I could work with him and get something to the list in the next 24 hours.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you Susan. So let me just see if I can put all of this on a single page. It sounds like we're not going to be able to proceed on this today on our call. And that's not entirely unexpected. The approach I think that we are circling around here is that we would get the latest comments, which seemed to be mostly referencing previous comments, except for a couple of new

items, we can get those to the list as soon as possible that all councilors would need to review that as quickly as possible. And Susan would need to confer with the BC leadership on that position to ensure that we've captured or at least addressed the BC and Phil's comments.

And then we would inform our GNSO folks, well let's say the Board members who were nominated by the GNSO, Becky and Markus, that we have a draft, presuming that that was then circulated to the Council, and that no one had any objections, we would then give them a copy of this, provide them with some indication that this was perhaps going to be relevant and useful for their discussions with the Board on the 27th.

And then we would move to an email vote concurrent with that with the goal of approving that document as quickly as possible. Does that sound like I've captured Paul, Donna and Susan's notes there? Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: So thank you. Paul McGrady for the record. So I think that - I guess what I was trying to figure out is whether or not this is something - I know we take a formal vote on this, which then hamstring us on notice, and that kind of thing. But yet for other things, which I think are just as weighty, we tend to send letters for which we don't take a vote, we just sort of reach consensus either on a call or on the list.

And so if Stephanie withdraws the motion and we agreed to handle this by letter instead of by motion, then we don't really have, you know, the notice periods to worry about, which means in theory we could have a letter ready for the Board finalized in advance of the meeting with the GAC, which I think would be more useful than here's a draft motion which may or may not pass.

You know, maybe there is some stuff to work out in relationship to the Red Cross IGO NGO stuff, probably most of it not about content and more about tone I suspect at the end of the day. But I don't really see anything on the list back and forth when this draft was being built that look like anybody was

really digging in their heels. So I think a letter might be possible. And I wonder whether not a letter format for the future to avoid all the difficulties around voting might be our usual approach to this in the future too. So I'll be quiet. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. That's a good idea. And maybe we can do both, you know, send a letter now and then adopt the letter via formal vote just to kind of keep with the process. Donna, you wanted to weigh in, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks, James. Donna Austin. I think I have some concerns in principle with sending a letter before the Council actually formally vote on something. But perhaps we could do it in the context that previously went drafting a response to the GAC communiqué, the Council has done so without a timeframe. And what I mean by that is we are trying to push something through now in order to meet the GAC Board discussion about the communiqué, so we want to make the information timely.

So maybe that's how we get around it this time. But certainly in the future I think we really - and we have discussed this I think in Copenhagen if not before that, but we really need to make sure that the response to the communiqué is timely. And I don't think we've managed to achieve that objective this time around. So maybe we just need to be super conscious of that moving forward.

I don't think previously we've necessarily had a hard time line to work to, and I guess in our defense we didn't know when the GAC Board discussion would happen so maybe that's the hook that gets us out on this occasion. But I do think that it's probably something that we do need a vote on.

One of the other challenges that I potentially have from a Registry Stakeholder Group perspective is that there are a number of our members but do like to have an opportunity to review the response to the communiqué before we sign off on it and so that may cause a little bit of heart ache within

the stakeholder group if we move ahead with something when they don't feel that they've had enough time to consider it. So just raising that as a potential issue as well. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And particularly know your point about some stakeholder groups and constituencies want to see the response before they can instruct their councilors on what to do, and so that's another factor in the timing here.

Going back one speaker to Paul, I'd link we can probably do both. We can proceed with a letter that contains the substance of our comments, and then follow up with either an email vote on a formal response that conforms to our previous submissions, either in an email vote or we could at that point we are probably out of the time sensitive phase of the response so we can move it to our May meeting.

But I think in all cases we are probably not addressing this on our agenda today and we will need to ask Stephanie, as the maker of the motion, and Michele, what their intentions are here, if they would like to withdraw, if they would like to do for this to May. But I think as far as what we need to do to prepare the response we have an urgent project in front of us to get some language on the list.

And I will go ahead and put my name down to work with staff and take the latest bits and bobs that we are going around and kind of synthesizer that into a single draft and then we will get that circulated onto the list as quickly as possible. And we will proceed with kind of a non-objection consensus letter and then a formal vote on the response there.

Next up I have Michele and Stephanie. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. I'm quite happy to go with whatever works, so if I need to withdraw my second, assuming Stephanie withdraws her - the motion, I'm happy to do so. Just let me know.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. I think Stephanie is next in queue so she's probably going to answer is here. Go ahead, Michele, or I'm sorry, Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I do think it seems like the easiest option is to withdraw that motion and settle it as Paul discussed, and you've already stepped forward to help. And if I say, I don't think there's much standing in the way, but I just wouldn't like to make a decision on that INGO without Phil being consulted. Thanks. So withdraw.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, Stephanie. Sounds like we have two withdrawals there, so I appreciate that. I guess the next action item is look for a message on the list from me in the next let's say 24 to 36 hours, and then we will, you know, hit that with some sticks until look like something that we can all agree with and then we will make sure we transmit that not only to the Board but also to Becky and Markus to take that meeting on the 27th.

So thanks for, what do we want to call it here, thanks for innovating a little bit here and working around our processes so that we can get something valuable and timely to those conversations between the Board and the GAC and that we are not, I think as Paul said, handcuffed by our own processes, so thanks everyone.

If there are no other comments on this, we can move to Agenda Item Number 5, which is the initiation of the GNSO process for amending approved GNSO policy recommendations relating to certain Red Cross Movement names. And that was presented by me. I'm still looking for a second. But before anybody jumps up just hang on, because we may have to do some surgery on this motion as well.

I'll introduce this - oh I'm sorry, I believe we actually do need a second before we can discuss this so we've got Michele is raising his hand, Rubens in the chat is seconding so Michele, was that what you were...

Michele Neylon: Yes, I was just going to second you, James, that's all.

James Bladel: Okay so we have two seconds then, great, a second and a third, however you want to call it. Okay, I will read through the resolve clauses here and then I will also just throw it open for discussion noting that we have received some communication from the folks associated with the Red Cross that was circulated to our as well, that we can potentially include as part of our conversation of this motion.

So the resolve clauses are, "1, The GNSO Council hereby initiates the process described in Section 16 of the GNSO PDP Manual; accordingly, the GNSO Council requests that the PDP working group be reconvened for the purpose of consultation by the GNSO Council on the following proposed amendment to Recommendation 5 in Section 3.1 of the PDP Working Group Final Report."

"Two, The full names of the 190 Red Cross National Societies and the full names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies are to be placed into Specification 5 of the Base gTLD Registry Agreement, with an exception procedure to be created for cases where the relevant Red Cross Red Crescent Movement organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the second level."

"Three, In placing the specified identifiers into Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement, this should apply to an exact match of the full name of the relevant National Society recognized by the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in English and the official languages of its state of origin, the full names International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, in the six official UN languages, and a defined limited set of variations of these names."

And, “4, In considering the proposed amendment, account is to be duly taken of the matters noted during the GAC-GNSO facilitated discussion at ICANN58 as well as the GAC’s public policy advice to reserve the finite list of names of the Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies, as recognized within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in all gTLDs.”

“Five. In accordance with Section 16 of the PDP Manual, the GNSO Council directs ICANN staff to post the proposed amendment to Recommendation 5 for public comment, for a period of 30 days commencing from the date of the first meeting of the reconvened PDP working group.”

“Six. In accordance with Section 16 of the PDP Manual, the GNSO Council intends to put the proposed amendment to a vote following consultation with the PDP Working Group and the conclusion of the requisite public comment period. The GNSO Council notes the approval of the proposed amendment requires a Supermajority Vote of both Houses in favor of the amendment.”

And, “7. The Council thanks all of those who participated in the talks at ICANN58 in Copenhagen, and in particular Bruce Tonkin for moderating the discussion.”

So that’s the motion as it stands today. I thought that - and we’ll open up a queue for discussion but I thought that there was a little bit more in the resolve 1 clause. I thought there were some sub points there. But anyway happy to take a queue now to discuss this motion. I think this is a first, no one wants to discuss Red Cross Red Crescent? And, Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady for the record. I’ll be brave and kick it off. A couple of I guess questions and clarifications on this, Question Number 1 is how long has this PDP been disbanded? Is it even something that can be rebanded? Are the same - I mean, I think it’s been years, right? And so will we be sending this to the same people? Are they still around?

I guess my second question is, you know, where did this come from? I think it came from the Board but it's being presented by James. You know, procedurally, you know, how do they get here but also sort of a broader question of I think we need to at least put on the brakes a little bit and talk about whether or not whenever we bump into the GAC that we want - we want the way out to be that we have to reopen what we're doing with a new set of directives as opposed to, you know, having the Board reject things and start over from the scratch. There's sort of that question.

And then lastly, this sort of - we've already talked about this briefly but I know that this is an issue that Phil Corwin feels passionate about and he's not on the call and I don't - I just don't want us to, you know, unless this is an emergency that this be done today, I'd prefer to have Phil's thoughts on this. If we can get those. And so I guess the timing question, which is, is this an emergency? Does this have to be done today? Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. Let me take a - because I see the queue is empty, let me take a stab at a couple of - I don't know if they're answers or responses and then see if other councilors want to weigh in as well. So just a note that this - first off, this is specific to the Red Cross and specific to the names. This is not acronyms, this is not IGOs. We tried to I think very deliberately tried to extract this very narrow slice of that problem into its own - into its own motion.

The second thing, and this came up quite a bit both in the run up to the discussions in Copenhagen and since then, is that the Council has always had the ability to restart or revisit or amend under Section 16 of a PDP. We were uncomfortable, both the chairs, and I think, you know, as the broader Council, were uncomfortable just doing that absent any action on the part of the board.

And so we had those discussions in Copenhagen but I think what the resulting action was is that we wanted the Board to ask us to do something

that we could have done at any time to avoid creating precedent of this sort of this new phase of a PDP lifecycle where you lobby the Council to reopen the recommendations.

And we didn't want to create that, we didn't want to establish that or let that become the new normal. And so we were essentially asking the Board to give us some direction so that we could go back and invoke our own process. And you raise an excellent point about, you know, this has been now since 2013, we're about four plus years on since this PDP was concluded.

Thomas Rickert, fortunately, is still hanging around ICANN. He was the chair of this. He has verbally, I don't know if he's signed it in blood or anything, but he's verbally agreed to step back in and try to get the band back together and reconstitute this PDP working group and revisit these. I don't know that we can predict what level of success he will have in getting those old members back together, but I know that some of them are still around. I think Phil might have been involved as well.

So that's kind of the context of where we arrived here. This is something that we could have done. In fact I think, you know, it's fair to say and it's no secret that we were being asked to do so at some point in the intervening four years, but we were uncomfortable just kind of launching into this amendment process without some - some indication from the Board that they wanted us to do that.

So I don't know if that addresses all of your questions but I think that is at least an effort to fill in some of those gaps there and provide some background. Donna, you wanted to speak on this? Go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. I just wanted to make the point also that, you know, the facilitated discussion was also in response to some of the reluctance that the Council had to make any decision absent some input from the Board as well so the facilitated discussion was a suggestion that came

from Bruce when he was on the Board in Hyderabad. We could have not agreed to go forward with that discussion but we did, we did it in good faith. We think it was a useful exercise in reaching a better understanding of the different - the two sides of the problem.

And I think, you know, as a result of that discussion this resolution reflects to some extent what was agreed during that conversation. So I think, you know, the facilitated discussion needs to be taken into consideration when we think about this as well because it was something that was suggested by the Board in response to some of our pushback that we weren't prepared to do anything unless, you know, independent of any action being taken by somebody else. So I think, you know, the GAC and the Red Cross have come to the table as we did as representatives of the Council in good faith. And this is what we have on the table in front of us is an outcome of that.

So I just wanted to make that point, James, that I think we shouldn't lose sight of that as part of the process that we've entered into as well to try to get this off the table. I mean, it has been hanging around for a long time and I think if we can move this along I think it would be really helpful. And just note that this resolution is just another step in the process.

We haven't agreed to anything yet, we still need to take this out to public comment and hopefully the - we can reconvene the PDP working group to get their input on this as well. So this is just really another step in the process, we haven't - we're not agreeing to do anything at this point in time, we're just going through a process. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Donna. And to your last point, I think that's an important factor is that one of our statements to - or commitments in those facilitated discussions is that we would reopen the discussion. But there were no guarantees that we wouldn't come back with or that the working group wouldn't come back with exactly the same answer that it originally arrived at in 2013.

That was a possibility. And I think we set that expectation that a reconsideration is just that and not necessarily a guarantee of a different outcome. And just a note that we did try to slice and dice this one by taking out the question of acronyms, by taking out the question of IGOs and INGOs, that's the subject of an ongoing PDP that is chaired by Phil. And I think, as Paul noted, something he is very close to. So it is something that we have tried to steer clear of and not have the Council tinkering around under the hood of a PDP that's currently driving down the road.

Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady again. So one clarifying question and then just a word of caution I guess which is the clarifying question is, this would relate only to reserve names, it doesn't have any effect beyond reserve names, is that correct? Am I understanding it?

James Bladel: So my - my understanding of your question is that the - the list of names that was identified here in the motions would go into the base registry agreement. They're currently reserved now on a temporary reserve and that would at least for this subset of names would then go onto a permanent reserve.

Paul McGrady: Okay. And so we're - essentially what we're talking about - if it comes back and there's, you know, positive public comment to do this, we're talking about making permanent reserve names list but we're not otherwise granting, you know, any other special treatment to these terms? Am I understanding it - I mean, I hate to, you know, I just want to make sure that I understand it, is that the deal?

James Bladel: I think that's correct. I may have to flag Mary here. I think that we have a very large list of names that are currently on temporary reserve from the Board. We're talking about moving a subset of those names into - potentially we're asking the working group to consider moving some of those names into this -

from a temporary to a permanently reserved status. And I think the result of that is because the discussions - the facilitated discussions from those folks in the Red Cross at least gave us some indication that those names were special when compared to the other names that were reserved temporarily and probably deserved a second look, and we needed to extract those from the PDP.

So I think that's - I don't know if I'm answering your question or I'm making it worse. But that's kind of what we're talking about here, this giant list of temporarily reserved names and we're looking at a slice of it that probably warrants some special attention, and it's not a case where we're granting them special privileges, I think that they are kind of their own unique animal.

Mary, I don't know if you - I saw your hand go up. Maybe you can...

Mary Wong: Hi, James, and everyone. This is Mary.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: Actually I put my hand down because you explained it. And I think as Rubens also noted in the chat, there is a list of temporarily reserved names. The final list if this proposal is approved, isn't necessarily going to be the same list. As you noted, there were certain discussions at the facilitated dialogue about it so our expectation is that as part of the consultation with the group, the original group, and as part of the public comment period, going into the Council vote, there will be a definitive list by the time you come to vote on that particular list.

James Bladel: Thanks, Mary. Paul.

Paul McGrady: And so then I guess my - just my follow up comment to all this is, you know, again, you know, I don't - everybody knows this - but whether it's the Red Cross issue today, which, you know, on its face seems pretty harmless, or

some other issue tomorrow, we are setting the precedent like it or not, that whenever we bump up against GAC advice that doesn't like the outcome of a PDP that the, you know, the easiest course for the water to flow is for the GNSO Council to reopen things, right?

And so I guess if we're going to vote for this we should all just remember the day when we sort of, you know, took the first step towards developing policy together as a community sending it up to the Board and if the GAC doesn't like it, you know, essentially ensuring that we can - that we'll see it again. You know, I'm really sort of frustrated that the Red Cross is such a worthy cause, right, and that getting this particular thing behind us is such a, you know, seems like such a (unintelligible) to do.

I wish the particular thing we were talking about were not as worthy, but at the same time I guess I just don't want the moment to pass that this is, you know, this is going to be how it's going to be in the future. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. And I note that some folks in the chat are echoing your concern. And just personally I agree with you, my thinking here, and I don't want to spill the beans, but is that I think that our treatment of the Red Cross names, if we take a closer look at the - not only the language of the whereas clauses but also the way that the facilitated discussions occurred, was that we can construct a narrow box that only they can fit in and that other factors or other - also worthy organizations but that don't have the same treatment under international law, would not be able to kind of jump over those hurdles or climb that mountain and achieve the level of status.

But I hear you, it is - it is concerning that the - that this issue, you know, in effect I think the Board has exercised, if I can editorialize here for a second, I think the Board has exercised a pocket veto or at least in the last four years by putting these on a temporary hold and then not taking any further action on them, I think has really exacerbated this issue. So but I appreciate your comments and join them to a large extent so.

Any other folks interested in speaking to this? Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. This seems to be one of these topics that just that been on the roster for what seems to be like forever, so if this is a way forward and we can move forward with it then I think we should. And I am a bit worried about what kind of precedent this might set, but if there is a narrow list of names and if that is not expanded, beyond then I guess within (unintelligible)...

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. Were you finished or were you cut off? It ended kind of abruptly there. Okay, he's indicating he's finished. And just a note to Paul and to Michele and others that, you know, this is going to go back to a PDP for consideration. There will be a public comment. I think this is not the - this is not the end but this is just a reopening of the conversation. And I think all of those comments are - and those concerns are fodder for that work as well. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I agree with Michele and Paul's thoughts on this. But also think that, you know, we certainly need to move on with this. And but I don't want it to set a precedent. And so I'm wondering would it be appropriate to add some sort of editorial comment that, you know, this was an extraordinary situation and the Council, although uncomfortable will move forward but this is not creating a new process or, you know, I'm not sure what we could add, but if we made it very clear that this situation should not occur very often or ever again, so that's just a thought.

James Bladel: Thanks, Susan. And I see that Paul and Donna are agreeing with you. I think we tried to do that a little bit in Whereas Clause - the one that has the enumerated factors there, where we talk about, you know, hey this is kind of a one-off, it's a special situation, these organizations have very specific status, they are unique, they are limited, there are no other legitimate uses for these names. You know, and I think we tried to be as narrow as possible. If

you don't think we did it, you know, we didn't draw that box cleanly enough we can certainly revisit that.

And I think that, you know, if we're going to, you know, it's something we can take a look at. Donna and then Heather, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. With regard to Susan's suggestion, I'm not really sure that there is anything in the Whereas that addresses the issue of we don't want this to become a precedent because I think the motion specifically relates to the Red Cross Red Crescent issues but it doesn't address the potential precedent that we're talking about here of the Board directing the Council to do something in order to appease the GAC.

So I think that's - I don't want to speak for Susan but perhaps that's the language we're looking for, something that specifically is about the Red Cross Red Crescent issue but more to the way that this has come about and that we don't want to feel like the policy is being undermined by GAC advice coming in after the fact. So I think perhaps it's more something like that. Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And I think Paul is also putting some additional language in the chat. And I think we're open to amending this if we can get that, you know, reinforced in a way that makes councilors comfortable. Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Heather Forrest. I wonder if we might do a little bit of tweaking in the enumerated clause Number 5? I think that was our attempt when we were drafting this motion to make it clear the circumstances had changed since the publication of the PDP working group's final report specifically I guess what I noted from the facilitated dialogue in Copenhagen was that that specific list of 190 names apparently wasn't available to the PDP working group, the PDP working group was I think working to some sort

of view that it was any and all names and it could be infinite and so on and so forth picking up some of the comments in the chat.

And that that provision of that finite list which we understood in the facilitated dialogue still had some cleanup needed for it was a new factor that then if you like, empowered us or gave us a reason to reopen this thing. I think that's the key point here is that we're not doing this because we're told to do it so much, we're doing it because we had a policy reason to do it. Whether we like the timing of the provision of that - of that finite list is another matter, but I wonder if we could do some doctoring then to enumerate clause 5 to make that a bit more clear and put this in its own special box as well as justify our actions? Thanks, James.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. And so just, you know, and I don't want to speak for Rubens and Michele who seconded this but I'm open to any and all edits that would capture that both the comments you made and I think statements from Paul and Susan and Donna that are - and some of the chat. I just want to note just a couple of things. One is that we do have this process, and I don't want us to inadvertently, you know, we may wish - or some future Council may wish to amend a PDP without any sort of intervention from the Board or the GAC just on its own, and we don't want to constrain those future Council's ability to use their own process.

And then the second thing is we do have another outstanding chunk of work associated with IGO and INGO acronyms that, you know, may potentially follow or at least some of those may potentially follow a similar path and we don't - I don't know that we want to be so rigid in prescribing what we can and can't do that we, you know, kind of cut off our ability to continue to participate in those things as well.

So I'm just kind of pointing out that there are two areas that we would need to steer clear of if we want to amend this language to reinforce the special

nature of the Red Cross Red Crescent names. So I don't know, Heather, if you wanted to respond or if that's an old hand?

Heather Forrest: Sorry, James, old hand.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. And see the chat is progressing but I'll go next to Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. A couple of things, first off in relation to the actual language around this, which we're discussing on the chat, I mean, I think the fact that the Red Cross and Red Crescent has - it's protected by international treaties probably of some help. But obviously we don't want to end up in the situation where we are restricting both ourselves and future Councils, so I think there's a balance to be reached there.

Secondly, earlier this week you circulated to the list (unintelligible) of the motion which was - had been marked up with some edits by somebody representing the Red Cross I believe. (Unintelligible) which we're looking at here isn't - doesn't reflect any of those suggested changes, does it?

James Bladel: That's correct, Michele, that was - I was going to raise that next.

Michele Neylon: Yes, that's because if we're looking at the language and added some finessing things it would just seem to be the kind of logical thing would be to potentially discuss some of those changes. And, I mean, as chair, I believe you did point out that, you know, some of the changes that they suggested weren't particularly controversial, however, there were a couple of changes that may overstep the bounds of what one might consider a friendly edit, but I'll cede back to you. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. And you are correct, that there was - that we received earlier this week some feedback from folks associated with the Red Cross on this amendment - or sorry, on this motion, and I think for the most part those

edits were, let's call them clarifications or more precise language than what we were using, so when we say something like Red Cross they were saying Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, or something like that.

So they were editing how we were referring to their organizations and I think that's fine. However, there were a couple of notes in there that potentially could have expanded the scope of identifiers and names that were covered by the - that would be reopened for examination by the PDP. And then there was also, outside of the text of the motion there was also a proposal that the Council consider either as part of this work or as part of separate work item to - what are we going to do with the acronyms of the Red Cross? Do we just fold that over to the acronym issue generally that we're dealing with the IGO INGO issue?

Those latter two, I think were much more problematic, those edits for precision. And I'm not, let's say, not very - I'm more reluctant to just go ahead and table those as potential discussions. So I see there's some editing going on here and I'm just kind of trying to follow along here, but I'm trying to find a landing pad for this for today's call. And I think we have two general items in front of us.

One is that we need to beef up the extraordinary - the language that notes the extraordinary nature of this work. And we probably also need to go through each of those proposed edits from the Red Cross and determine whether or not those are something that we want to consider or if there's something that we want to table or not. We don't have to accept or reject, they're not coming from a councilor so it's really just a matter of which ones do we want to table, discuss, propose as friendly amendments and which ones do we wish to reject by essentially doing - taking no action?

Michele, you're up next. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James. Thanks for clarifying. Just for my own personal perspective I think the accepting edits which provide clarification, as in for example when the naming of the organization seems to be perfectly reasonable and helpful, but obviously we don't want open up other cans of worms, I don't think we're going to be able to resolve all this on this call. So can we do for this motion and just work on it in the interim? And if so, how do we do that?

James Bladel: Well, you ask, and I think you just did.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay, I just did.

James Bladel: ... kind of where we're going. I note that - okay so I think that it sounds like we have two basic - it sounds like we have two basic challenges that we need to resolve, and one is to make sure that everyone is comfortable with the box that we are drawing around this to ensure that it is a special case, and then also whether or not we want to table or consider those other edits that we received as feedback. So I think that's probably something reasonable. I think - I'm sorry, I'm just trying to catch up on the chat here so if it sounds like I'm stumbling it's just me trying to multitask here.

And I see some folks saying that if we can just fix a couple of these things maybe we can move this to the list and look at a potential email vote. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. So I was going to suggest, you know, maybe if this is just a few changes to the whereas clauses that we could perhaps defer the motion, kick this to the list for on the understanding that we would have an email vote because we don't want to kick this over to the next meeting in May. Some of that is because I want to continue this discussion in good faith, and I know we don't want to be held, you know, accountable to the GAC but we have gone down a certain path to try to resolve this.

And I think if we can - if the only thing at issue here is the current whereas clauses or, you know, some of the language in this resolution, if we can take it to the list and resolve that with the intent of having an email vote, you know, in the next two weeks, that might be preferable to kicking it to the next meeting, which is a month away. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Donna. And I just - I just want to remind folks one of the reasons why we decided to tackle the Red Cross stuff first is because this is a point that's been receiving a lot of attention lately, and if we can get this one in the rearview mirror I think it dials down a lot of the pressure on this particular issue generally, because these are, as I think as someone mentioned earlier, these are noble organizations, they do good work, very specific status in international laws and treaties. And we are trying to be aware of that.

So it sounds like there's - and I'm just looking through the chat here, it sounds like there is kind of sentiment brewing here perhaps moving this to the list and moving this to an email vote. Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: It's Michele. I think I need to formally withdraw my request for deferral. I'm happy to deal with this by the list and a vote that way or whatever works. I just didn't think we were going to get it resolved today.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. Actually I think your deferral still works because it doesn't necessarily defer it to the May meeting, it just defers it to further conversations on the list. And if we want to kick off an electronic ballot we can do that on the basis of your deferral so I think we can do that. Let's - but that's just - yes, that's just a process thing, we'll get that worked out.

Okay, all right well it sounds like we have a couple of open questions relative to this. And I also want to point out that this is - this is going to be referred back to Thomas Rickert and whoever - the coalition of the willing previous working group members, so they may also have some thoughts, some

comments associated with their recommendations, whatever comes out of that on the unique nature of these names and these organizations.

So either through their own work or - and reflection of public comment, so I think we can continue to shore up that sentiment so that this is not a - doesn't become a well-worn path for future PDPs. So with that being withdrawn, if there are no other comments and the queue is clear, we can move to a slightly hopefully less contentious item which is Item Number 6. Just a kind check here, we've got about 40 minutes left on our call, and about four other agenda items so I'm going to try to be as expeditious as possible.

Item Number 6 is another motion up for a vote on GNSO Council comments on proposed ICANN budget for fiscal year 2018, we discussed this in Copenhagen. I put together a draft comment based on some conversations that were occurring previously with Council and some of the analysis that was conducted by staff.

And this is certainly not meant to supersede or collide with or conflict with any comments that might be - might've been submitted by SGs and Cs, it's meant to augment that from the Council level.

So first off I think, do we have a second for this motion? Can we even talk about this yet? Staff, can you give me some indication? Okay, we need a second. Michele, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Are you seconding? Okay thanks. Great. Okay I'll just read the resolve clauses, pretty straightforward, "The GNSO Council approves the fiscal '18 Draft Budget comments prepared on behalf of the GNSO Council and instructs ICANN staff to formally submit the approved comment to the Public Comment Forum." And, "Two, the GNSO Council thanks the volunteers who prepared the comments and ICANN staff who provided invaluable assistance

to the volunteers in the drafting of the comments.” So, yes, pretty simple motion.

And thank you, Michele and Donna for seconding this. Now if we can go back to the language of the comment itself? And I'll just hit a couple of the highlights here. I hope that folks have had an opportunity to read the comments, they've been out, I know, for last week and this week. But there are just a couple of highlights that I'd like to draw your attention to, one, noting that these are coming from the Council and not meant to - and are meant to just kind of reinforce any comments that are coming from the stakeholder groups and Cs.

The first one is that a continuing comment from our sentiments on the draft fiscal 2017 operating plan and budget that we'd like a greater degree of transparency about how comments are reviewed, how they are decided, adopted, and how ICANN is responding to those folks who are submitting comments in their amendments to the draft budget as they prepare a final budget.

And I think that we note something here about consider publishing a detailed analysis of comments received along with the rationale particularly for those that are not incorporated into the final budget. Next one is noting that again, that the comments themselves could be - and we referred to a few pages here, but I think this is the one where we would want to have the comments, or the budget categorized by portfolio as opposed to by function and I think that would be helpful in the analysis of these budgets going forward.

Finally, we just note again that the GNSO policy development seems to have, in terms of headcount and growth, seems to have a lower priority compared to other activities, and we just reemphasize that setting the policy and technical coordination for the DNS is a core function of ICANN's mission and bylaws and everything else is supportive of that mission. And we want to see that reflected in the budget.

And then we have some more - again, some more comments regarding global engagement, what's included there. Is it being comingled with meeting expenses? And there was also finally a note about transaction fees, there's some projected scenarios for transaction fees, we want to ensure that ICANN is working closely with the GNSO and particularly gTLD registries to ensure that there is agreement and support for those assumptions, I think in particular the low estimate was still fairly aggressive in terms of growth and what I think is generally understood to be an industry growth level.

So that is the comment. Hopefully it's not a shock and everyone's had a chance to look through this and would like to open this up for discussion for anyone that has any concerns or if you feel that, for example, we're missing something, something is omitted or something is running counter to comment or a sentiment coming out of the - your stakeholder group, please raise that.

And then I just also question for staff, when is the cutoff for comments on this? I thought it was the 26th, is that - do I have that right? Comments on this close on the 26th? Something like that. The comments are closing probably close to the end of this month so we do need to get those turned in. So that's the draft as it stands. Any other thoughts, comments, edits? Marika is checking on the date. She's saying maybe the 29th.

Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Hello. There is some noise around me. Just asking here why we are making specific comments about the global engagement (unintelligible) try to understand here from why we kind of - we have concern from the GNSO Council standpoint? I understand that different stakeholder groups or constituencies they have their own position or view about the global engagement, that's why we are putting that on our comments. Just trying to - seeking for more clarification.

James Bladel: Thanks, Rafik. I think the comment here about global engagement is that that in terms of the dollars spent and the headcount of employees that that continues to grow or let's say the growth is outpacing some of the other areas of ICANN the organization. And it's a question of because I think in many parts of the budget it is comingled with meeting expenses, meeting and travel expenses, is asking staff to provide some greater details demonstrating, A, you know, what is the measure of engagement? How do you measure that those dollars and those employees are actually working, you know, working to achieve those goals? And then, B, you know, is there a way to separate those out so that we can view those separately?

So that's the thinking behind the engagement. And I note that we had even some - let's just say some more - some stronger comments coming from - and I think you alluded to this as well - from other parts of the GNSO. And I tried to tone goes down while still capturing just the general question of the nature of global engagement and particular in light of its growth.

Michele, you're next.

Michele Neylon: Yes, thanks, James. Just on this particular point, this kind of thing where the spending increases but there's no transparency on a KPIs, and everything, is something that we are right to question. I mean, as noted elsewhere in the comments, the expenditure and budgeting around what would be considered a core function, namely policy development, doesn't seem to be growing; however the expenditure in areas such as this global engagement, which doesn't seem to have any real metrics or KPIs attached to it, continues to grow. So I think it's perfectly logical that we would question it.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. And I think the comment, just to be clear, is not questioning the need for global engagement, it's just questioning how it is measured versus the growth in its resource allocation. So you know, if it's important in terms of, you know, it's mission, can you show us how adding these people

and adding these dollars is going to further that mission? And I think that's to your point about its transparency. Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, James. Rafik. I do agree on the comment about the - for GNSO needs to get more support and resources allocated for the policy development. I do support that. But I think we put them kind of in opposition that while we are spending that in global engagement but not giving enough for policy development, I don't think that's kind of - no constructive way to do. So and I have a concern is that in other (unintelligible) within the community there are (unintelligible) like the GNSO are not doing enough work to outreach to try to engage more.

I know that we are trying to do our best and each stakeholder group and constituency they have their own plan initiated. But (unintelligible) and I think how we are putting the comments (unintelligible) in the global engagement and kind of - only kind of support that (unintelligible) so I'm wondering how we can maybe put it in more positive way. I understand that it's more about transparency and asking about expected outcome of those expenses with regard to global engagement so just to voice any - yes, just - just like policy development versus global engagement and how we can also perceive them.

James Bladel: Thanks, Rafik. So just so I'm clear, are you proposing alternative language to the second to last bullet point or are you proposing that it's being merged? I guess I'm not 100% clear on what you're proposing. I think that there is - unless I've misunderstood the conversations that there is some, you know, some general support for the idea that ICANN needs to be a little clearer about what global engagement is expected to result in and how it's growth in resources will, you know, will drive it towards that. I don't know if you're suggesting we change that or remove it or I guess I'm not clear where we're going with this here. Are you objecting to it in - its inclusion entirely?

Rafik Dammak: Okay hi, James.

James Bladel: Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I'm not saying that we should remove it for whatever, just kind of trying to raise here the concern and how that may be perceived and just I think I wanted to share that with others and that we have result about, I said again I understand that we want more metrics, KPI and so on, to get it kind of maybe more structured in the way that we can evaluate the impact of (unintelligible) but I try to understand that, you know, such (unintelligible) maybe just kind of reinforce what others think about GNSO (unintelligible)...

James Bladel: Sorry, Rafik, I'm sorry, you're getting very, very faint here and I'm not able to hear you anymore. I can tell that you're still speaking but I just can't make out what you're saying. Could you start again please?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so what I was saying is that I'm not asking for removing or amendment but just I wanted to share this concern with other councilors because I think that it's something - I mean, I understand that it's some perception within the community about how GNSO (unintelligible) engagement and so on. Just I wanted to share that to have that in mind, but I was not asking for any amendments of the comments.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Rafik. If I understood you correctly you're saying that you're not proposing any change to the comment but you want the councilors to consider that there is a broader perception that the GNSO - I don't know what the right word is - use global engagement as a rival for these types of resources, and we want to make sure that our comment is not perceived as oppositional to that. Is that - did I capture that correctly?

Rafik Dammak: Kind of, yes.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks. Well fair enough. I did give it a shot. So next we have Michele. Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. I mean, just on Rafik's point there, okay, fine I can understand that that might be something that somebody may perceive but if you actually look at the way the comment is drafted, the two things are not directly linked. ICANN handles a very large and growing budget. And post IANA transition, it is even more important that ICANN does a good job of a steward of that budget. So it is not - it is not unreasonable for us to question the metrics of the KPIs that are linked to expenditure especially when you're talking about such large sums of money.

But the wording that we're looking at here is quite gentle. I don't think that's particularly hard core, I mean, it could have been, as James said, I mean, it could have been a lot rougher. And I think it's perfectly right to question some of these things.

Now, I mean, ultimately, the answer from ICANN could be in some cases, you know, if they have difficulty measuring some of these things, well that's fine, or is it? But, I mean, it's something where you need to have a greater degree of transparency and I don't think it's wrong for us to look for that.  
Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. And I don't think that I heard you were proposing any amendments to the language of the comment either, is that correct?

Michele Neylon: Understood correct.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. Stephanie, you're up next.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I don't want to slow this down at all, but I was wondering if a simple flipping of the order of that paragraph might actually respond to Rafik's concern. I think we don't want to give the impression that we don't believe in global engagement, that we are penny pinchers.

Personally, I think that global engagement brings new cost and in particular it brings particularly in translation costs, but that's a whole other topic, and I'm not suggesting that. But if we just flip the order and put the policy concern paragraph, which is currently at the top of the page, behind the growth and resources for global engagement, I think it might help. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Stephanie. So just to note, your proposal is to move the second bullet point, which is regarding - oh I'm dotty, the third bullet point and the fourth bullet point, you want us to swap those two?

Stephanie Perrin: Exactly. Put projected growth and resources allocated for global engagement at the top of the page there, and put the lower priority on policy development underneath it. Then it...

James Bladel: Okay.

Stephanie Perrin: ...kind of follows a more logical order. Right now it looks like we're whining about no money for (unintelligible) and then we say oh yes, and they got tons and money and we don't agree with that. I think it does help defuse it a little bit. Other than that I think the wording is, as Michele said, it's not bad. And Rafik wasn't proposing a change in wording.

James Bladel: Thank you, Stephanie. And I note that Rafik and Martin and Michele are also fine with that and Donna as well. And I'm fine with that as well, if I'm understanding you, we would swap the positions of bullet points 3 and 4 and they're not numbered, I'm just kind of noting here that they're on the second page of the - on Page 2 there are three bullet points, we would swap the first two.

And it looks like - okay and Darcy and Donna are agreeing. So let's make that change, and I think, okay, this is going away. We have 20 minutes left in our call. We have this item and one other vote that needs to occur today as well so now that we're all kind of plus-oneing that change, thank you very much

for that suggestion, Stephanie, that addresses Rafik's concerns and here is the new draft, which I would point out just does exactly that, swaps those two bullet points.

So any - I note that the queue is clear and that the chat seems to indicate that we have - that Stephanie has very artfully gotten us past this particular sticking point. If there are no other concerns I'd like to move this motion that we adopt this comment to a vote. And here is the motion again. No concerns there.

So, Nathalie, if you don't mind, can we move to a vote by acclamation please?

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

(Group): Aye.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Moving onto the proxies now. Would Donna Austin for Valerie Tan please express your vote?

Donna Austin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Susan Kawaguchi for Phil Corwin.

Susan Kawaguchi: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Marilia Maciel for Ed Morris.

Marilia Maciel: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Stephanie Perrin for Rafik Dammak.

Stephanie Perrin: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Rubens Kuhl for Keith Drazek.

Rubens Kuhl: Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: No abstention, no objection, James. The motion passes. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie, and thank you, councilors particularly Stephanie for proposing that edit that addressed those concerns and changed the tone a little bit to something a little more productive, constructive. So okay, then moving onto Item Number 7, and just being mindful of the time, we have a motion to adopt the GNSO nominees for the Registration Directory Services Review Team, that's RDS Review Team. And you will note that this is a first time out for our new - shiny new Standing Selection Committee so first off, thanks to that group.

The motion was raised by Julf and needs a second. I will go ahead and second that so that we can get this on discussion as well as Michele, so Michele's seconding everything today. Thank you, Johnny on the spot.

Julf, if you have a solid connection, if you could read us the motion, the resolve clauses, otherwise I'm happy to do so on your behalf if you'd rather?

Johan Helsingius: Actually it might be better if you read it out because my connection can be a bit iffy.

James Bladel: No problem, Julf. Happy to do so. "Resolved, 1, The GNSO Council nominates, ranked in order: Susan Kawaguchi, Erika Mann Stephanie Perrin

and Volker Greimann as its primary four candidates for the RDS Review Team. Furthermore, the GNSO nominates, in ranked order: Marc Anderson, Stefania Milan and Timothy Chen to be considered for inclusion in the RDS-RT by the SO-AC Chairs should additional places be available.”

“Two. The GNSO Council expects the GNSO Chair to communicate to the SO-AC Chairs the importance of considering the four candidates as primary as well as respecting the ranking of the additional candidates in the discussion with the other SO and AC Chairs concerning potential additions to the RDS Review Team, unless for reasons of diversity/skills it becomes necessary to deviate from the indicated ranking. In such a case, the GNSO Chair is expected to communicate the rationale for such a deviation back to the GNSO Council.”

“Three. The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO Secretariat to communicate resolved 1 to the staff supporting the RDS Review Team.”

“Four. The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO Secretariat to inform the applicants that have received endorsement to the GNSO Council expects that, if selected for the RDS Review Team, the applicant will represent the views of the entire GNSO community in their work on the RDS Review Team, and provide regular feedback as a group on the discussions taking place in the RDS Review Team, as well as the positions being taken by GNSO Review Team Members.”

And, “5. The GNSO Council requests staff supporting the RDS Review Team and application process to send a response to those applicants who did not receive endorsement, if any, thanking them for their interest. The response should also encourage them to follow the RDS-RT work, and participate in Public Comments and community discussions.”

That is the motion and certainly open a discussion on this point here, but just want to note thanks to all of folks who volunteered and also participated on the Standing Selection Committee.

So first up is Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James, very much. And sincere thanks to our Standing Selection Committee given that this is their first effort. I just wanted to make a note of really a point of procedure for that committee going forward, I don't think it was really all that wise to put forward a motion that seems that it was really more a draft motion in that first version albeit that it named names. I think that was probably not optimal for all of the candidates who went for that - those roles and anyone who saw that initial motion and are now seeing the revised motion might be a bit confused.

So, you know, it's - I think this is a situation that could come up in the future for that group. And to the extent that we can avoid putting forward a strawman or a draft motion and presenting it as if it were a finalized motion, I think that would be helpful. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather. I think that, yes, that's an important consideration. And I think we should definitely communicate that back to that SSC, not necessarily formally or as part of this motion but just as a note going forward. So that's a good point there, thank you.

Julf, you're up next.

Johan Helsingius: Yes, this is Julf for the record. Just wanted to respond to that, definitely note but in this case, we actually thought we had a final version of it. It turned out that there was some issues that turned up after the deadline, that's why we actually went to this rather weird motion.

James Bladel: Thanks, Julf. Fair enough. And point taken on that as well. I've got Michele and then I want to go ahead and put myself in the queue as well. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. I think, you know, some of the points other people have made around this are - while they're valid, I think maybe in some respects we are being a bit too hard on both ourselves and on this particular group. This is the first time that they've ever had to do anything, you know, like any process it's, you know, you don't really get to see how well it works until you actually start doing it. So the fact that there might be some teething problems and what have you is to be expected, and it's more a case of how you deal with those issues rather than the fact those issues arise themselves, that we should be looking at. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. And I think, you know, your point about this being sort of a shakedown cruise of the SSC is probably one taken. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady. Not to change gears too quickly, but I would like to propose a few tweaks to Paragraph 5 just to make it a little bit more friendly, to make it clear that the, you know, the way that I read it, it sort of felt weird to say that they did not receive endorsement because that sounded kind of final like they might never ever.

And so I made a little proposed change there, and then tacked on an additional thing at the end, encouraging them to apply for future opportunities within the GNSO community as they arise, so that the people who weren't picked don't feel like they weren't picked, they'll never get picked and they ought not try again in the future. So hopefully this is considered friendly. If it's not considered friendly then I might withdraw it just so we can get this thing done. But it looks real nice. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Paul. And I'm sure that was not the intention to discourage future applications or to, you know, speak with any degree of finality on these

candidates. As a seconder, I certainly would take that as a friendly change. I guess I would just look to Julf and in the chat he has also accepted that. So good catch. And I think that's certainly, you know, doesn't give any unintended finality to that statement.

Yes, and everyone is noting that it makes that much better. In fact I would ask that maybe we capture that for future SSC motions so that we include that going forward. Okay and Michele is also agreeing to it, so good add, Paul.

The queue is clear. I had myself in here just to note that, you know, for the folks here that are - with regard to Resolve 2, you know, I fully - instructions - acknowledged and received and I will do my utmost to make sure that we get our four primary candidates. You know, last time around, the last review team, the SOs and ACs were not really - there wasn't a consensus to accept anyone from the list of alternates. I think in this particular case the GNSO occupies a very unique position when it comes to RDS policy. And I will communicate that to this group and emphasize that we really need to ensure that one of our - that we have four rather than three primary candidates.

Yes, so I will take that as a, you know, as a directive from the Council. And I will do my utmost to make sure that that is indeed the case given that the importance of the GNSO in this matter. So, okay, any other comments or we can move this motion to a vote. Looks like everyone is fine.

Okay, Nathalie, if you would do the honors, please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, James. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say your name. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say "aye"?

(Group): Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. Would all five proxies now say “aye”?

(Group): Aye.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. With no abstention and no objection, the motion passes. Thank you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie. Thank you, councilors especially to the SSC and we will proceed in notifying those who were endorsed, once I've had the opportunity to meet with all the other SOs and ACs and get our folks included on that review team.

Okay, next up is Item Number 8, we have eight minutes left. We have Item 8 which is a discussion on the charter, the updated charter for Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. We also have a discussion for planning for ICANN 59 in Johannesburg, which we do have some discussions that we need to get in front of the Council. So I would beg your patience as we work through these last two items here.

The first one is the updated charter for CCWG IG. I don't know if we have any one from the CCWG IG that would like to speak to this charter? But if you'll recall, that meeting in Hyderabad we asked this group to please come back with some proposals by Copenhagen to how the structure of this particular work effort would fit within the CCWG, which now that we have these specific guidelines for cross community working groups, we wanted to ensure that this work conform to those guidelines, or alternatively propose different structures and a transition plan to moving from a CCWG to whatever new structure or successor format was being used.

In Copenhagen, we were given this charter, this revised charter. And I'm - I'll be honest, I have skimmed it; I have not put it under a microscope so I really don't know that I'm qualified to speak to it or defend it but I'm hoping that if

anyone else would like to review it they could certainly take a stab at that, be my guest.

But I'd like to put this on the table for discussion. And certainly if anyone has any questions. Or if anyone has any proposals for next steps. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. I guess just to - a few observations. So we had some discussion about this on a Registry Stakeholder Group call yesterday, and I think reservations have been raised previously about whether this is a CCWG or not or whether this could be - whether another vehicle could be used for this group like a, you know, whether it become a discussion group or something like that.

So I think I'd like to understand whether consideration has been given about whether something besides a CCWG is available to this group. But also just some general questions about the goals and objectives of this group. You know, one of the goals is to increase awareness about relevant Internet governance and policy issues in the ICANN community. That is a really, really broad statement. And I - tongue-in-cheek I would say that that's something you could almost have (unintelligible) CCWG on in trying to understand what is relevant Internet governance and policy issues in the ICANN community when you're talking about Internet governance.

So that is, you know, really broad and I think there will be some benefit in trying to skinny that down so that the rest of the community actually understands what that means because Internet governance covers so many things. But I think certainly within the Registry Stakeholder Group we have some concerns that there's a lot of mission creep associated with Internet governance. And we sometimes question whether things that are being discussed within the ICANN under that banner actually should be - are within ICANN's mission or whether it should be sitting somewhere else.

So have some real concerns about, you know, that goal in the first instance, that I think it would have some value in defining what you mean by relevant Internet governance and policy issues for this CCWG.

Also enhanced cooperation between the CCWG and the ICANN government engagement, is that government engagement or is that global engagement? So I notice that global - government engagement is what's used but I thought it was global engagement. So that's just a very high level that, you know, has some other mechanism been looked at for this group? And also it would be really helpful if you could define what Internet governance and policy issues are relevant to this group.

I understand that this is really important that the political environment that ICANN works in is, you know, very sensitive and it has been for a number of years before transition, after transition. But to get - define that scope about what Internet governance and policy issues this group intends to be looking at, I think would be really helpful. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Donna. And just a note that I have Rafik in the queue, Paul had his hand but I think he lowered it, and just gave a plus one to your comments. And then I want to close the queue because we are running out of time and we do have one more item on our agenda. So next up is Rafik. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. I guess I can speak as cochair of cross community working group. Thanks, Donna, for the comments. I think, as a working group we can take all the questions, I mean, unfortunately there was no discussion from the Council and the mailing list so this is kind of the first really time to hear those concerns.

For the first question, based on the motion, we - how to say - the motion from Hyderabad give us kind of two options, either to amend the charter and/or

explore other structure so we focused first on the charter amendment. So if you can respond to the first question.

With regard to clarifying the (unintelligible) regarding Internet governance, we can probably work on that and I can come back to the working group and we can clarify if it's - there is a concern about the mission creep. And for the - how to say - government engagement, ICANN is involved on Internet governance (unintelligible) Tarek Kamel, which is the global engagement, and I think it's within - not government engagement, which is within the global engagement.

So that the team that's engaging with - how to say - international - intergovernmental organization and so on and that's (unintelligible) involved in all Internet governance space representing ICANN as an organization. So if people have any questions or it will be helpful to list all of them and I can come back to the working group and try to respond to those concerns.

James Bladel: Thank you, Rafik. And thank you for agreeing to do that. So just noting that we are at the top of the hour and we're at the bottom of the queue for this particular topic. What I'd like to suggest is that we - we've had this document now on the list since Copenhagen. But I note that we haven't really spent a lot of time discussing it.

I think what I'd like to see is a discussion of these topics on the list as well as a list of questions perhaps that can be taken back by Rafik and others who are participating in the CCWG and that we can roll that up into either a more substantive discussion for our meeting in May or even a motion to adopt a revised charter or to propose other paths forward. So that should be our goal for our next meeting if we could take this to the list and - I'm sorry, I'm hearing some background noise there. But I think that's how we can proceed on this one. And certainly if others have alternative ideas on how to go forward, we should raise those on the list as well.

Okay, then moving to our final item, Item Number 9, which is planning for ICANN 59 in Johannesburg, the good news is, is that we're a little bit further along in the planning than for the last previous meetings, thanks to an early start. And certainly thank you to Donna and staff and all the folks who have been working very hard on this.

The bad news, as you can imagine, that, you know, we're still running into a number of the same issues when we start to stitch this together with the other SOs and ACs, that we start to run into, you know, and trying to resolve all those conflicts is a never ending challenge as part of building this schedule. And I think I have a whole new appreciation for that as a result of this.

So and noting we're losing some of our councilors because we've hit the top of the hour. So thanks, all. I don't know if we can put Donna on the spot or if we have someone from staff who can just give us a brief overview of what we're looking at as far as this being the - the overall calendar, and then how the GNSO calendar fits into this framework.

But as you can see, we are following much of the same script that was developed for the first policy forum last summer in Helsinki. You can see that we have identified some GNSO subjects, some subject work which is an area of focus on Monday the 26th of June.

We also have allocated PDP face to face PDP meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday, and then we've also noted that there are some PDP and GNSO related work flagged for these cross community discussion topics, what used to be called high interest topics which are occurring in the afternoon of each day, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, particularly you see the one there for geographic names and the RDS as well.

So this is the, you know, this is the lay of the land as it sits today. You can see that we're trying to steer this around some of the other activities that are

ongoing throughout the community and there's some comments associated with a lot of those sessions as well.

Did I butcher that sufficiently, Donna, or would you like - have anything to add and certainly some of the folks on the staff have been working on this as well.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. So I think you've covered it pretty well. I think Terri - well I know that Terri Agnew has sent around requests for the respective SGs and Cs for individual meeting requests. And I think the intent is for the GNSO leadership to adopt the same practice that we did for Helsinki in reviewing those.

You know, our preference is that we don't have sessions against the cross community discussion groups. And to the extent that we can limit, you know, big chunks of time being against the PDP working groups, I think that would send a good message as well. But we understand that, you know, that's going to happen because groups will want to meet.

So we're doing the best that we can to maintain the integrity that this is a policy forum. And to the extent that you can take that message back to your groups it would be appreciated. I think, you know, just in terms of what you've seen on the screen, at the moment, I think the GAC has requested that we move something from one of the cross community discussions from Wednesday because they want to be part of that and the GAC does its communiqué on Wednesday, so, you know, that's - Wednesday afternoon so that's a conflict for any cross community discussion.

So still some inflexibility from some of the groups, but, you know, we're pushing very hard to maintain the integrity that this is a policy forum. That's all I've got. Thanks.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Donna. And I just want to point out that having Donna, who is an alumni from the Meeting Strategy Working Group to continue to reinforce the

message that this is a policy forum, has been very helpful in these discussions.

I think the challenge, you know, in addition to working within a shorter time format is also that, you know, just honoring the requests or fulfilling the requests that something be unconflicted I think that is a real challenge, because I think as you might imagine, there's a lot of differing expectations on what, you know, what sort of topic should be unconflicted and versus which ones can happen concurrently.

So any questions or thoughts? This is an iterative process. As Donna mentioned, we're getting closer to something that is considered a near final draft. But I don't think we're quite there yet. So if there's any other questions or concerns? Otherwise we would say that your SG and C chairs have been very constructive in this and we would ask that they continue to work with us to get this hammered out.

Okay, all right so then seeing an empty queue here, I think we're seven minutes over and folks are probably wondering if we can just bring this meeting in for a landing. The next agenda item is AOB, any statements or questions for AOB? Empty queue. I think Marika is noting - Marika, do you want to weigh in on this, that there's a deadline tomorrow for input on the schedule from SGs and Cs, is that correct?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, it actually refers to the block schedule so specifically the cross community discussion topics and where these have been located. My understanding is that following the discussions that took place earlier this week between the SO/AC and SG C chairs, this version was produced, but I think (unintelligible) the GAC has specifically requested one change. I believe there's also a question on the session on Monday morning, the community forum, where I believe there's also a request to potentially move that to Tuesday.

So I think any input that the Council may have or any of the respective groups on indeed the topics and where these are located and potentially also the question of what of this is unconflicted, I believe those questions should be in by tomorrow as staff is looking to publish the - at least the block schedule so people are aware of what is scheduled or planned in principle when.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you, Marika. Okay, so that was the last bit on Agenda Item 8. And Agenda Item 9 we don't have any hands going up for AOB. So we'll - if there are no final comments, we'll move to wrap this meeting up. Okay, thank you. And thanks for your patience for those of you who stayed on a little bit past the top of the hour. I think we have a couple of urgent items, if you note that two items that were deferred to our list which is the communiqué and the Red Cross motion.

We don't want to tackle those in our May meeting; we want to tackle those in the intervening time so please look for the list and also take a look at that block schedule and take a look at the CCWG IG revised charter.

Okay, thank you, everyone, for your work today. Thanks, staff. And we will sign off and keep your eye on the list. Thanks, everyone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Man: Thanks, all. Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, everybody. This concludes today's call. You may now disconnect your lines. And operator, you may stop the recordings. Thank you.

END