

Marika Konings:GNSO Council Meeting 10 May 2012

Jonathan Robinson:Hi everyone

Bill Drake:Hi everyone

Bill Drake:Glen, Mary will be 15 minutes late

Glen de Saint Gery:thanks Bill, noted

John Berard:someone is typing very loudly

John Berard:should we wait on this until we have a quorum?

David Taylor:sorry late.

Glen de Saint Gery:David can you get on the phone line please

David Taylor:I am on with Brian

Glen de Saint Gery:thank you very much!

Zahid Jamil:ok so we defer - and this may help iron out concerns

Bill Drake:it is customary to follow custom...

Zahid Jamil:agreed!

Mary Wong:Hello, sorry I got stuck in another mtg. Am on now but waiting for operator to connect me ...

Mary Wong:Marika, this is a great visual slide. Thanks!

Bill Drake:Indeed, swank slides, would be helpful to our SG to post...

Glen de Saint Gery:

<http://gns0.icann.org/correspondence/intro-revised-gns0-pdp-14mar12-en.pdf>

David Taylor:awesome slides yes Marika!

Marika Konings:I wish I could claim credit for creating the graphics, but it was a professional who developed those ;-)

Ching Chiao:great slides! just a friendly reminder that the PDF file on the agenda page -- the graphics on slide 9 are mixed up :-)

Mason Cole:yes....it looks like two slides are overlapping

Marika Konings:I'm not sure what the issue is as when I download it looks fine, but I know others have had the same issue. I'll look into it.

Ching Chiao:thanks a lot

Marika Konings:Credit goes to Tom Hodgson, the graphic designer

Carlos:I lost the communication. could the operator recall me, please

Alan Greenberg:Plus the Board always does another public comment before they vote.

Glen de Saint Gery:yes we are calling out to you Carlos

Carlos:thanks Glen. I tried but I couldn't

Glen de Saint Gery:the operator is calling you Carlos

Marika Konings:Yes, Alan, that is correct

Jeff Neuman:So, technically, the Board resolution added potentially 80 days onto every PDP (nearly 3 months)

Jeff Neuman:sorry potentially 84 days

Jeff Neuman:(4 public comment periods)

Alan Greenberg:@Jeff, Yup in my mind (well, a bit less because their own PC or the one the GNSO does prior to approval could be just 21+21)

Carlos:Im connected again, thanks

Mary Wong:If there is flexibility for the Council within the existing process, plus the possibility of SCI referral, we really shouldn't introduce additional procedures/complexity (i.e. no special fast-track process should be needed).

Alan Greenberg:@Mary - minimum presuming NO disagreement on outcome is about 1 year. That, in my mind, confirms the community belief that we cannot move quickly when necessary.

Mary Wong:@Alan, that's why I wondered whether the Council/GNSO itself already had sufficient flexibility to change the time lines (within reason).

Alan Greenberg:Based on my reading, there is NO discretion to go much below that 1 year timing. Short of re-writing the PDP manual and perhaps even the Bylaw section (not really sure if latter is needed, but perhaps).

Wendy Seltzer:of course it can be ignored

Wendy Seltzer:It may be impolitic to do so, but ALAC ExCo's statement is rather over-strong

Thomas Rickert:How can we provide the GAC with a meaningful answer without working on the subject?

Alan Greenberg:@Thomas. That is exactly the question.

Alan Greenberg:@Mary, no problem with that if the DT is folded and a new group today is formed to continue the work.

Alan Greenberg:But just a name change seems a mite petty.

Mary Wong:@Alan, it won't be just a name change. It would involve a call to the community for volunteers. Like I said, maybe it will be largely the same people but it may not, and it would be clear that the group is working on a GNSO issue

Mary Wong:(i.e. second-level protections now a GNSO issue b/c of the Board resolution & not just a GAC request)

Bill Drake:Clean slate

Alan Greenberg:@ Mary - great, then let's do it now and not delay.

Mary Wong:@Alan, that works for me, as long as the new group bears in mind the possibility of a PDP and its work reflects that.

Mary Wong:@Stephane, agree.

Thomas Rickert:DT gives recommendation to the Council!

Wendy Seltzer:Council, not DT

Bill Drake:Council

Jonathan Robinson:I saw it as DT drafts and prepares a response for the council

Yoav Keren:I agree - the council needs to respond based on the advise of the DT

David Taylor:Yes, the DT would prepare the response for the council, that makes sense

Bill Drake:Jeff---everything in that material was "facts"?

Jeff Neuman:I tried to clarify that it was "facts" they presented

Jeff Neuman:Everyone is free to interpret as they see fit

Thomas Rickert: Exactly, Jeff!

Mary Wong:Thanks, Jeff.

Bill Drake:Thanks Jeff...the facts are not necessarily facts, but rather what is claimed to be facts

Thomas Rickert:Status report would be most useful!

Jeff Neuman:Bill - Certain things ARE facts. (i.e., The IOC filed a case against X number of names in 2000 and prevailed.

Jeff Neuman:Or, the RC filed Y number of UDRP cases

Alan Greenberg:Status report is reasonable prior to or for Prague. But does that mean the DT then continues?

Jeff Neuman:Other things may be interpretations

Jeff Neuman:interpretations

Mary Wong:@alan, no.

Alan Greenberg:At this stage, there does not seem to be unanimity on the DT to continue.. And not likely to be so

Jeff Neuman:Mary & NCSG reps, please speak up if you disagree with the approach

Mary Wong:@Jeff, we agree with what Stephane is saying.

Mary Wong:The second-level issue, and who is tasked with doing it, shd be an agenda item for discussion/action at the next Council mtg.

Wendy Seltzer:"the approach" meaning DT comes to council with discussion draft on top-level only

Wendy Seltzer:and Council approves or modifies

Jeff Neuman:Wendy? Do you mean second level

Wendy Seltzer:no, I explicitly mean top-level.

Jeff Neuman:Then We need to re-discuss

Jeff Neuman:The message I got was we continue status quo on second level

Alan Greenberg:Given the PDP, no purpose in 1sr level recs for round 2+ and board has already decided to ignore rec for 1st round.

Wendy Seltzer:I do not agree that DT should go forward into 2d-level

Mary Wong:Yes, sorry if I misunderstood Stephane's last comments. I thought he was just going to send a letter to the GAC with a status report on the DT's work to date, and that we hadn't yet decided what to do with the DT ... ?

Ching Chiao:@Mary ... same question here

Stéphane Van Gelder:What I meant, and what I asked for consensus on, was that we continue with the DT, and we tell the GAC that's what we're doing.

Stéphane Van Gelder:I did not intend for any response to include any detail on the DT's work. It's obviously way too early for that.

Jonathan Robinson:My understanding is / was. 1. Respond to GAC asap.2. Use DT to provide GNSO with substantial input on response to GAC. 3.Consider using DT for any future related work

Jeff Neuman:Rafik - Why can't you answer the questions from the JAS point of view

Jeff Neuman:Did you appoint reps to serve on a new committee

Jeff Neuman:and what do you believe the JAS believed their role was

Alan Greenberg:No money but perhaps a clarification.....

Stéphane Van Gelder:@alan: LOL

Alan Greenberg:For the record, I did start pushing key before ruling ;-)

Mary Wong:@Stephane, in view of the apparent confusion over the DT issue, can you respond to the GAC simply stating what the DT has done to date and indicating that the GNSO as a whole is continuing to work on the second level issue without specifically mentioning that the DT will be the group doing the work? And then including that question on the agenda for our next mtg?

Stéphane Van Gelder:@Mary: happy to... if the Council is happy for me to. I think it's a good suggestion.

Bill Drake:Oh so happy

Jeff Neuman:Mary - I do NOT support that approach

Mary Wong:I hope so - it will mean we respond in a relatively timely fashion to the GAC w/o seeming like we're stopping work, but allows us to figure out the best approach from within the GNSO.

Jeff Neuman:Mary - I know that is the NCSG view

Alan Greenberg:@MARY iT PRETTY WELL MEANS THAT THE dt WILL DO NOTHING FOR THE NEXT MONTH - A LOSS OF IMPORTANT TIME.

Jeff Neuman:But that is not the view of the RySG and the others that spake

Alan Greenberg:Oops - sorry for caps.

Jeff Neuman:I should have said others that "spoke"

Wendy Seltzer:applause for the ICANN schedule change to eliminate Fridays.

Mary Wong:I'm not suggesting that work stop entirely. It may be that the DT's work is taken over by a new, formalized WG.

Mary Wong:@Jeff, I liked the "spake" myself :) Very classic.

Alan Greenberg:@Mary +1

Bill Drake:Verily

Wendy Seltzer:(if I get disconnected from Adobe, my hand is still up)

Stéphane Van Gelder:So Mary's idea doesn't seem to have consensus, back to my original proposal: no change to the DT, a short message from me to Heather. Everyone OK with that?

Wendy Seltzer:except NCSG

Mason Cole:yes

Jeff Neuman:@Stephane - I believe that is all we can do. IF the DT believes that the work it does over the next few weeks will be ignored, then they will not do the work

Bill Drake:no consensus on that either SVG

Mary Wong:@Stephane, would the Council consider at least a further call for DT volunteers, since the framework has now changed a bit (i.e. it is no longer just a question of GNSO response to a GAC request, which didn't go thru a PDP, but has now become a formal Board request to the GNSO)?

Stéphane Van Gelder:If there's no consensus on that, what should we do?

Jeff Neuman:@Mary - The Drafting Team has always been completely open.

Stéphane Van Gelder:We can't just do nothing.

Jeff Neuman:Avri joined as of a couple of weeks ago

Bill Drake:Council sends a letter

Jeff Neuman:New volunteers have continuously joined

Mary Wong:@Jeff, Avri was a replacement for KK. Again, I'm not saying the DT isn't open, but perhaps a new call would alleviate some concerns that my SG members have.

Stéphane Van Gelder:Unless I get some clear direction from the Council, I will do nothing.

Mary Wong:@Stephane, u shd definitely send a letter to the GAC. Can we not agree that your letter just says GNSO work on second-level protections continue,?

Jonathan Robinson:I support Thomas view on the board meeting change.The substance of the change is not necessarily the issue. It's the method by which it was done.

Bill Drake:I'm for transparency and keeping Friday and making use of it

Alan Greenberg:@Bill +1. The last time we tried to drop Friday's it made for a horrendously compressed week.

Bill Drake:exactly---decompression should be pursued, not the reverse

Mary Wong:Taking an entire week away 3x a year is really unrealistic & expensive for a lot of folks, tho.

Bill Drake:one day difference = ?

Mary Wong:Well, lots of pple already leave on Weds since the public forum & other Thurs sessions really don't do much any more.

Mary Wong:I'd actually be for having the Council wrap-up on Thurs morning so people can leave that day as well.

Bill Drake:everyone participates based on their priorities, which are asymmetric, so variable geometry is inevitable

Mary Wong:Maybe ICANN can consider not always doing the mtgs the same way, same length.
rafik dammak:@mary yes reengineering the meetings,

Steve Sheng:We have one question regarding the IRD-WG report: The IRD-WG has sent their final report to the GNSO and SSAC on March 6. We have not heard any objections from the GNSO regarding the report. Today, the IRD-WG will send a revised Final Report (incorporating SSAC's suggestions) to the Council. The question from staff is an additional two weeks enough for GNSO review?

Bill Drake:sorry multitasking forgot to take hand down

Bill Drake:are "summits" a bylaws term?

Jeff Neuman:All - I got dropped and can't get back in

David Olive:Thanks All

Jeff Neuman:I will get a summary from others

Mary Wong:@Jeff, u missed a tantalizing ending :)

Mary Wong:Bye all!
Thomas Rickert:Bye!