

**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference
15 January 2015 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 15 January 2015 at 18:00 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-15jan15-en.mp3>

and the Adobe Chat transcript is available at:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-15jan15-en.pdf>

on page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jan>

List of attendees: NCA – Non Voting – Carlos Raúl Gutierrez

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Volker Greimann, James Bladel – absent apologies proxy

Thomas Rickert, Yoav Keren – absent apologies proxy Volker Greimann

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jonathan Robinson, Donna Austin, Bret Fausett

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Gabriela Szlak, Susan Kawaguchi, Osvaldo Nova, Tony Holmes, Brian Winterfeldt, Heather Forrest –absent, apologies, proxy to Brian Winterfeldt

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Amr Elsadr, Marilia Maciel, Edward Morris, Stephanie Perrin, Avri Doria, David Cake - absent, apologies, proxy to Avri Doria

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Cheryl Langdon Or – ALAC Liaison

Patrick Myles - ccNSO Observer - absent, apologies

Mason Cole – GNSO liaison to the GAC

ICANN Staff

David Olive - VP Policy Development

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director

Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director

Mary Wong – Senior Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director

Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Cory Schruth – Systems Engineer

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, Glen. Hello, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of today, the 15th of January. We have a reasonably full agenda with no motions on the table, rather a series of either items to round off and deal with and/or discussion points or updates.

So it may be that we can move through this fairly quickly. We'll see how we go.

Coordinator: Excuse me, Brian Winterfeldt has joined the conference at this time.

Jonathan Robinson: If I could remind everyone to please make sure that their microphone is on mute. I hear a little coughing and so let's just make sure your microphones are on mute if you are not speaking.

So, Item 1 then is our administrative matters. And let's commence immediately with a roll call please, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: I'll do that, Jonathan. Thank you. Bret Fausett, I do not seem him yet on the call. Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: We have apologies from James Bladel and Yoav Keren. James has given his proxy to Thomas Rickert. Yoav has given his proxy to Volker Greimann. Volker Greimann - if Volker is not answering...

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Oh, welcome, Volker. Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Gabriela Szlak.

Gabriela Szlak: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Susan Kawaguchi.

Susan Kawaguchi: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Brian Winterfeldt.

Brian Winterfeldt: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: We have apologies from Heather Forrest who is in transit and she has a given her proxy to Brian Winterfeldt. Osvaldo Novoa.

Osvaldo Novoa: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Tony Holmes.

Tony Holmes: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Edward Morris.

Edward Morris: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: Present.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Amr. Marilia Maciel has told us that she will be late joining the call but she will join. Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: I'm here, thanks.

Glen de Saint Géry: Stephanie Perrin.

Stephanie Perrin: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry. Daniel Reed.

Daniel Reed: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Carlos Gutierrez.

Carlos Gutierrez: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Patrick Myles, our ccNSO liaison, has sent his apologies. And for staff we have got Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Steve Chan, Lars Hoffman, Julie Hedlund, myself and perhaps there are staff together in one office, Rob Hogarth or David Olive. I'm sure they will join shortly. And we have our guest, GNSO liaison, Mason Cole.

Thank you, Jonathan, and over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Glen. Welcome, everyone. Let's move on then with the agenda. One thing that we don't need a reply on now but it might be good to get a reply on the list is any reason why we don't have audio in the Adobe Connect room. That's something we can pick up on because it's not obvious why we don't have that so let's think about that.

But in the meantime I'll move straight on to 1.2 which is an opportunity for any updates to Statements of Interest. Seeing none we'll move on to call for any points to comment on or amend the agenda. Item 1.4, I see that the minutes from the 11 December meeting are not yet approved. Apologies for that. We will deal with that shortly and get that tidied up.

Next we typically come to Item 2 where we have an opportunity to review the open items on the action list and note that there is a fuller description in the project list of all Council related activity.

So first item is the Singapore meeting planning which comes up on the main agenda. Similarly with the next item which is an update on the

community working group to develop an IANA stewardship transition proposal.

I will note here that's an action in here on all of the councilors, notwithstanding the fact that the different groups have members in the IANA CWG, there is a note here that it is incumbent on councilors to ensure that their constituencies and stakeholder groups are informed as we work through this process.

And we can talk about that in a bit more detail in the main item. But just please note that it would be very good if you could keep yourselves informed and abreast of what's going on in these two critical and interrelated community working groups dealing with the IANA transition and the accountability working group and make sure you're confident that your group is well informed. Yeah, that's probably enough said there for the moment.

On the next item, that deals with the CWG on ICANN accountability which is effectively the same point, and it does come up on the main agenda; the same point insofar as keeping groups informed.

The next three items are on hold for various reasons. The next item is on the Expert Working Group final report. Well, it's not strictly on the final report it's more about the integration of the work of that group into GNSO policy. I think we've planned to schedule a proper update on that from Susan at the GNSO weekend working session in Singapore.

But, Susan, I'll just pause for a moment in case you'd like to make any comments as to (unintelligible) or any issues that you'd like the Council to be aware of in respect of that group's work at the moment.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you. We are - we just met again last week via phone call.

And we are working through the issues trying to just figure out exactly what would be helpful, what work would be helpful prior to a PDP. And I think staff is - will start work soon on the preliminary issues report and the draft charter. So we will have more details on that. We're waiting for a few bits more of information; some of the members are working on some issues.

And there will be a phone call next week but I'm on - or the week after, I'm on vacation so somebody else will head that up. And we will have a report to the GNSO in Singapore.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Thanks, Susan. Any comments or questions with - in relation to that work or any of the other items I've already passed over?

All right, the next item is the fact that deals with the outstanding IGO INGO PDP recommendations. And this is waiting for feedback from the NGPC to the GNSO Council. And I think we can expect an update in Singapore here so that's something imminent but there isn't, as far as I'm aware, any update right now.

Next item, Board Working Group on the Nominating Committee and we completed a statement and sent that in as part of the reply period. I think that worked well insofar as it, you know, responding to something during the reply period, being confident that we knew what the groups had done and where appropriate the Council responding so that was useful.

With respect to the new GAC leadership I sent an email to Thomas - I think it's probably too late to send something to Heather now so I have missed that deadline - but I think we can consider that item completed. And I will pick up on communication with the new GAC leadership team, which I believe is due to be seated in - at the next meeting.

Thomas was, in a sense, premature in that he came in I think earlier than would normally have taken place and the remainder of the new vice chairs are due to in place then. So we will need to pick up and I'll aim to pick up with them in Singapore.

On name collision, this is work in progress with Donna, Susan and Tony, and we'll pick that up in the main agenda. Skill sets for the Nominating Committee, that was completed.

This GAC communiqu  work is part of the main agenda so perhaps we'll come back to that as well, although just noting that Volker and David, you both are on the hook as well as I am, in fact really to do something that I mentioned a moment ago. And so just be aware that each of your names and mine come up in that area.

And then, gTLD application rounds. I might need a nudge on this one. I'm not quite sure where we are on this one. Does anyone - anyone assist me here. Is this part of the main agenda? Thanks, Marika. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to confirm that that is part of the main agenda under Item 7.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I thought so. That's great, we'll come to that then. And then finally the letter to the GAC sub working group on geographic names, that was completed and sent off.

Our next item is to come to the consent agenda. And this one always slightly surprises me because technically what we have to do is vote on the consent agenda even though to me it sort of feels like if it's a consent agenda it's subject to objection or not.

But in any event this item here is to approve the GNSO Council recommendations report to the ICANN Board concerning IRTP Part D. Hopefully you've all read and seen that report. And in addition I put in there as we construct the agenda to note the outcome of the vote of that Council input.

Now strictly we don't need to vote on that because we voted electronically but was encouraging and positive to see that that process in action and work to support the sending off of that input to the public comment on the Board working group - NomComm work.

So here we simply vote to approve the consent agenda. And I will do it by a voice vote. So if I could call for any objections to this item being on the consent agenda first of all. No objections. And then look for any votes against the consent agenda as it now stands. Any abstentions. So, Glen, if you could record there were no votes against and no abstentions so we'll take it that everyone present has voted for accepting the consent agenda as it stands.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you, Jonathan, I will.

Jonathan Robinson: Next item, Item 4 is an opportunity to provide an update on the work of the Cross Community Working Group to develop a transition proposal for IANA stewardship. This is a high profile piece of work that, as you may well be aware, I am one of two co-chairs chairing the work of this group. It's pretty intense work and there's a lot going on.

A proposal was put out - a draft proposal was put out on the 1st of December, public comment was duly received by the 19th of December. And then intensive work carried on over the holiday period to try and assimilate and deal with those public comments.

And the time table was then - the intention was to take all of that work and ideally, in order to meet or close to meet that of the coordinating group, the ICG, who's dealing with these transition proposals from the different components of the broader community - the idea was to pull that together into a - into - pull the public comments and all the work that had been done together and work through that systematically via an intensive work weekend which took place for the past weekend with the idea that that could then be drafted into a revised proposal in time for review by the GNSO as one of the chartering organizations and the other SOs and ACs who were jointly responsible for chartering this group.

And in any event, and then the intention was to review that final proposal and vote on it at our next Council meeting. That always was an exceptionally stretching timetable and has proved to be just that. So where we are right now is that the public comments have been reviewed in some detail. We had the intensive work weekend. There were four two-hour meetings took place over the course of the past weekend.

And there is significant progress being made but it's increasingly, if not evident if not absolutely clear that the meeting of the ICG's timetable will not take place. There's too much work to be done and there's too much consultation to be done with the various groups and bringing the whole thing on board.

So where the group is at at the moment is that it's continuing to work. I think there's an intention to produce a decent update of the work in time for the Singapore meeting so that it can get significant socialization and discussion and feedback during the course of the Singapore meeting and well in advance of that - of the Singapore meeting to draft a revised timetable with a new target date for submission to the ICG.

We as a Council still have a meeting and a diary for two weeks' time. And I would propose to you that although we won't be, at that point voting on a final proposal it may be very useful to keep that meeting in place in order to review in more detail the work of the CWG.

So in some ways I don't propose to say a whole lot more now. I think we're probably better off meeting separately to look at this on the 29th. But I really throw the microphone open now to any questions on the work of the CWG and any specific points on the value and use of the meeting of the 29th to get a - to at least retain that meeting and the diary as a prospective update meeting on specifically this topic, possibly also the related topic which we'll come to next under Item 5 and that's the work of the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability which is inextricably interlinked with the transition work.

Let me pause and see if anyone who is on that IANA stewardship group or anyone who is not but feels they would like to be better informed in order to inform their perspective groups would like to ask questions or provide comments or any other related points.

Thanks, Marika, for your comment in the chat. I note that the meeting is the 28th of January, not the 29th. I'm not sure where I picked up the 29th from but 28th, noted.

Stephanie, your hand is up. Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you, Jonathan. I just wanted to make a rather obvious point that I think this is a heroic effort. And I really applaud all of the people who have been doing the heavy lifting. I myself have not; I have been attempting to follow and it's very difficult even just to follow with all the work that's going on and to cross thread the two groups.

But I'm concerned that in the event that we don't make this heroic deadline of September, which really is June of course, that it will be perceived as a failure on the part of ICANN and a failure of the multistakeholder model. Whereas in fact, the fact that we have these robust discussions that we do all this work is indeed an endorsement of the multistakeholder model. But it's how to get that communicated.

And I wonder - well, it's not for me, as not a member of the group, to say we got 50/50 odds of making deadlines. But if the odds are 50/50 then we'd better start working on the communications lest we lose control of the spin. And I just wondered if anyone has any thoughts on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Stephanie. I'll come straight back and respond on that.

But - and I think it's perceptive and accurate. I think we - you are absolutely right and that's one of the most critical points we've been mindful in recognizing that the timeline cannot meet the target of the - set by the ICG.

It is incredibly important that this isn't either presented or represented as some form of failing of the work. And so we, the co-chairs, and those working on - in the CWG, are very mindful of that.

And you simply highlight a good point that there is - the care has to be taken at all times with respect to the language and communications around this in order to make it crystal clear that this not a failure but in many ways a success of the richness of the process and the requirement to bake the cake at the right temperature and the right speed and such that we don't have a flop. And that's what we're working on but it's a good and perceptive point. Thank you.

Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Jonathan. I think my point echoes and maybe and answers the point that Stephanie was making. I think it shows a very vivid discussion by the community in developing proposals which I think is an excellent thing and can't be stressed enough.

Additionally I think what's needed in order to avoid a perception that the community fails is that we send out clear signals that the CWG is not working in isolation but that is actually in contact with the CCWG, with the other communities as well as with the ICG.

So my question to you, Jonathan, would be to maybe elaborate a little bit more on the timing and the plans and maybe answer the question whether you wouldn't share my view that it would be very good to set up some sort of coordination on timelines on who adds what to what between all groups involved so that we can show to the rest of the world that it's not the CWG more or less failing to meet a deadline that has been prescribed but that all the groups are working together towards the joint goal of coming up with a holistic cohesive proposal to the NTIA.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, that's a good point, Thomas. The CWG is now going to work over the next week or so at revising a time table and providing that to the ICG. But you do make a good point about the integration of that. And as you know, we are in communication as respective co-chairs of the different groups.

And that is a good suggestion that there is a form of coordination about the representation of any timeline because we're vulnerable in a couple of areas, as you say, these - there's Stephanie's point which she made earlier and also the fact that the work of the Accountability group and the IANA Transition group are not synchronized in terms of their timing but the work is being coordinated.

So it's a good point. And it's something we should perhaps pick up when our two groups meet and in addition when either of us talks with the ICG. I'm not sure if there's a fourth or a fifth group that should be included if you're thinking of coordinated timescales but that definitely makes sense. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: If I may jump in? I think it would even be worthwhile discussing this with the Board because ultimately the Board will also need some time to review the proposal and submit it. So I think in terms of timetable it would be good not to exclude them from the conversation although it's clear that the proposal has to be community developed.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I guess there's two ways of talking with the Board about that. Are you proposing this is a GNSO item for the Board? Because it could be; it could be a point where we make it clear that that - at very least from a GNSO perspective we are supportive of a (well-baked) proposal so we could have this on our agenda in Singapore or alternatively it's something where, again, the chairs of this group, the accountability group and the ICG talk with the Board in whatever way the process.

Thomas Rickert: If I may respond? I think it doesn't harm to have communication at various levels. What I think is needed to actually demonstrate that we are working together towards this joint goal and to avoid that there's friction and that there might be misunderstanding in terms of who delivers what to whom by when.

As you know and as the councilors know, the naming community submits its proposal to the ICG while the accountability group submits its recommendations to the Board after having - after those have been approved by the chartering organization.

So we, more or less, have a triangle where different pieces of the puzzle need to be coordinated. And I think we need to ensure that now that original planning in terms of time can't be upheld, that everybody is in full agreement on the ways forward to avoid that we get some last minute issues with this.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Thomas, is there a specific proposal you're making though with respect to the Council?

Thomas Rickert: I think I would open it up for discussion. But my suggestion would actually be that the Council also takes part of its shared responsibility as a chartering organization to uphold the dialogue with the other parties including the Board.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, that's helpful. Thank you. Tony.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Jonathan. I was going to suggest - and I very much agree with the rationale put forward by Thomas that when we get to a convenient stage most of the criticism of the process is going to come from outside of ICANN, not within ICANN.

I think it would be worthwhile the Council considering making a public statement where we applaud the work that's been done from all of the groups, the numbers and the names as well and the protocols and offer publicly a statement of support recognizing the good work that's been done and the benefit from getting a coherent approach even if it has taken a little longer that's something we could consider.

Jonathan Robinson: Interesting idea especially with the Council being the multistakeholder body that it is and as Avri points in the chat there's a chartering organization (to) these key groups. Well...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Exactly, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Well that's a very constructive suggestion building on the back of Thomas's and in some way's Stephanie's as well so it's a nice thread. What we're going to need then is really - it feels to me like that might be appropriate to come out around our next - we could even make it as part of the - targeting the 28th meeting since the purpose of the 28th meeting is to review the work of these two groups.

So I wonder if anyone would volunteer to at least get the principles that should be covered in that statement. It doesn't have to be massive but it could certainly capture the role of the Council, its position as a multistakeholder body and its - its function as a chartering organization.

Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I was pressing the wrong button to unmute. Avri speaking. Yeah, this is certainly something that I'd be willing to help put together since I'm also working at sort of what I've been calling the cross-CWG process. So I'd be happy to work with, you know, Tony's idea so perhaps - but I'd certainly be willing to work on it.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, well, I mean, I don't know, Tony, if you're willing to throw your hat in the ring as well as Avri and then we can work with you to try and do that. I think it would be great if we could do that and then with that form perhaps the basis of one discussion item with the board. So we'll pencil that in as a discussion item with the Board in Singapore.

But that - but to be clear, we propose to do something ideally ahead of Singapore. And it might be good coming up - it might be timely for it to

come out just ahead of Singapore so that dovetails nicely in with that 28th of...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Certainly, Tony speaking. Jonathan, yes, more than happy to work with Avri on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great, that's helpful. I - that's very helpful. Thanks, Tony. I'm just hearing that there is some confusion, some remaining confusion about whether they said the date is actually the 28th or 29th of January so we need to get that sorted out very quickly and communicate that clearly to the Council list and understand...

Thomas Rickert: Jonathan, it's Thomas. The GNSO public calendar displays the 28th.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so I think we should work with the 28th. That feels like what we - what we should cement it in as. Let me just have a look. Can you confirm to me what time that is, Thomas? Oh, eleven o'clock. Eleven am UTC.

Yeah, I think we should stick with that. It's unusual for it to be on a Wednesday but if that's what the calendar says. I think it's possibly an error on the calendar but if that's what the calendar says and that's what's in all of our diaries I suggest we stick with that.

All right good. Well I think that maybe covers this topic for now. And it gives us a neat segue into the so-called related and interdependent area of the group that Thomas is chairing which is - or co-chairing, which is the Cross Community Working Group on IANA Accountability.

So, Thomas, why don't you take that one away for us and give us an update there and see if there's any related questions and comments.

Thomas Rickert: Sure. Thanks, Jonathan. And I'm not sure whether we already had the third co-chair when I gave the last update to the GNSO Council. So we actually do have three co-chairs being Mathieu Weill from the ccNSO; Leon Sanchez from ALAC and myself. So we have a little bit bigger leadership team than the CWG has.

Since we started later I think we might need that manpower or - in order to catch up a little bit. But we are actually working very hard. We have weekly two-hour calls. And in order to be even more effective we have scheduled a face to face meeting which is going to take place in Frankfurt on next Monday and next Tuesday. We're gathering on Sunday evening. And we hope to make significant progress with our work during that intense two-day time span.

I should also say that one of the focal points of our work next to the substantive work on the questions that we've been chartered with is to coordinate with the CWG. So the co-chairs of both groups are holding regular coordination calls. The next call is going to be tomorrow in order to ensure that we have full knowledge of each other's actions and that we keep each other updated on the developments and the respective work areas.

Out of these coordination calls actually came the idea of coming up with a relatively early statement issued by the CCWG through the co-chairs to advise the interested community about the progress that we're making. And you will have seen the note on the GNSO Council

list that we have issued so-called high level statements, which are still very general and broad but which are as - which have as much substance as we can provide today.

As you know our work is still at the - pretty much at the beginning so we do not have concrete plans but there are some general themes, I would say, that already become clearer and that we thought we should officially propose to the rest of the community, publish it, so that our thinking is known to a wider audience.

So being cognizant of the fact that these are preliminary thoughts that might be subject to change based on updates to the CWG proposal as well as to our ongoing deliberations as well as other external factors, we still thought that it might be valuable to share the following thoughts, which are: Number 1, that the CCWG Accountability considers addressing in Work Stream 1 those are the parts that need to be either completed or committed to prior to the transition that an independent mechanism for the review and redress of decisions of the ICANN Board of Directors needs to be established.

I think there were concerns by the community that have been voiced during public comment periods held last summer that there is actually no means to get Board decisions challenged or reversed. So this seems to be one of the main topics. So the CCWG is cognizant of that and will very likely come up with such independent mechanism.

The second topic is that many think that the mandate that ICANN has is an issue so there is the fear that after the historic relationship with the US government is in place that ICANN might alter or extend its

scope. So that's something that also needs to be controlled by an independent mechanism.

And the third main topic that came up over and over again is the possibility to recall one or multiple members of the ICANN Board of Directors. Yet, the legal nature of this mechanism, its composition and the exact mandate of this mechanism is yet to be determined and we're hoping to make progress with this during the Frankfurt meeting.

We've also clarified that we are working on the definition of the term "accountability" to further flesh out what actually we're tasked to do. So you can expect from our group that we will work very thoroughly on the questions of to whom ICANN should be accountable, on what ICANN should be accountable and how ICANN or its Board of Directors should be held accountable.

So I think that this, combined with internal and/or external review and appeals processes is something that might be a rough outline of the roadmap that we're working on and of the recommendations that we might come up with.

In terms of the work and where we are, you might recall that we have established four subcommittees or four work areas where sub teams are working on in parallel. The first of which is the - deals with the creation of an inventory of ICANN's current accountability mechanisms. And that work is completed so the group has agreed on this inventory.

The second work area took the challenge of analyzing public comment and other sources for request for accountability work. We expect that list to be completed in Frankfurt. And we also do hope that we can

allocate specific tasks on that list to either Work Stream 1 or Work Stream 2 or both so that we can better prioritize the items that we need to look at.

The third work area deals with interaction with the CWG so that is something that's going to be standing for, I guess the lifetime of the co-existence of these groups. And the fourth work area deals with the collection or the creation of an inventory of contingencies because if we're thinking about - thinking of accountability mechanisms these should be reflected in contingencies.

So what are actually the threats that ICANN might face and which we need to stress test in order to see whether we have created accountability mechanisms that are robust enough so in order to better scope that we have asked the sub team to work on a list of contingencies. We do hope to get that list finalized and agreed on in Frankfurt.

And the next step for that group, which will likely be repurposed, is to look at these contingencies to see whether they are already addressed by existing accountability mechanisms in which case no further work by our group would be required on those items; and in case the contingencies are not adequately addressed by existing accountability mechanisms the group would then need to make a determination as to whether existing accountability mechanisms need to be altered to address these issues or if new accountability mechanisms need to be recommended.

And that will - that exercise will help us understanding better what we need to find responses for and maybe even cluster various threats into

groups so that we can have a cohesive set of accountability mechanisms prioritized according to the threats that we're facing.

But then we're taking them all equally serious at this stage creating the inventory and hopefully after Frankfurt I will be able to report in much more detail what we have achieved.

I think I should pause here and open it up for questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Thomas. And so just to highlight again, the purpose of Item 4 and Item 5 here is that the GNSO Council - well the GNSO through the GNSO Council is a chartering organization of both of these groups. And ultimately the work of these groups is going to come back to be signed off on by the GNSO through the GNSO Council.

So we've got a tremendous responsibility here to track this work, to be appraised of it, to appraise our own groups of it, notwithstanding the fact that the - the stakeholder groups put members and there are other participants in both of these groups.

So that's the purpose of having these items here is to - because of the substance and far-reaching nature of them so quite often typically we bring things up rather than when they come for a vote but don't necessarily have significant updates in between. But it feels important to me and I think to Thomas to ensure that this group, the GNSO Council, is continuously and properly appraised of this work. Okay, thanks Thomas. Any other questions or comments for Thomas on this?

All right, we'll keep things moving then and move on to Item 6 which is an update on the prospective policy work on name collision. There's

been a draft circulated - prepared and circulated by Donna to the list. Maybe it's relatively straightforward. I think it's something which we could hopefully get to a conclusion without much difficulty. Donna, I don't know if you'd like to just briefly introduce it or say anything about the content of the draft.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jonathan. Donna Austin. So given your introduction, Jonathan, I don't think there's much more to be said. My question would be obviously we want to get a response back to Cyrus as soon as possible so a question as to how long we give people to comment or provide input before we finalize the letter and get it sent.

Jonathan Robinson: Mary, you've - there's a symbol in your chat. I'm not sure if that's - oh y you've stepped away, that's a stepped away symbol I think so that's why I was certainly confused by that. That's okay. I was thinking it was a - looked like some form of disagreement. Okay.

Good. So sorry if I took the wind out of your sails there, Donna, with the intro but that's - you know, it's a relatively straightforward piece of content. We have discussed it in the prep for this and you kindly agreed to draft it. My feeling is that we could probably take this 24 hours from this meeting and essentially seek objections or - or any proposed revisions.

And otherwise we send it off. But let's call for the sort of comment now if there's any questions or concerns with the content and if not we'll give it a further 24 hours to respond or to seek any modifications on list and pending that I think we send it.

Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I did agree to the language on this letter but I did want to voice concerns with what is going on now. And I agreed that, you know, because of how long a policy process would take that we probably can't address wrongdoings that are going now.

But I think everyone should be aware that this is not going that smoothly and we've actually, you know, as domain manager at Facebook we are facing a \$35,000 fee to register one of those name collision names.

The registry additionally, in their sunrise period, put out, you know, charged \$4500 for the original sunrise period. Their land rush fee, I think is \$90 but they added an additional \$30,000 because this was a name collision domain name.

So I will be working that through ICANN Compliance but I'm not sure, you know, what we can do as a GNSO Council and the limitations of our policy development process to address the issues that are occurring right now. So, you know, I'm not sure - I agreed to the letter but I think we've got bigger issues with name collision.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I'd certainly welcome some additional explanation of that perhaps in writing on list to understand. I'm not sure I understand that issue completely. So - but I see James...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Kawaguchi: I don't either. Why would they add \$30,000? I can post the email though.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, anything that you can do to inform because I'm just not clear how whether this is a name collision or some other form of - I don't want to use the wrong word but...

Susan Kawaguchi: Extortion.

Jonathan Robinson: It does seem close to that. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. My word was going to be shenanigans but I don't know if that translates well. James speaking for the transcript and just wanted to perhaps put on the table that recommendation that - because I'd like to learn more about how that's occurring too and see if that practice that Susan described is more widespread.

I'd like to propose that we separate that from, I believe, from the letter that we're responding to which is perhaps a bit of a more narrow question of name collision itself and not necessarily what happens when those names come out of the name collision framework and are then released into, you know, into availability.

And I think it's that second part that drives Susan's concerns that I would like us to address that one as well but I think as far as the issue of the name collision framework itself I think that that's - I'm fine with the letter - or the language of the letter now. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So I think - I don't think I heard Susan suggesting anything different either. That certainly is something that - there's some implementation issues around the release of the names it sounds like

which is - which doesn't - which means it still sounds like something we could usefully talk about and think about what can be done. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yeah, as much as I sympathize with the frustration over this business practice I wonder whether this is actually something within the scope of the Council being the steward of the policy development because this clearly affects a commercial parameter or side effect.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I would think, for me, Thomas I think the topic - it's a fair question and I think we could - I'd like to understand better what happened here and whether there are related things.

Because it strikes me there are related points whereby on the back of - I'm thinking of the release of names generally; there may be some - there may be no policy issues or there may be policy issues. I'm not sure we can cover that now and I'd like to keep us on the topic of whether we're satisfied with this letter in respect to the request of the Board and through Cyrus that.

And second, I'd like to suggest that this is something we could perhaps discuss with the Board and maybe even sensible to widen the topic depending on where we get to. But we should at least make this as one of the minor points at least that we feed back to the Board when we meet with them in Singapore. So if I could put that as another draft topic for talking with the Board.

Volker, your hand is up.

Volker Greimann: Yes, it seems to me that this is mainly an issue of compliance to see if - that action actually violates policy. If it's been found that this

action is not violating policy then there might be something to consider that policy needs - whether (unintelligible) policy needs some change to take care of the situation or this is actually intended result of lack of policy.

So basically the first step would be to see if policy covers this and then if it doesn't then we should regard if policy is needed or not.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: So I did post that - the email tagging on approximately \$30,000 USD to the registration fee so you can see what I received. And I agree that it may not affect this letter but I do think it would be worth our while as GNSO councilors to ask our constituencies if they're having other issues so that we can become more aware of these. I mean, this just came up last week for me.

And we may find that maybe this is the only issue and I just happened to have bad luck. But other registrants may be coming out of the woodwork to complain also. And like I said, I think - I agree with Volker, I think it could be a compliance issue but we should all be aware that this is not going as smoothly as I had hoped.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Susan. James.

James Bladel: Hi. So James speaking. Thanks. And thanks, Susan, for sharing that. And, you know, while not - I don't have an identical experience to this I can say that, you know, we also have seen some - say, some unusual practices that perhaps are, as I'd say, and I think as Thomas - or as Jonathan mentioned - are unrelated to the names collision issue

specifically but probably are good fodder for a discussion in one of our weekend sessions when we meet with staff, when we meet with either compliance or Akram or Cyrus.

And also I believe that it could be something that this kind of experience, if we find out it's more widespread, could be something that we would include in our discussion of when we are evaluating this round and looking at future round modifications of the implementation of this round of TLDs and also future rounds.

I just - I just - I think it maybe just too big of an elephant to address in this letter which I think was appealing to me because it was very narrow and succinct. And I think that - I'm not trying to discount the issue that Susan is raising, I just think that it needs to find a different home and I think that we need to take it up at our weekend session.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, James, thank you. And to be clear, I didn't hear a proposal that it was to be included in this letter merely that there was a link, a connection and it was something we needed to be aware of and to consider which is what I'm hearing we will do anyway. So that's good.

Great, so it feels to me like we've got support to send the letter off in substantially its current form. I'd like a mandate from you to send that letter subject to non-material edits which is a mandate I've got from you before and/or any other further comments by let's say 24 hours from now so that's 1800 UTC Friday 16th.

And if there are no further modifications proposed on list I will send it off in substantially or materially the same form subject to the style and grammar edits. All right, that deals with Item 7 then.

Item 8 is an opportunity to pick up the item from the action list and also the sort of related areas as covered in this which is really two separate points which we had on our agenda previously. One is an opportunity to hear and be prepared for any update and imminent work of the GAC GNSO Consultation Group and, second, to deal separately with the process for dealing with the GAC communiqué.

So first of all we'll deal with 8.1 which is an update on the work of the GAC GNSO Consultation Group and to give us a heads up as to what we might expect to see in Singapore in relation to this group's work. Mason, if I could ask you to contribute - to lead that that would be great.

Mason Cole: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Mason Cole speaking. I have only a minor update, I'm afraid, for right now; I should have a more fulsome update for Singapore.

As I think the Council is aware there is two areas of work by the Consultation Group. One is on establishing a process for engagement between the GAC and the GNSO on policy work, the other is on the business of the Council that - the GAC may be interested in at the present time.

On the first matter the Consultation Group has spent most of its time in recent meetings discussing a process by which the GAC can be notified about issues of interest that it may want to weigh in on in some form or another.

I think that we're getting close to having a process in place that the GAC will find useful. It would involve alerting the GAC at the earliest stage of a policy development process being undertaken, at the issues report phase, so that the GAC would have the most opportunity to contribute to the - to matters that they think the GAC should have a voice in. Excuse me.

So Marika has helpfully outlined this entire process in a document - in a flow chart which is not in front of the Consultation Group for review. I expect that that should be finalized very shortly and I'm hoping that in Singapore the GAC will in effect sign off on having that process in place.

On current work that the Council is undertaking that the GAC might want to weigh in on there's one issue on the curative rights mechanisms for IGOs and INGOs that is a subject of a PDP right now.

The working group that is handling that, which is chaired by - co chaired by Petter and Phil Corwin, that working group submitted a list of clarification questions through the Council to me, which I've submitted to the GAC. They're now in the process of trying to help us or help the Council - to help the working group via the Council clarify its point of view on issues that they put out in their communiqué. And I'm hoping to have that feedback very shortly.

And that's - I think that's pretty much it for right now, Jonathan. Again, I'm hoping to have a more substantial update for the Council in Singapore including hopefully a ratified process for GAC GNSO engagement.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks, Mason, that's helpful. So at Singapore we will have then
- the hope is that the group will be proposing something that, as you
say, is the group's view on the mechanics for engagement.

Mason Cole: Yes, correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful, that's great. Thank you. Are there any other questions
or comments for Mason in respect to this group's work? Mason, I'm
sure you'll share the materials as soon as the group's settled and we'll
look forward to seeing that in Singapore.

James, you go ahead.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. James speaking. I just had a couple of questions,
one is that when we say "group" who are we - who are referring to in
that? I mean, is there a group of - I'm sorry, GNSO councilor or other
GNSO community members or is it - have we sent Mason off on his
own to deal with the group of GAC members or can you give - maybe
give me a sense of the structure and composition of who is working on
this issue?

Because I, perhaps might want to be - throw my hat in the ring in
getting involved if it's appropriate but if it's crowded, you know, I
wouldn't want to step on any toes.

Jonathan Robinson: James, let me speak sort of - and if I miss something Mason can let
you know. We set up what we called the GAC GNSO Consultation
Group approximately a year ago. And that group was set up to have -
to deal with enhanced or improved early engagement of the GAC in
GNSO processes.

We specifically didn't call it a working group because of the connotations in GNSO process and procedure that that would confer on the group. And we put on that group, as members, the Council chair, vice chairs and a couple of other participants. And they were - that was reciprocated by an equal number from the GAC.

So we ended up with sort of equal participation from both sides so in that sense it was an ad hoc closed but fairly represented group. And over time there's been a couple of changes to the membership.

The GAC membership - has tapered off a little. I think one or two have dropped out and it may need to be refreshed with - and then from the GNSO side I know at some point I think Avri joined in in replacement of someone else. And Volker was unable to continue so there's been a couple of changes.

And Mason, as the first productive product, if you'll forgive me referring to you like that, Mason, was, you know, the GAC GNSO liaison was the first output of that group. And once we had put Mason in place as the GAC GNSO liaison he's come into that group and begun to work in that. So that's the sort of very brief part and history of the group and what it does and who it is.

And, oh, Carlos, thank you for reminding me, you replaced Volker. Yeah, and Avri replaced Mikey. Thank you, Amr, who is also on the group. And Amr puts me - reminds me that it's been in place since approximately shortly after the Buenos Aires meeting in 2013.

Yeah, so there's a couple of notes on historic and current composition and maybe that could do with ty,aced Mikey.ty you replaced volker.ory of eh ike that, mason,roup's view on the mechanci mg we needed to be aware . Some rethinking and perhaps that's something to have on the agenda of the group in the face to face meeting in Singapore actually, Mason and others on that group it's something to just think about whether we refresh and make sure that - and we can also talk to the GAC leadership about that as well.

Mason Cole: Jonathan, if I may?

Jonathan Robinson: Mason, go ahead.

Mason Cole: I just wanted to add too, there's - we're also having a face to face meeting of the Consultation Group in Singapore before the entire week gets kicked off so I'm hopeful that there's some (unintelligible). I think it probably will and I should have a better update for the Council when we get to the - when we get into the weekend session.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mason. And to be clear, the group is - whilst it's normally a closed group it's - all its meetings are recorded, transcribed and available so there's no - it's not in any sense hidden what's going on there and just to be clear on that.

Mason Cole: Correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. This is Avri speaking. Two things, I think that - and I put one of these in the chat already - I do think that it's time to sort of -

given that it's existed for a year, given that Mason's role is there, that we need to look at the composition and just get it rebalanced and make sure because we've had substitutions, as you said, and drop outs and everything and I admit to having been a very intermittent participant and someone that still believes I'm sitting in a seat that's probably better held by someone from the CSG since I did replace Mikey at that time.

So - but, you know, I don't want to ad hoc say, hey, you take my seat, though I did try that at one point. So I think that we need to do the step back and, you know, reconstitute the group with incumbents but also, you know, some new folks just to make sure it's got the right balance. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. And I note Carlos's point in the chat that it's important to engage the GAC leadership and ideally have at least one of the co-chairs on the group. And hopefully that's something we can do with the transition in leadership that completes in Singapore of the GAC.

All right, let's - sorry, that's 8.1 I guess. We have, in draft, a process for dealing with the GAC communiqué. Now you'll recall that when we met in - actually in the post LA meeting on the - the Council development session we looked at the possibility - someone suggested the possibility of dealing with the GAC communiqué in a more timely way and in particular looking for whether there are any policy implications in that. I think that came from Bruce Tonkin, to give credit where it's due.

But then we put that in front of the Council as a suggestion because the development session isn't strictly a meeting of the Council and it's not recorded and transcribed in the usual way. So we brought that

before the Council and it there was appetite to develop it. And Volker's produced a draft process.

Volker, where is that at and what, if any, help do you need to try and push that to some kind of provisional conclusion? I think the reason I say provisional is specifically because I think we wouldn't want to close off and agree to do this without at least having this as an item we discuss with the GAC leadership as well. I think that's politically sensible. Go ahead, Volker, if there's anything you'd like to add to produce an update.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you Jonathan. I would stress that anything that we produce at this stage would be a work in progress and an attempt at - first attempt at dealing with the GAC communiqué and analyzing it for the use of the Board. And we - once we have a first draft in place - the first trial draft in place that we continue tinkering with that until we are confident and happy with the result and the way that the process works.

That said, what I posed earlier was mainly - I wouldn't even call it a draft at this stage. It was a -yeah, a first attempt to start a brainstorming session which did not get picked up very well but I will restart that with a new draft which should be released before the next Council call.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks, Volker. And then I think David, you were going to look at a sort of test case, if you like, running the LA communiqué through that process. I don't know if you've looked at that at all or if there's anything you'd like to say about that.

Glen de Saint Géry: David's not on the call, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, that explains it. All right, we'll pick that up with David separately. Any questions or comments in and around this Item 8?

Volker Greimann: Well - Volker speaking. Just maybe as homework for the councilors to think as well and comment on the list of what they would like to see addressed on the example of this last communiqué and how you feel it would be appropriate for the GNSO Council to go about analyzing this.

We do not want to create an impression that we would take the GAC communiqué and break it down into criticize it but rather we would like to see a process of how to advise the Board of what to make of this and how - what the policy implications of this are.

So all the councilors to just bear this in mind and maybe take it back to their groups as well of what role the GNSO could play and in what form this should be taken care of would be very helpful for when the next (unintelligible) arise so we can have a meaning discussion on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker. And I think that's precisely the point; it would be for the purposes of seeking policy implications. All right Item 7 then next. I inadvertently skipped over that in moving through the agenda. This deals with the Board resolution concerning future gTLD rounds. And we have, I believe, if I recall, prepared a draft letter in response to this. And I - was Bret the - was it Bret who drafted this on behalf of the Council?

Bret Fausett: No, no, Jonathan, it's Bret. Marika drafted it and I provided a couple of comments to it. And with those revisions, which Marika accepted, I was

happy with the letter. I don't know if anyone else commented on it as yet. But Marika should be the presenter there.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Thanks. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And just to note as well that I had assistance from Steve Chan in putting this together especially in relation to the table so just maybe to explain what, you know, the letter does, the letter is in response to the Board resolution in which it provided a list of items that they suggested should be considered as part of any conversations around a future round.

So basically what we did is took all the - we took all those items and put them in the table that you see from Page 2 onwards in which we, you know, put the description and rationale that the Board provided for considering that issue and then in the GNSO response column we basically outlined how we believe this issue is already being considered and dealt with or in which cases we are going to, you know, add to what already is being considered based on what the Board has provided.

So I think that's - basically that's all the letter does it just outlines for each of those items how it is being addressed. And if I'm not mistaken I think almost all of them are either covered by the GNSO discussion group or work that is already lined up to kick off at a future date.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well since this has been around for a little bit of time I suggest we consider dealing with it in the way that we did similarly to the other letter that I think, Gabriela, your hand is up so let me take input or

comment from you. Gabriela, we're not hearing you, maybe you're just coming off mute?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I see that Gabriela is actually muted, I think, by the operator so, Glen, if you or the operator if she's listening in if you can maybe unmute Gabriela? I see she's off mute now.

Gabriela Szlak: Hello.

Marika Konings: We can hear you.

Gabriela Szlak: Can you hear me? Oh thank you. Sorry, it says the option was not available so I couldn't get off of mute. So everybody hears me right now?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Gabriela Szlak: Okay. So I just wanted to ask something to Marika. So this is only answering about a list that the Board to the discussion group but this doesn't mean that the group is not - the discussion group is not taking other issues or amplifying what we are saying there for our own - for the group's report, right? It's - because I don't think that - maybe there's more issues that we want to add. Maybe the BC members of the group wants to add more things to this list for the publication of the group's own - I don't know, report. That's my question.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Your assessment is correct. This only deals with the list of issues that was received from the Board and I see that Bret

has his hand raised so I'm sure he'll tell you more about what the discussion group is doing.

Gabriela Szlak: Thank you.

Bret Fausett: That's right. In London we approved a - I think it was a four-pronged motion. One of them did ask for feedback from the Board committee on what we should be talking about. And that was meant to be one input into what we were going to discuss, not a complete list. So we certainly will, and have, taken account of things off of that list. This is just one input into the process.

And of course, obviously a big input into the process since the Board committee has been dealing with aspects of the program that applicants and users and others affected by the new gTLD program may not have been privy to.

Gabriela Szlak: Okay, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Technically the letter does cover that in that it says that the table that indicates how the topics that have been provided by the Board are being considered by the discussion group. But it could be possibly be emphasized a little more so we can take that as a suggestion to tweak the wording to make sure that that's very clear that the discussion group is dealing with much more than the topics provided by the Board.

Okay, great. So I think conditional on that change we should conclude this item as well. And with your permission I will send this letter off in using the same process as before. In other words, subject to not

receiving any other edits in the next 24 hours, again, by 1800 UTC tomorrow, I will send that letter off early next week in materially - with materially the same content as it currently has before you.

Okay so that deals with Item 7. And we previously dealt with Item 8 so here we go onto Item 9 for an update on the planning for Singapore and any questions or issues arising.

Volker Greimann: Yes, thank you Jonathan. I think Glen, you posted the first draft of the agenda as it currently stands. We are looking at a very busy Saturday meeting with a lot of working groups coming in, some of them with initial report at least they have announced that they might have one so the Privacy Proxy Working Group is still working on finalizing the initial report and I think the Policy and Implementation work is also very close.

So we are going to have a good Saturday with a discussion as well for the Sunday meetings with the Board, with Fadi. But I would encourage the councilors that if they have any topics that they would like to see discussed on the Sunday where we first have the GDD update then the discussion (unintelligible), the COO, the Board meeting and finally the GAC.

If they have any topics that you would like to see addressed during these meetings that you post them to the list or to Glen and me so we can schedule them and inform those parties that these are topics that we would like to discuss with them.

Moving on, Monday is quite light, as usual, the same sessions that we usually have. The joint ccNSO GNSO Council session is not very early

in the morning. There wasn't any option at this time to have it later so I hope you will be able to get up after partying on Sunday.

Tuesday we only have the informal session in the later afternoon. I would encourage all the councilors to come to this session; this can be a very valuable session to get together with constituency members and head and officers so please schedule this into your time slot and come to that meeting as well.

On Wednesday we have of course various working groups, the Council public meeting and on Thursday the wrap up session as usual. Any questions? Hearing none I yield back to Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Volker. Just going back on the previous item noting that in response to a question from Amr we set the deadline for the second letter, the one on the work on new gTLDs, we pushed that out to Monday 1800 UTC so there's a little more time to comment or question or modify. Thanks for your work on this agenda. I think we'll pick up on earnest some of the detailed topics for items with the Board and others. I know I've picked up a few as we've talked through this call.

We'll likely send out a sort of fishing email, if that's the right word, an email looking for suggestions, fishing for suggestions, for contributions in the various topics. We normally try and get some kind of coherence between meeting with the GDD staff, Theresa Swinehart, Fadi and the Board to make sure there's not unnecessary overlap and there's proper cohesion between the topics.

So I'll try and manage that while still being open to suggestions, comments and inputs from all of you. So if you do have something you

feel is pressing and important that needs to be covered in discussions with any of those groups or individuals please do make it known to Volker and myself.

Good, then under any other business we've got a few items here somewhat unusually under Item 10. There is the correspondence with the new gTLD program committee on the IGO and Red Cross Red Crescent issue. Mary, is there any update there?

Mary Wong: Hi, Jonathan. Hi, everybody. Mary from staff. As you noted, Jonathan, in the action items list we're still waiting for a response from the NGPC. But my understanding from talking to colleagues who support the Board is that there is - there are plans to move ahead with discussions. And I'm very hopeful that we will hear something back by Singapore or at least in Singapore.

Jonathan Robinson: Good. Thanks. That's helpful. Item 11.2 was one I put in although it was on the back of discussions and comments that I've heard elsewhere and suggestions. Essentially there's something going on in the background and that is that at least from some of our perspectives it's in the foreground from others, but there are new gTLD auctions going on, some are being conducted privately by the so-called private auction method in which case there's no significant transfer of funds to ICANN.

But there are those auctions that don't get resolved privately and come to be - have their auctions managed by ICANN and there are funds being generated from that auction proceeds. This seems like a - the perfectly logical piece of work, at least to some that have spoken to me for the work of another cross community working group.

Now the challenge here is it's timely, it's sensible, probably, I'm assuming for a moment that you agree, but we're all very busy. So I guess it's flagging this as a possibility. If anyone feels passionately about this and feels that this is an opportunity to step up to the plate, by all means, let yourself be known.

And I think for the moment that was all I wanted to do by highlighting this. But I think if we leave it too long and don't initiate something it may - it may not be there for us to initiate something. And it does feel like this is appropriate that the community broader than just the GNSO takes up this issue and tries to deal with it. Any comments or questions on that one? Volker.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Jonathan. Volker speaking for the transcript. The - I remember quite succinctly that I think one meeting before the last meeting that Steve Crocker commented that the Board is actually waiting for the community to come forward with a proposal of how to deal with this money. So the Board would not want to make a decision on their own.

However, I also, similar to what you just voiced, cannot see them waiting for that decision forever if we don't even make a move to initiate work in that regards. So a brainstorming session followed by working group - cross community working group would be a good idea and I think we should start this as soon as possible, ideally at the Singapore meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks for that, Volker. Let's see if we can't find someplace to weave that into our agenda somewhere and see if we can get a bit of momentum behind that.

We note that the Translation and Transliteration PDP Working Group initial report is out for public comment. I think, Amr, you might be the liaison on that group? I don't know if you want to make any comment or input in respect to that?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. Yeah, this PDP working group is done with its work as far as the initial report is concerned and that's been open for public comment for a couple of weeks now and will remain open until February 1 with the new public comment period the formats having changed so it's just one long public comment period with no reply period.

This working group has been working since August 2013. It was tasked with answering two charter questions which is - the first being is mandatory transformation of contact information in the Whois database to a single common language and script desirable or not?

And the second question being who should, in the view of the working group, bear the burden of transformation which was the word being used as opposed to just saying translation and transliteration.

So, yeah, the working group did receive quite a few comments early on from ALAC, NCSG, the IPC as well as the European Commission, the governor of Thailand and the People's Republic of China on these issues. It's taken all that into account.

It's also filed with the work of the EWG on registration data services as well as the expert working group on internationalized registration data services. The work of both these groups seemed relevant to this - to this PDP.

Right now there are some recommendations that have been put forward in the initial report. There has not been a formal consensus call on the working group and that will take place after the public comment period is over. There is not unanimity in the view of what the recommendations should be. There is some division although there was a majority suggesting one way to go and a minority suggesting another.

Should probably also note some that there is a webinar that will take place tomorrow at 1400 UTC to inform anyone who is interested on the recommendations that in the initial report. And I would encourage everyone to go back - I know this is a bit short notice but I would encourage folks to go back to the groups, anyone who is interested in this to participate in this webinar and just sort of catch up to what's being recommended.

We're still doing a few more weeks for public comment. And I don't think, to date, we haven't received any public comments to this PDP yet. And I see Lars has put into the chat the link to the announcement of the webinar for tomorrow so that's about it. If anyone has any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Amr. That's a decent update. And just flag it that councilors might want to bring this to the attention of their respective groups as well. It's something where, you know, there's so much going on and it

may be that this is somewhat under the radar. And so this could be a useful function of the Council meeting and flagging that this is out there. So please do bring it to the attention of your groups if you think that this is something which they will have concern or issue over or with.

Amr Elsadr: Jonathan, would it be helpful right now for me to go over some of the recommendations that the working group is proposing?

Jonathan Robinson: I wonder if it's - I think it's possibly better to - if may be if could pull something like an executive summary or the key bullets so just put them to the list so that that's - I think that may be the most useful because really this has got to propagate out to the groups and that may be the most useful if you'd be so willing, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Sure, sure I can do that. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Thank you again then for that update. I notice that there's 11.4, I think this is something which you are able to contribute to, Mary, is that right? If you could that would be great.

Mary Wong: Sure. Thanks, Jonathan. And this is Mary from staff again. And the purpose of asking that this item be added to AOB today is to have an opportunity to answer any questions that councilors might have or to clarify any particular issue arising out of the staff request that we sent out about a week or so ago requesting an extension to the issue report that's coming due for the rights protection mechanisms for both legacy and the new gTLDs. That means including the UDRP as well as the new RPMs developed for the new gTLD program.

The request that was emailed to the Council list does lay out the reasons that we had for requesting this extension until October of this year. You'll recall that the issue report is mandated because of a Council resolution from I believe December 2011 which was even before the actual launch of the program. And so the 18-month period that was designated there after the launch of the first new gTLD (unintelligible) reasonable.

Of course everybody knows by now according to the draft work plan for planning for the next round that came out shortly before the LA meeting there are a couple of related reviews that are being done or scoped right now one being on the RPMs for the new gTLD program and we expect a document to be published before the Singapore meeting, possibly next week for that, as well as a specific review of the TMCH that had been requested by the GAC.

So since these two reviews would, we are told, source quite a lot of data and feedback from actual users of these mechanisms it was felt that it made sense for the issue report to take those on board and in order for us to do that we would need to wait for the results hence the request for the extension through October.

So, Jonathan, this was just something that we wanted to bring up to remind the Council that we do have that request and hopefully it'll be granted but also to answer any questions if anyone had any.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mary. I feel this is a little bit lower in priority being sort of the last item under AOB. And the way it feels to me to handle this is to reflag it with the Council. It's very helpful it's been raised in this way

and to reflag it on list with the Council and for us to deal with this as a consent item at the next meeting.

So at least we get to vote on it because it feels substantial enough that it should be dealt with in that way. Are there - Mary, go ahead, I see your hand is up and then I'll call for any other questions or comments.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Jonathan. So what I'll do is resend that request to the list after the - to the Council list after the call today. But my hand did go up because I did have an additional item that's not related to this so I'll wait on that until you've had the opportunity to ask others for their comments.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mary. And if you could keep us honest by ensuring that that ends up on the consent agenda that would be good. And then I'll just see if there's any other questions or comments in relation to that point. Gabriela, go ahead.

Gabriela Szlak: I'm sorry, not to that point so I can wait.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Let's close that point then, let Mary make her additional point and then, Gabriela, if you could put your hand up as well.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Jonathan. And this is Mary again for the record. And, Jonathan and everybody, this was in relation to the request from our IDN program colleagues asking for GNSO input with regards to the pending update of the IDN implementation guidelines.

I recall that Edmon, a community member, had volunteered and that I think the Registry Stakeholder Group was doing some internal

checking to see if they would have folks who would be ready to step up.

The reason I wanted to bring it up now, and I can also follow up with an email, is the deadline that had been requested is the end of this month. So however the GNSO decides to proceed, whether it is with, you know, individual group comments or individual comments or perhaps having an informal group led by Edmon and Registry volunteers, I just wanted to remind everybody of that deadline and also of the fact that Sarmad, who leads that program, will be briefing the GNSO as usual in Singapore.

So the staff hope is to let Sarmad know one way or the other, A, who may be working on this from our end, and, B, when they might expect some feedback. I will add that for the last iteration of the guidelines, which I think took place in 2011, there was input from the GNSO primarily from the Registries.

So I think since these guidelines deal with issues relating to fears of cyber-squatting and consumer confusion in IDNs that hopefully there will be some interest from the GNSO even at this busy time to help in the update for these guidelines. So that was it, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mary. So where do you see that we would sort of bring this up or deal with it other than here?

Mary Wong: Well I was hoping, frankly, to have some guidance from the Council as to your preferred approach recognizing how busy everyone is. So that's why I suggested that maybe an informal group of interested

volunteers could take it upon themselves to at least provide some input.

I think what's being asked is basically a list of issues to be studied, not an actual redraft at this point. So my hope is that if I can get back to Sarmad saying either we won't make it by the deadline but here's a group of people who will be providing the input, something like that would, at minimum, I think be very helpful to them.

Jonathan Robinson: All right well let's get that request to the list again and see if we can't get anyone to step up to the plate to help here.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Mary. Gabriela.

Gabriela Szlak: Yes, I'm on mute or not? No.

Jonathan Robinson: No, you're loud and clear, thank you.

Gabriela Szlak: Thank you. So I just wanted to say good-bye. I think this is my last Council call. So I wanted to thank everyone. It has been a great experience. Thank you so much for everything for the collegiality, for the friendship, for everything that you've allocated me on Council's procedure.

Of course, again, thanks to the staff. So I'm very sorry I'm leaving but this is what it is. And I just wanted to say thank you on the call. And also for the great messages that you all sent to me privately and on the list so thank you so much and I hope you will survive next year with -

sounds like a very, very busy year. And I hope my replacement will also be of a lot of help to you during this year. So thank you so much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Gabriela. It's a particularly happy reason you have for leaving so congratulations. And thank you for your help. And I'll thank you and wish you all the best on behalf of the Council and of course myself. And, as you say, I know you've received various messages and I see there's a few more coming in through the chat. But thank you for your contribution. And we'll miss you. And we will look forward to meeting your replacement of course.

Gabriela Szlak: Thank you so much.

Jonathan Robinson: All right thank you, everyone, for a well conducted meeting. And we'll look forward to seeing you again on the 28th and picking up on those various action items that have derived from the call. Please try and be as active as you can on the list. There's lots going on and we need all of your hands to help wherever you possibly can. So please do pick up on things when we're asking for volunteers and contributors.

Thanks very much.

Avri Doria: Bye, everyone.

Jonathan Robinson: Bye, Avri, and bye everyone else. Thanks. We'll close the meeting at this point and stop the recording.

Gabriela Szlak: Bye.

END