

**ICANN**  
**Transcription ICANN Johannesburg**  
**GNSO Wrap-Up Session**  
**Thursday, 29 June 2017 at 13:30 SAST**

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

James: This is the GNSO Council wrap-up session for ICANN 59 in Johannesburg where we go through the action items that we picked up from our meeting yesterday and throughout the week. This is fairly informal session. If folks want to chat about the topics we have or add additional topics to our agenda then feel free to do so. We'll go ahead and get started I think with the first topic which I believe was proposed by Avri which is a discussion on the Cross Community Sessions on geo names. And I believe there's another one in this afternoon right? Okay Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thanks, Avri speaking. So yes I put this – I asked that this be put on the agenda because I really wanted to make sure that the GNSO was sort of apprised of where we are and where we're going and what kind of issues may be coming it's way because of it. In some sense one could say that we start up a hornets nest and it was quite well to do so. And Jeff is here so he will help me when I get too far down the wrong path. He's happily eating popcorn. So we had our first meeting. We had our straw person that turned into a straw horse that was eventually beaten to death.

And but it managed to achieve its purpose. It opened up the discussion. Boy did it open up the discussion. But anyway so...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria:       Oops. That was I - oops. Yes. So at the moment we've sort of been managing how we're going to continue. We've got another three hours of it today where we're not going to proceed with the straw person but basically go through the issues that have come up. The folks that we brought in have talked to like at least 25 different groups of people over the day getting different opinions.

Now one of those things that I wanted to make sure that the council knew is that there's a certain amount of apprehension about first of all was this a GNSO conspiracy? Now we hopefully have explained to people that no, us going doing this was just Jeff and I trying to basically solve some of the issues that we have in a PDP. But it took on a larger thing, so just wanted to alert the council that there may be people that think this was done by the GNSO as a way to preemptively deal with issues whereas it was people within chairing a PDP trying to preemptively deal with issues that we had so I wanted to say that.

I believe that there's also a resurgence in the GAC -- and we have not seen their communiqué yet -- and it won't be coming out today that, you know, they have a lot of advice that they've given before. Now this has really never been acted on and such but they -- it looks like they will be looking for a reaffirmation of this advice that they've given and in a sense sort of acting like advice that they had given in the past having been approved by the board is now in some sense law that constrains what we can and cannot recommend. And it's something that I'm concerned about, wanted to make sure that council was aware of and basically alerts you all to look for it since of course I'll have escaped from the council again by then but ask you - I keep doing this coming for a week, you know, creating a hubbub and then leaving.

But anyway that basically when you see the communiqué and the council is working on its response to it to make sure that, you know, you look at the part

where they talk about previous advice and the degree to which that device is determinative. So just basically didn't want the GNSO Council to be sidelined or hit by any issues without having been warned. I'm not really asking that anybody do anything.

I just wanted to make sure that you are aware that there's a bit of a hornet's nest that was stirred up. There's going to be a lot. Jeff and I still intend to proceed with our Worktrack 5. We still intend to find a way to invite the other SO and ACs to participate in the coordination of it. We've got a certain amount of feedback that said don't call it chairs so we won't call it chairs but to help us coordinate that effort. But we're not really sure yet what shape it will take. That's going to take a little bit more work. And if you want to add anything to my babbling please do.

Jeff Neuman: They always make these too tall. Hi. This is Jeff Neuman. I like the wrap-up session. It's always less formal. Just to add to what Avri said the specific resolution that - or GAC advice that was given I think goes back to 2010. And I don't even remember it or at the time no I guess we didn't really pay as much attention. But the GAC advice was something to the effect of that country names and abbreviations of country names and any reasonable representation of country or territory names is should be decided in a PDP by the ccNSO and the GAC or the PDP should be done - to the ccNSO PDP with input from the GAC. So I somehow we all missed that but that is what they are trying to bring back or some of them.

I think it needs to be made clear that a ccTLD according to RFC 1591 is two characters. That's the jurisdiction of the ccNSO. Everything else is a gTLD within the jurisdiction of the GNSO. So I think that's - that if I can anticipate what their communiqué is going to say I would say that that would be part of the response you all may want to consider.

Apart from that there is consternation from other groups about participating in a GNSO PDP. And so what Avri and I have been doing is going around trying

to figure out exactly what the concerns are other than just being under a label of a GNSO PDP. One of those is the fear that a GNSO PDP will be stacked with mostly GNSO people so when votes are taken it's, you know, the other groups are going to be drowned out. I tried to explain that as a working group especially one that Avri and I are participating in -- and we've done this many times before -- we generally do not take votes. We don't take polls. We and if we do try to gauge the consensus of the group it is not by individual person but by, you know, by group, sorry by, you know, we look at, you know, if there were let's say 100 registrars and two IPC members we're not going to go, oh, well the vote was 100 to two and therefore there's consensus, no. We look at the groups.

So to alleviate that some members wanted it to be -- may want it to be more structured like a CCWG where there's official people that are allowed to vote if there ever a vote which we do not plan to have a vote. My view as one of the co-chairs of the group is I really don't care how that group is structured in terms of voting because we don't intend to vote. So there may be some unique things that we do within our this sub group or this worktrack that may not be the norm or conventional but are going to be done with the goal of enticing other groups to come and participate. I think that is the most important thing. So when you, you know, I certainly encourage the GNSO and all the groups to watch what's going on. Obviously if you have any concerns let us know but really are what we're trying to achieve is getting participation from everyone so thanks.

James: Okay thanks. It's a very hot mic. So we'll call that hornets' nest number one. If I'm -- I think we've got about four more buzzing around and I Paul in the queue. Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady for the record. So a couple -- one issue about what Jeff has said if the -- in the event that you stray too far from the average way that the average PDP works in Worktrack 5 maybe I happened to be the liaison for this PDP, maybe the three of us could talk. And if it's too weird it

needs to go back to council but, you know, just depends on how weird that, you know, the difference is.

I do think Worktrack 5 in inviting the co whatever they're going to be called to participate is as much of an olive branch as we can do. We can't make people participate if they don't want to nor can we change the nature of how PDPs work to accommodate people who, you know, want to have their inputs but they want to have them only in their own way. But I agree a little flexibility makes sense.

As for the issue that Avri raised I'll say something really impolitic. I think that the GAC advice that has been issued since the GNSO principles were adopted I think at 2007 in Paris have in significant ways deviated from GNSO Council policy. And so therefore I think the same level of discretion that they've shown us we should show them.

(Jess): Thank you. (Unintelligible).

James: Yes go ahead (Jess).

(Jess): Yes real quick on the first point. I won't touch the second one. You know on - the truth is there's actually nothing in the PDP guidelines that really address how the internal workings of a group or subgroup work. So I don't know what the norm is. You know, I mean I've been in a lot of PDPs but I take your point that if it gets too weird you'll certainly be there and others. But again there's - if this is ever something, you know, we're just trying to find different models within the overall framework that's established that will provide incentives for others to participate.

James: And thanks (Jess). And I think if I can channel what Paul's saying is that you know we are all recognizing that this is an interesting situation and you guys are coming up I think with some creative approaches to try and bridge some of those divides. But, you know, the ICANN culture sometimes is if you've

done something once then it now becomes a requirement for all future PDPs that something follow that because it'll be cited as precedent and whatever. And we're just I think trying to avoid, you know, going too far afield I think to Paul's point so...

(Jess): Unless it works great in which case it might be a good thing...

James: Well...

(Jess): ...maybe.

James: But and I just note that we have a long list of topics and folks, you know, we've got a lot of – and we've got more hornets' nest so we'll go Greg and then Heath and then we've got to probably move on.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan and I'll be brief. I think that the issue that Jeff brought up and I've – I think it's the outgrowth of something I observed in the CCWG accountability I think there's a fundamental misunderstanding in the rest of the community about what the GNSO as compared to what the other groups are.

The other groups are essentially affinity groups. The governments are in a group. The ccTLD operators are in a group. The end-user representatives are in a group but we're not that kind of a group. We're a supporting organization. The S doesn't stand for stakeholders. It stands for supporting and our job. And the reason we're all brought together from disparate groups is to do exactly what is - we recognize which is policy development for the gTLD space. So we get treated many ways like as if we're an affinity group. Essentially the GAC views us as some sort – like them. We're an affinity group of the private sector or something like that.

But that's just not what we are and I think there needs to be some positive educational outreach and maybe just needs to be as Paul said we just need

to say this is what we are, this is what we do, this is why we exist. You know, it's as fundamental to the existence of ICANN as any other element, maybe more fundamental is that we are here to do this job. We're not an affinity-based group. We're a job-based group so we have a job to do. Thanks.

James: Thanks Greg. Heath?

Heath Dixon: Heath Dixon. In the process mapping meeting this morning which if you haven't looked at the process for the PDP process the map that they – the flow that they put together you should probably take a look at that because they're going to be publishing that at the ICANN 60 meeting to as a way to help educate people about how the PDP process works. The point I wanted to make though is that one of the three questions that they came up with as far as things that are broken or that they don't know how they work one of them that they identified this morning was the problem of getting advisory committee advice after a policymaking process has happened to collide. And so it's a problem that they already identified. And one of the solutions that I think they're looking for is how do we fix the policymaking process to get advisory committees to give their advice earlier on?

So this is not just an opportunity to deal with this issue in this PDP. It's also a good time for us to be thinking a little bit bigger on how do we want to try to get the governments involved earlier so that we're not having a repeated process of fighting with them after the fact? So we should not only look at it this time but also be thinking kind of bigger about what that precedent could be.

James: Thanks Heath. And just to note that getting advice earlier in the process including in particular from the GAC has been an ongoing project including now resulted in the position of a liaison and the quick look mechanism and type of lead, the monthly one pagers that are sent out on all these, you know, so but always open to more avenues for that. Okay Michele and then we've got to move on. We've spent...

Michele Neylon: That's fine.

James: ...a half an hour on the first topic, first bullet. Okay all right thanks. The July meeting calendar you saw the note. This is a follow-up for our discussion. You saw the note from (Natalie) that the document cut off for the July 13 meeting will be on the 3rd and we'll proceed then with our standard meeting although we just got a compressed timeframe as far as getting documents and motions submitted.

I think because of the change if someone has a motion that maybe the language isn't 100% hashed out yet, you know, we have in the past used placeholder motions that are, you know, that are – we understand are going to be edited or amended as we go. And I think that's certainly something that we could entertain given the lateness of the change.

We are leaving the 20th on the calendar but again if there are no petitions to reject the budget including from the GNSO then we will not need the meeting on the 20th. Okay standing committee on budget and operations I don't see Ed. Okay so this is a proposal from Ed to rather than be deadline oriented when it comes to approving the budget our new role as I said in the empowered community requires us to maybe be a little bit more engaged throughout the budget and operating plan, a strategic plan process. So can we go to the list with volunteers? Do we want to do that at the table? Do we want to – yes go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just a question. What would the volunteers do because I guess step - first step for them would be to actually draft a kind of charter or working agreement because I guess there needs to be a common understanding of how the group would operate, how members are selected and what they're supposed to produce, at least have an idea of what is involved.

James: I honestly, you know and I don't mean to speak too much out of line here but I really would hope that we could make this a lightweight and informal process without going through the whole thing. If folks are ready and willing to contribute to the review of the budget on behalf of the GNSO I think that we should welcome that and that we could have one person designated maybe as a lead or as a coordinator and that the first step for that group once it's formed and self-organized would be to report back to the GNSO what it believes its work calendar will look like, you know, as we prepare for fiscal year '19 budget. Yes Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Maybe with – I noted that the ccNSO actually has a standing group. Maybe we can just look at what they've put together as their kind of operating rules of program and that may be just a copy paste exercise to some extent.

James: Yes absolutely. We'll make sure that anybody who wants to volunteer we'll say look at what the other groups are doing. Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes Wolf-Ulrich speaking thank you. Well it's a raised question. Is this a committee then which includes all the input from the constituencies and stakeholder groups should that or is that a on top of that so just looking from council's point of view and then combining that? That is a basic question for them.

James: Yes so the way we've done this in the past is that the council has commented on those aspects of the budget or the operating plan that affects the council or the GNSO generally. And that has not prevented any stakeholder group or constituency from submitting their own comments so it's not meant to preempt or supersede any of those stakeholder group comments. It's just that we as a council are often kind of linked to the party in that and we're trying to give further ahead of that. This group could certainly remind all the stakeholder groups and constituencies about that calendar and when those comments will be due but it wouldn't replace that. Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Paul McGrady. So would this committee be comprised solely of councilmembers or could we, you know, bring volunteers from our own groups to sit on this committee because we have, you know, some people who are very interested in this topic and follow what they'd be a much better committee member than perhaps the council rep?

James: So based on my previous response I think it should be limited to counselors because that's for the perspective of the GNSO. And if we have someone who is not a counselor then I think that that could be certainly brought to this committee and said look here's what we're doing in the IPC or the registrars and bring those folks in. But again I – I'm speaking to an idea that's not mine so I'm trying to kind of fill in some blanks as I go along but I feel like this could be a fairly lightweight and open-ended process to anyone that wanted to contribute. I don't think we would turn away anyone at the door. Yes Susan?

Susan: Quick comment.

James: I got Michele and then Susan.

Susan: Oh I'm sorry.

James: No go ahead, Susan and Michele...

Susan: Okay.

James: ...and Donna. Okay. Could we scroll the list so I can see the queue please? I'm sorry I can't...

Susan: I didn't put my hand up but in the SSC the Standing - Selection Standing Committee -- whatever it is -- we don't -- didn't restrict it to just councilors. It is part of those communities so...

James: Okay but again this group with replace the ability for stakeholder groups. That's different. The SSC is replacing and is exclusively making decisions on behalf of all the stakeholder groups. And this is just a council perspective on the budget and on the operating plan. There's – if there's a stakeholder group that has something to say that even – may even contradict what the councilor is saying all of that is fair game. So it's not closing the door to any of those other folks who want to do it, who want to weigh in on the budget. But you know what let's not try to build it here.

Let's maybe get some folks together and start working through these issues and maybe they'll come back to us and say we need some guidance on this here. You're going to have to paint us a roadmap. And I think as Marika pointed out other groups have already formed similar committees. Maybe they've already answered some of these questions as well. Michele and then Donna.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James, Michele for the record. Wasn't this idea floated by a member of council and...

James: (Ed)...

Michele Neylon: ...where is that person?

James: He's – I don't know. He's not here.

Michele Neylon: No I just – because I think this is part of the problem that you as chair are having is that you're trying to defend somebody else's idea and that person isn't here. I agree. I mean this – some – I like the idea of the GNSO council being – having a small group of people looking at the budget and preparing some kind of commentary or feedback or whatever but it sounds there like it's becoming some other kind of structure of its own and becoming much more complicated which I don't think we really, really want. And I think we want something like when we have the several counselors getting together to

respond to the GAC communique --, that kind of thing. So I just don't want this to become some over engineered new little structure that needs to be managed. Thanks.

James: Yes and maybe the word that's tripping everyone up is the standing committee part because now we start to think of it in the same vein as other standing committees when really what we're talking about is just like a working group of councilors to take this on because the way we're doing now is not working. It's not comprehensive enough and it's not timely. And we're just trying to think of ways to do that. And again as you point out this was I'm trying to state that this my understanding from how it was described to me by (Ed). Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks James, Donna Austin. I basically support you in the fact that I don't think this is something that we need to go out outside council for. The Registry Stakeholder Group does have a smaller group that looks at the budget on a pretty, you know regular basis. But this is specifically about the council. It's not about the stakeholder group so I think it makes more sense to have dedicated group of counselors looking at this.

James: Yes thanks. And I think if you look at our previous comments on the budget they've been very narrowly limited to just to those issues that affect the council on not weigh in on those issues that drive other stakeholder groups and constituencies so but we'll hash that out a little bit more and maybe some of these questions could be addressed by the person who tabled the idea and maybe a couple of other volunteers if folks want to help.

Next is the update on the revised bylaws and do we have the folks who are working on that here? Marika? Well I don't know if like – okay go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika and I'm happy for others to chime in but this is basically a staff update as the pen currently sits with staff. So a couple of slides are

coming up and maybe (Emily) you want to know do the full screen and then when I'm done go back to the small screen because it's easier for everyone and I think for everyone to see. I think I'm probably move the slides here.

So just to very briefly capture everyone remembers where this all comes from. Basically in June anticipating the new post transition bylaws. The council tasked the drafting team to fully identify all the new or additional rights and responsibilities that the GNSO has on their revised bylaws. So the group has asked to look at, you know, one needs to be in place in order for the GNSO to take up its role as an additional participant in the empowered community. In October the - that group submitted its final report to the GNSO council which did include a minority report which you may recall there was some difference of views on the role that the GNSO Council would take in that. But apart from that the group did identify all the different aspects of the bylaws that would require some kind of change or at least agreement on how the GNSO as a community would fit in and take decisions.

So following that the council accepted the recommendations and directed ICANN staff to draft proposed language for any necessary modifications to the GNSO operating procedures and/or ICANN's bylaws. And I think it was an issue foreseen that we would come back with our findings quicker than what happened in the end. But actually working through it staff identified a number of questions, we made a number of assumptions and it was some - the legal assessment which was also requested that was done. And that also identified a couple of issues with the recommendations of the bylaws drafting team. So with all that staff went back to the bylaws drafting team to work through those issues, you know, confirm those assumptions. And based on that conversations which happened in April and May of this year - this year so it's be 2017 not 2016. They don't travel back in time.

We then I think it was two weeks ago or a little bit less than two weeks ago we actually published the proposed revisions to the GNSO operating procedures and ICANN bylaws for public comment. So the proposed changes

that are intended to implement the drafting team recommendations basically are - can be summarized in six different categories. So first of all there are quite a few recommendations that don't require any changes as the existing procedures of simple majority vote of the GNSO council and/or other aspects of the operating procedures provide sufficient guidance. And also some new structures have been created in the meantime that are addressing some of the aspects of the new bylaws. And I'm specifically referring here to the Standing Selection Committee which has taken on this role of making recommendations to the GNSO Council with regards to review teams and as well some of the other structures that are foreseen under the new bylaws.

There are number of new voting thresholds that are recommended to be added to the GNSO or to the ICANN bylaws to the specific section in there that deals with the GNSO. As you all know there are a number of voting thresholds that are called out there that deviate from the standard simple majority voting threshold. And again the voting thresholds that are included there are those that are - have been recommended by the Bylaws Drafting Team to deal with some of the decisions that are foreseen as part of the GNSO's role as a decisional participant.

There is a proposed revision to the consent agenda. There was a recommendation from the Bylaws Drafting Team that in certain cases and if I recall well I think that deals specifically with petitions for inspection. Those - there should be an ability for stakeholder groups and constituencies to put those forward without an ability for council or other groups to block those. So but at the same time and that was something that was for example identified as part of the legal assessment there is a need for a GNSO decision as decisional participant as stakeholder groups and constituencies are not a decisional participant. So the approach that we've taken in consultation with the Bylaws Drafting Team to have a system whereby these items would go automatically to the consent agenda without an ability the ability for anyone to remove that apart from the maker of that petition or someone, a proxy or an alternate that has been put in place. Again it's a solution that we thought met

the intent of the Bylaws Drafting Team but if you have any ideas of how that would work in a different way we're more than happy to take that under consideration.

Something we already mentioned I believe the other day is a waiver that it contains a specific section on the GNSO's role in the empowered community and also this aspect of a waiver that in specific circumstances and in relation to specific sections of the ICANN bylaws the GNSO Council may waive the time frames in relation to the submission of motion as well as scheduling of meetings to be able to meet its obligations as a decisional participant. Again probably not the ideal solution but the best one we were able to come up with in consultation with the bylaws drafting team to be able to meet the timeframes that are in there as they're definitely very much out of scope with what we currently have as requirements for submissions of motions and scheduling of meetings and those type of aspects.

Then there's also this notion of a petition by individuals via stakeholder groups and constituencies. There is the bylaws foresee that individuals should have the ability to submit petitions. The way that the Bylaws Drafting Team has suggested that happens that it would go through a GNSO Stakeholder Group or constituency and then through the GNSO Council for consideration. This does mean that each GNSO Stakeholder Group or constituency will need to develop their rules for the submission of such petitions by individuals and at least the understanding is that individuals means anyone, doesn't necessarily need to be a member of a stakeholder group or constituency. And again that's probably an area where further work needs to be done also by the GNSO Council because as you see for the next item for petitions that concern a direct or removal process those also need – individuals also need to have the ability to submit those directly to the GNSO Council so there again the GNSO Council is expected to develop a clear process and rules for how the submission would work and as well how such a petition would then be considered.

In addition to that there are number of processes and steps that will require some further work that the report refers to that as well development of templates. There may be some cheat sheets or things like that for all these new roles and responsibilities that are in existence. But that is probably that would come some - would come after approval of the new operating procedures and bylaws. But that there is definitely additional work that will need to be done to really make sure that everyone understands what is required when someone wants to submit a motion, what kind of information is required to be submitted as part of certain actions because there's a lot of detail as you all know in the new bylaws.

We did take advantage of including some other updates in the operating procedures because there were some, a number of outstanding items that were kind of put on hold because we didn't want to put the operating procedures out, you know, every two weeks. But also we took advantage by including a number of references because of course reference in the bylaws had changed and we're still referring to the old bylaws. We updated the generalized schedule for board elections to align with the new timing as well as notification requirements. That's something we realized when the last board elections happened.

We included the references to the GAC Quick Look mechanism and again it was a result of the GNSO GAC Consultation Group recommendations. And then we also included the references to the inclusion of a draft PDP working group charter in the preliminary issue report. And that was one of the outstanding recommendations from the GNSO improvements project that we ran.

So what is next? These documents were published for public comment. They're in redlined version to facilitate your review and see what has changed. It also is accompanied by the staff report that really goes through each of the bylaws drafting team recommendations and explains the assumptions that staff made and what changes were made as a result of

those recommendations. It also includes of course reference to the drafting team, the final report itself.

The comment forum closes on the 10th of August, was given quite some time but again, you know, there is one way of course a pressure because as long as you haven't adopted these changes you will be operating under the existing GNSO operating procedures are bylaws so most of your decisions as in empowered community participant are simple majority. But at the same time of course it's important to get this right so if additional time is needed, you know, let us know that there's no fixed reason why we picked the 10th of August. We thought it hopefully would give you second sufficient time.

So once the public forum closes and staff will produce a summary of the comments received and basically hand it back to council and then it will be for you to make a determination what needs to happen next. Should the Bylaws Drafting Team come back together and look at those comments and see if anything needs to be changed, do you want to direct staff to look at the comments and make proposed recommendations? If everyone's happy with it you may just be able to move forward to the next step and consider the proposed changes for adoption.

As it also involves the changes to the ICANN bylaws it will also require the ICANN board then to subsequently consider those proposed changes. And I believe that's also accompanied then by another public comment period. And then once that all has happened the revised documents will enter into force and as said there's then some additional work that has been identified which would then commence. And I think that's all I had and the links to all the information.

James: Thanks Marika. First off thanks to the Drafting Team. This has been a huge chunk of work and the staff of course as well. I think the key thing to note here is that the comment period is open until August 10. We are really tinkering under the hood here folks so make sure your stakeholder groups

and constituencies very carefully review these proposed bylaw changes. And if they have comments gets them into the comment. And if they have concerns that they want to make sure that we take on board, you know, that needs to be done as part of this comment period.

And I think to Marika's point we are operating under the, you know, existing bylaws until we have new ones. And that means we are kind of I want to say sort of voiceless in the empowered community or we would just go through just our standard GNSO operating which is somebody would make a motion and if it passes then bingo, you know< there goes the GNSO as a decisional participant. And I know that that's putting there's not a lot of safeguards between a very important lever of power and kind of a more routine operating procedure. So take a look and make sure you get your folks to review it and send in their comments. Looking to see if there is a queue and there isn't. And I think everyone just kind of recognizes this is super important and we need to be - proceed thoughtfully. Okay and thanks again.

Next up is the – where' my agenda list, shopping list go? There we go. Next up is the update on the implementation of the PDP Working Group Chair support pilot project. Is that going to be Steve can provide an update on that? Steve go ahead. We had some things happen recently. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks James. This is Steve Chan from staff. Counselors may be aware there was a request by the GNSO Council for a pilot in support of PDP Working Group travel support that request for to the FY '18 additional budget process was approved by the ICANN board. And so that resulted in travel support for up to four Working Group, PDP Working Group leaders per ICANN meeting. So what has happened is the GNSO Council leadership has prepared a framework for this pilot. It's actually sitting on the Drafts page. I'll share link for that after I stop talking.

With that framework intends to do a layout the eligibility requirements, the selection process, what benefits are provided to travelers, what requirements

are – there are for approved travelers and things like that. So the intention is to for James presumably to send a note to the PDP working group chairs with this framework and to essentially invite candidates for this pilot program. The date that we envisioned for submission to this process is somewhere around the middle of January or – not January, July -- so relatively short timelines. That's a result of the constituency travel deadlines they need. They're approved travelers by the 30th of July for with in context of ICANN 60. So it is relatively short timelines but, you know, there is a pretty small pool of eligible candidates because it's PDP leadership. I think that's about it so as I said I'll put the link to the framework in the Chat right now. Thanks.

James: Thanks Steve. And just a reminder that this is for folks who wouldn't otherwise be supported. I know a lot of folks are a PDP Chair or co-chair vice chair but they're also like the counselor or they're a member of the CCWG or something that, you know, they would've been here anyway. This is for folks who would otherwise be absent. And just because we have four slots allocated doesn't mean we would use all four.

It's up to four so this is a pilot program. We're going to try this for the fiscal year and see what happens. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks James, Michele for the record. I think this is a fantastic initiative and I'm delighted to see this. I mean one of the barriers for participation within the ICANN circus is the cost of attending meetings in person. It doesn't matter whether you're a registrar, a registry, noncommercial -- whatever any group. There is a cost. There is a's cost associated with it both in time, flights, hotels -- everything else. So being able to provide some support to people means that the people who might not otherwise step up to a position of leadership in a PDP or something like that might be feel a little bit more comfortable because otherwise we run the risk that we're only going to see independently wealthy well-funded or retirees. Not that I've got anything against retirees don't get me wrong but I'm - before anybody murders me but it – we do run

the risk that we're going to reduce the volunteer base even more than we already have. Thanks.

James: Thanks Michele, absolutely. And, you know, to that point this is where the policy development happens. We should put our money where our priorities are and support that work. Heather go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks James, Heather Forrest. Michele to your point I thought it was very interesting and a number of us were lamenting in that session that we had with the GAC, GNSO council and the GAC. There seems – we moved on to a new level of community perception beyond though. We kind of jokingly James, Donna and I think that, you know, there's this perception out there that the contracted parties swim in vaults of money at lunch time. And the GAC banging on and on about resources and how few resources they have and the ALAC sort of jumped onto that and it's true.

But I mean we as the GNSO need to make clear when we can and then we get banged on the head when we do it but we're not rolling in money here either. We seem to be the ones that are kind of identified as, you know, oh well you're exempt from this problem. So to the extent that we can and the opportunities when we can we don't want to cry poverty here but we do need to make it clear that we're not rolling in dough in this regard so...

Michele Neylon: And Heather thank you. It's Michele just responding. I mean I think there's a - there is a misperception at times or misconception I beg your pardon that just because you're a registrar or registry or some other kind of corporate entity that you have a lot of resources. We have - on the registrar side we have registrars who only have two or three staff. We have registrars whose core business is something completely unrelated. And, you know, getting those people to attend an ICANN meeting or to actually engage actively in policies that are going to impact our business is hard work.

James: Thanks Michele. Thank you Heather. I think yes that was a really strange takeaway from that discussion that only the GNSO has sufficient resources to do its job which has always left us little head scratching. It's right up there with you guys are doing your work too quickly which also kind of makes me scratch my head so anyway but thanks.

And we have this pilot program. We'll be sending out a note to those PDP leaders. So those of you who are either liaison or chairs or co-chairs just be a heads up that that's going to be coming. Donna go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks James. I missed most of the session with (Sally)'s team earlier on in the week and I'm looking forward to reading the transcript because I think feedback I got was that went in a little bit hard so that's not such a bad thing. But I also went to the ops budget session yesterday and some of the reason or the rationale for providing fellows with funding for three ICANN meetings is so they can get engaged in PDPs. And I did make the point that it's very difficult to engage in a PDP if you don't have a strong interest in the subject matter. And just giving somebody funding to turn up to three meetings isn't actually going to result in longevity of somebody sticking around to being a PDP.

So it will be interesting. I think (Sally) is supposed to come back to us with some stats but if the rationale for providing fellowship funding is to get people involved in a PDP maybe we should be looking to the people who are actually involved in the PDPs and seeing how we could support them to turn up to ICANN meetings so that we can progress the work.

James: Thanks Donna, well said. Okay. Let's – oops I'm sorry I'm just noticing Heather's point in chat. Let's move onto the next item here which is planning for ICANN 60. Heather and Donna and I just prior to this meeting attended the kickoff for ICANN 60. It seems like we're getting a little bit better at this or maybe it's because we're starting earlier about the block schedules are starting to kind of already be mostly filled in and we're not looking at a blank

page right out of the gate. I think we have some – certainly we have quite a bit to discuss. There's still you know a process if we were submitting topics for sessions and certainly agendas need to be hashed out.

A number of other folks from other SOs and AC's as well as stakeholder group and constituency chairs were present in the room. There is a work plan to get us, get a finalized schedule for ICANN 60 published I believe in was September 20 was the date I heard was that was the final cut off for changes. So working backwards from there I think, you know, you can see over the next coming months that the schedule for ICANN 60 will start to take shape.

And I think the only other thing to note is that it also includes a gala and a farewell for Steve Crocker. So and just be, you know, no spoiler alert be prepared for those types of activities in Abu Dhabi. Okay Heather go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks James. I think one thing that would be helpful to note as well was this discussion we had tacked on at the very end about should the community be more involved in as I see it there are probably two angles and you were helpful in trying to merge those into one really this idea.

James: So you think I was anti-helpful right?

Heather Forrest: No. No I think maybe...

James: I think it may be an issue but...

Heather Forrest: I think you make good points about should the community be more involved in how - has the process of how we choose meetings venues and the actual selection of meeting venues. And James, you know, made some interesting interventions there around does that open up a kettle of fish and how do we do that? There was also some interesting comments made from other SOs and ACs representatives about, you know, dealing with this in the context of the fact that we have new gender representation efforts and we're a new

independent ICANN and all of this sort of thing. So just for everyone in the GNSO to know that this has been thrown out to us. (Martin)'s shaking his head and he was there too. Looking around the room there are a few folks that we weren't there alone today it - just to let everyone know that that's on the table for discussion. Thanks.

James: Yes good point Heather. And maybe what we could do - and I'm kind of asking you and Donna and others who were there does it make sense to circulate that request to the list for discussion? Yes so let's - Marika can you and your team capture that and we'll circulate that to the list? But it's bigger than just, you know, how we plan for meetings. It's also about, you know, what are some red flags and what are some deal breakers for certain regions, cities places?

And I think ICANN has some criteria and they're asking us are those still operative? Do we need to revisit them, revise them? Are they causing, you know, are they causing problems? So we'll get that to circulate to the list. I've got a queue coming up now so next up is Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the transcript. Considering what's happening in Hyderabad or having a lot of schedule conflict could we just throw away that schedule and start from scratch instead of giving it consideration or even considering it a starting point? Just throw it away and start with a blank page. I think it will be more comfortable that way. Thanks.

James: Thanks Rubens. And I can assure you that no one, particularly the folks who are on the hook to plan this thing wants to see anything closely resembling the experience we had at Hyderabad. My initial take and again this is a very, very early rough cut is it looks more like a Copenhagen schedule with it's some sort of a hybrid between Copenhagen but with the length of the Hyderabad meeting. So and the number of high interest topics or community across community discussions are cut way, way down. I believe there were eight in Hyderabad, -- way too many.

So but it's still very much a work in process but your point is taken. Nobody wants to go down that road again. Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich from the ISPC Constituency. I couldn't participate in that session just before because we had our own meeting. My question is as we are also already starting to prepare our outreach events for Abu Dhabi for example so is there already six to date for the GNSO day for that because I think the ICANN meeting started on Saturday and goes to Friday so is there a day? If not so I would like to ask for keeping out, leaving out this Sunday.

James: So you don't want us to meet on a Sunday?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes Saturday would be better. But that's just a question.

James: There - no...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, just a question so...

James: Well it's not very settled right now. I think...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

James: ...that could have a ripple effect on other things like if the CCWGs want to meet or if they're face to face PDPs they're going to meet on Saturday which means our working day would have to meet on Sunday. But we can work that through. It's just that date has not been set. The date of the council meeting I believe that was still Wednesday.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So my request is more -- Wolf-Ulrich speaking -- that it should be fixed as soon as possible that we are could be clear with regards to our own plans. That's one. The other question is while this meeting was different here right now but it happened that constituency meetings could just take place after

the council meeting and that shouldn't happen anyway in the follow-up meeting in Abu Dhabi so the plan should be that the council meeting or that the constituency meetings should be placed prior to the council meeting. Thanks.

James: I think that's how the current block schedule is but again everything is very much in flux but I think that's how it's currently drafted out. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks James. I know we're talking about ICANN 60 but I'm kind of interested to get a feel from the room about how you feel about ICANN 59 and whether the policy form is, you know, whether it works. I expect that it's going to continue. I think it's kind of locked in now but to the extent that we can make improvements in the scheduling or try to do things a bit better will be really helpful. I mean the idea behind this meeting B was to progress policy so are we meeting that objective would be really good to get some feedback. Thanks.

James: Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thanks James. And I don't want to foreclose the opportunity to respond to Donna. Donna do you want folks to reply on the list or now or...

Donna Austin: No. No, that doesn't (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: I mean I'm happy in answering Donna's question. I'd say the opportunity to do real work face to face is brilliant. I think that aspect of the policy forum is great. I think in principle having a shortened meeting is brilliant but the reality is we've all traveled a pretty significant distance for a very short period of time on the ground and it's a very intensive four days. I feel as exhausted now as I do after the end of a normal length meeting.

And I see for the record lots of nodding heads. And that's either nodding because we're all falling asleep and there's waving and all this. Waving

means awake. We're all exhausted in an unusual level of exhaustion. And add to that, you know, part of the advantage I think in principle having these meetings in venues that maybe can't best support us over that longer is great in principle but that that means extra travel for all of us. And easier on the venue, harder on us maybe is something to be said. So I just put my comments down as a marketer. On the shifting gears a little bit but then I'd encourage everyone to not just take my word for that. Shifting gears to something else about ICANN 60 the conversation that Donna and James and I have been having in the background is - and it's a great segue actually if I can be proud of myself for that.

The length of the meeting yes brain is still on. I can make - I can string a sentence together. It so it - the length of the meeting. So we got into this chat I forget in what meeting where we were about the development day and did we want to have the development date be an extra day?

Given that we have this fantastic new addition in our calendar for next year which Donna and I probably need to say something about because sorry James you won't be with us we have our approved budget for council development or planning sorry, council planning in early 2018. I think I flipped off the question on the list to say what - do we still want to have our council development day at the end of the AGM as we normally do? And I think all three of us instantly replied to that question to say please not another day. So we've kind of floated the idea amongst us.

I think we all quite appreciated the opportunity to get out of the conference room in Hyderabad and do something social and actually get to know each other as people rather than in a formal setting in a conference room hi I'm so-and-so kind of thing. And we also proposed that rather than do that on to take up a whole extra day that maybe we could blend that into an evening and maybe make that the Thursday evening before we all go home rather than stay the extra Friday. We're not fixed necessarily on the day of when

that happens but if we could get - I think it would be very helpful for our planning purposes to get some early feedback on that. Thanks.

James: Thanks Heather. So yes please get some feedback regarding that development day. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks James, Michele for the record. Picking up immediately on Heather's comment about the Developments Day I do like the idea of interacting with other councilors, other people as people as opposed to across the table except on of course when it comes to (Cheryl) because her dragons do scare me a little. No but I think that's a fantastic idea. Adding an extra day headache, nightmare no thank you.

With respect to the format and everything of the policy forum I think in common with others I have a love-hate relationship with it. I do like the idea that it's shorter but it's not - it's we are ending up with ridiculously long days. I couldn't - if I wasn't doing this myself as the owner of a company I would have difficulty getting one of my employees to do that schedule. I've had days where I've been going from, you know, 7:30 8 o'clock in the morning till 7:30 8 o'clock at night. That's insane. I mean and as Heather says everybody's absolutely exhausted.

If it had been stretched out by another day or two that would maybe would've released the pressure though I know people are very good at piling it on. But maybe something that could be looked is to put a hard kind of how do I frame it that you only allow meetings to start from a particular time in the morning and they have to finish by a reasonable time in the afternoon evening. And for so many of these things where it goes into like 7:30 at night which I think is unreasonable. Thanks.

James: Yes actually Michele just to respond I think that that is at least how it's reflected currently there is a block that is called optional early start. And obviously that's optional but nothing were to occur prior to that. And then I

think that the blocks then go to what you're saying, you know, in the late afternoon early evening -- stuff like that. So we've got a couple of folks in the queue. We have a couple more topics we have to cover and we have 20 minutes to do so. So next up is Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady. I apologize for missing part of this. But the development session we're talking about for Abu Dhabi is - do we have to do it in conjunction with the longest meeting or could we push it to one of the two shorter meetings? I mean and I'm not just asking for an extra day in Puerto Rico although they appear that way. Thank you.

James: Thanks Paul. I think it was just meant to kick off the new council which is usually seated at the end of the third meeting which is the longest meeting so I guess, you know, it's really that's good meeting feedback. Let's, you know, let's start the conversation on the list of those kinds of ideas. Would it make sense to go a few meetings and then have a develop development session? Okay Darcy?

Darcy Southwell: Thanks James, Darcy Southwell. About the policy -- well I guess it's policy forum we're calling this right? It seems like this one is a lot busier than Helsinki and maybe that's just me. But I feel like there's a lot more conflicts and maybe there's something about how it was structured block-wise in Helsinki. But I think that was easier to accommodate.

It was just as tiring as Heather's talking about so that wasn't better. But you still crammed a lot into four days. But maybe when we talk about how it's actually blocked it felt like there was a lot more going back and forth this time.

James: Thanks Darcy, good feedback. And then everyone else if you have feedback send it through. Marika also just reminded me going to Paul's previous comment Marika just reminded us that we have a pilot program for a council strategy session in January. So maybe skip the dev session in Abu Dhabi and instead, you know, if it's going to be someplace cool, you know, then you

have your council development session at that strategy session. That might be, you know, move that – take it out of the ICANN calendar, put it on the calendar.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

James: You did.

Woman: Yes.

James: Why? Just now?

Woman: Yes. (Unintelligible) in the chat.

((Crosstalk))

James: Well I thought - It's in the chat now.

Woman: Yes.

James: All right well I'm trying to follow a couple different things. And to Michele's point if you add more days to the calendar people are just going to fill them up. Yes okay. Let's then move - okay. Let's just move then past my own multitasking self here and go to the next item which is the chair election timeline as Heather noted that this will be my rotation off. I'm term limited. I think neither Heather nor Donna are term limited.

We'll have new counselors coming on and per the new election procedures that we adopted they will also be eligible to run. So we actually don't know who's all eligible. But here's the - here's a rough outline of the timeframe.

So this is the first block here. We're announcing that this is a proposed procedure and timeline, about 60 days away from the election. We'll know

who the NonCom has selected and we'll know the results of all the stakeholder group and constituency elections. The houses can then begin to make their nominations and submit those looks like in 2nd of October is when we'll need the houses to submit those nominees. The candidates then will have ten days to – no I'm sorry, 12 days to submit their candidate statements. And those would occur at the ICANN meeting in Abu Dhabi, those candidate meetings. The election would occur if you recall I think that was on the date of the council meeting and then afterwards the council informed support. And I think we – so my only concern so there's a missing piece here is that we say one election held there's actually a – it's a two-step dance as I recall. There's the election for chair because that determines who in the houses would then be eligible and interested in vice chair. So because I know that some of the different houses have different arrangements. Like, you know, if a registrar becomes a chair then the registry puts forward the vice chair. And I think the same thing happens to non-contracted party house. So I think maybe if we can take that step where it says election held it was like you know election chair, election vice chairs yes.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Actually the election of vice chairs is actually internal kitchen for the houses so that usually sometimes indeed they can immediately confirm it upon the election of the chair. So in cases it either has to wait a bit longer because it depends on the outcome of the chair election but it's not part of this processes as such.

James: I just wanted to see it on the schedule. That's all.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The point is there's no schedule for that.

James: You win. It says election it's an election. Okay I was trying to, you know, but I get it, you win -- persistence. Okay any – any way we can – we've circulated this or were going to circulate this on the list. Take a look there, make sure that it conforms to your expectations and your stakeholder group's understanding of the process. Hi Phil. Go ahead.

Phil Corwin: Yes quick question. On the chart it appears that the stakeholders and constituencies have to inform the council of the results of their election by September 1. Is that correct? I'm asking because the BC ExCom met yesterday talking about what my seat is up for reelection. I plan to stand again. But we were kind of on your September election. Obviously if we need to inform council by September 1 we need to hold that election over the summer. So I just wanted to...

James: Yes thank you for that.

Phil Corwin: ...confirm that.

James: Yes.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think the 1st September date is a target date because under the procedure that was recently revised now incoming councilmembers also have the ability to be nominated. So the idea is the later that happens the least likely probably is that the houses will know that someone is available or elected to actually stand for that position. So again that's really up to the stakeholder groups and constituencies to determine what fits their timeline. And I think you need to factor in that indeed those incoming councilmembers are also able to stand so if there's little notice there may not be considered by the houses as a result.

James: Okay thanks. Yes it might be worth having that conversation Phil in the BC about moving up that calendar. Okay any other thoughts? It looks like we've got a blank empty queue.

Next up is the volunteers for review of the GAC communiqué. We don't have a GAC communiqué yet unless it posted while we - since the time we set down in this meeting. And no one? Okay but yes Michele go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I'll just – I'll volunteer.

James: Oh okay you. I thought you – maybe you heard that there was a communiqué waiting for us on Twitter somewhere.

Michele Neylon: I'm good. I'm not that good.

James: Yes. Yes go ahead Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks James. I have a question – Heather Forrest I have a question. How do we want to take on board if at all these – the feedback that we received from the GAC yesterday as to concerns about us dealing with substance rather than pointing out areas of overlap?

I think that that's something we can certainly consider when we're examining their communiqué. I – it's potentially a fair point. It's also potentially an attempt to draw some boundaries around what they think we can and cannot comment on. And I don't think that's – so I think you could look at it either way. But we don't have a communiqué yet. We have a volunteer and Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl just volunteering as well.

James: Thank you. Rubens and Michele and Paul also volunteering -- fantastic. And just a reminder that the board has said that they find those our response to the GAC communiqué to be very helpful and had asked us to be if possible to be more timely in getting that to the board. So I would just point out if you few volunteer for this please make sure you have the time and the availability to really do the deep dive into the issues that are raised in the communiqué because it is read and it is used. And maybe that statement carries as much if not more weight than what the feedback we got from the GAC is that the board says they like it. So and that's who the recipient is intended to be. Go ahead Heather. Oh, okay Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. It may be helpful as well to discuss the timeline for this. I think the last time around we tried to get it to the board in time for the conversation with the GAC but we somewhat managed but not completely. I checked with my GAC colleagues and they anticipate that that call that happens between the GAC and the board to make sure that both parties understand what is actually in that (vice) hasn't been scheduled yet but they anticipate it will be like in four weeks, probably early August. So the question is is it something that you want to try and get in front of the board before that time which would mean that that would be really short because your next to opportunity for a vote would be the 13th July unless you want to consider this for an email vote for example. So again and maybe we're thinking about a timeline and sort of the volunteers also know what they've signed up for and by when they need to hand in their homework.

James: I actually think that if the goal is to have this done by the document cut off which is the 3rd of July I think that's probably asking too much to be honest. We might have to look at an email vote or we might have to do what we did last time which is send a synopsis to the board as the letter and then adopt the full text of the communiqué at our next available meeting. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks James, Michele for the record. I mean it looks like the GAC communiqué will come out sometime later this afternoon and then everybody is on flights and or holidays or whatever. So yes around timelines and how we actually address that. We need to have so timelines to address it but I don't think we're going to be able to do it on kind of on full conference calls and all that. So doing it by email make sense to me.

James: Okay. Becky?

Becky Burr: I just want to say in terms of timing, well two things. This – the input that you provide is enormously helpful to the board. We really value it. So thank you for doing it and please keep doing it.

We have committed to get our written response back to the GAC at least four weeks before the - prior to the next meeting so at least four weeks prior to Abu Dhabi. So anything that you can do to get it to us in time like I understand it would be great if it was before the call. But if it can't be before the call if it was, you know, in enough time in advance of Abu Dhabi so that we can have it for formulating our responses that's really helpful.

James: Thanks Becky. I think the goal here is to get it to you as soon as possible and to target it as to have it to the board by the call. But if we let our response to one communiqué for an ICANN meeting slip to the next ICANN meeting then we're definitely doing something wrong so okay and now for the last item I'll turn it over to Stephanie and she can expand upon an idea that she raised on the list. Go ahead Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much James. Stephanie for the record, Stephanie Perrin I should – and we have two Stephs here. This is an idea actually that I chatted to a few people about socialize I believe is the dreadful word that describes this activity back in Copenhagen and got some support. And the idea is to duplicate the Ethos Award by producing an award for staff who go above and beyond the call of duty to look after our needs as a multi-stakeholder community.

As a former public servant I know what it's like to serve the public. And I can't imagine what it's like to serve this multi-stakeholder community. I think it's very challenging. We're a difficult crowd and so when you get wonderful service and wonderful support I think it's nice to reward it.

So and I was hoping to get this out by the time Glen retired but sadly we were too busy. So I'm bringing it up now in hopes that if it is supported that we could get it ready for the annual meeting. I did chat with David Olive about it and he seems to think it's a good idea and that we could just replicate the process, mirror the process that we use for the Ethos Award. I did talk to Glen

about it in Copenhagen to see if she was willing to have it named after her. And she loved the idea. So I think of course Glen is always very polite but I still think that she liked the idea so in any case we've got permission to use her name. So there you have it folks. That's the idea and I think it'd an appropriate thing for the GNSO so to grab hold of. Thanks.

James: Thanks Stephanie. We have Donna, Michele, Keith.

Donna Austin: Thanks James, Donna Austin. Stephanie I like the idea but I have several reservations about supporting it. It has the potential to be divisive depending on how you set up the selection process. It could be problematic among staff, becomes a competition. And as somebody who has been on the selection panel for the Ethos Award the last two words it is a very difficult process.

And I don't know how we replicate it for staff because, you know, there's - it's hard enough to do it for a community member but if the panel is replicated the same way that the selection panel is for the Ethos Award I suspect there would be a real (unintelligible) fight in trying to get to who should get the award. So I have – I look I think it's a tremendous idea and I think I agree that staff does a great job. But I have real concerns that it could be divisive in a number of ways and have some unintended consequences. So I look forward to hearing from everybody else but I have some real concerns about it as a former public servant as well.

James: Thanks Donna. Michele and then Keith.

Michele Neylon: Thanks James, Michele for the record. I think Donna's perspective is interesting and it's something I personally haven't thought about until she raised it and I think it is an important thing to consider. Having said that I also think it's very important that we as a community are able to potentially recognize people who are going way beyond what they're being asked to do, what they're being paid to do. But I don't know how on earth you can do that

without, you know, not have caused that potential problem that Donna's mentioned. But I think we should explore it.

I mean there are requests to explore lots of ridiculous things that come to come across our desks or our inboxes. But at this is something I think that actually has genuine merit. Thanks.

James: Thanks Michele. Keith and then Heather.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Keith Drazek, just a point of clarification. Stephanie were you thinking that this would be GNSO specific or sort of communitywide? Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: I was thinking it would be communitywide and so it's up to James I thought if it gets endorsement to discuss it and shop it around with the other stakeholder groups. Just if can respond to Donna I mean I certainly have been on the awards committee's and I've seen them go downhill. And almost anything can be ruined by human interest shall we say. I don't think that that's a good reason to not try though because I think particularly I was sort of in the context of the staff accountability discussion so I thought gosh who the heck ever rewards staff when they go above and beyond? I take Donna's advice on the Ethos. Maybe we don't use the same structure as Ethos. Maybe we come up with a different structure because you do not want this to become a competition between the various groups as to well my stuff's better than your stuff, our support's better than yours, et cetera. I can see that. And then it's serving staff. It's serving other interests. That's something you – that I mean I could go through the list of (thenol) and what's the other one model sins but, you know, that's going to require serious work and a balanced committee.

James: Thanks Keith and Stephanie. Look the queue is growing and I just want to note that we're coming up against our time. This is obviously something that's very interesting and folks want to talk about it. We do have a thread on our list so we don't have to design it here at the table. In fact I would discourage

us from doing that. But we'll go through the list here quickly and then Marika has one other item of AOB so next up is Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks James, Heather Forrest and I'll be quick in light of the time. I wanted to say two things. Number 1 I share Donna's concerns having sat with Donna on that Ethos panel about the mechanisms that are used there. But just having a chat with Donna I think some of that has to do with the Ethos panel. So to the extent we can avoid that that's great. I did want to make a more specific comment which I think is appropriate in light of the fact that I very quickly expressed a very strong amount of support for Stephanie's idea and I want to explain why.

I take on board Donna's concerns but, you know, two things. Number one in the IPC we really struggled with some way to recognize Glen. How do we recognize Glen in a long-standing way? And this seems to me to pick up on some of those things that we really couldn't manage to do through all kinds of structure. So that's objective one that I think this achieves leaving aside how it's achieved.

Objective number two is, you know, I try at every opportunity not because I feel like buttering them up but it's become, you know, incredibly apparent to me sitting at the top of the table and working with James and Donna, even more than it was working as a member of PDP Working Groups and so on and so forth how hard our staff works. And that needs to be acknowledged and in every possible opportunity, not just the platitudes at the end of a meeting of thanks to so and so for doing a great job. I like the idea of away and maybe we just have to acknowledge all of our staff in a more formal way. Maybe that's somehow I don't know how we do this. I appreciate Donna's concerns that she's articulated but I think maybe the staff can take away – you know, two things can be the takeaway from this.

One there's a lasting impression that Glen has made on all of this. And we didn't just want that to end with our goodbye to her. Two there's a long-

standing you know or there's a reason to recognize the effort that staff are putting in here. And both of those taking on board Donna's concerns both of those are very laudable objectives. So Stephanie that's why I was very quick to express such strong support. Thanks.

James: Thanks Heather. And you mentioned IPC. I think the first thing we ought to do is get a trademark on (Glennie)'s and then look into my registrar colleagues to get us in appropriate domain names so that we can start yes. Okay Paul?

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady. I just didn't want to miss the opportunity to agree with Stephanie because Stephanie and I don't always agree on everything. And when we do it such fun. That's right, thank you.

James: Thanks Paul. Phil?

Phil Corwin: I'll be – Phil Corwin for the record. When I originally heard the name The (Glennie) I thought that this proposal is GNSO specific and we're talking about policy support staff because Glen had always been identified with supporting the GNSO. When it becomes ICANN-wide I think we had need a long discussion off, you know, off list from this meeting. But I'm more concerned about the representation of the selection committee, the competition between GNSO support staff and ALAC support staff and GAC support staff and what about the ICANN staff who served the entire community and don't have directory like finance and legal and all of that.

So personally I'm more favorably disposed to exploring a GNSO specific award and more concerned about something that's organization-wide but I'm open to further discussion.

James: Thanks Phil. I think that definitely simplifies the issue and addresses a number of the concerns, maybe not all but a number of the concerns that Donna raised. And I see that folks are agreeing with you in the chat as well.

So limiting it to the GNSO makes this a much more straightforward exercise.  
Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: That wouldn't preclude us from giving an award to oh, I don't know  
constituency travel for instance who support us.

James: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Folks outside. Yes I just pulled that one out of the air. Okay good, thanks.

James: Okay. That – we do have one – I see folks are packing up but Marika has one  
other item of business. It's real short and simple she said. She promised.  
Okay go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'll be very brief. I think as some of you may have heard  
there's some musical chairs going on in the policy staff. Olof Nordling is  
retiring from the GAC Support Team. Rob Hoggarth is taking on his duties.  
And I'm very sad but at the same time very happy to share that Mary will be  
taking over Rob's responsibilities. That doesn't mean that she's off the hook  
for GNSO stuff or doesn't – not yet at least. So we're – this is going to be a  
transition period. Nothing is going to be dropped. We're going to think  
carefully on how we're going to manage the transition, what resources are  
needed. And there's definitely some projects where I'm not letting her go in  
any shape or form. So I just wanted to share that with you because I think  
some of you may have already heard that through the grapevine and that  
she's definitely not going very far away in any case but thank you Mary and  
congratulations.

James: Thanks. Congratulations to Mary. Thank you. Well deserved. Questions? Will  
Mary still be supporting the empowered community or will that transition?  
Okay great because you've been immensely helpful there and that would be  
a tough transition.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

James: Yes the IGOs and Red Cross that we – you can't escape those yet. Yes I know. And yes your last two hires of (Emily) and Amr were home runs so just do that again. Okay thank you and congrats to Mary. Any other times of business? No, okay.

Well thank you everyone. I hope you agree with me when I say that we had a fairly productive time here in South Africa, our Monday session, our council meeting today. We've got tons of action items. We've moved up our calendar so we're in a very tight timeline before next call. And we've got a lot of planning to do between now and July and Abu Dhabi so stick with it.

Please use the list. We don't have to do everything over the phone or face to face. The list is there for us and the more we can decide and discuss and hash out on the list of then these calls and things become formalities. So and just one other note thanks to (Carlos) and staff for planning a very lovely dinner for us here in South Africa. That was also a nice event.

Thank you everyone and (Calvin) yes (Calvin) for the recommendation. Great. All right thanks everyone. We're adjourned. Have a great time for the rest of the time that you're here in Johannesburg and safe trip home.

END