

**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference
12 December 2013 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 12 December 2013 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-20131212-en.mp3>

on page :

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

Adobe chat transcript

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-12dec13-en.pdf>

List of attendees: NCA – Non Voting – Jennifer Wolfe

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: James Bladel, Volker Greimann, Yoav Keren

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Ching Chiao, Chuck Gomes

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG); Gabriela Szlak, John Berard, Osvaldo Novoa, Mikey O'Connor, Petter Rindforth, Brian Winterfeldt –absent – apologies proxy to Petter Rindforth

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Amr Elsadr, , Klaus Stoll, Maria Farrell, David Cake, Avri Doria, Magaly Pazello – absent, apologies proxy to David Cake

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observe- absent, apologies

ICANN Staff

David Olive - VP Policy Development absent, apologies, Marika Konings – Senior

Policy Director, Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director, Mary Wong – Senior Policy

Director, Julie Hedlund – Policy Director, Berry Cobb – Policy consultant, Lars

Hoffmann – Policy Analyst, Carlos Reyes, – Policy Analyst, Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat, Eric Evrard– Systems Engineer

Coordinator: And pardon me, this is the Operator. Just need to inform all parties that

today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time. And you may begin.

Jonathan Robinson: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO...

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, (Lori).

Jonathan Robinson: ...Council call of the 12th of December, 2013. It's our last call of the year. So, Glen, if we could go straight ahead then with the roll call please?

Glen de Saint Géry: Certainly Jonathan. Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Ching Chiao will be late. Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: James Bladel.

James Bladel: Here. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yoav Keren is not on yet. Volker Greimann.

Volker Greimann: On the line.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thomas Rickert. Thomas is not on yet. Gabriella Szlak, she is not on yet from the Business Constituency. John Berard.

John Berard: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Brian Winterfeldt is absent and has given his proxy to Petter Rindforth. Petter Rindforth.

Petter Rindforth: And I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Mikey O'Connor.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Maria Farrell.

Maria Farrell: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: I'm here.

Glen de Saint Géry: David Cake.

David Cake: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Magaly Pazello is absent and she has given her proxy to David Cake. Avri Doria, not yet on the line. Klaus Stoll. Klaus?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I see that Klaus looks disconnected on the meeting view but...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes, he is disconnected on the meeting view so we'll just give him a minute to get back. Daniel Reed.

Daniel Reed: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jennifer Wolfe.

Jennifer Wolfe: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: And we have apologies from Patrick Myles also we have apologies from David Olive. And for staff we have Marika Konings, Rob Hogarth, Mary Wong, Berry Cobb, Carlos Reyes and - Rob Hogarth and myself, Glen de Saint Géry. Have I left anyone off or has anyone joined in the meantime? Thank you, over to you. Sorry, apologies from Berry Cobb as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank, Glen. Two quick housekeeping things. We do seem to have everyone on the mute at the moment but just to remind people if you're not actively speaking please make sure your line is on mute.

Second point, which I announced on the Chat, if we are joined by others late please just make us aware via the Chat that you are here and we'll be able to add you to the roll call.

So welcome, again, everyone. If I could call under Item 1.2 then for an update or any updates on Statements of Interest. I've still got some noise on the line so if I could just remind everyone to mute your line if you're not actively speaking.

Great so hearing no update to Statements of Interest a special welcome to Dan Reed who joins us for the first time for - on the basis of previous arrangements he was not able to join us in Buenos Aires but welcome, Dan. We'll enjoy having you and look forward to working with you.

Dan Reed: Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: So we now, under 1.4, we'll typically note the status of the minutes of the previous meeting. Because of the sort of slight hiatus in the - on the back of the Buenos Aires meeting the minutes are not quite ready. We will turn those around as soon as possible and you're likely to see minutes from the Buenos Aires meeting come out as soon as possible in addition to the minutes from this meeting.

I know, from advance warning, that Ching is unable to join us now and will join us a little later. So I'm sorry - I skipped over 1.3, which is actually relevant to this point anyway. Are there any comments or inputs on the agenda? Anyone would like to review or amend any points on the agenda?

So - what reminded me of that point was that I'm expecting - or we are expecting Ching to join us at - shortly after 3:30 - 30 minutes past the hour so we're around 10 past now.

So providing there are no objections Ching would very much like to make some introductory remarks to the Item 4, the motion on the JIG final report. So I'm going to push that further down the agenda unless there are any objections to doing so. And we'll come to that a little later.

I think in order to avoid any confusion we'll keep the rest of the agenda in sequence as was published but just work with that a little further down the agenda.

Glen, I'm not sure if Avri has joined but I think we'll just pause at this moment and if you could note that Gabriella and Klaus are in the Chat room. And perhaps you could just confirm on the audio that they are present on the audio or...

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri. I've been on since the beginning on the phone. I just don't have the Adobe Connect info, sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Welcome, Avri. We'll mark you as present. And Gabriella and Klaus, could you confirm on the audio that you're both present?

Gabriella Szlak: I'm present, thank you. I'm Gabby.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Klaus seems to have disconnected again. We'll go see if we can dial out to him, maybe that'll provide some more stability to his line.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Thanks, Marika, thanks for your help there. And no luck with Yoav at this stage.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan, this is Glen. Yoav is going to call in now. I have spoken to him.

Jonathan Robinson: All right well then I think given that we - that our first two items are motions and we've got people with disconnection and other problems I think we'll wait to hopefully get Klaus and Yoav on the meeting with us. And, Marika, how do you feel - are you able to proceed right away then to discuss...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Is that Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: Yes, I'm back.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. Just to get some order in here then my suggestion is that we skip over - I was going to just skip over the JIG to wait for Ching to join us but I think it makes sense to skip over both the motions, go into the discussion items and come back to the motions at a little later after a couple of items. Are there any objections or concerns with doing that?

There are no hands up. Seeing no hands up we'll do that. We'll postpone dealing with the motions until a little later in the agenda. And,

Marika, with your willingness I think we should go straight into - forgive me, everyone. I rushed into this meeting and I just - there's one other thing I would like to do anyway. I apologize for the confusion here.

I'd like to go over the action items which is something - I've sort of rushed over a couple of early items so I apologize. Let's try and get this back on track.

I'd like to work over the action items very briefly and call for any comments on the projects list. So let me just talk you briefly through the action items and we will - we'll take it from there.

So we are on Item 2 just to confirm a review of the projects then the action items. As far as the action items are concerned I'm just going to talk through them very briefly and highlight any key points that need discussion or give you the opportunity to give input.

As far as the Singapore meeting planning is concerned, it's an open item on the action list. David is going to be leading that. I'll work closely with him together with staff since this is his first time working on the job. We'll pick that up early in the New Year.

Similarly there has been no development in terms of the GNSO review item. Unless, Jennifer, you'd like to make any comment there. I'll just pause for a moment but I'm expecting us to pick up that in earnest in the New Year. I'll just hold for a moment and see if there's anything you would like to say as the sort of lead Council member on this or if you're happy to leave it until the New Year to pick up on this? Jennifer.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure. Hi, Jonathan. Hi, everyone. This is Jennifer Wolfe. Yes, it's going to pick up in the New Year. I have spoken with Ray and some staff members and we're coordinating a call just to discuss what is the timeframe and logistics. So I would anticipate I would be reporting back on that at our next meeting and then looping in the group at that point in time. But nothing really new has developed since Buenos Aires at this point.

Jonathan Robinson: And, Jennifer, just to be - to make sure that no one has any concerns about this there is no substantial work going on at this point. This is current dialogue is about interfacing with the Structural Improvements Committee and making sure we understand - and in fact, due to Jennifer's sort of professional experience and expertise, they are interested in her expertise in terms of really the mechanics of how they conduct reviews in more than just the GNSO review.

So it's very, very early days. But it's us keeping a close track on their thinking about how they're going to do the review not the substance of the GNSO review. I think that's an accurate reflection. Is that correct at this stage, Jennifer?

Jennifer Wolfe: Absolutely. It's right now just coordinating what is the timeframe, what would the logistics look like? There's absolutely nothing substantive at this point.

Jonathan Robinson: Great so just to make sure that no one thinks there's sort of something going on behind the scenes that should be being reported at this stage and I'm sure you'll keep us mostly informed there.

On the PDP improvement item, we'll come to that as part of the main agenda item under Item 6 so I think we'll deal with that. On the SCI - it says SCI charter but this is really the SCI. It's the appointment of a Council liaison. I recall that Avri has volunteered and I don't think we have any other volunteers so I guess I'll thank Avri for that volunteering and just, I guess, reconfirm that and make sure that anyone has the opportunity to comment or give input.

So, Avri, if you could confirm your willingness to act as Council liaison to the SCI and that would be great.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan, Avri is not on the call yet. We're getting her on.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay she did confirm a moment ago that she was on the call.

Glen de Saint Géry: Oh sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: She may just be on mute.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes, she is on the call but she's on mute.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, we'll come back to you as soon as you've got audio or if you can confirm in the Chat. On the Policy and Implementation Working Group I believe we are still looking for a Council liaison there but I may - I have a feeling someone has already volunteered for that. Can I check that?

Amr Elsadr: Jonathan, this is Amr. Brian Winterfeldt and I volunteered to help each other out in that role.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for reminding me, Amr. So actually that item should be not on the - I may have an out of date version of the list or otherwise...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...taken off the action item list at this point. Yeah, it's not recorded on our action item list so if we could make a note of that please, Glen, and remove that item from the list.

Avri confirms, for the record, that she will act as our liaison to the SCI. Thank you, Avri. And hopefully your audio problems are sorted out as soon as possible on the (speaking).

As far as the ATRT2 is concerned and the Council input to that - that's a substantial item on our agenda and we'll come back to that in a little while. As far as...

Avri Doria: I'm so sorry - this is Avri. I finally figured out - I'm still lost in Android (hell). But, yes, I wanted to confirm and I was having trouble unmuting my phone. Thank you. Apologies.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, Avri, thank you. No need to apologize. Appreciate that. So there is - the next item deals with the multistakeholder innovation panel. And what we agreed in Buenos Aires was we would have two councilors in a sense - the word liaison is not strictly correct because they don't have an opportunity for a liaison, but to closely track the work of the multistakeholder panel - innovation panel and to inform the Council and potentially lead any Council input into that or indeed even perhaps, yeah, at least Council if not assist with any GNSO input into that panel.

And we had two volunteers in the persons of Jen Wolfe and James Bladel. So I'll give them an opportunity to speak in a moment. A second action there was for me to follow up with Theresa Swinehart to discuss, you know, just to make sure we're updated and ensure we had ongoing engagement and interaction.

And I did meet with Theresa yesterday in London. She happens to be in London because of other panel-based activity so I was able to meet with her face to face. In fact together with both David Olive and Marika Konings from ICANN policy staff as well.

And in a nut shell really my main point, I think, to Theresa was to discuss with her the interrelationship and to try and emphasize the existing work going on in the GNSO and to make sure that as best as possible we understood what and if any impact this was - might be having on policymaking within the GNSO and particularly this multistakeholder innovation panel.

Because I think for - certainly for myself and I think for others of us when we read the scope of that panel it appears to be very closely related to what we do in the GNSO. I'm hoping - or as a follow up from that meeting with Theresa I will get the opportunity to talk directly with Beth Novak who is chairing that panel, although there is nothing confirmed at this stage.

And I did emphasize, and I think Marika and David will also at least have a similar view or at the very least are aware that the way in which this panel is structured, which it's simply as an opportunity to put input by email or by some kind of open interface to put sort of unstructured

input is possibly unsatisfactory for the GNSO depending on how closely its remit - you interpret its remit or its remit does overlap with the work of the GNSO.

Now Theresa did reassure us that the panel's function was more broad and looking more at mechanisms and so on. But I just - I think that's probably enough to say at the moment is just to say I've gone through with that action, made sure that the channels of communication are open and then I don't know if, Jennifer, yourself or James, either of you would like to make any input on this as well?

Jennifer, first your hand is up. I just want to make sure we've got the right - I see a bit going on - sort of clarification in the Chat. But, Jennifer, before we get your update, James, are you - is your hand up to talk about specifically the multistakeholder innovation panel or some other - is there an element of confusion about who's participating in what?

James, if I could just ask you if you are in line with...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: My hand is for - to address the topic on the table, the multistakeholder innovation panel.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. Well then let's go in the order of the queue. James, we'll first hear from Jennifer and then from yourself.

Jennifer Wolfe: Hi, this is Jennifer Wolfe. And, James, you and I may have similar things to say so I'll be brief so you can step up. But just to let everyone

know you can sign up for the - there's an email distribution list where you would receive the emails if you're interested in doing so. And James and I certainly have and are watching the emails.

Right now in terms of the timeframe between November 19 through December 31 the panel has essentially launched this crowd sourcing campaign to look to anyone to provide comments, ideas and then to have people following these lists, vote on them and respond to them.

So I think one of the things that we wanted to talk about today is, you know, should the GNSO Council, as, you know, the voice of the GNSO, be voting or responding on these or should we just sit back and watch and see how this evolves through the concept of crowd sourcing?

But so everyone knows, some of the ideas and information being put out there directly address how the GNSO works as a whole. So substantively it's right on point with issues we address every day. But from a process standpoint it truly is just a crowd sourcing, everyone put in ideas and let's vote on it.

So that's what's happening in the panel. They're going to move from crowd sourcing, looking at that data, into actually developing proposals in January and so that will happen in January. And then by February they're supposed to have some draft to start to present. So that's their timeframe. So I don't know if we have enough time in that timeframe to develop official GNSO positions but wanted to make sure everybody knew what was happening. And, James, certainly I'll defer to you at this point if you'd like just add to that.

James Bladel: So this is James. And then perhaps I should have gone first to indicate that I was not up to speed on this particular group and I'm very grateful that Jennifer is covering it for the time being. But I am currently joining and getting caught up on that mailing list.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so it's Jonathan. I have a question then. So, Jennifer, what I think I'm hearing you say is that from what you're seeing the inputs - the inputs to the panel, in other words, it's not just me or perhaps others in the Council who might be - have concerns about the really close overlap of the scope of this panel with the work we do in the GNSO. It is others who are putting input into the panel already who appear to have a similar perception or view. So I'll let Jennifer answer that question and then, Amr, I see your hand is up in the queue after that.

Jennifer Wolfe: Sure, I'll briefly answer the question. It's - it's anyone, I mean, it's anyone in the world who signed up for this panel to get these emails. It doesn't seem as though there's a lot of traffic on it right now. I mean, some there have been ideas submitted, there's no one who's voted on it. Some I've seen one vote or five votes. So I'm not seeing a really large volume in terms of probably what they were hoping from a crowd sourcing perspective.

But it's truly just anyone so, I mean, I think for the Council to know any one of you as an individual could go and vote and comment or add ideas. I don't think with this timeframe it's reasonable for the Council to develop positions on each one of these ideas being submitted. But wanted to make sure I was reporting back on what's happening in that group.

Jonathan Robinson: Is there any point in doing any form of - is there anything that we could usefully use as any form of distillate of where they're at the moment, or the kind of questions that are being asked or are councilors generally satisfied with us just keeping a watching brief on what's going on at the moment? Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. I have a question that might perhaps influence the answer to some of these questions. I was wondering what the panel - after they're done with the crowd sourcing, when they've submitted a formal proposal, I was wondering what their perception is of what the next steps following that will be?

Because my understanding is that these panels will somehow prompt some sort of Board action but this Board action will not be in the form of a vote. So it's a bit unclear or confused about what is actually going to happen once the proposals are - or once a proposal comes through and will that influence our decision on whether we want to be more engaged or just sort of monitoring what's going on there? Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Amr, I'll try and give - attempt to answer. My understanding from my discussion with Theresa yesterday is that in this particular case at least this is about specialist experts taking inputs on an area and trying to pull together using their own expertise and inputs they receive a form of report or guidance that we can then - we as the community in the broadest sense, that the Board, the staff, the participants in the multistakeholder model, can pick and choose from how we use that in the future.

My worry is - my clear concern is, one that the areas they're looking over is very close to the work of the GNSO. And potentially, if we're not

careful, they make recommendations that in some way are either ill-informed or conflict with the way in which we work. And we appear then defensive in arguing against those recommendations. So - which is why I feel we've got to - at the very least keep a close eye on what direction it appears to be taking.

Mikey, I see your hand is up.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Mikey. Yeah, I posted a little note to our list a while back sort of raising a series of questions and I won't belabor them now. But I'm concerned about this project just from a project management standpoint. It doesn't seem well chartered, it doesn't seem like the organization, ICANN as a whole and especially the GNSO, is really ready to address this project right now. We're all incredibly busy with all the other stuff that's going on. The timetable seems very aggressive.

The panel itself is not terribly familiar with what we do. And looking at these inputs - I just went to that site, thanks, Marika for posting that to the Chat. But going to the page it looks like the crowd sourcing has sort of stalled and somebody has started feeding in, you know, things that are labeled, "Overheard at ICANN 48," just to give them a little bit more of a list.

And so I'm sort of standing in - with my project manager hat on and saying - I think we need to be right on top of this. So, Jen, I'm really glad that you're keeping an eye on it. But I'm concerned. I think this is a project that's in trouble and it may lead to recommendations that aren't very well grounded. And then, indeed, Jonathan, you're right,

we're going to look defensive because we're responding to badly crafted proposals with common sense. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Well I'm going to try - I mean, my sense I that we are doing the right thing at this stage. I'm plugged into Theresa and we can take that up further. We - I hope to talk with Beth soon about the GNSO, the work of the Council and how this may or may not overlap with the work that this panel is doing.

One of the things that I found immensely encouraging recently is the activity - and I know this was recognized as a potential shortcoming of our recent work - that possibly enhanced by newcomers on the Council but maybe some great discussions, some productive email threads. So there's no reason why this couldn't become one of those. And I think we've just got to keep a close eye on it.

My question to you as a Council is, is there any other action apart from those which have been already described, which we should be taking in this respect? If there is none I'm happy; I think we're pretty close to it at the moment. We're going to keep an eye on it and we can move on to the next item. But I'll just give one moment to check if there's any other suggestions or comments.

Dan, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Daniel Reed: The only other thing I could think of might be is, you know, to just post a couple notes in the forum and say we're here and we're open to suggestions or comments. And maybe that's a bit of a way to steer the discussion back at least to something benign but maybe something useful.

Jonathan Robinson: That's actually a very good suggestion because it does the proper thing, Dan, which is - I like that idea. What I could volunteer to do is record, in my capacity as Council chair, one, that the Council is aware of this work and sees the potential for significant or for overlap with the areas we're so intimately involved in.

And, two, to highlight that we have a couple of people, at minimum, keeping a close eye on the work of the panel. And, three that we are available to assist the panel in whatever way they would like to link them in to understanding and coordinating with the work of the GNSO. So I think that's a very good idea.

I see Chuck - Dan, I'm assuming your hand is up from previously so I'm going to go to - well, let me just check that. Yeah, your hand is down so we'll go to Chuck and then following Chuck we'll go to Amr. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. Just a quick suggestion, for those that are participating on it I think it's really important to correct any factual misstatements about the GNSO and what we do. Often in a wide open thing like that there are quite a few of those things. And it's important to set the record straight with regard to erroneous statements that are made about the way we operate. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a great point, Chuck. And I think we should take that as a proper suggestion to James and to Jennifer that - to please accept that as a suggestion that that's part of the role; it's not simply monitoring what's going on but to feel empowered or at least come back to the Council with an opportunity. If you feel you can do it yourselves, great,

if you want help to ask for help and to doing exactly what Chuck has suggested. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr. Maybe one thing we could do as a Council is follow up on a recommendation that was made to Beth Novak during her session in Buenos Aires which was to invite members of her team to sort of monitor or participate even as - just as observers in PDP working groups helping them get more of an insight on how we do things in the GNSO and hopefully that will just help them have a more informed opinion when they're developing their recommendations. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. And that suggestion was made in Buenos Aires as a very general suggestion in relation to this and other related types of activity. And in fact Marika, myself and David specifically raised that with Theresa yesterday as a concern with this type of activity and specifically in this case with Beth's activity that there's sort of disconnect between the grass roots activity or the actual activity on the ground and this appearing to go off in blue skies thinking not connected.

So thanks for reminding us of that. And, yes, it's a good point that could easily be made as part of a sort of Council submission that I could lead into this panel. Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you, Jonathan. I very much share your concern. Just one suggestion, I do not even know if it is proper and possible is before any recommendations which are concerning to the GNSO are made, published and even voted on would that be possible that they talk to the GNSO to give us a chance to comment on and maybe even do these corrections which might be necessary?

Because I've got the same fear that some misunderstandings raise and certainly come to vote and when you are standing there looking like we are defending ourselves. So maybe that we have the possibility to look at the things which concern us first and to comment on them?

Jonathan Robinson: That's another good practical suggestion. Thanks, Klaus. So I feel, given where this item sits in the agenda, it was relatively small but it has substance so I'm glad we spent a bit of time talking on it. I think we've got a way forward now. Got a pretty clear idea of what we need to do and so that was a helpful discussion.

Moving on to the next item under our action items, which is still in the main agenda under Item 2, review of projects and actions, is the issue on GAC early engagement. Given that this is proceeding satisfactorily and as expected I'll be very brief here.

Essentially you will see from the action list we have a group of people, councilors, plus equal or very roughly equivalent sized group from the GAC. We've had our initial meeting. We're very sensitive to the way - the fact that the GAC has not worked in this way with the GNSO in the past. And so some of the initial discussions in the meeting centered around rules of engagement, do we have a public and open mailing list? How do we handle chairing the meeting and so on.

We have agreed to have an email list. It will be available for all to see. It will be a public list. We're going to work on the two main topics that we've talked about previously, that's early engagement in the PDP process and the liaison. So our initial meeting has gone very well. We seem to have a pretty engaged group and with a reasonable chance of

producing - I won't set your expectations too high but reasonable progress by the time we get to the Singapore meeting.

We will be meeting every two weeks, I think is the idea, together with both the Council vice chairs and the other councilors you see on that meeting. So it's active and we're getting on with it so that's good news. And that's what there is to report there.

I'll just pause for a moment in case I've missed something that someone else would like to cover but I think that's the essence of it. I should say that the group has agreed to be co-chaired by myself and (Manel Ishamel) who's the Egypt representative to the GAC. And this is a pretty big break so I'm really pleased that we're working actively with them. I think there's some challenges going ahead. We may have different expectations of the outcomes and so on. But at least there's an open and engaged working group.

Yes, thank you, Amr. The email list is up and running as of the last day or two. But I'm not sure there's much content. It was initially just an email list amongst the members of the group and we may want to post a couple of previous items onto the list but at least we now - are now getting on with it. So thanks.

All right so that covers that. Does anyone have any comments then on the project list? You will have all seen the project list, it's circulated to you, it's updated, it's really a record of the activity that's going on in the background. I don't propose to go over it any detail but I will pause for Petter at least to give us some input. Go ahead, Petter.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. I just have a question. I had volunteered for the translation and transliteration working group but I've not received any confirmation. And then I heard, again, not directly, that the introductory Webinar was cancelled. I'm not sure if that's correct. But I'm still waiting. I think there will be some initial meetings by next week so it will be good to have confirmation of that.

Jonathan Robinson: Petter, can I just confirm whether - have you volunteered as Council liaison or as a member of the working group?

Petter Rindforth: As a Council liaison.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Well that'll...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: And then does anyone have anything to confirm on that? Amr, I see your hand is up.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, this is Amr. Yeah, Petter, you are correct that the introductory Webinar was cancelled and that was due to low participation, I think that was the reason that was given. There didn't seem to be as much interest in the introductory Webinar.

As far as the first meeting is concerned my understanding is that there's still a Doodle poll out for people to fill in so we can decide on when the first working group call is going to take place.

I also did not receive confirmation of joining that working group. I only just received the Doodle poll for scheduling the first call which I thought

was a bit strange. But if you don't have that then perhaps it would be a good idea to recirculate the link to the call on the list (unintelligible). I hope that answers your question.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. Lars has kindly posted the link to the Doodle in the Chat. Marika has her hand up next.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just maybe to clarify a couple of things. Normally when people sign up to working group they'll get a welcome message that typically comes from Glen, noting that they have been signed up to the working group and requesting for them to fill in their Statements of Interest.

I think in the case of Amr, as you were on the drafting team you may have been automatically added or there was the assumption that you were already aware that you had been - joined the working group and the mailing list. And in Petter's case I think we'll double check because maybe that it has slipped through that you weren't added so we'll do that as soon as possible and get you added to the list.

As I said, Lars has posted the Doodle poll there and it looks like the first meeting of the working group will take place next week. With regards to the Webinar that was - that came out of an idea that was suggested in Buenos Aires to - instead of immediately going into a working group maybe to see if a Webinar would help those that are interested are not sure if they want to join or not really sure what it's about to give them an opportunity to join an introductory webinar to learn about the subject and, you know, what it will entail to join the working group.

But we actually only got one person signing up for the webinar so we decided that maybe it was actually more helpful to still run the same information but then as part of the first working group meeting instead of having a separate webinar as such so we did inform the one person that signed up for it and, you know, if anyone's interested just to listen to that first meeting that's no problem either.

And on that basis they can decide then whether they want to join or not. So I think that's where things currently stand. And I think also on the liaison part if I recall well I think it was Ching who volunteered to be the official Council liaison to that working group which of course does not present any other Council members to participate in the working group as working group members.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Marika. Petter, would you like to go ahead?

Petter Rindforth: No if you could just resend - check that I'm on the list and resend the Doodle poll. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, all. Any other...

Ching Chiao: Hi, this is Ching. This is Ching Chiao just joined. Sorry for being late.

Jonathan Robinson: Ching, welcome. Thanks for joining. And we'll record you as present from now on.

Ching Chiao: Thank you.

Yoav Keren: Yeah, this is Yoav here. I already joined like 20 minutes ago but just didn't say anything so I'm here also.

Jonathan Robinson: Welcome, Ching. Welcome, Yoav. All right any other comments on the projects list so far? Okay thanks, everyone. So actually given that we have Ching on the call now and no other technical issues that anyone's facing I think we can go straight on with the agenda as was posted and move right into the first motion which is Item 4 on the JIG final report.

So, Ching, you are the maker of the motion and the opportunity here is to consider the motion to accept the final report. I don't know if you would like to make any comment or input on the motion before we go to actually reading the resolve clause? Ching, go ahead.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Jonathan. And, once again, sorry for being late. Yes, I did have two actually comments and slight suggestions for this motion. Which we have discussed this and thanks to the reminder from Marika and also from Edmon to make sure that we are, you know, making sure that this is the report so the third one is on its way and we should have try to manage in the timely fashion.

So the first point I would like to actually make is this issue - the third issue which is the universal acceptance of the TLD, in this case the IDN TLD. But this has been a general issue since the 2000 (wrong) - the TLDs. And ever since then, and honestly speaking, it's never - in ICANN's top priorities. ICANN has not been able to let the world know about, you know, the domain names, other than Com Net Org.

For example registries like DotAsia, DotMobi, DotTel, we take years using individual efforts and the outcome is somehow limited. So that

alone the IDN TLD so who knows how many years an IDN TLD will be known and acceptable generally.

So I think it's very important that we look at this particular issue. I mean, otherwise this will be a lose/lose situation for everyone, ICANN, the registrants and the user at large. So you may simply think - think about an email address that ends with Doticann and it cannot be used to register let's say a Facebook account.

This is bad user experience. I mean, and I personally think if we fail to promote this universal acceptance of both IDN and ASCII TLD it will lead to the failure of the new gTLD program. So I think from now on we have this report and the recommendation. And I think we - so we can do something concrete and, for example, structuring a formal mechanism to ensure that say the ISPs and the software companies, etcetera, to accept the new gTLD in the more timely fashion. So that's the first point.

And the second point is actually for the G group itself especially I'd like to emphasize once again the GNSO should express the appreciation to the members of the JIG especially to Edmon Chung. JIG is definitely a living example of a successful cross community effort.

That said, we should also keep in mind that the JIG charter has extended once in 2012 and we are still asking them to continuously work on the substantial issues such as IDN TLD variants and the - and just mentioned, the universal acceptance of the TLD. And we are asking them to deliver a report in Singapore next year.

This issues, which just mentioned, they are not going away or even pause any time soon so therefore I strongly (unintelligible) we should consult with the - with the ccNSO and, you know, actually talk about possible next steps, you know, potentially a new cross community work group in dealing with issues of common interest in relations to the ongoing IDN issues.

So I will stop here and, you know, so back to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Ching. I've got Avri in the queue but I just want to make sure I capture that. So what specific, I mean, I heard that, you know, a couple of suggestions that I'd really like to get those down in specifics so we can have an action item - a broad action item and some specific actions with responsibilities for this.

Can you help me to know, I mean, I heard about, you know, thanking the JIG for their work and so on. But if you could help me capture those key points that you want before we move on to the queue that would be helpful.

Ching Chiao: Sure. So my - so I just made two points. One, is actually to, you know, this motion is about the universal acceptance of the TLDs. So first point is simply to, you know, just to - trying to raise the awareness just amount the Council that, you know, this is critically important issues that - which we should have picked up, I mean, earlier. But thanks to JIG their continuous effort we should really look into the recommendations made by them and make the effort so that's one.

The second point I like to make is more on the JIG - the working group itself. We have extended their charter in 2012 which we are asking

them because of the ongoing issues of the IDN so we asked them to continuously to, you know, to monitor and to develop the suggestion recommendation. And, I mean, even implementation plans for IDN relevant issues.

So issues does get picked up by the staff or the Board. The first issue, let's say the IDN single letter TLD, is not being picked up for security reasons. So what I'm suggesting is that since the JIG is about to give us the third report by - sorry, there's - I mean, this is the third report - let me take a step back.

This is the third report and we understand that in the motion we said that there's still continuous development on the IDN issues. But given JIG has been extended and we are still asking them to do more work we as the GNSO Council should talk to the ccNSO Council about the next steps, whether to extend the JIG or to extend this work, I mean, the working group or to create a new working group for relevant IDN - I mean, development issues.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Ching, that's pretty clear then. So I've got both of those. One is about raising awareness and tracking the recommendations and the other is ensuring we work closely with the ccNSO and decide what the future of the JIG is or whether a new working group should be chartered.

There's a queue built up while you've been speaking so let's move on first of all to Avri and work our way through the queue. Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Avri speaking. I've been a member - well actually I've been an observer of the JIG since it was first created. And want to endorse everything that was said about it being a hard working bunch.

However, the way it was created - and I think this is reflected in the charter, though I haven't looked at it recently, there were specific people who were assigned to this group. It was, I think it was open-ish but it wasn't as open to full participation as perhaps it could have been or it perhaps could be.

The point that I've noticed is that there are very, very few people in the group doing most of the work. And as an observer I haven't even been one of those lately though I was at one point in time in the past.

Edmon and one or two people from the ccNSO really do carry most of the work weight and, you know, and staff carry most of the work weight. So I think if we're talking about having it do more or, you know, redirecting to other working groups or stuff we better make sure that we've got the people in GNSO that'll actually be there doing the work.

By and large except for Edmon who is - is multistakeholder like some of us - there haven't been that many people GNSO participating in the weekly meetings. So I just wanted to bring that up as one of the considerations in anything we continue. I mean, I'm willing to continue being an observer because I wasn't in the Council, I wasn't one of the people that was appointed to the group but I was in it as an observer, as a hangover of previous membership. So I just wanted to add that.
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Avri. We'll go straight to Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Mikey. And thanks, Ching, for this motion. I have several things I want to say. One is that the ISPCP is very interested in this issue and wants to get more engaged with it. And so one of the things that the ISPCP is planning to do is focus on IDNs in the Singapore meeting and would love to coordinate with the JIG on ways to make this more visible.

Which gets me to sort of the general issue that I think I heard you saying, Ching, which is sort of the difficulty in getting attention and priority assigned to this in terms of outreach, awareness raising and so on.

And I think that one of the actions that we might want to take, I'm not sure how this works with the charter of the GNSO, but it would be great to get more coordination with issues like IDNs fed into this extremely expensive global stakeholder outreach program where lots and lots of resources are being expended to reach a global audience.

And it seems to me that this would be a perfect example of one of the things that we would want to encourage ICANN staff to coordinate and plan and include in that global outreach effort. So mostly just wanted to say, you know, speaking for the ISPs, we're interested, we want to help and we too are a little frustrated with the lack of coherent outreach on this topic and hope to see that change. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mikey. Go straight to Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Jonathan. Actually I think Mikey and a couple of people may have said from their perspective a couple of the things I wanted to

highlight so let me just I guess restate one or two of those items from a staff perspective.

I mean, first of all there are several of us, myself included, working at least within the policy team so for example Marika and I work with Bart Boswinkel from the ccNSO side, to support the JIG. I mean, that the group that's been chartered by the both our councils and that's the work that was done. And universal acceptance is one of the three issues that this group has worked very hard on, as already been noted.

To follow up on Mikey's point, I mean, there are a number of things going forward that the Council and the GNSO may want to consider. First of all if you look at the third recommendation here we are expecting the JIG to come back with some suggestions on how to move things forward by Singapore.

That may or may not be, as Ching has said, say a new cross community working group but there are other ways in which they as well as members of the community could try and take it forward in the sense of making this particular issue that I think everyone on this call agrees, is a pretty important issue that cuts across ICANN and the operation of what we do onto the radar of a number of different groups.

One is our own constituent groups within each of our SOs and ACs. And, secondly on a broader outreach scale, which is something that Mikey has talked about. So then if you look at Recommendation 1, sending it to the Board, you know, one of the things the Council could consider doing is basically following up perhaps regularly and directly on what's being done both within ICANN across divisions, perhaps, as

well as on the outreach side leading up to Singapore and beyond so that the work of this group continues.

Because some of this work is not going to be strictly policy, some is going to be policy-related. But whatever it is to make sure that this issue continues to be an important one that's flagged for all concerned.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mary. Petter, you're next.

Petter Rindforth: Thanks. Well let me first say that I think it has been done a very good job on this. And I just wanted to point out especially the Recommendation 3 that - well I may not have formulated - might sound diplomatic because I think it's already running out of time.

So what I supported I definitely look forward to the further work and suggestions and hopefully earlier than in March. I mean, the presentation meeting on ICANN and also when you discuss it with participants from countries where IDNs are up for running. They see a lot of initial problems that are not solved on how to use and how to search for it. So I just wanted to point out that this is very important subject. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so we've had a good discussion there. And before we move to actually vote on the motion, I mean, it's quite clear that this awareness raising, ensuring we thank the JIG, which we do formally in our motion in any event. I should say that as far as I'm aware the ccNSO has adopted this final report so when we do we will have both done so then.

And it's quite clear that it sounds like we've got a couple of things to do, is one continue with this - with a focus on the awareness raising. I'm not sure practically what to do whether we - and I slightly worry about raising awareness when the solutions aren't involved. But it seems like we want to keep it high up the agenda.

And one way of doing that is to work closely with the ccNSO. And it seems that that might well pave the way for what the future incarnations of the JIG or a variant on it that start to work on this. So I hope we've got some clear items to work with coming out of this discussion. We've certainly got a motion to vote on right now. And that's useful input.

So if there are no other comments, Ching, if I could ask you to read the Resolve clauses for the motion then and then we'll go on to proceed to vote on it. Ching, I understand you are traveling so it may not be practical. If it's not practical for you to read the motion by all means pass it over to someone else. I'm sure one of the vice chairs can step in.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Ching just disconnected so he may be having issues.

Jonathan Robinson: That's unfortunate but Chuck does carry his proxy anticipating that there may be problems. So could I ask one of the vice chairs to come in and read the resolve clauses please?

Volker, I haven't heard David on the audio. Are you available to just present the resolve clauses? Right, hearing nothing from Volker I will, myself, read the resolve clauses.

This is a motion made by Ching Chiao and seconded by Chuck Gomes. It's the motion on the JIG final report and universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.

Resolve that the GNSO Council adopts the JIG final report on universal acceptance of IDN TLDs and its recommendations and will submit it to the ICANN Board for its consideration.

Two that the GNSO council thanks the JIG for its work with special thanks to Jothan Frakes for his contribution in proactively reaching beyond the ICANN community to address issues identified in the report.

Three, that the GNSO council recognizes that further work needs to be done in relation to IDNs, in particular IDN variants and the universal acceptance of IDNs and asks the JIG to put forward suggestions on how to deal with these issues and deliver these suggestions to the GNSO Council by the ICANN Singapore meetings in March 2014.

Glen, if you could - I think we'll run this by a voice vote. I note that Thomas Rickert has just joined the call. So if I could call for anyone who is not in favor of the vote, anyone who is not in favor of the vote please could you let us know on the voice in the audio?

Anyone who would like to abstain from voting on this motion, can I hear you on the audio? I hear no votes against, no abstentions. Could I call for all those in favor to say, "Aye."

Man: Aye.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Glen, could you please record that we had no votes against, no abstentions and all those in the call voted therefore in favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: I will do that, Jonathan, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Glen. Right our next item is a second motion for the day on the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group final report. And the Council here will vote on adopting the final report as well as other related actions contained in the motion. This motion is made by Mikey O'Connor and I understand that the ccNSO has adopted this report. And so, Mikey, if you could perhaps read the result clauses and then we'll open it up to discussion.

Mikey O'Connor: Certainly Jonathan. This is Mikey. The resolve close is read as follows - one, the GNSO council adopts the report submitted by the co-chairs of the DSSA working group as the final report of the DSSA in accordance with Section 2.4 of its charter.

Two, the chair of the GNSO council has requested to inform the co-chairs of the DSSA working group of adoption of the report by the council. Three, the chair of the GNSO council has also requested to inform the chairs of other participating SOs and ACs, the SVAC, the ALAC, the ccNSO and the NRO.

And finally, number four, the GNSO council thanks and congratulates all, in particular, the co-chairs of the working group, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond from the ALAC, Joerg Schweiger from the dot DE registry of the ccNSO. I was the co-chair for the GNSO and James Galvin was

the co-chair for the SSAC and Mark Kosters was the co-chair for the NRO - and all of the volunteers and staff who helped with this effort.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mikey. Avri, I see your hand is up so fire away.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Avri speaking. Yes, my question was - and I have absolutely no issue with the motion - but what's meant by the motion. In other words, so we're accepting and adoption the report. Now, the report has a very strong section, if I understand correctly, on phase to work.

And in some sense that report is calling out the doing of phase two work. By adopting this motion are we somehow setting in process something to actually get that going? Are we not worrying about it? The fact that that's not mentioned in our motion at all - and I apologize for just reading the report this morning. These are comments I know I should've made a week ago and I'm just catching up at the last minute.

But in reading that, it looks to me like there's something that - so having approved the report, sent it on, told the community that, you know, here's a report they should read and discuss further and think about, you know, the categories of risk and all those things, but now what? And I don't see that in our motion. And I don't know what I'm not understanding. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Good question. Avri, do you feel in a position to respond?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure. This is Mikey. And I'm happy and delighted to respond actually. There's a story to tell. Jonathan, feel free to cut me off if I get long-winded. I sometimes do that.

But let me just give a little bit of background. It's found in the whereas clauses. The first couple clauses sort of tell the story of what happened. Clause number one is that some time ago, this was - a working group was established. It was a joint working group. Several members of the council including Chuck Gomes were part of that chartering group and a number of you participated.

In number two's whereas, we're calling out the point that the board of directors has established a quite overlapping initiative when the DNSA was in midflight. And although we very aggressively tried to resolve the overlapping scope issues, ultimately we weren't able to do it in such a way to continue our work.

So that's whereas number three where we went basically to sleep for a while because, although if we continued to work, it was almost inevitable that we were going to collide with the board initiative. And the upshot of the board initiative was left out of the motion but the result of the board work is a DNS security framework which conflicts with the direction that the DSSA was going.

And thus we, the co-chairs, wrote a letter which I sent along, Avri, in reply to your note to the list. So the rest of you who haven't had a chance to get to the list yet, you'll see a letter from us strongly recommending that the DSSA not proceed to phase two because of this conflict with a structure that was put in place by the board.

And so the justification for the motion that we've put on the table for you to vote on today is really contained in that letter and I would be

happy to go into more detail but I'm quite concerned about the (press) of time.

I would also be willing to withdraw this motion and defer it for another month because this isn't terribly urgent at this point. This is simply tying a bow around a report that was essentially completed about a year and a half ago. So I throw it back to you, Jonathan, as to how you'd like to proceed. I'd be happy to take this to the list and spend more time discussing it. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a follow up?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, please do, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. So what is essentially missing and was (unintelligible) my reading is, indeed, the letter and that recommendation. So shouldn't that letter and that recommendation perhaps be part of our motion so that people don't do what I did, which is read the report innocently and see phase two work listed and misunderstand? Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: And Avri, I guess you're along the same lines as me. First of all, Mikey, thank you. That wasn't long-winded. That was pretty succinct and clear, at least as far as I was concerned. And what I would quite like to do, if it's at all possible, is tie the bow around this now, as you said, Mikey.

But I understand - Avri makes a very good point about an apparent loose end in here. Can we creatively both vote on the motion but perhaps simply include or in some way include the letter without going through the sort of deferral and having to bring this up again in the

future? So that's what I'm looking for, the guidance on it, if anyone's got a suggestion.

I mean, for example, when we record and report the outcome of the motion, we could make reference to the fact that we are aware of this letter and that the work is being effectively suspended because of a parallel track that appears to, if not conflict it, at least overlap with the work of this group. Mikey and then Avri.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan. One thought is that I already have a friendly amendment that I sent into the council that has not been accepted by my seconder, Osvaldo Novoa, yet.

And so one option would be to close the discussion momentarily in this meeting, let me find a link to that letter that could be included in the friendly amendment and bring this motion back to the meeting before we end today with a link to that letter included as another part of the whereas clauses. Would that work?

Jonathan Robinson: It seems to work for Avri. She's put a green tick in there. So yes, I think in principle, we haven't voted on this so that seems like we haven't opened the vote on this so we could hold off. And could you just make it clear to the council what your friendly amendment was prior to adding the (phase two) of this letter?

Mikey O'Connor: Certainly. Hang on a minute. I need to find it. The friendly amendments were to - whereas number four - oh, in fact, the friendly amendments have been included in the text that's in front of you now.

So I'm not even going to go there because this is as amended. But let me highlight some changes just so people know. In number four, I changed the word, "send," to, "sent," so, S-E-N-D, as in dog, changed to S-E-N-T.

And I also changed in recommendation - or in whereas number five, I deleted the word ccNSO for their consideration and changed it to read that the final reports be disseminated to registry operators and registrars for their consideration.

And then in result number three, I added the SSAC to the list of ACs and SOs at the end. These are very minor, non-substantive changes. I'm not anticipating any controversy around them but we do have an amendment that hasn't yet been accepted as friendly by Osvaldo so Osvaldo could just hold off on that and I could revise that and submit it yet today.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, Mikey, I'm not sure it's necessary to go so far. I mean, I think - as I understand it, and I just need to be sure I'm clear on this - and Marika, I see your hand is up.

The amendment - the friendly amendment that you proposed already includes a motion. Marika has put a link to the letter in the chat and that could easily be - we could vote on this knowing that that link will be included in the whereas closes. We have it in front of us.

We can just simply - the clauses make reference to the letter. So I think we're in shape providing there are no other changes and, of course, providing Osvaldo is able to simply accept that friendly

amendment. But Marika, let me just make sure we hear what you've got to say.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I was just going to suggest, because I think in whereas clause four already references the letter and it will be very easy just to include the link there, if that's all what is needed or ask for. I don't think that's a big change provided, of course, Mikey and Osvaldo agree with that. But we have the link and I can just - on the screen, add it behind the mention of letter, add the link in there.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that's precisely what I anticipated. Thanks Marika. So...

Osvaldo Novoa: May I - Osvaldo here.

Jonathan Robinson: Osvaldo, please go ahead.

Osvaldo Novoa: Sure. I have a problem with the Adobe Connect. I cannot get into the chat. Just that - I accepted the amendment. I thought it was just a text correction. That's why I never sent my acceptance. Sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: That's useful. Thanks for that. And Avri, just to check where you are on this now.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. This is Avri speaking again. I think that, including the reference, but it also seems to me like it needs at least an expression of the content that - and it can be done in one line - that sort of says the letter indicating that contrary to the suggestion, that phase two not be worked - not be done because it was in conflict with work done at the board's instructions.

I think that, you know, in the midst of everything we're talking about, I think having that statement there, that because otherwise it really does look like halfway through people got bored and moved off.

So I think that in terms of the historical reference for this, indicating that the chairs made this decision belongs in the (whereases) also I would think and not just the reference - not just the pointer to the letter but a one sentence explanation of the letter. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. I think if we - I take the point and I'm not suggesting we shouldn't do it but if we do, I think we will need to either come back at this later or at another meeting. And, if Mikey, you've got an elegant way of accommodating that. What's your thought, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: It's complicated. That's part of the reason this motion's worded the way it is, is because the letter, indeed, does lay out a fairly elaborate rationale that it will be hard to summarize in one sentence.

This is, in a way, a great tragedy and I get a little emotional about it because we had a fabulous group of people doing an amazing amount of incredibly good work that essentially got derailed by a not very well-managed, not very well-scoped board initiative and I think there are two ways to play this.

I think one way to play it is matter of factly which is the way that this motion is worded. But if you actually want to get into the substance of the issue, then we're into a different kind of discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, thanks Mikey. Here's what I'm tempted to do and I mean, you did make some of these points in Buenos Aries, so I should

acknowledge that. You have explained some of this to us previously and, you know, I understand the sensitivities here.

But what I would like to suggest, because I'm hearing you suggest that - I'd like Avri to consider one of two options. I think, Avri, you've either got to request that we defer this and reframe the motion. I think this is what's available to us. Or accept that, in essence, that it's Mikey's point that it's too much to contain in a single sentence.

It is covered in the letter and I think either are ways forward. And then thirdly, separate to the vote here on the motion on the constant referring onto the letter, if necessary, it may be that there's some other course of action, you know, contact with the board on this issue to just explain any other concerns entirely separate to the motion. Let me hear from you, Avri, if you think we can either go ahead and vote on it as it is or you would like to request the (referral) to reshape the whereas clauses.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Avri speaking. I'm not going to request a deferral. I'm going to offer a friendly amendment to the particular sentence that mentions the letter. And that friendly amendment can say this editor outlines the reasons the chairs recommend not proceeding with phase two because of (into leading) board actions.

And just leave it at that. So it basically states it. It states it as part of the history. I believe it states it in a matter-of-fact manner. And if the motion is willing to accept it - and that tells people go read the letter.

Jonathan Robinson: That's helpful and clear, Avri. I see you've put that in the chat. I see Mikey's hand up, so Mikey, if you could respond. We need to keep this

moving now. I'm a little - getting a little nervous about time. So Mikey, if you could just respond to that suggestion.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I have a very quick request and that is that we just end that sentence with this letter outlines the reasons the co-chairs recommend not proceeding with phase two, period. Cold stop. Because there's more to it than that. And I think then we're fine. You okay with that, Avri?

Avri Doria: ...but sure.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we have a deal then. Thanks all.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much. So I just wonder if we can make sure we capture that wording that - I mean, it's a very simple change but it's probably a good idea to put it in the chat so there's a written record of it in front of everyone before we vote, Mikey.

Thank you, Marika, for recording those words. If everyone could note that the new wording will say, "This letter outlines the reasons the co-chairs recommend not proceeding with phase two," and it will be referenced - the letter will be referenced by a link in the report.

And then, in addition - which we can pick up separately - or you may wish to respond now - Chuck is (asking) highlights that we make consider and we can keep this live on the email whether we write a letter to the board just highlighting the sort of procedural concerns that have gone on here.

So what I recommend we do is proceed to vote with the amendment as accepted by Mikey. Osvaldo, technically I would like you to just confirm as second, that you accept that friendly amendment as well. Mikey's accepted it and if you could just reconfirm that you accept the subsequent, additional amendment.

Osvaldo Novoa: Yes, I accept it. I tried to do it on the chat but couldn't.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Osvaldo. So if the council could then proceed on this basis that would be great. So Glen, if we could move to a voice vote again and I will ask for anyone who is against the motion as it now stands, amended both immediately prior to the call and on the call, to please let it be known if you are against the motion. Anyone who wishes to abstain from the motion, on voting on the motion. I hear no comments, no votes against, no votes to abstain. And all those in favor, indicate by voice now.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Yes.

Avri Doria: Aye, with a comment.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Aye.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Avri. Can you just comment then, please?

Avri Doria: Right. Yes, the comment I would like to put in is actually just to note with this appointment, the situation that led to the chairs not deciding to take the work further. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. All right, Glen, if you could record, then, that we voted on the motion. There were no votes - on the motion as amen- as friendly amended, and there were no votes against, no abstentions and all those on the call voted in favor.

Glen De Saint Gery: I'll do that, Jonathan. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: We put ourselves into a relatively tight corner time-wise. So if I could make everyone please be cognizant of that. I think it's - we've got the most critical, from a time point of view, is this work on the ATRT2 because that is due tomorrow.

So I'm going to move to that item, Item 7, which is our written final input to the ATRT2. And thanks, John, I see you suggested that. You either read my mind or (put that) up ahead of me. But it makes sense.

So we have an opportunity to pro- we discussed recently on the list with quite some traffic, to submit comments on behalf of the council to the ATRT2 and their request for a final written comment by tomorrow.

So we have a statement that's being work shopped and I would like to really ask you to just keep this - as tight a focus on this as possible. First of all, really, two questions. Are we okay with the council

submitting this? I'm very keen to do so because I think that ATRT2 work is commenting directly on work on - on areas that the council manages and is involved in.

Notwithstanding the fact that other GNSO participants will put their own comments in. And second of all, are we okay with the text as it is now? So those are my two questions. Maybe we should just - I will take it as (read) that we are okay to put in a written statement unless someone actively makes a point that we should not.

And then we can concentrate on the text if there are any minor revisions or significant concerns with the text as it now stands. Any comments or questions please? And thanks to Maria for leading the charge on this and others for the very active participation. Petter.

Man: Well, first of all, I'd say I certainly know that there's a limited time and I think it has been (unintelligible) and I just wanted to state that although we work to approve - how we work to approve, the submission is not to be construed as IPC, formal IPC approval of it because there's simply not being time to obtain that approval. So when I worked and when I was (unintelligible), we did a (countless) not specifically representing IPC on this issue. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Petter. We will endeavor to cover that properly and I may need your help to make sure it's represented out properly. Maria.

Maria Farrell: Thank Jonathan and thanks everyone for all the comments. And I just wanted to note that there was (TD affection) on others and basically noting for information, other GNSO work that's relevant to this.

I actually wasn't able to pull, you know, a (compile a) list together on that in the time. And I haven't had any feedback on that. So I've taken the liberty of deleting that section from the paper. But if anybody does want to take it on or feels that could just, you know, slide in four or five bullet points that would be great.

Jonathan Robinson: Maria, I have a suggestion on that, and maybe it's good enough. If that other GNSO input is going to go in, if we just - we can just, from a council point of view, simply acknowledge that there will be other submissions from other participants within the GNSO.

And we can leave it at that and just simply flag that, you know, this is the council's submission but there will be other - we don't need to necessarily list that or comparatively cover it. That will be my suggestion there.

Maria Farrell: That makes good sense to me. Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Maria. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm speaking on behalf of the ATRT and as the person who's going to be charged with - who is charged with doing the revisions to these specific recommendation.

Just as the ATRT solicited input in Buenos Aires from the GNSO council, if the caveat is added that this is the position of the council, not necessarily reflecting agreement of the stakeholder groups and constituencies involved, that will be taken as written and understood.

And I would, however, encourage if there is anything left out of this statement that had been discussed and that is supported by individuals or by groups within the GNSO, that a short statement saying that would be appropriate also. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: And sorry, Alan, just to clarify. Were you essentially supporting what I had suggested?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'm just reiterating that the - I'm making it clear, the ATRT will understand if this is stated as a council position, not necessarily reflecting agreement of the groups just as we solicited input from the council and from individuals on the council in Buenos Aires.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. I see Avri supports that as well in the...

Alan Greenberg: Avri is my co-author of this recommendation. So between the two of us, we pretty well will decide where it's going. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. John.

John Berard: Thank you Jonathan. To Alan's point, the business constituency has offered comments to the ATRT2. The letter that we are contemplating here as the council is fully reflective of - as far as it goes, it covers - it is supported by BC position and so I have no problem supporting this letter.

Certainly could argue late into the night a (jock) or a tickle but I don't think that's really important. The substance here is totally in line with what the BC has already filed with the ATRT2.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. John, thanks very much. So I would just like to make very clear then where we are to try and make sure I'm clear and we are clear. We have the text. We have, as far as I can see, support of the council. In fact, the groups behind the council we're seeing - my understanding is that this is being shared with some groups but this - maybe it's just cleaner to send this out as a council submission and not indicate that this has support of the various groups.

But we can just submit it as a council and indicate that the bit that's missing here, that we talked about earlier, Maria, that there is - there will be and (we flagged) with the ATRT2 that there will be submissions from various other components of the GNSO.

And that covers it. And then really my only next question will be the mechanics of who and how this will be submitted but we can take that off list providing we've got the substance. Thanks Petter. I see we have your support there.

So I think - I certainly - unless there are objections, I think we're all trying to finesse which groups on the council did or didn't support this. We can simply take it as a council position supported by the council as - I don't even think - we can just say this is a council position and that the groups that make the GNSO will provide their own additions.

Good. So I'm not hearing any objections there so I think we have a way forward. And, yes, thanks again to Maria and all of those who worked rapidly on tidying this up. I think something (unintelligible).

Our next item is Item 8, which is our response to the request from the geographic regions review working group. In essence, it's a similar

kind of requirement to that of the ATRT2 and that is the council has the opportunity to put some form of response together.

And I think Chuck has either - well, has assisted and either accidentally or deliberately volunteered himself to sort of lead our position and there doesn't seem to have been - it doesn't seem to be particularly controversial. So we have a suggested council response which is, I think, pretty similar to the registry's response. So from a registry perspective, I'm okay with it. It would be good to hear how other counselors feel about this from a counsel perspective, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Just very briefly this is Mikey. I support Chuck's request for some clarification of that sentence in the report that said, these bottom up groupings would be complementary to the formal regional framework and would not replace it.

They would not form any part of ICANN's decision-making structure but would be free to lobby for the support of elected representatives. I agree with Chuck it would be nice to have some clarification of what is intended with that, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So Mikey just to be clear doesn't Chuck's wording already ask for that clarification?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes if - I wasn't sure if this was an actual edit or whether this was a request to the group to change something. So if that's actually proposed wording then I support it, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: (Beck) I see your hand is up.

(Beck): I just want to confirm what you said Jonathan and let Mikey know that that is the intention. The text in blue was the comments, the dark black is the - was the quote from the executive summary. So that - you - Jonathan is correct on that.

Jonathan Robinson: So are there any objections to the counsel I mean this is - the way Chuck has formulated this is really a - it's not in a final form in which we might submit it but it covers the essence of what we would do by frankly acknowledging the key points, calling attention to a key question.

So personally I'd be happy to either do it or work with Chuck to just (unintelligible) this and make it into a submission. But in terms of the substance and essence of it has anyone got any concerns, John?

John Berard: Thank you Jonathan, I have a question regarding to be. The recommendation says staff should also develop and implement a process for (mid) stakeholder communities in countries or territories to pursue if they wish reassignment to a geographic region that they consider to be more appropriate for their jurisdiction.

So does that mean that there's essentially going to be venue shopping I mean is it - I don't know I don't really quite understand what that flexibility - why there is such flexibility.

I mean if you're in North America, South America I mean Europe, Asia Pacific I mean it would seem to be me to be fairly black line with the region. And the other thing is some of the - my colleagues in the business constituency have suggested that there may be - that these changes may cause a shift in a resource allocation, voting, rules.

And I was just curious I'm very late to the game and I was just curious as to whether those things the flexibility of what region you might want to be in and the effect of shifting regions on resource allocation and other rules that we live by might be affected.

Jonathan Robinson: John you've prompted a slew of hands in the room so I will attempt to answer that let's hear from Chuck first and then others in sequence.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan and thanks John. Good question I think you need to look at the whole report to understand the context but I'll very briefly just share that there are some countries or territories that are in regions where they're really not located physically because of they're a territory of a European Government or something like that.

And so that's what this is really oriented towards. Your concerns are legitimate but I think it's helpful to look in the whole context of the report in order to understand this particular need.

And all it's asking really - all it's doing is really suggesting that a process be put in place to consider that and then I'm assuming that such a process would involve community input in terms of that so we could deal with the issue, the concerns that the business constituency has at that time.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck, Alan do you have something for the (unintelligible)?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, yes Chuck did most of - said most of what I was going to say. The other little intricacies also relate to facts that in some cases countries that get their IP addresses or territories that get their IP addresses from one place are in another ICANN region.

And you have situations where countries, territories that work very closely with each other in all normal events are in different regions. So there's a whole bunch of anomalies that resulted from the way the current regions and regions are allocated.

And this was an attempt to say we can't come up with a general set of rules that will make everyone happy therefore include an exception process.

Jonathan Robinson: Right, thanks for those explanations Chuck, Alan and others I think that helped clarify. So having had that clarification are we - is anyone uncomfortable or not happy with us submitting a response to a geographic region working on behalf of the counsel but essentially along the lines as proposed by Chuck and in front he counsel now?

I see no objections, which is great so that gives us our marching orders on this one and John I note that you would like to see final copy, yes we can do that. I think this is going to be in the form of a letter from me so I'd have to work rather rapidly on that since I'm going on vacation early this year.

I'm going on Sunday so I'll work with Chuck and if necessary we can delegate it to one of the vice chairs to submit, we'll try and turn this around right away. I note you are in the same position Kathy as John, that's great.

All right we can close that item off then and we've got our marching orders on that one as well, which is great and it looks like we should be able to do something conclusive there.

I think that leaves us with the opportunity to come back now and for 10 minutes or so on the item 6, which we moved over, which is our perspective business to policy development process.

Now here we have a number of items tabulated, which are listed in my email to the counsel shortly before the meeting. We have an opportunity, we sort of - we've had an initial idea, we've taken some counsel feedback and it's recorded on the table that produces some possible changes and we've also noted the ATRT2 draft recommendation.

None of these changes are irreversible they are really pragmatic changes to attempt to experiment within the gold rules of the PDP, within the rules of the PDP opportunities to enhance the way in which we work and subject to coming back and reviewing them at a later stage.

So with that context in mind Marika if you could keep it as brief as possible but try and highlight what we might, some of the practical things we might do. And really what I'd love the counsel to do is support some or all of these as practical suggestions that we can get on with.

And as I said in my letter, my note to the council earlier we then come back and review perhaps as early as London it may wait until the annual meeting later in the year depending on how many PDP's they have impacted and how sensible it is to review it at that stage, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika I don't think I need to go into detail for each of these items because we already went through them in Buenos Aires and I think as I explained there most of the proposed next steps are really in the very pragmatic approach of trying to say, okay let's, you know, try this out and see how it goes.

Or in certain cases let us do a bit more analysis or research and come back with further concrete recommendations on how we may implement it for the counsel to review in order to be able to decide whether or not to proceed with some of these items.

So I think the question is really are, you know, any of those proposed next steps or any of these items on this list does the counsel feel at this stage we should not proceed with those or are there any items where you feel are higher priority than others and we should first focus on those or should we just, you know, as staff, you know, tackle these as we can.

I just note and on some of these we've already actually started with some of that work you'll note on the for example the charter the number one is something we already did for the privacy and proxy accreditation issues PDP and we'll also, you know, similarly prepare a proposed or a draft charter for the issue of (unintelligible) being prepared on the (PDRP) or as for IGO's, INCO's as that was also part of the request made.

And we're having a new (commair) and Webinar on Monday and will be hosted by Mikey looking at how we can integrate new commerce better and we'll start looking at some of the educational materials that are on the new ICANN learning platform.

So I think some of these things we're already actively pursuing but there are some items that we're suggesting maybe we do a little bit more research or try to understand a little bit better what the options are, what the potential implications are of pursuing those options.

So we can put those items back there on your table once we have that information together and move forward from there. And as I said I think in several of these as well and I think it was a suggestion that was made by Maria that in any case I think we'll put a stake in the ground like either in 6 months or 12 months for a basic come back.

And say, look on all these items what we have done to date and what has the impact been so we can actually then decide on, you know, should we continue with some of these.

And I think if I noted as well in the document some of these may eventually require updates to the working group guidelines as, you know, some things may become standing practice.

So I think that's something that we'll, you know, need to factor in as well that we do build in a kind of review period or a time where we say okay let's look back what we've done, how did it work, was it effective, should we continue or should we, you know, steer in different directions or focus on other things that we've uncovered may assist in this process as well.

I think I'll leave it at that and happy to take any questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika there's a couple of suggestions in the chat at 4, 5 and 8 from John Berard, 3 from Mikey I suspect that that's a useful guide to those but actually many of these should be able to be done in parallel as you said, Chuck I see your hand is up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan and thanks for all the work that's gone into this. A couple things, first of all as I've already communicated and I won't repeat my concerns here.

I have problems with number 4 to require representatives from stakeholder groups and constituencies. I think that's good if we can accomplish that, I think it's very difficult to enforce and we have examples where that hasn't been necessary for example the IRTP, PDP so I'll just leave it at that.

Secondly, I'd like to suggest adding one and this one really has to do with increased - which could result in a slight improvement to time efficiency. We require - we now require initial comment periods and reply comment periods.

And I think the general idea there is good but in cases where a work - where there are comment periods during which while a working group is still functioning I think we could eliminate the reply period.

Maybe make the initial period or the only comment period 30 days and then replies could be sent straight to the working group for their input and that would pick up a little time especially in longer PDP's where we have quite a few comment periods, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck, Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Yes I would like to speak to number 3 increase for PDP's working group volunteers. I took that one very much to heart after Mikey's comments in Buenos Aires.

And actually went out to try to recruit some people from my constituencies and beyond four working groups. And one thing I found out that the (aramis) about working groups and what they are doing, how they operate inside and outside ICANN is actually very, very low.

And that when you talk to people and explain to them how this works you - first they get frightened and then suddenly they get interested because they realize they can actually do something.

So my suggestion is I think that by using the working group as an argument and as an example in the outreach it also helps our in reach problem of getting more working group volunteers in there.

And I really think we should make the working groups as one - as the future in the outreach so to get more people in with more expertise and I only can to repeat myself share the concerns of Mikey those concerns, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Klaus, Volker.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Jonathan, I would like to just briefly touch upon number 2 the intensity of the working group meetings. As proposed it sounds like there's two meetings or a longer meeting each week and a lot of volunteers this would touch on either their ability to participate in other working groups or having to drop out or attending only half the meetings because of time constraints.

Many volunteers have a day job on the side so increasing the intensity of PDP working group output meetings might lead to burnout and I would caution against that especially since the work of the working group does not only take part at place in the meetings but also in the mailing list.

And sometimes between the meetings, sometime between the meetings it's just necessary to discuss certain issues and to get your arguments across and then end the meeting to discuss on what has been discussed in the past.

So it's not like the increase of - increasing meetings during the week would lead to more discussion it might even lead to less discussion if people see the meetings as the main exchange forum and rely less on the mailing list, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Volker, I'm going to go to Marika next because she may be responding I suspect to something that's come up and then I'll go back with James and Mikey in the queue, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika just briefly responding to some of the comments. First of all the comments made by Chuck on your requiring participants and I think we're really looking here not maybe at active participants but could be these are all observers.

And Chuck actually gave the example of IRTP but I think it's actually one of those where we did have in the past conversations when the report came at the counsel level and certain groups that hadn't been participating suddenly were.

What is this about we had no idea that this is what they were proposing. So I think it's really maybe needs some re-framing but it's kind of the idea that at least everyone is able to follow the discussion or has someone assigned to a working group to be able to answer questions or keep groups up to date from a timely manner.

So that when, you know, decisions need to be taken on certain issues even if it's not of core relevance to that specific group they at least are aware or have someone that can represent the group in the discussion.

But again, you know, this is I think probably next step there is we need to discuss our floated idea with stakeholder groups and constituencies and, you know, as you said maybe that the answer will be well, you know, we can encourage people but there's no way we're going to be able to do that for every group or be able to require that.

And on the public comment I think it's a very good observation but I think currently we're actually working on our overall ICANN framework. So I'm not really sure and it's something, you know, we may need to discuss either with the board who I think is currently mandated the initial comment period and reply period on whether we have flexibility to modify or change that.

But it's definitely something I can add just - and on the comment by Volker on intensity I think it's exactly what's, you know, in the next steps we propose to actually look at, you know, what is current timing, how much time is spent on working groups.

I mean how does that scale really look as well at pros and cons and actually you need to say look if you increase intensity it may mean that people will drop out of all the working groups or they'll have to step out altogether but basically put down those options back to the counsel for further review and discussion and decide whether, you know, any or none of those options may be worth exploring.

And again maybe in certain circumstances where I think the IGO-INGO is a good one where it was clear that it wasn't expedited after agreement of all participants to do it in a more intense basis to go forward.

But at least I think, you know, having the options on the table and, you know, pros and cons will hopefully give you something further to discuss and elaborate on.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika and just to - commenting on Chuck's point and what I see in the chat since I mean I don't think Chuck was suggesting bypassing the process on the comment and reply period it's simply making sure that the comments were conveyed directly to the working group so that they could be incorporated into the working groups work right away if the working group was actually still in process.

I must say it made me wonder where the - if there were no - if there was no input in the initial comment period whether we could drop the replay period but that's a different point and that's a more substantial point so let's go to you James.

James Bladel: Thank you Jonathan, James speaking and I was also focusing a little bit on Chuck's suggestion regarding the comment period and the

replay period. And if memory serves the thinking - this arose out of the recommendation from the ATRT1 group, which came up with this idea as a means to prevent what was a phenomenon at that time.

This flood of identical or copy, paste comments so that comment boxes were flooded with large numbers of identical comments. And we were trying to provide I think some mechanism for like-minded commenters to just sign onto those comments that had already been posted rather than reiterating the same point.

So I think that it would be perfectly within bounds to ask if that problem has been addressed if this comment and reply period is still even necessary. But I think I would defer to Marika on whether or not we have the flexibility to make that change since that came out of the - it came from the board or from the ATRT1 group.

But I think that we should keep in mind what the purpose was or the intention was in proposing that and then making sure that that problem is being addressed.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks James we've got a - I'm going to cut the queue off to Alan so we've got Mikey and Alan and then we're going to wrap up, come to wrapping up this item and actually the meeting as a whole so Mikey go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Jonathan it's Mikey I'll be really brief, just two points. One, I want to point out Chuck's idea in the chat this notion that rather than just touching on these issues once a month in counsel meetings we put together either a subgroup of the counsel that's interested in working on these things more intensely.

And if so I'd love to be in that group or I think Chuck's idea was maybe to go even broader than that and put together a working group on this and I think that's a great idea as well but some sort of group focusing on this rather than these little 10 minute shots looking at a giant matrix I think would be good.

And then the second point is that one of the problems with number 3, which is increasing the pool of working group volunteers is that we need a staircase that we can take people through in small steps so that we're not taking a complete newcomer and dropping them into an intense working group.

Those of who have been in working groups have seen this happen and it's hard on everybody. It's hard on the newcomer as it's hard on the folks that are more experienced.

And so one of the things that I'd like to propose to stick into this is in the - especially in in reach that the drafting of comments for the comment period be a mechanism to be used to draw in newcomers, provide them a chance to learn their jobs a little bit, a little bit lower pressure, a much shorter duration as a sort of part of a staircase to bring people into this process, there you go.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mikey, over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you and I support much of what Mikey just said. Three very quick comments regarding mandatory you can - we can clearly ensure that every stakeholder group constituency has a representative.

We can't make sure they actually read the emails or participate. I think the intent of this one was that we didn't want people disavowing themselves of the process and then coming in at the last moment and saying but.

And again you may not be able to legislate that but that was the intent of the direction. In terms of the public comments there is a new ATRT recommendation acknowledging that the past changes didn't work and saying we need to fix this problem.

Therefore there will be discussion and a board, you know, a board comment period that we'll be coming up there for. It's very appropriate for the GNSO to look at what might work.

And yes that would require changing the overall ICANN rules but we're going to be doing that so the timing is just perfect on that. And in terms of intensity I'm not quite sure why that one is there because there's already, you know, that's essentially business as usual that some groups choose to meet every two weeks, some groups meet once a week, some is for an hour or an hour and one-half.

And under duress groups meet more than once a week or for longer periods and it's always done only with great trepidation but it is done. So I think that's business as usual at this point, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan and thanks to all who contributed that's a great set of contributions here. I think what it leaves us with the opportunity to do is for Marika as the sort of owner of this document to go over the transcript and or the audio file of this update, this document.

And essentially use it as a guide to then continuing to make some of these improvements. We have a second suggestion I would like us to take up a list and see if there is enough traction on it, which is to form an ongoing group working group if you like to deal with these PDP improvements.

And that group could monitor both whatever's going on with this work and turn it and take it off the main counsel agenda. So I think that's very attractive as well.

So it looks like - and we can - I see Alan you've put in the chat we need some ongoing discussion to refine the list and I agree. I think it's quite - it should be okay to do that.

So it seems to me that as I said if Marika can refine the document based on this discussion we can keep that as an active and living document that we work with.

I just wanted to make sure that we A, had something to be getting on with. B, that this wasn't just a repeat to what the counsel lists and I think by getting on with some of these items and having potentially, which it looks like there is some interest for a working group to pick this up we'll be in a position to both make practical improvements and be able to demonstrate to others that we are making improvements.

So I think we can draw a line under that item now. Marika please just I see your hand has come up.

Marika Konings: Just it doesn't make any difference to describe repeat. I think most of the items is actually in your next step proposed is ready for staff to go

away and do some more research or come back with more information.

So what may be helpful is actually to identify those items where I think it is suggested that maybe a small group looks at for example to, you know, the training Web site or the learning materials to see what can be done there.

And those may be specific items where any small group or committee may be helpful in starting to look at that. But I think I'm cognizant with so much other things going on that forming another formal working group may be overkill or may be a challenge at this point in time. So I can at least highlight those items where indeed it may be suitable for a small group to start looking at those and then you can maybe decide what will be the appropriate form or shape to do that in.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay we will try and pick this up. I think the intention here was to try and make changes that - and there's some real changes that are being suggested in the chats and so on that would require more comprehensive changes to our rules.

And maybe that we need to do more of a deep dive in it but I've also been cognizant to your point Marika that to the amount of work that's going on. Right now I'm aware of the - that the time clock and we've just gone to one minute past the hour so I think it's time to wrap up these or any other business item.

There is a - I'm reminded that there is a Web site survey, this is a (primitive) - - Marika this is a survey of the GNSO Web site if there is

something out there that might be worth resending a reminder for lists so I can just make sure I'm clear on that.

Marika Konings: That's correct and we'll get it out to the counsel list again as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes it would be great to get any input from either counselors and or the groups they represent. The meeting schedule I think we've sorted out and actually I just want to make one other point before - unless there are any other AOB's and to just thank Chuck actually although he's come in as a temporary alternative I think the registry's will put in a new counselor by next time.

Chuck as you know is an immensely experienced participant in the GNSO and has been immediately valuable to the counsel even though he has only been in (unintelligible) temporary alternative. So thanks Chuck really appreciate your brief reincarnation of a counselor so that's great, John.

John Berard: Just being ham handed nothing to say.

Jonathan Robinson: All right great and I see others, James and I'm sure others - yes I see in the chat as well appreciate Chuck's involvement. Thank you very much all I think we covered some decent ground there.

Wish you all the best those of you that are taking the break over the sort of holiday season and will of course get together online over email and in the New Year. So thanks for your participation today and look forward to working with you in the meantime and in the new calendar year.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you Jonathan, bye.

Man: Thanks (unintelligible).

Woman: Bye John.

END