

**Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference
16 April 2015 at 11:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council teleconference on 16 April 2015 at 11:00 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-16apr15-en.mp3>

Adobe Chat Transcript

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/transcript-chat-council-16apr15-en.pdf>

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

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

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Volker Greimann - absent, apologies, proxy to James Bladel, James Bladel, Yoav Keren

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

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Phil Corwin, Susan Kawaguchi, Osvaldo Novoa – absent apologies, no proxy, Tony Holmes – left call early, Heather Forrest, Brian Winterfeldt

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Amr Elsadr - joined after roll call, Marilia Maciel, Edward Morris, Stephanie Perrin, Avri Doria, David Cake

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Daniel Reed – absent apologies proxy to David Cake

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Olivier Crépin-Leblond– 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

Julie Hedlund – Senior Policy Director

Steve Chan – Policy Director

Lars Hoffmann – Policy Analyst

Berry Cobb- Consultant

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Cory Schruth – Systems Engineer

Coordinator: Certainly. The recording has now been started. Please go ahead, thank you.

Glen De Saint Géry: Thank you very much Ana. Would you like me to do a roll call for you Jonathan?

Man: Excuse me. Mr. Chan just joined.

Glen De Saint Géry: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Glen, I think you can take the roll call off the Adobe Connect (unintelligible).

Glen De Saint Géry: Adobe Connect?

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible).

Glen De Saint Géry: I'll do that. And may I just add...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: And if you could just call to check if anyone is on audio only.

Man: Hi (Unintelligible) here, I'm still not on Adobe, so.

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes; I'm still joining Adobe as well. Thank you.

Glen De Saint Géry: And Thomas Rickert is in his car so he is not on the Adobe Connect, Jonathan.

And we have apologies from Volker Greimann, his proxy is given to James Bladel. And we have apologies from Daniel Reed whose proxy is given to David Cake. And that David is on the line.

So with that, may I just...

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Glen, so we'll note everyone in the Adobe Connect room as present. We'll note that we've got three people on audio and you'll record that and you record your apologies. Thanks.

So welcome everyone, welcome to today's Council Meeting. Thank you for being prompt. It's the 16th of April, GNSO Council Meeting, and we will start by Item 1.2 having completed the roll call, and call for any updates to Statements of Interest. And I see a hand up from Bret Fausett. Go ahead Bret.

Bret Fausett: Yes, I've updated my Statement of Interest. I'll put a link to it in the Adobe Chat. I've updated it to indicate that Uniregistry, the company that I work for, has a non-controlling - some investor interest in a handful of TLDs that we don't operate including Dot-Sucks. So since that is a topic of discussion these days, I wanted to make sure that people understood that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Bret, that's helpful and clear. So we have an agenda and under Item 1.3 there is an opportunity to review or make any comments or remarks on the agenda including if there is anything you would like to see added.

And I note Tony Holmes has to leave after an hour, and I also have heard from Mason that he will need to leave after an hour. So I expect that his involvement in Item 8 might encourage us to bring that forward in the agenda.

Apologies about the status of the minutes; it's something that's been overlooked and we will catch up with those. So sincere apologies that those

haven't come out. Of course the transcripts and the recordings are out, but it's just a matter of logging the minutes.

We have all of us been a little stretched with various things going on in particular work on the cross-community working group work on the Transition and the Accountability. So apologies; we will catch up on that.

I don't have any specific opening remarks under Item 2 other than that, but I do think, as is customary, we will note that there is a Project List and any councilor is welcome to comment or provide input on that and I will briefly review the action list at this stage.

So we could have the Action List up in the Adobe Room please. Thank you Marika.

So the items on this we've made pretty good progress on this. We come to Buenos Aires planning later in the agenda although not substantially, and we will pick this up in earnest after this meeting.

The next items are either on hold or complete or to be dealt with here. Daily there's reports in the main agenda are on both of the work; both the CWGs. And so that's keeping the Council regularly informed and updated on those.

And just to remind you of the purpose of that, the purpose of that is obviously because these are important and central themes of work going on across at this stage. But significantly, they are both groups that are chartered by the GNSO. And as groups chartered by the GNSO, their output will ultimately come back to the GNSO for approval.

In both cases, there is a requirement to do the work or at least a perceived necessity to work at reasonable speed. And so what we don't want is for the work to be delayed by virtue of the fact that people haven't been regularly informed and are not sufficiently knowledgeable about the work.

So that's the primary purpose to ensure that the Council and through the GNSO, although of course other routes by which the GNSO is kept informed by the stakeholder group reps, but just making sure that this channel is properly covered. And so that's the purpose of those two action items.

With respect to those other items not on hold, the issues for the SCI come up in this meeting under the consent agenda, and we'll come to those in a moment as does the work of the Expert Working Group. We will touch on that; I think it comes up under Any Other Business later.

We are still in a holding path as far as the outstanding IGO/INGO PDP recommendations are. Some of the implementation work is going ahead there I understand, but there's still some background work that needs to be done before we receive an update - further update from the New gTLD Program committee.

There's work going on in the GAC Communiqué and we'll come to that in a minute agenda item.

The IDN Implementation Guideline work is completed. And so I see that someone else has scrolled - Marika has scrolled on this. So is it - perhaps you have individual scroll on this so we're at the top of Page 2 now with the outstanding IGO recommendations.

I see it's slightly different. I think this has been updated since I have my printed copy I'm working from. And you all have scroll rights on the document.

The ICANN Meeting Strategy is complete to the extent that we have a drafting team working on it, and we are in the process of commissioning the drafting team to work on the cross-community working group on auction proceeds.

I'll draw your attention. Those of you who haven't seen, there was a letter - an email note from Steve Crocker in his capacity as Chairman of the ICANN Board to me in my capacity as Chair of the Council in relation to this prospective CWG on auction proceeds. So I'd encourage you to have a look at that and express if you have any views on Steve's views in that note in relation to the prospective work on the auction proceeds.

I think that does it for the action list for the moment. Clearly we'll come back to some of these items in the main agenda, so if we could go back up to having the main agenda on the screen now.

Thank you. And again, I believe you have scrolling privileges so you should be able to go to wherever the relevant point is.

Any comments or questions before we close Item 2 on either the action or the project list? I went through that pretty fast and I'm familiar with it. But let me pause and see if there's any comment or question on any of the items arising there.

Seeing none, I'll move us then onto the Item 3 which is the Consent Agenda. Under Consent Agenda, we have effectively put in two motions which from memory were presented to the Council by Avri, and I believe it was Avri who presented those. But in any event, we discussed them in some detail at the previous meeting. Thanks Avri for confirming that.

And these are essentially two procedure changes that we have asked the standing committee on improvement and implementation to review and come back to the Council with some recommendations.

As items on the Consent Agenda, they're typically taken as red and given that we discussed them at the previous Council Meeting; that seems appropriate. So it's likely we will go straight to vote on the Consent Agenda unless anyone

has any comments at this stage and/or has an objection to these two items being on the Consent Agenda. I'll pause now to check if that is the case.

We'll I'll take it that that means there are no comments or issues which is perhaps unsurprising, but feel free to - you know, I don't want to bundle up through this agenda without people having the opportunity to speak. But it stands to reason that this is okay.

So Glen, we will now call for a voice vote to deal with the Consent Agenda. And in so doing, I will first call for anyone who would like to vote against the Consent Agenda.

Anyone who is voting against the Consent Agenda, please make yourself be known now.

Anyone who would like to abstain from voting on these items on the Consent Agenda, please make yourself known now.

So Glen, in the absence of any no votes or abstentions, if you could please record that everyone present is in favor of the Consent Agenda as it stands, and that includes Amr Elsadr who joined us a couple of minutes into the call. So if you could record him as both present and as in so being as one of those in favor of the motion.

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

Jonathan Robinson: Good. Item 4 was an item we also discussed at the previous Council Meeting. And this is a motion to amend the charter of the IGO/INGO working on curative rights protection mechanisms and the access of the IGOs/INGOs to this curative rights protection mechanisms.

And there was a discussion at the previous meeting about the prospect of amending the motion - or amending the charter. And this motion has duly come forward to us at this meeting. And do that and it's proposed by (Susan).

(Susan), I'll give you first opportunity to just discuss or remind us of any aspects of the motion you would like to, and if you'd like to refer your seconder or to Phil Corwin or indeed to Mary Wong from Staff, please feel free to do so since I know some Mary's done some good work in supporting you on this.

(Susan): As the liaison to the working group, I did propose this, but I'm going to defer to Phil because he's actually the Chair/Vice-Chair of the group. So he would have better background information - or Mary.

Phil Corwin: Phil here; happy to step in. And good morning all or whatever time of day it may be for you.

The purpose of this motion is simply to give the working group on Curative Rights Protection for IGOs some greater flexibility in the scope of our final recommendations. This results from determination by the working group that only those IGOs which have exercised their option to notify the World Intellectual Property organization that they wish to protect their names and cross (sic) with their acronyms under Article 6ter of the Paris Convention should have standing for whatever final process we recommend.

The original motion would have bound us to a broader list, this gives us more flexibility. As I said, it does not derive any IGO of potential access to Curative Rights Process whether it's some amended form of UDRP or USR or some new process. It simply requires that they do that - take that step of notifying the WIPO.

So I'd be happy to take any questions but that's the basic intent of the Council. And my Co-Chair Petter Rindforth and I worked with Mary Wong on the language of the amendment and believe it does the job.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Phil. Any questions, comments or issues arising for Phil in respect to this motion and the intention and issues and the like?

Amr, go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan and thank you Phil. I was just curious if there was any concern raised by members of the PDP Working Group on changing the charter. I guess it would be good to know right now. Thanks.

Phil Corwin: Are you asking if there is any concerns within our working group about this change?

Amr Elsadr: Yes I am, thanks.

Phil Corwin: No, there were none. All the members of the working group are supportive of this amendment. We've heard no objections from anyone.

Jonathan Robinson: A good point, thanks Amr. That's a useful to know that it's coming effectively then if..

Phil Corwin: Yes, and it was discussed on a working group call. All the members of the working group had opportunity to review and comment on this language.

Jonathan Robinson: I will note there was some in the Registry Stakeholder Group of which I'm obviously a member, there was some discussion of this and there was some initial concern. And then Mary was very helpful in providing clarifying information such that she had already done to the Council in expanding on that a little, and those concerns were laid by that expansion. So that's a little bit of background from a Registry Stakeholder Group point of view.

Well I think without any further comments or issues, I guess for the record it would be useful (Susan) to just capture the Resolve Clauses on the audio and then we will put it to vote. So if you could read out the Resolve Clause that would be great.

(Susan): One; the GNSO Council approves the request from the working group to amend its charter as follows: where under Mission and Scope the current charter reads, "For purposes of this PDP, the scope of IGO and INGO identifiers is to be limited to both identifiers previously listed by the GNSO's PDP WG on the protection of international organization identifiers in all gTLDs as protected by their consensus recommendation designated by that working group as Scope 1 and Scope 2 identifiers and listed in Annex 2 of the Final Issue Report," it is hereby amended to read, "For purposes of this PDP, the working group shall take into account any criteria for IGO or IGNO protection that may be appropriate including any that may have been developed previously such as the list of IGO and INGO identifiers that was used by the GNSO's prior PDP working group on the protection of international organization identifiers in all gTLDs as the basis for their consensus recommendations and the GAC list of IGOs as provided to ICANN in March 2013."

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you (Susan). Are there any objections to a voice vote? All right, would anyone like to abstain from voting on the motion? Would anyone like to vote no to the motion? So seeing that there are no abstentions and no no-votes, Glen, could you record again that everyone present is in favor of the motion as previously.

Glen De Saint Géry: I will do that Jonathan including the two people who have proxies. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Correct, thank you.

All right, I think at this point we will probably introduce Item - I'm not sure if - Thomas, can you just let me know if you have any time constraints as well because if you do we'll move to Item 6 in earlier order. If not, I'm going to bring probably Item 8; go 8, 5, 6.

So Thomas, could you let me know if you've got any time constraints here?

Thomas Rickert: No, I'm available. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, thank you very much. Under those circumstances then, we will bring forward Item 8 which is to deal with the progress of the work on the GNSO Council Template for feedback on the GAC Communiqué or Communiqués. Item 8; next please.

And in order to provide us with an update, this has been work of a small group initiated by Volker who is not present today, and assisted by David Cake and Carlos Gutierrez. So David or Carlos, are either of you in a position to give us an update as to where we are at the moment?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes (Unintelligible) Jonathan. It's very short.

We had a binary question on the table here if there is any action ongoing or assisting. And based on this question, if there is an ongoing action by the GNSO, my recommendation was to ask the Chair of the respective PDP or working group to comment. And if there is an existing policy on the issue, to ask Staff to prepare a sentence as simple as that, just to make some progress in this discussion at the table. I don't know if I made myself clear.

Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Hi Carlos, I heard you. I'm not - could you refer to where you are on the review of the Communiqué because I think we just need a little background here, so just orient us.

So I mean you sort of prepared a process here that is effectively in draft. We agreed that we would have a look at the Singapore GAC Communiqué and run that through the process.

Carlos Gutierrez: Exactly.

Jonathan Robinson: And then so this is really the Singapore GAC Communiqué being run that process as in effect a form of test. So if you could clarify where we are with that that would be helpful.

Carlos Gutierrez: We took a part through the table that you can see here on the screen. And we worked the third column issue by issue reaffirming if it was related to GNSO work or not. So we filled the third column yes or no, and we didn't make any progress after that.

So my suggestion was to continue on the fourth column that says, "If yes, please explain if it's subject to existing policy recommendations and limitation action or ongoing policy development work." Anyone this is for me a binary question that then has to produce some kind of recommendation.

And the suggestion was if it was ongoing PDP work, a sentence or recommendation should come from the specific working group; maybe from the Chair.

If it was existing policy, if there existed a policy on that issue, maybe it would be easier that Staff directs us to the source of these recommendations so that we can summarize to the Board in a way that says, "Yes, there is some existing work here either already approved or ongoing." That would give a quick reaction to the Board to say, "(Unintelligible), okay, be careful, we have to relate whatever the GAC told us with an existing policy or ongoing work of the GNSO."

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks Carlos. I've got it now, that's very helpful. So there's a couple of points/remarks I would make is one, generally, this seems like something which has real value potentially.

I guess the question is to what extent is it being picked up on list. I see a couple of hands that shot up so let me defer to those. I've got James first. Go ahead James.

James Bladel: (Unintelligible) thinking about this.

Jonathan Robinson: James, audio is patchy. If you could just start again please that would be great. I hope it's not only me.

James Bladel: Okay, I must have (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: James, you're indistinct to inaudible. I'm going to go to Amr and see if there's a practical issue you can deal with on a microphone or a connection or something and then come back to you.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan, this is Amr.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, I just wanted to note that the GNSO Review of the GAC Communiqué and this template was briefly discussed on the GNSO working group The Policy and Implementation Working Group. And we should hopefully have a final report coming out of that working group before the Buenos Aires meeting.

And the reason why this was discussed is because should the recommendations of that working group be adopted, then some of the processes being recommended may be helpful in the work of developing this template and going forward and sort of how to handle - how the GNSO may

recommend the ICANN Board handling advice items coming from the GAC to them.

So I just thought I'd note that at this time. I was not asked as the Council liaison to that working group, I was not asked to specifically bring this to the Council right now. But I thought it may be helpful especially since Carlos sort of highlighted what the GNSO may recommend or may not recommend in response to specific GAC advice. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, that's interesting and helpful. Thanks Amr.

Could you make one other comment? Is it in your opinion, how - I mean given that we're in a very sort of draft stage of how this might work, how consistent is what is being proposed here with what the Policy Implementation Group is likely to or is currently on track to recommend or produce?

Amr Elsadr: Well this is Amr again. I think it is actually very consistent. I think you may actually - I think some of the recommendations and processes being recommended to be adopted by the GNSO will be very helpful in this because these processes are sort of designed to address situations where other ACs or SOs or possibly the Board may want to refer issues whether they are gTLD related or not to the GNSO for guidance or input.

And there are specifically at least three different processes being recommended and each one with its own set of prerequisites depending on the scenario. And eventually the GNSO Council will determine which process is the more appropriate to be used under what set of circumstances.

And so I would see that at least two of these processes, the expedited PDP or possibly a GNSO guidance process, may be very useful in terms of recommendations from the GNSO Council on action items being recommended using this template to the ICANN Board in response to GAC Advice.

I hope that was helpful. I guess (unintelligible) could take a look at the preliminary report of the working group, and hopefully the final report will be coming out very soon. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, great. I think that is helpful. Thank you very much Amr.

James, you're back in the queue now, so let's see. And Carlos, if you could drop your hand - you have done; thank you. So James, go ahead and we'll see if we can hear you.

James Bladel: Hi Jonathan, thank you. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Loud and clear, thanks James.

James Bladel: Hello? Okay, good. You scared me for a moment. This is James speaking. Thank you and I apologize for that audio problem. I hope that my comment is still relevant because I missed the other contributions.

But I think that this is a good start and I do thank Carlos and the other folks who worked on this for showing us the way. But I wonder if there would be value in incorporating two, perhaps, other points or pivot points that could be addressed as part of this template.

And the first one would be some - in addition to an analysis of whether or not the advice touches on an issue that's within the remit of either policy that's under development or policy that could be under development or existing policy, I think particularly if it's in the latter case, if it's under existing policy, there might be some mechanisms for determining whether or not, in the view of the Council, that this, you know, advice is aligned with that existing policy or somehow cuts across the grain of existing policy and therefore requires some further action.

And then the second thing is in the action here, I think that when we say, "How is the issue being dealt with by the GNSO?" I think we should be very specific about how the expected audience of our response, like we're directing action or dealings with the GAC itself, with the PDP that may be working on the policy or if we're directing it back towards the Board. I just want to be sure that that's, I believe, a required element of that last column.

So those are just my thoughts on this. And I don't know if they are just kind of color commentary at this point because I missed a lot of the conversation. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: I think on your first point James, that's consistent with what was suggested elsewhere which is that as a first pass, Staff could comment and help populate the template with if it's consistent with existing policy, and if so to point to where. What would be useful then is if the Council confirms in its view, it reviews that.

So there's quite a need (sic) step it seems where one could look at what Carlos suggested, which is refer those that are under development to comment by the working group chair, those to the extent that its existing policy, and it could use Staff as a first part to link us to that existing policy, and the Council could then check whether there was daylight as you suggest between the two. As to action, that's a good point as well.

Marika, your hand has come up in response to that and then we'll go back to the queue which now includes David Cake and Mason Cole. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika; just responding to the Staff action item for this. I mean at first sight, it sounds pretty easy, you know, find the policy and link it to it. But I think in many cases, there may be nuances to that.

You know, for example, just looking at the first item, you know, of course there is a new gTLD policy. But, you know, what issue specifically address as part of that, you

know, if it's not called out doesn't mean there was not policy on it, or because it wasn't address means the policy is that there is no policy.

So I'm a little bit hesitant to, you know, have Staff make a determination there as I think there are probably different views on how or whether or not that is addressed. And I think as well I would encourage the Council and especially groups that have specific interests or knowledge as well of these items to look at that and make a suggestion to the Council of whether or not they believe it is something that is covered by the policy or not.

But you know, of course we can, you know, in general sense, for example, you know, several of the items are relating to new gTLDs, so obviously we can refer to the new gTLD policy recommendation, but I think it's still probably up to the Council to make the link on whether, you know, that is specifically covered under there or not. You know, or if it needs to be dealt with in another way.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, and so that - thanks Marika, thank you for that. And that's entirely consistent with what I said a moment ago. It would be that Staff would not be the sole determinant; it would have to come past the Council as well to look at those nuances and where that they like might be by that way or so in both interested parties.

David Cake, go ahead.

David Cake: Sorry, I was just away for a minute.

I just wanted to say a couple of things about this. One of them I'm pretty sure that the version that's on the Adobe Connect here is not the latest version. So the group, it doesn't seem to have items in (unintelligible) (unintelligible) which I think we have done. So a version will be stipulated to Council very sure I think pretty soon.

I think that this is a good process as far as it goes, but we do really need input from the entire Council in order to really produce some advice on this. So I think this initial phase of working out whether or not it is something on which the GNSO Council should comment has been very valuable, but I think it will probably need to be an item for the entire Council to discuss what that response should be in some cases.

And just wanted to assure James that we are very cognoscente of the idea that the audience of this is precisely for the Board to inform there. So it's only to inform the Board a decision liking in regards to their response to the GAC Communiqué, it is not intended to - well of course there are other mechanisms in place for the individual working groups and the individual - and for the individual working group to deal with the GAC Advice and stakeholder groups and so on can respond.

So (unintelligible) things that we need to work out what we need to respond to as a Council though there is a clear GNSO interest, which what would exactly would be the GNSO response and what would be the Council response and which will come from individual stakeholder groups is a question that we haven't really addressed in this discussion as such.

So there's still - I think this has been a very useful exercise, and I think we're at the point where we really need input from the entire Council as to where we go from here. That's all.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks David, and I think you're obviously getting some of that input now. So that's helpful.

Go ahead Mason.

Mason Cole: Hi, thank you. This is Mason.

One thought; one relates to process and the other relates to the content and the output.

In terms of process, it looks to me - I'm speaking in my role as liaison to the GAC. It looks to me as though the process is fairly well defined and it's something that can be shared with the GAC or at least the GAC GNSO Consultation Group as a way to set expectations for how the GNSO is going to contribute to the dialogue on Communiqués.

So if it's agreeable to the Council, then I'll prepare to communicate what to expect in terms of our engagement on their Communiqués.

And then in terms of the content of the output, I guess my question for Carlos and David would be I understand what we're looking at on the screen is preliminary and requires input. Is there a timeline of some kind that we might expect output from the Council on the Singapore Communiqué?

Jonathan Robinson: Mason, go ahead Carlos.

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, thank you Mason.

During the last call, we discussed this. We were in too late in this exercise and some people said, "Well we have to finish the exercise." I don't know if it will be effective for this round. I guess the Board has already (unintelligible).

So my feeling is we should finish the exercise with the content, as you said, and share it with the GAC and the Board. But after Buenos Aires, we need to set serious timelines for doing it on a prompt manner.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Carlos and thanks Mason. Mason, if you'd like it's still open.

Mason Cole: Thank you Jonathan; Mason speaking again. I appreciate the update Carlos.

Jonathan, with the Council's permission then, I will prepare to update the GAC/GNSO Consultation Group on the process so that we can begin to set expectations on the GAC about Council engagement on Communiqués. I think it's important that we do that so they're not taken by surprise. So if the Council is agreeable to that, then I will move forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Mason, and close you mic. Thanks.

Yes, that's absolutely right; I think that makes sense. Subject only to the fact that, as you know, it is our intention to have an initial meeting at which this will be an item on the agenda with the GAC Advice Chairs and Chairs.

So I think we need to have that discussion with them and just let them - I'm just cautious of the political surprise factor, and so I just want to make sure that they are properly briefed on what the plan/intention and how it fits in with the work of the GAC GNSO group. So we need to do that either in parallel or probably in sequence.

But subject to that, I think both yours and Carlos's points make a lot of sense to me. We ensure that the work continues with the GAC GNSO group, and as Carlos says, we push this even if it's an exercise without timely output so that we're in a position to do this properly and rapidly post Buenos Aires.

Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much; Stephanie Perrin for the record.

Just a question. Are we going to have an opportunity to discuss this document before it is sent to the GAC? I'm curious myself about Items 9 and 10 as to how we redecision that the GNSO does not have - is not that these are not within the remit of the GNSO. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So Carlos puts in the Chat the point that this would be communicating with the Board. I expect as a courtesy we would probably communicate, what we communicated to the Board, we would copy the GAC in; that would be my expectation of the process.

But in any event Stephanie, we are not proposing to send this in short order. This is not agreed yet and we haven't even discussed this, the kind of the concept, with the GAC Leadership which is one thing that I would like to - I mean I've mentioned it in passing literally in a corridor conversation to the GAC Chair.

And then it is our intention that Volker, David, myself and Mason will meet with the GAC Chair and Vice Chairs next week and give them an indication that this is a process we are working on. But as a specific content, we are absolutely not yet agreed to communicate that to the GAC.

Olivier, your hand is up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much Jonathan; Olivier Crepin-Leblond.

And I wonder whether in the third column, does the advice concern an issue that could be considered within the remits of the GNSO yes or no. Has it been considered to include a rationale for the yes or no answer on this, or is this outside the scope of this document?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olivier. Marika has put her hand up in response to that. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. As addressed I think as is up here, you know, I helped put together, and I think the yes/no's may have been mine as a starting point for discussion and nothing authoritative or anything.

But my determination was basically, you know, as part of bylaws, the agreement of the GNSO Council specifically gTLD policy. So you basically look at these items are those, you know, specific gTLD policy items.

Of course that doesn't mean that, you know, the GNSO may have views or work on other items that are not, you know, purely related to gTLD policy, but that, you know, the criteria I used for this column.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay, if I may again Jonathan, my question - it's Olivier again. My question is actually whether this rationale was going to be given in the column or whether this column was going to be clearly a yes or no answer. And with regards to the next columns, will these also be yes or no answers or will there be further text?

Jonathan Robinson: Amr points out that - and Marika points out that it will be up to the Council to decide. And Amr points out that Column 4 is effectively rationale.

Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan; this is Amr. Yes, just to pick up on Olivier's question.

Yes I did get the impression that Column 4 was meant to provide the rationale for the answer in Column 3. But perhaps it could also be modified to not only include existing and ongoing policies or policy development work, but also possible future policy work. So that may also help cover gTLD policy issues even if they have not yet been addressed by the GNSO or not being addressed currently.
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Amr. I happen to agree with you on that. I think having a forward-looking component makes a lot of sense. So I think we need this work to continue both on the format of the template in the way that it has just been suggested a moment ago, and in the content of this exercise. I think it's far

from a (unintelligible) it makes a lot of sense to subject the work into a trial run with relating to the GAC Communiqué of Singapore.

So is there anyone - I mean Volker is actually out of action in terms of I understand he's got some personal time off for a relatively long period of time over the next few weeks.

Is there anyone else who is willing or interested specifically to join this group and assist with pushing it forward along the lines we've just discussed? Stephanie, go ahead. Stephanie, could you confirm if that's a hand raised to talk or join the group?

Stephanie Perrin: Can you hear me now?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Stephanie Perrin: Good, I don't know what happened there. Yes, I'd be delighted to join the group. Most of the work appears to be done I must say. It's just a question of finishing it off in time for the next meeting if I have that correctly.

Jonathan Robinson: I think there's clearly two elements. It feels like there could be some work to improve the template and to populate it, and I think both of those could be very useful based on the discussion we've had here.

If anyone else is willing to join and work with Carlos, David and Stephanie, please do let them know. This ultimately pushes the way in which we work forward to a new level potentially and allows us to really insert and assert ourselves appropriately in the process. So I look forward to that.

All right, let's move us along through the agenda, and we will of course go back to - I think what we'll do is we'll go to hear from Thomas which is technically Item 6 on the Cross-Community Working Group in enhancing ICANN's accountability.

This has two benefits. One is that you don't hear from me in a continuous fashion, and two is that it actually possibly makes more logical sense to hear from the Cross-Community Working Group on enhancing ICANN accountability ahead of that on the transition since the transition work has increasingly begun to rely on and depend on the work of the Accountability Group.

And so I think a sort of high level summary and update on that and opportunity for anyone particularly to ask any questions that they might have, because as you would have seen from perhaps an article that came out yesterday, there's a concern, a community concern, about the pace at which this work is going. And that's understandable. There are myriad meetings and a lot of activity.

And in particular, one potential consequence of such pace is that the chartering SO and ACs may feel insufficiently informed or up to speed on what's going on. And so that is precisely why we have these updates on record and for your benefit and your respective groups' benefit.

So go ahead Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much Jonathan and I hope that everyone can hear me all right. Thank you for the opportunity to update the Council, and hopefully a lot of folks from the wider GNSO also listen to this.

I would like to express my appreciation and the continuous efforts by our group on this project. As you rightly pointed out, at the moment we're going at quite a speedy pace. But I think that is not unusual for projects such as this.

To be quite honest, I haven't seen any project where you didn't have time constrains and more workload towards the completion of the work result. And

I'm cautiously saying work result to avoid the word consensus position or final recommendation because that's where we have definitely not at yet.

So what we are doing at the moment is actually have quite an intense few weeks of work. You will remember from earlier updates to the Council that we have agreed on components that would make for an accountability architecture, so we have the community, we have the ICANN Board, we have the bylaws and we have the independent review which would be the equivalent to the registerative (sic), the executive, the judiciary and consistency to compare it to checks and balancing systems in states.

We are continuously fleshing out the community powers. You will remember that we have identified community powers for Work Stream 1 i.e. those items that need to be either implemented or committed to prior to the transition. That would be the community power to approve or veto the budget, the strategic plan, to recall directors, and there's one that I'm missing now but I'll get back to that potentially later.

So it's the power community that we're working on. It's change to the ICANN bylaws that we're working on in order to have a revised mission and core values that would enshrine the fundamental principles on the basis of which ICANN would operate. And they would also be the basis for an independent review panel to assess whether certain actions that ICANN has taken, or particularly the ICANN Board has taken, is in violation of the bylaws or not.

So these areas as well as review and regress mechanisms are being fleshed out as we speak. We have been waiting for independent legal advice for quite some time.

We had the first call with the whole group and the legal advisors last Thursday where they have suggested to us implementation vehicles that we could use to actual achieve the implementation of the requirements that we've established for the accountability system. And we are working very

intensely with the lawyers to answer all the questions that our group has and also to advance a discussion on which implementation model would be favorable.

You will remember from earlier briefings that we have been very cautious only to work on requirements that we have in order to provide for and enhance accountability inside ICANN. We have not talked about concrete implementation.

There has been suggestions to turn ICANN into a true membership organization. There has been the suggestion to look at a delegate or designator model. There has been the request to look at a supervisory board or two-tier board structure, and we've always kept away from that because we felt that we, not the California not-for-profit lawyers, we can't make an informed decision on whether a certain legal vehicle is appropriate to achieve our goal whether it's easily implementable, whether the rights that the community gets are enforceable and so on and so forth.

And now we're at a stage where we have exactly this discussion, and we are particularly looking at the designated model as well as the membership model both of which have their pros and cons. And I think it would be premature to give a trend to this group.

But basically, what we're planning to do now is get the questions answered, to put the loose ends together if you wish, and provide for a very concise report outlining the basic principles for our recommendations, to refine that in a two-day intense work period that we plan to have on next Thursday and Friday. We're going to particularly focus and prioritize the items that have been requested by the CWG, and I'll get back to those in a moment because they're a particularly dependency of the CWG on what we're building for them to build on.

So we are finalizing this and we're going to have a document freeze period which allows our group to assess the interim work results. Then we're going to have the intense two-work days to further clarify what we have been working on, and then we will put together a report that is going to be put out for public comment.

Now Jonathan, you mentioned the point and I need to get back to that, of complaints about the workload being too high or us going too fast.

What we try to do is ensure that even if we go fast now, the quality of what we are doing is not suffering. We have agreed with our group in Istanbul that we would work from general recommendations to a greater level of detail. So we might need to confine ourselves to more principle or general recommendations, and leave the definition or detail for a later stage as long as the community can understand the gist of what the new Accountability infrastructure is going to look like.

So simplification, making it easier for not only the 170 people that are in our group, but also for the wider community to understand is key. So we need to convey the messages clearly, and by doing so we as co-chairs still think that we can be inclusive.

You know, certainly not everybody can read everything that every sub team is producing. But this is exactly why we share the burden among sub teams.

The challenge now is to put these work results or interim results together, and put it into an easy-to-understand format. And we're actually looking at a 20-maximum-25 page report that people can look at.

We're not yet there; I have to say that loud and clearly. But I think that our completion or our progress is much greater than some people would think. And the challenge forward is the responsibility of co-chairs of such complex

projects to keep an overview of where we are. And we've discussed this with the group.

And we think that we've made huge progress over the last couple of weeks, and we will keep the community fully informed. And certainly inclusiveness should not suffer from what we're doing.

We are also working an engagement plan with the community. What we are doing needs to be easy to understand. It's not good enough for our group to understand what we're doing. We need consensus not only from our group but from the whole community. And this is why we are working on having webinars.

We are working on having the cartoonists that we've been using previously, we are looking at other forms of rich media, you know, like little films that would tell the story of what we're doing in an easy-to-understand fashion so that people can understand and comment during the public comment period.

And for that, we're actually looking at a specific interview type of (unintelligible) form type of Q&A with the community so that people are not forced to right freeform comments in the public comment period, but that they confronted with some specific questions that makes it easier for them to participate and contribute.

And also -- and the councils will know this -- public comment periods are not only used to seek confirmation for recommendations that a working group has previously come up with. But public comment periods can also be used -- and this is I think the way that is right to pursue -- public comments periods are also used to ask the community whether we are on the right track and to clearly communicate the pros and cons of different options and ask the community which option they favor.

So you know, without going into detail, you can have, let's say, one option which is perfect to achieve your goals but which might be cumbersome to implement and very complex to manage.

And the question then would be whether you maybe sacrifice one or two details that are not decisive and rather go for an option that allows for the community to have more flexibility in managing the responsibility after the historic relationship with the US government has ended.

So I think I should pause here. I hope that you understand or that I was successful in conveying the message that I think we're in good shape/making progress. I've talked a lot about process and not that much about substance, but that's due to the fact that we are working full throttle on finalizing some details on the interim results on substance. But the concern that has been voiced in the community (unintelligible) process which is why I spoke to that issue primarily during these few minutes.

Let me finally highlight that the CWG - and you know that we are engaging very intensively with Lise and Jonathan being the co-chairs of the CWG. You know, we have sat together with them in addition to regular phone calls that we have and ask them to provide us with some specific recommendations or requirements that they would have for the accountability work. And we've been provided with the documents specifying exactly that earlier this week; I think it was yesterday or the day before yesterday. So we will work on those.

For example, relating the ICANN budget. So the CWG wants to have certain details in the budget in order to be able to understand where the budget allocation is and whether money is spent where required.

They also would like to have certain features in the community empowerment mechanisms. They would like to see certain features in the review and redress mechanisms and in the (Unintelligible) mechanism.

So we're now seeing that the work of the two groups is actually moving to being closer and closer because what we're trying to achieve is a holistic approach; one proposal that meets the needs of both the CWG as well as the ccWG. And I think that we're on a very good path to achieving this goal.

I think Jonathan, I should pause here. I hope I haven't dwelled on this for too long but I thought it was worthwhile explaining a little bit where we are.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Thomas for a well-structured and comprehensive update; that's very useful. I've had the privilege of working with you and the co-chairs in the coordination role, and you know, my personal view is that you're tackling a substantial and challenging project with a big group and doing a great job of making progress.

I'll speak a little to the link to the CWG in a moment when we deal with the next item, but I'll pause here to see if there are any comments or questions on that update that Thomas has proposed/provided.

Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Jonathan, is that a queue for me? This is Amr.

Jonathan Robinson: Please go ahead Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thank you and thanks Thomas for the brief, and thank you everyone on the ccWG for all the very challenging volume of work that you're undertaking.

I thought there was item you mentioned that I was not aware of before that I believe to be interesting. And you mentioned a period where there would be a document freeze, and I think that would be extremely helpful.

I'm disappointed it's not just about providing ample time for the community to sort of review the work that you're doing and try to build the consensus that

you want to build. But it seems to me that there really is a need for the actual members and participants of the ccWG to have time to reflect on their work and then sort of like take a step back and look at it.

So my question is, if you're planning on holding a document freeze period, what length do you think that period may be?

Thomas Rickert: This is Thomas. I might be disappointing you now, but we're talking about three to four days. Because at the moment, we're producing updates to individual documents and quite frequently. And this is difficult for the group to follow which is why we want to make sure that people can actually step back have one document.

We're going to package all the information for the group in a nice format so that they can take a look at it and digest what we have before we enter into the intensive two-work days.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Thomas. I hope Amr, that I see from the Chat, that he has disconnected, but it is on the record in any event.

Any other comments or questions or points?

Okay, well thanks again Thomas. I will use that as an opportunity to introduce the next item to which I won't say a lot. But I do think there are a few points under Item 5, the work of the Cross-Community Working Group to develop a transition proposal.

This is similarly intense and active. Most recently we spent two days, Monday and Tuesday of this week, in which we ran six two-hour sessions, so that was a total of 12 hours over two days of the group being in session at some particularly unsociable hours for some.

And where we've got to is, and the intension here, to produce a draft proposal within approximately one week of now. And that draft proposal is rapidly taking shape on the back of two overarching areas of work. One is that of the so-called Design Teams who are fairly concentrated on the operational and technical aspects. And the other is of the so-called or already the structural issues; that's to say this sort of model that we've worked with.

And I see that Marika has helpfully put up some slides which were prepared by the animators that Thomas - animators and communication specialists that Thomas referred to earlier, a group called (Explain). And you can be able to scroll.

And I think we should share this communication document with the whole Council. So if I could ask you Marika to send this out by email to the Council, and that includes on Slide 4 a timeline and some key aspects of what has been achieved including Slide 3 on coordination between the two groups?

And there I would say the use of a common law firm has been very helpful. And it's helped the critical thing. It's really helped with, in my opinion, is two-fold. One, it's allowed this cross working group on the Stewardship to really hone in and cut down and refine the most likely structure in which the IANA operation and what's being referred to as the post-transition IANA will sit.

And secondly, to build a greater confidence and common understanding of what work will be done in the cross-community working group on Accountability that Thomas was just talking about. And to understand how we could depend on that.

This slide deck deals with both the progress and the timeline on Slide 4, what was dealt with at the Istanbul face-to-face meeting, and in fact then look forward to the meetings that I just referred to over the 13th and 14th of April; Monday and Tuesday this week. And sort of box out the steps and how they

run up to a public comment period later in April/May and in towards the Buenos Aires meeting.

And if you go to Slide 7, you will see exactly how the group is focused on producing a proposal using the Design Teams to breakdown the constituent parts of the work and feed those into an overall proposal. And those Design Teams are cataloged in Slide 8 and including a status at the end of the Istanbul meeting.

So I'll leave you to look at those eight slides at your leisure. I happen to think that the (Explain Group) did do a very good job of simplifying what's a complex and multifaceted project. And there is similar explained materials, as Thomas has referred to, for the work of the ccWG.

Notwithstanding that, I'm sure some of you may have questions or issues. So I'm going to pause now and just see if anyone and anything they'd like to know or understand about any aspect of the work of the group on the Transition.

James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Thanks Jonathan. Can you hear me okay? Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

James Bladel: Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: James, we hear you fine; thank you.

James Bladel: Oh okay, thank you. James speaking. And thanks for this. I've been trying to follow this group, but being involved in the Accountability Group and then following the ICG as well has been a challenge.

Just a quick question. Looking at Slide - I believe I'm on Slide 6 where the different next steps all flow through to the proposal that Dennis submitted to the ICG, I guess two quick questions here, and perhaps they're overarching and outside the scope of this Council call.

But what is the expectation of the CWG? What are the expectations the ICG will do with this report given that the other two communities have already basically submitted their draft proposals? Certainly there's a recognition that this operational community is kind of bringing up the rear because we have so much more to do, and I'm just curious as to how, if at all, that's even factoring into the work of the CWG.

Jonathan Robinson: I think that's a really interesting question James and it's a good point. Let me tell you what I think which is I think maybe personal opinion combined with my view as a Chair.

We had those two proposals by time we went to Singapore from the numbers and protocol communities in with the ICG in time with the original ICG target date or deadline.

We had the prospect of the Names community submitting independently or that, and then the ICG having to do substantial work to try and reconcile these. Arguably the ICG may still have to do that.

But we've worked within the CWG on a couple of things to try and make that work of the ICG both more straightforward but more time efficient.

Recognizing that, in my opinion, this was a responsibility that we picked up by virtue of the fact that we were out of sync with the timing.

So we benefited from the fact that those two proposals were in already; we could see the shape and structure of them. Although as a side point, (unintelligible) still refinement and parallel work going on on those two both in

response ICG requests for clarification and other work. But I won't go any further than that, that's just what I hear.

So what we have done in the CWG is said, "Okay, we understand the structure of those proposals and we can attempt to structure our proposal as closely as possible to correlate with those other two proposals in order the ICG can do the most efficient side-by-side analysis." And that's really at a kind of structural level, at a practical level in terms of composing the proposal.

What that really means is that we get to build a proposal where we push significant detail into the annexes and have what we've called a short-form or proposal that will sit on top of those annexes, that will be directly comparable and ideally reconcilable with those two proposals.

Now some in our group have the view that we should write our proposal to suite the naming community and we shouldn't overly or even at all refer to the other group's proposals.

I think there's a pragmatism here. Clearly it's the ICG's job to reconcile them. But I understood that should the ICG have real difficulties, there's a very realistic chance that they'll simply refer that back to our group in any event. So we might as well anticipate that in my view as Chair, and do our best to anticipate any issues like that, and provide the ICG with a proposal that is as reconcilable as possible. We can't solve all the issues, but that's it.

So I hope that's a comprehensive enough answer to your question. And I see that Avri's hand has gone up also I think in response to that question, so let me hand it over to Avri.

Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes thank you; Avri speaking.

I only wanted to add one thing, and in fact I almost pulled my hand down. But one of the things that I think we've made an intentional effort to (unintelligible) is to not force either of those two operational communities to have to adjust to the Naming Community proposal. At a certainly point, there were implications and what have you that might have required some change however small on their part.

I think at this time, there's a real focus to make sure that we don't do that. And I think that's been an important part of the process. So I'm not contradicting anything Jonathan said, but that extra effort has been clear and quite intentional. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thank you very much Avri. I'm glad you didn't put down your hand. I think that's a really useful additional point. We have been mindful of the autonomy of those groups and their independent (unintelligible) of proposals.

And you're right. There was some concern, and in fact there's still due to be a call between the co-chairs of the CWG and one of the other groups submitting a proposal at least just to answer any questions in relation to that. But that's a really good point you make in supplement to what I was saying.

Any other questions, comments or points in and around this work? Okay, seeing none, I'll keep us moving on then onto Item 7.

Now this is an interesting one. This was a point that was raised - and I'm not sure who specifically raised it; I think it might have been Volker in the Singapore meeting.

And essentially there was a - this arose from a concern, if you like, or an issue. The relative allocation of the budget of ICANN where it seemed to relatively small in relation to policy work. And so Volker advocated that we should have a look into this and do a little bit more work to understand about

the proportion of funds allocated to policy development work and the extent to which that may or may not have changed.

So I understand that Amr has stepped in to make some input on this point in Volker's absence which is great. Amr, we'll welcome you doing that.

I also understand that in response to a request from the Council or from the Chairs Group, myself, David and David yesterday -- David Olive - ICANN's Director of Policy is prepared to talk with us a little bit about this and give us a bit more background.

So Amr, let me see if there's anything you'd like to say, and thereafter we'll invite David to make any remarks. And then we can discuss it and see if there are any next steps.

Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Well thanks Jonathan; this is Amr.

Yes, I actually have very little to say about this. I've been going over the slides for the FY16 Budget and Operating Plan. I've largely found it to be confusing and difficult to understand. I think it would be helpful to have more information on some of the items.

It does - as Volker did point out and as you pointed out right now, it does seem that the actual budget allocated to supporting policy development in the GNSO seems to be rather low.

There are references to Staff and issues revolving around new gTLDs. There's also a reference to gTLD Team; I'm not sure if that's regarding the ICANN Staff or if it's - I believe there's also a private contracting firm that helps ICANN out with this stuff by that name.

One of the other issues that Volker raised was bringing in experts to assist in policy work and specifically experts in data protection and privacy. And I personally, speaking for myself, I see how that may be very useful in some of the work that GNSO is going to take up especially regarding the new registration directory services model and PDP that will probably take off some time later this year. There is a reference to a budget allocated to that.

I have really very little way of knowing whether this budget allocation is sufficient or not. And then maybe - at this point it may be appropriate for the Council to actually provide/give questions more than come up with a position on this.

And there is a May 1 deadline for an open public comment period on this topic. And we probably should have something prepared whether it's in the form of a position on the budget or questions requesting clarification or perhaps maybe both.

One of the issues Volker did raise, and he's not here to speak to that, in his email was a comparison between support for policy work in terms of supporting Staff and bringing the expertise versus outreach and sort of academic initiatives by ICANN.

I would personally not be very much in favor of conflating the two and maybe comparing them. I think they're very two separate initiatives and parts of the work of ICANN and really no need to really hold that comparison.

It was my understanding that David Olive would be on this call and I see he is, and I'm grateful to have him here. If he could also perhaps give some insights into this at this point, I would be very grateful.

I do apologize. I've only been looking into this for the past couple of days. Thanks.

David Olive: Thank you Amr and Jonathan for this opportunity. David and Volker, I know who's not here, but we talked about this yesterday and I was asked if I could provide some additional information and I'm happy to do so.

I know everyone is very busy and sometimes we provide large documentation, and the budget is an important one. As one knows, this is the link to now our Strategic Plan and our Five-year Operating Plan, and this is the first year of having the Annual Operating Budget in that five-year timeframe.

And it is of course supporting the five strategic objectives and goals. The one that is most of interest to all of us and the one that I focus on is the objective of evolving the policy development process to be more accountable, inclusive, efficient and effective.

So to that extent, in the document that's out for public comment, I would draw your attention to the Draft 16 Operating Plan and Budget document on Page 8. It talks about resource utilization by the various groups.

And in particular there's an entry that's called the SO/AC Policy and Engagement item. Here we're talking about a proposal for FY16 of a little over \$11 million, up from about \$8 million in FY15 as kind of a general number.

But I should be careful and point out particularly that these items are looking at the dedicated resources, the Core Policy Development Support Budget that I manage for personnel, travel, professional services and admin for the department as they support you and others.

And it is just one indicator of the support for the Policy Development and Advisory processes that we give to community groups that fuel of course your work. And in fact, there are separate indicators that reflect community support in this, but I just wanted to point that out.

The Policy Team in general supports the three Supporting Organizations who develop policy at ICANN as well as the four Advisory Committees.

At any ICANN public meeting, we are also supporting over 150 sessions of your groups and other groups as they do their work at the face-to-face meetings at ICANN and obviously the service to the GNSO you know well.

In case of the GNSO, and the staff, the people that are hosted there on the Web site you know as well, we have the dedicated staff of Marika and Mary, Steve, Lars, Glen and Nathalie, Gisella, Terri Agnew, and then on different occasions Julie, Rob Hoggarth, Benedetta, Steve Cheng and other in support of your particular work.

Another component of that SO/AC Policy Engagement Budget is the constituency travel support area to support Council and other leaders in the face-to-face policy and advisory work at ICANN public meetings, and that is part of that as well.

So in addition to what is a narrow snapshot of the core dedicated functions, I have to add that there are an extensive shared support infrastructure capabilities that are in the budgets of other departments for the SO/AC support.

And this includes IT, and that would be teleconferences, AC Rooms, transcripts and meetings such as this meeting today is under that. Assistance from the Legal Office, Compliance, GDD and the relationships of consultations, communications including videos, publications and translations, community online tools such as Wiki, the various SO/AC Web sites, and tools for working groups and constituencies that are being developed as well as the annual special SO/AC budget.

At this stage, the Finance Team doesn't currently produce the costs by department function; that is to say policy or something like that. This may happen in the near future as this degree of detail may be needed, but at the moment it's a combination of things as I was pointing out.

The specific numbers aside, Jonathan and Amr and Council Members, I can definitely state that as the ICANN budget has grown over the last several year, we've been able to increase the number and amount of support capabilities and engagement services delivered to the GNSO and to the other SOs and ACs.

For the GNSO alone, we now have a core part of the budget that is for the Annual GNSO Strategic sessions at the end of the General Meetings. We've also been able to resource targeted groups for face-to-face meetings during the ICANN Public Meeting and that will continue in the FY16 proposal.

Over the last couple of year, we've been able to solidify constituency travel to support the GNSO stakeholder group and constituency leaders for attendance at ICANN meetings to help facilitate their process and involvement in the policy development work of the Council. And as we go forward, we hope to increase that travel support for both contracted and non-contracted leaders.

In terms of trying to open the door for engagement and outreach, there's been travel support through a series of pilot projects called the CROPP Program, you know, from FY14, 15 and 16, which we hope to add to as an outreach component for some of the communities.

Also in FY15, we launched a pilot project for secretariat support for the Non-Contracted Community, and to the point raised we are looking to develop an FY16 a pilot program of expanded community support to address the policy development workloads helping with documents and document drafting and this type of thing.

Jonathan and others may be informing you of the overall improvements within the SO/AC community leadership as they are considering how to address the general workload of prioritization, information management, how easy it is to access information.

You've seen some improvements in the GNSO site to make a one-page landing a quick reference to get the materials you need to do your job, and more of that is coming as well as community engagement opportunities, some of the projects we've talked about. And these will have a longer-term impact as well.

So despite the various games, we still have a lot of work to do obviously with the community and the workload continues.

Thus to the extent that the Council has an interest in commenting as you are, the managers of the Policy Development work for the Generic Naming space, I encourage you to look at this and to try to focus on some of those pages I've indicated on the budget document and comment on that.

Now areas that could be, if you didn't want to get into too much detail, would be one, is the level of policy and other Staff support for the PDP activities adequate or not, or the need for additional resources for substantial new or additional policy work that you may see coming down the road in FY16 over and above the expected workload; comment on that possibly. And three, any other comments about the overall direction of the budget, focused on the policy work I think would be some areas and good to hear your views.

So I will just stop there and hope that this has been a helpful explanation as of course the CFO Xavier Calvez and his team have been conducting seminars and webinars to brief the group. He has a smaller group of budget interested people as well that provide more of the details of many aspects of the budget. But I thought I would focus on this one and hopefully encourage

your look at and if you think you would like to make a comment or input on it I think we would welcome that. I'll stop there, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible), thank you. That is both informative and helpful. I think it would be very useful to hear from other councilors and I see some hands have gone up. So let's fire away and get comments or questions or other points in relation to this. Go ahead, Donna, you're first in the queue.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin. David, thank you for the view. I mean, it's very helpful. But it also seems to illustrate there's a hell of a lot of work going on, but I don't know that your whole resources in terms of staff have changed significantly over time. And I'd just be interested to understand from your perspective whether you think you have the adequate resources to keep up with the job, I suppose. Because, you know, obviously we don't have the broad overview that you have. So it would be useful to get your perspective.

And I'd just like to add, I mean, that Marika turns up everywhere and she does a tremendous job, but, you know, mostly very conscious we talk about community burnout, but you also need to be mindful of - you know, that staff aren't being overextended as well. So it'd just be interested in your perspective in whether you think you have the resources you need to get through the work and also all of the work that's coming down the pipe.
Thanks.

David Cake: Thank you, Donna. The issue is in a sense for my department we have grown the policy staff from roughly 23 in fiscal '14 to - we're now at 27. We've brought in a series of people at various levels to make sure that we have growth for people as they learn the job as well as senior people to help train them. So we're at 27 for fiscal '16 at the moment and we do have some professional services help to - for specific expertise to do additional work as well. And you know some of them who help us out on the various areas.

That said, it, you know, really is the expectation of will we now move into a period of more rapid policy development issues, now that the new GTLD program is launched and other issues that may now come back to the GNSO as policy work, what does that mean? And we in the sense we're rather cautious to ramp up from the 23 to the 27 today, positioning both subject matter experts and secretariat support in anticipation of that waiting to see exactly which way this may go. And FY16 may be that turning point.

But I think at the moment we think we have the staffing, but should something come our way -- a special project or board mandated efforts -- we would then talk about increased resources to address that as we did, for example, with the IANA - U.S. Government transition of IANA function and the cross-community working group. That was not anticipated the 12 plus months ago in any budget planning. But we made the arrangements to put resources and staff there to address those issues.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks David. Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jonathan. And you can - thank you Donna and David. I think the two of you in combination pretty much covered anything I wanted to raise. I think it's interesting that it wasn't planned to sort of budget policy staff's involvement in things like the CWG. I don't mean to blame anyone for that, but I would say that I do foresee a significant amount of policy work, at least the GNSO that will be coming up and while policy staff has been doing an amazing job supporting the GNSO and now the wider community as well -- for example -- having Marika (unintelligible) involvement in CWG on the IANA stewardship transition.

Did there - I'm guessing there will be other initiatives that are beyond just the GNSO work. Again, you may have to have staff allocated to other groups; things such as the potential cross-community working group on how to handle auction proceeds. There's also - there may also possibly be an initiative on - a cross-community initiative on one of the strategic plan items

concerning ICANN's role in the public interest. There may be a number of things.

And I - all I'm saying is I do hope that there is sufficient budget - there is sufficient budget allocated to, you know, sort of make sure that you have the support that you need; I'm talking to David now. You and your team have the support you need to support the work that the community is doing. And what I would really be grateful for is -- because obviously we couldn't ask for better insight than what you could provide us -- is if it would be okay for you to work with Volker, myself, and anyone else interested in coming up with a - with questions or comments before May 1st. I'm sure there are several gaps you could fill. Thanks.

David Cake: I'm happy to review that which you are preparing and to assist in that respect. Just one other comment -- I thank you -- the policy team is indeed primarily focused on our core functions - that is supporting our organizations in their policy development work and the advisory councils - committee -- excuse me -- in their advisory work to the board. And other staff are of course assisting in the CWG and the CCWG from a strategy, legal, and the like. And we have also been advising them as well.

I think now with the experience in the cross-community working groups that we've had to date, I think there is a better understanding of what are the resources needed to assist the community in doing these important tasks and I think there's also a sensitivity about the budget to make sure that the staffing of the resources are there for that. So to that extent, thank you for that comment, Amr. And Donna, thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Amr, David. I suppose (Susan) and then I'm going to try and pull this item together a little.

(Susan): Thanks Jonathan and thanks David for the overall input. What is the - one of the, you know, things I'm concerned with and the council should think about

on maybe commenting is that if the next generation directory services PDP goes forward -- maybe in the fall or at the beginning of next year -- that that be - that the adequate resources be available for that. You know, we've - we need -- if we have time -- discuss the framework document that our small working group delivered to the board and to the GNSO Council recently.

But, you know, the working group envisioned maybe a three phase PDP which, you know, we've all be working on Who Is for a long time and realize the complexities of it. And would envision, you know, a lot of budget being necessary to move that forward. And one of the ideas we were thinking about was maybe even a paid facilitator to manage the - to chair the PDP. So I think it is important that we think about all of the different policy work that could possibly go on and make sure that we're funded - there's enough funds to do that work.

David Cake: Thank you, (Susan). That's again, you know -- and our learning curve of how best to direct our work and how to make it more efficient and effective, utilizing the best time of our volunteer leaders such as yourselves -- I think those types of comments would be very useful and I think helpful to reinforce some of the issues that we've been identifying with the cross-community working group and the CCWG in this latest round of transition and accountability. So thank you.

(Susan): Uh-huh.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so that's been a really interesting discussion. It's been informative and it's been pretty thorough. What I'm hearing is - I think I heard almost everyone refer to providing some sort of comment. This -- from my erection -- would be unprecedented. Typically the way this works is that the groups of the GNSO have provided their own comments and their own tracking of the budget. And I'm clearly aware most obviously of the work of the registries stakeholder group does. However, I think we've heard good arguments for

why there might be some areas in which we would want to comment. One of the challenges, of course, is having the resources for us to even do this.

But it strikes me that from what I've heard is there is a question here of ensuring that the current resource is adequate. There is also a question on the effective ability of us to understand -- us as the manager of the process -- to understand the budget allocated to policy development activities. So it strikes me that there's a segmentation issue. And I know that that cuts across many things. That's being worked on through accountability, through transition because in the transition group there's a strong desire to understand the segmentation of the budget related to the IANA function.

And then there is also the forward looking component; how confident are we that we are properly covered for FY16 work, including some of the big strategic pieces like the cross-community working groups referred to by Amr and the expert working group related PDP referred to by (Susan).

So it feels to me like if we could pull together a structured and effective comment that would be -- I think precedented -- but I think seems to make particular sense at this time. But it's going to need some work in the next couple of weeks, a time when we're all very busy. So I think what we will do is - we've effectively got to some extent a volunteer in Amr, but I detect -- and reasonably so -- he's not wholly confident for a variety of reasons and we need to support him. And this is support in particular from people who have knowledge and understanding of financial issues and reporting in general. And ideally of ICANN budget.

So anyone who is willing to come together in a group -- and we may - we shouldn't presume that Amr will be the team lead of that group -- Volker's definitely out of action for this particular next two weeks. So I think I'll ask Glen to put out a call for volunteers to join that group. And we need a draft - we'll have to have a draft on an online document in very short order. I would suggest the mechanics of doing that is by creating some headings first and

then fleshing it out, but that's just my - happens to be my style and I won't presume too much.

Let's get some volunteers together, get some work doing and put this in by the first of May, noting that won't have a council meeting in between, so this is going to take some additional work to make sure we have - we build consensus on the list. Yeah, and that's the point, (James). I - it's a very good point. (James) makes the point about consensus and so this will be - have - but I think if - and I feel confident that providing we focus on the role of the council and remember the role of the council as policy manager and focus our attention on resources to support the policy management function, I feel confident that we're on good territory and we won't cross over that other work of the stakeholder groups or constituencies.

Good. Well, thank you for that. I'm mindful of time, energy, and resources. I think we did have - we have a couple of other items on the agenda. And those are picking up on the strategic discussion item from Singapore, which we struggled to get to and I think realistically we're going to struggle to get to again in this meeting. So unless somebody feels strongly otherwise, I am tempted to push us on to any other business items.

I think what we will do with respect to the strategic issues is probably push the presentation (unintelligible) to the list again as a reminder and just see if there are any comments or updates on that. We'll perhaps flag a couple of the key items that then maybe useful updates on that. And in the meantime -- for now -- deal with a quick update on the four items in AOB in order to finish on time.

So item 10.1 relates to the update on the proposed cross-community working group on auction proceeds. If you'll recall that we as the GNSO Council put out a note asking for interest. We got quite some expressions of interest from other SOs and ACs. We did have the CCNSO indicate that they were interested in the topic and would be able to provide expertise from the various

CC registries but that they would probably not be a charting organization. But for the rest -- from memory -- that was support and that's been now followed up by a call for volunteers to join a drafting team.

They - sort of hot off the press is a note from Steve Crocker which I encourage you to read carefully that came out last night where Steve says essentially that a CWG is a welcome initiative, but we should be mindful of the fact that the board is planning to do its own work on this. So there's a - I wouldn't mind any - I haven't replied to Steve other than to acknowledge receipt of the e-mail. And so maybe those of you that have read it might want to comment now and I'll welcome any comments you have. And I see a few hands have gone up. So Bret, go ahead.

Bret Fausett: Oh, thank you Jonathan. I was surprised by Steve's message. And maybe I need more background on the process here. He seemed to suggest that the cross-community working group would be one input into the process, but not dispositive. He said at the end, "I hope this is consistent with your understanding and expectations." It wasn't. It was my understanding and expectation that the cross-community working group would be dispositive of what happened.

And I am sort of curious to know the background here. And maybe I -- certainly and maybe others as well -- need to do more research on this and understand sort of where this is supposed to live within ICANN. But I thought it was supposed to live with us, not at the board level. And I wonder if Steve is in fact right and we are just going to be one input into a process, maybe we just ought to go with the process rather than creating the cross-community working group. So I don't know if other people have more information on the background here, but those were my initial thoughts.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Bret. That's an interesting response and I noticed that (Aubrey) gave a checkmark to your early comment. I must say that -- just to comment on my - this is hot off the press, I only got this last night from Steve -- there is

no other background to it specifically, although I've tracked a couple conversations over ICANN meetings over the past. At a very simple level I think I agree with you in some ways. It's either - I'm not sure that what Steve said reconciles. I think - feels to me like it's a little bit of an either/or situation. Let me defer to Phil and (Aubrey) who are next in the queue. Phil.

Phil Corwin: Thank you, Jonathan. I join Bret in having been surprised by this e-mail from Steve. I don't really know what he means by saying that the board's going to make a point of reaching outside the usual SO and AC structures to include the rest of the internet community. I don't know what that means, since the internet community and anyone in it is very active within ICANN and there are no barriers to anyone being involved with ICANN.

But I have to say this strikes me -- at a time when we're talking about accountability and ensuring that ICANN's a bottom up and not a top down organization -- that this decision by the board -- which comes after, you know - I don't have a record of what the board has said in the past -- my impression had been that the board had said, "When we get to discussing what to do with the proceeds of the auctions -- which I believe now stand at about \$55 million, so there's a very substantial sum of money -- we will consult fully with the community." There was no hint of going outside the community.

And to suddenly see a board decision without any consultation with the community about whether the outreach should be broader just announced as a fait accompli, I found somewhat disturbing. So I don't think it's a good idea to -- just because the board has made this decision without consulting with anyone in the community -- that we should abandon the idea of the cross-community working group. In fact, I think the group becomes more important in the context. But that's just based on a very short and not fully explanatory note from the chairman of the board and I think we need to find out more about what the board means by this and how they reached this decision without any conversation with the community. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, Phil, you made another very important point and that is that a cross-community working group would be open to anyone within and in fact from whatever outside the ICANN community might be. They are open groups. So I think there's two points here. One is how - is, you know, it would be very good to get not only the council's views but any views from your groups on this and then second how if -- at all -- we respond to Steve's letter. Go ahead, (Aubrey).

(Avri): Yes, thank you. I support very much -- this is Avri speaking -- I support very much what Bret and (Phillip) said. Going further, I mean, I was very dismayed when I read the note. It was politely dismissive and that seemed inappropriate. And in terms of your response and interpret of the council's response, I believe that this is one of these occasions where we would push out and say - you know, push back and say that, you know, their approach does not look appropriate and the cross-community working group with -- as you say -- further outreach and comment being (unintelligible) beyond that is indeed the appropriate way to go with this.

I mean, this is not strictly speaking like other policies, but it is a policy as to how we will handle that kind of money. And for the board to take this top down approach is a very good indication of why some of the things in - that are happening in the cross-community work on ICANN accountability are indeed necessary. At times being in that group I go, "Well, gee, are we perhaps not trusting enough?" But actions like this show that no, there really is a need to dampen the board's enthusiasm for top down decision making. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: (Aubrey). So then the question is, is this something which should be handled at the council level or is this perhaps something which needs to bring in other leadership within the GNSO and possibly other - even SOs and ACs. So that's something we need to think about, whether or not the response to the letter is given that it's no longer a GNSO activity, really. I mean, it's all very well that Steve has responded to me, but in a sense this has gone

beyond the council and beyond the GNSO to some extent. So that's an interesting thought as well. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And my colleagues on the ALAC in our own discussions have supported the idea of a cross-community working group. I of course haven't had the chance to discuss the recent response from Steve Crocker on this, but I will in future calls. And I will come back to you. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So I think that's -- given the time constraints -- it's pretty clear where the council is - feel this stands, both from your comments and from the responses in the chat. Thomas Rickert, (Susan), (Heather), (Penny), and others. So I think that this is something that we will need to pick up on the list some thoughts as to where we go next with this. And - but it does feel like a response is necessary and it's a question of where and how that response comes out.

On 10.2 I don't think there is much to add, so we did discuss this in the preparation call for this meeting yesterday and as I said at the outset when we talked about the action items, we intend to pick this up -- David, (Kay), myself, Glen -- in short order. That's to say that Buenos Aires planning work. I'm just mindful of approaching the top of the hour.

As the council liaison for PWG on country and territory names, do we have a volunteer or someone who we need to appoint to that position? Is there someone we have already? Could I be reminded?

Carlos Gutierrez: Yes, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Carlos, go ahead.

Carlos Gutierrez: I don't know if we need a permanently assume, but in any case we want to raise a flag and ask for time during the next call to report to the council on what's going on there, please.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Sorry, Carlos, could you repeat. I got distracted. There was a hand went up and down and I got a couple of other - just following in the chat as well. Could you just repeat what you're requirement?

Carlos Gutierrez: I am not sure if we are at the right moment to ask for a permanently some or not, but in any case, the co-chairs have agreed that we need some time the next call of the GNSO Council to ask a few questions - to put forward a few questions on this work, please. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: And (Heather) helpfully points out that we are missing a liaison on the absence of (Sheryl). So can I check - maybe this is something that's not open that we can roll over to the next meeting, based on having an update and doing that at that time. (Heather Forrest) confirms it's not out. I think we'll pass on this one for the moment and pick it up at the next meeting. I note (Bret's) point in the chat that he's asked for time on the May agenda to discuss the work of new GTLD. Discussion moving the warm-up to Buenos Aires. That's fine.

And I'll remind Bret and all other councilors that you're always welcome to help out in proposing items for the agenda. We very much welcome any work in that. Can't guarantee it'll go on but certainly very receptive to proposals. And effectively this work on country territory names will - looks like it's going to become an item as well.

(Susan), we've squeezed you out at the end. I think we've got a pretty good update from you on list, but let me just give you a minute or two to just come up under 10.4 with any points you might like to make, even if it's just to flag what's gone out on the list. Go ahead, (Susan).

(Susan): Yes. For the EPWG finished the work on the framework document. We incorporated all the comments we received at the Singapore meeting and then submitted that to GNSO Council and the board. Marika and staff are working on the preliminary report, so I would just say read the framework and read the report. It'll be part of the preliminary report. And so that hopefully will go out for comment sometime in May, I think. Marika could speak better to that. But that's about it.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, thank you (Susan) and thank you for keeping that very brief and for the effort. My concern for Marika says more likely in June. In any event, it's clearly addressed. Alright. Well, as my clock goes to zero zero at the top of the hour, I think we'll take that opportunity to thank you for a productive meeting. That was very useful. It felt like we had lots of time, but we ended up using what we needed. And so thanks for staying with us. And we'll of course pick things up on list and talk with you all at the next meeting in May. We can stop the recording now, Glen.

Man: Thank you everyone. Thank you Jonathan. Good bye.

Man: Thank you everyone.

Woman: Thanks. Thanks everyone.

END