Marika Konings: Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of 4 September 2014
Gabriela Szlak: Hi there, can we join also the audio? or we will need to call?
Gabriela Szlak: Sorry, just saw the note in Glen email. I am calling asap
Bladel: Question: Can anyone join the adobe as an observer?
Bladel: Or is this "closed"
Marika Konings: @James - only Council members can join the AC
Marika Konings: the audiocast is for observers
Bladel: Ah, ok. Thanks.
Bret Fausett, RySG: Good morning all.
Gabriela Szlak: Good Morning Bret and all
Bret Fausett, RySG: I'll be in the adobe for hand raising and chat but on the telephone for voice and sound.
Bret Fausett, RySG: Let
Amr Elsad: Sorry I'm late. Dialling in now.
Osvaldo Novoa: Hello all, sorry I'm late. I am dialling in also
Maria Farrell: Hi there, just signing in. There seems to be no sound on the adobe connect.
Maria Farrell: Will try to call in now on skype
David Cake: I am not dialled in individually, but Maria and Avri and I are in the same room and can share a connection.
David Cake: We have found a room in the IGF secretariat.
Mary Wong: The PDP has already been approved
Mary Wong: As has the Charter
Mary Wong: PDP initiated in early June, Charter approved in London
Gabriela Szlak: I have bad audio today. The voices fade and it is being difficult to understand. Maybe someone can call me?
Marika Konings: @Gabriela - we can dial out of you
Marika Konings: can you provide us with your number?
Gabriela Szlak: Yes please +54911 43280231
Gabriela Szlak: sorry without the 9 +541143280231
Marika Konings: @Gabriela - the operator should be dialing out to you shortly.
Gabriela Szlak: thanks
Bladel: I'm not clear on how option three would work... Board PDP?
Alan Greenberg: I asked questions to the list (very late) related to this motion. They give my interpretation of what the NGPC asked for in their letter. My question is if my interpretation is correct.
Alan Greenberg: For the RCRC, what is being requested is that the country names (up to 2 language versions) be prohibited from registration at the 2nd level, with the possible exception of registration by the RCRC organization in question. If there are any existing registrations, they will continue to exist, but if they expire or are otherwise cancelled or deleted, the new rule applies. For the IGOs, what is being requested is that post 90 days, registrations of the "protected" acronyms be allowed without a claims notice being sent to the prospective registrant, but that after the registration, the TMCH (or some entity) must advise the IGO that the registration has taken place.
Jonathan Robinson: My understanding is that you are correct Alan
Mary Wong: By country names, I believe Alan is referring to the 189 Red Cross national societies for which the Red Cross had requested protection.
Amr Elsadr: Thanks Mary. Was wondering about that.
Bladel: Yes, thanks Mary
Alan Greenberg: Mary, do you have a pointer?
David Cake: I admit my personal opinion of the ICRC advice is similar to Chris
Mary Wong: The 16 June letter does not contain a specific request
Bladel: "Give the GNSO an opportunity to consider modifying the elements of the approved policy recommendations in accordance with the procedure established in the GNSO Operating Procedures."
Mary Wong: The NGPC lists the differences between the GNSO recs and GAC advice, and requests that the GNSO consider using Section 16 of the PDP Manual to assist in reconciling the differences
Bladel: Sounds like a specific request to me.
Bladel: Diplomatically, worded, of course. :)
Mary Wong: @James, yes for the process but not the actual scope of the amendments
Alan Greenberg: Didn't the PDP say that existing TLD needed to follow new rules (without requiring cancelling existing registrations)
Mary Wong: @Alan, yes to the extent that there are some notes/recs from the PDP on issues with applicability to legacy gTLDs - these to be handled by the IRT
Bladel: Adding URS and TMCH to incumbent TLDs is NOT an implementation concern.
Bladel: That clearly falls on the "policy" side of the line, IMO. And would hate to see us "backed over" that line.
Mary Wong: @James, one of the charter questions for the new Curative Rights PDP is whether the URS can be Consensus Policy
Alan Greenberg: I would be happy to work with whoever to draft that letter to the NGPC
Bladel: @Mary - we had that discussion for months on the Registration Abuse group, and in the development of the program. Just pushing it to new gTLDs is not simply ticking an implementation box.
Mary Wong: @James - yes, which is why the only way to deal with it (given the PDP recs from the original IGO-INGO WG relating to UDRP and URS) is to have a GNSO PDP WG look at it, as a policy issue.
Bladel: Ok. It sounds as tho this is one of the chips being placed on the table in order to seek a compromise.
Bladel: @Alan - Chris asked us to await the next NGPC meeting.
David Cake: Thanks you Chris.
Bladel: ...for a response to that pint.
Alan Greenberg: Sorry - must have been focusing on something else for a moment.
Bladel: :)
Ching Chiao (DotAsia): agree with Jonathan. RySG would like to defer the motion and take the info back to our group. Thanks
Thomas Rickert: I could also withdraw again...
Avri Doria: without a second it is not a full motion
Mary Wong: The GNSO Operating procedures do not require a second - that has been a custom only.
Avri Doria: it can just sit there until it is seconded
Avri Doria: bummer
Klaus Stoll: if I second it and we then refer?
Alan Greenberg: So if it is withdrawn, it is gone.
John Berard: Can someone enumerate exactly what new information we have?
Alan Greenberg: That things may change next week, and pending that, we need to
know exactly what the NGPC is prepared to propose regarding protection of RCRC
country names.
John Berard: Won't have the WG reconstituted allow us to move faster?
John Berard: having, I meant
Mary Wong: @John, the Council first needs to have a substantive amendment
proposed TO the WG for comment.
Alan Greenberg: To reconstitute the WG we need specific wording, I believe.
Mary Wong: So the Council needs to first decide what that wording/amendment will
look like.
Amr Elsadr: I'm in favour of the motion being withdrawn. I hope it can possibly be
reworded before being made again.
Mary Wong: @Amr, possibly. Certainly some updating (e.g. developments since
London) may need to be made - but since the motion doesn't include the substantive
amendments, it may be more important for the Council to first discuss and agree on
(1) whether to amend the PDP recs; and (2) if so, how - before voting on the motion
itself.
Mary Wong: And for that discussion/agreement, it may be more prudent to wait until
the NGPC has met (as Chris noted).
Amr Elsadr: @Mary: It's (1) that doesn't sit so well with me.
Mary Wong: @Amr, how so?
Amr Elsadr: I would prefer to give the WG a context to consider and ask whether the
WG itself would want to provide amended recs, but not specify the
recommendations we want them to agree to. That sounds more like bottom-up to me.
Glen de Saint Gery: George sadowsky has joined the phone line
Volker Greimann: Agreed, I got renewed appreciation for the work of the NomCom
Mary Wong: @Amr, the thing is - this is NOT what the PDP Manual prescribes.
There it's clear that it's the Council that proposes the amendment. The proposal
must be sent to the PDP WG for input and published for public comment before the
Council takes a final vote on it (or amends or withdraws it), but that's the process, I'm
afraid.
David Cake: Sorry for the drop out, dialling back.
Amr Elsadr: @Mary: Interesting. I'd like to go over that again and get back to you.
Some homework for me.
Mary Wong: @Amr, sure thing :)
David Cake: We are having difficulty reconnecting.
David Cake: But we can hear discussion.
Maria Farrell: David, avri and I are trying to call back in. Just got hung up on by the
operator
Bladel: "open ended"
Bret Fausett, RySG: I think Mason will be terrific and diplomatic in his approach.
Maria Farrell: +1 Bret.
Terri Agnew: @Maria, if you have a number we can dial out to you
Maria Farrell: thanks so much terri, avri's just trying again. We have a slightly
complicated joint adobe and phone set up here, so all good.
Maria Farrell: ah, avri is back in now, so we - avri, david and i - can speak again if needed. thanks again, terri.
Maria Farrell: oops we just fell off again!
Maria Farrell: can we vote through the chat window?
Avri Doria: vote in favor
Marika Konings: @Maria - yes, please go ahead
Maria Farrell: thanks everyone. I also vote in favour
David Cake: vote in favour
Gabriela Szlak: I am mute so yes
Avri Doria: we actually spoke
Amr Elsadr: And I vote yes for Magaly as well.
Alan Greenberg: ALAC vote on the charter is underway and will complete at the end of Sept 6.
Alan Greenberg: The ALAC is also voting on a proposed amendment with would add at the end of the SCOPE: Issues related to ensuring IANA's viability and effectiveness, are also within scope of the CWG. Such issues could include, but are not limited to: Charging structure or the lack thereof and languages that IANA can function in."
John Berard: interrelations and interdependent doesn't seem to commit to accountability coming first
David Cake: I can confirm that Avri is speaking fairly loudly.
Gabriela Szlak: Thanks David, my audio is bad! I appreciate Avri’s effort!
Alan Greenberg: Notice of the amendment SHOULD have been sent to the DT and the other AC/SO chairs. Cannot speak to why that did not happen.
Osvaldo Novoa: I think my phone line is in mute and cannot unmute it. I vote in favour of the motion.
Amr Elsadr: And mine for Magaly.
Amr Elsadr: I can't hear George at all.
Gabriela Szlak: I can't hear George
Bladel: Sorry, cannot hear.
Amr Elsadr: Much better!! :)
Gabriela Szlak: better
Mary Wong: Current Nom Com composition: 
https://www.icann.org/sites/default/files/assets/nomcom-org-chart-900x675-19mar14-en.png
Mary Wong: So proposed composition changes would see addition of 3 members from ccNSO and ASO - for geo reasons.. GNSO reps would be by SG, not C.
Petter Rindforth: Can you call me at +46 702 369360?
Terri Agnew: @Peter, we will have op call you
Petter Rindforth: My other tel line dropped
Petter Rindforth: Can you call me again?
Terri Agnew: @Petter, we are dial in gout to you again
Gabriela Szlak: can someone explain the word they are using to describe the voting problem? horse??? sorry can’t get this word.
Bladel: "horse trading"
Bladel: Sorry, it is an English idiom meaning they are exchanging votes.
Bret Fausett, RySG: I'm not sure that I see anything wrong with groups getting together and voting as a block. There is a word for that kind of behavior. It's called democracy.
Gabriela Szlak: thanks James
Bladel:@Breet - I agree. If ultimately all candidates are qualified, what's the problem with discussion/negotiation?

Bladel:@Brian - Agreed. I think the entire GNSO should be concerned.

Avri Doria: I guess I am not concerned. I like the parity notions it incorporates.

Gabriela Szlak: Marika/mary, could you please share in our email list the presentation that was just shared?

Amr Elsadr: So if there's a new SG in the GNSO, that would add a GNSO NomCom Seat? I'm just wondering in case privacy/proxy service providers form a SG.

Marika Konings: @Gabriela - yes, definitely

Gabriela Szlak: thanks

Avri Doria: I guess I am somewhat amused by the fact that the intent was to reduce the size and instead made it larger.

Bladel: @Volker: It's not an "impression" The GNSO is being downgraded.

Avri Doria: the other are being made equal.

Avri Doria: and in stead of gnso of 6 commercial to 1 non commercial, it will become 3 commercial to 1 non commercial

Bret Faussett, RySG: When the ASO and GAC fund ICANN to the same degree as the GNSO we can discuss parity on the NomComm.

Bladel: Agreed.

Avri Doria: ICANN is not all about money: should we give great money to the registrar dna registries who contribute the most?

Avri Doria: give votes based on the amount of money a constituency brings in?

Bladel: It is folly to pretend that the GNSO is not the largest, most influential and most controversial structure in ICANN.

Bret Faussett, RySG: It's not as much about the money as it about the internal emphasis of ICANN. Most of ICANN's operations are devoted to the GNSO-related area of operation. ASO demands far less in terms of policy, compliance, etc. It's not even arguable, I think, that the focus of ICANN is the GNSO.

Bladel: We could equalize NomCom representation, but have all nominations "ratified" by the GNSO Council.

Amr Elsadr: @Brett: +1

Bladel: Thanks, George.

Maria Farrell: But the nomcom appoints only one or two ppl a year to the gnso, and as many each to at large, board, and liaison to cc. Don't know why gnso should have more seats than others.

Bladel: @Maria - My concern is Board seats. Perhaps remove / reduce those from NomCom, and have the GNSO (and other SO/ACs) fill those seats directly.

Avri Doria: if the GNSO wants more board seats, then we should fight for more seats we elect.

Bladel: Right. Reducing the number of seats filled by NomCom

Maria Farrell: ah right, sorry james. I certainly support that.

Gabriela Szlak: I also can’t stay for another half hour

David Cake: I’m happy to update the list about LA planning tomorrow.

Avri Doria: I second that 'motion'

Tony Holmes: I couldn’t stay for 30 mins, 15 max

Bret Faussett, RySG: That’s a fair point., Avri. I believe that right now the Board composition is very far away, in terms of knowledge and experience, from the domain name industry. I would like to have Board members who understand us better. I'm
not looking for a shill, or a homer, just someone who has a sufficient depth of
knowledge in what it is the GNSO does.
  Tony Holmes: good idea Brett - support that
  John Berard: @Bret +1
  Ching Chiao (DotAsia): https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/agenda-
2014-09-09-en
  Ching Chiao (DotAsia): Planning for Future gTLD Application Rounds on the consent
agenda as well
  Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan and all.
  David Cake: Thanks all
  Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you all!!
  Ching Chiao (DotAsia): Thanks all. Bye for now
  Gabriela Szlak: Thanks!!