

GNSO Council Adobe Chat Transcript 3 September 2015

Marika Konings:Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of 3 September 2015

Carlos Raul:Good morning

Carlos Raul:Costa Rica has a national earthquake alarm in one hour, so i may have to disconnect for a few minutes in between if it gets too noisy over here.

Marika Konings:thanks for the warning Carlos, I had no idea

Marika Konings:so I don't need to hide underneath my table?

Carlos Raul:~)

Carlos Raul:you are far outside the city, so you may not even notice

Marika Konings:Phew :-)

David Olive:Be safe Carlos and Marika

volker greimann:i am on the adobe only, will dial in when home

Jonathan Robinson:Hello All

James Bladel:Do we have two Jonathans today?

Marika Konings:Lars, Steve, Berry and Mary are joining shortly - they are still on another call

Amr Elsadr:Hi all.

Mary Wong:We're here! (Berry, Steve, and me)

Thomas Rickert:Hi all

Mary Wong:And Steve Chan

Steve Chan:And Steve!

Thomas Rickert:Sorry, had an audio issue. Missed the roll call!

Oswaldo Novoa:Hello all, sorry I am late.

Glen de Saint Gery:Patrick Myles, ccNSO liaison to the Council is absent and has sent his apologies.

Mary Wong:@Jonathan, wasn't this at least mentiond to the Board, ie that the GNSO was going to do this, at a public meeting some time ago (maybe Bs As or Singapore)?

Mary Wong:Yes, that was what I was getting at, thanks

David Cake:I;m here Jonathon

James Bladel:RDAP?

Amr Elsadr:RE: reviewing the function of the GNSO liaison to the GAC, not sure if folks here would like the GAC/GNSO CG to perform this review and perhaps provide guidance to the GNSO and GAC?

Thomas Rickert:have we lost audio or is it just me?

Amr Elsadr:Have I lost audio?

Mason Cole:I don't hear anything either

Carlos Raul:hmmmm

Carlos Raul:me too

James Bladel:Hello?

Heather Forrest:Agreed

Stephanie Perrin:I have too

David Cake:me too

Stephanie Perrin:back not

Stephanie Perrin:now

Amr Elsadr:To be clear..., 3.2 will be on the next council meeting's consent agenda?

Marika Konings:@Amr - Correct

Amr Elsadr:Thnx.

Steve Chan:<https://www.icann.org/public-comments/new-gtld-subsequent-prelim-2015-08-31-en>

Carlos Raul:prevent what xxx downstream?

Steve Chan:40 day PC -> 10 Oct PC Close -> 9 Nov Final Report (9 Nov D&M Deadline) 60 days PC -> 30 Oct (1 week after ICANN meeting) -> 29 Nov Final Report (7 Dec D&M Deadline)67 days PC -> 6 Nov (2 weeks after ICANN meeting) -> 6 Dec Final (7 Dec D&M Deadline)

Steve Chan:that didn't come out very well, let me put them in separately
Steve Chan:40 day PC -> 10 Oct PC Close -> 9 Nov Final Report (9 Nov D&M Deadline)
Steve Chan:60 days PC -> 30 Oct (1 week after ICANN meeting) -> 29 Nov Final Report (7 Dec D&M Deadline)

Steve Chan:67 days PC -> 6 Nov (2 weeks after ICANN meeting) -> 6 Dec Final (7 Dec D&M Deadline)

Amr Elsadr:If necessary, we could vote on this in between council meetings.

Steve Chan:@Carlos, if I understand correctly, I think I was speaking more towards the fact that the detail in the report will help downstream work (not prevent)

Stephanie Perrin:There is a lot going on now, especially with the IANA. I think we need a longer time period

Marika Konings:To add to Jonathan's comments, 40 days is a minimum period with discretion to extend either because of events that may effect the ability of groups to provide input or at the request of SO/ACs that more time is needed.

Bret Fausett, RySG:It

Amr Elsadr:As Steve pointed out, a 67 day PCP would provide 2 weeks post Dublin.

Bret Fausett, RySG:It's worth noting that we have another meeting on 24 September 2015 - so we can go with a standard comment period, work on our comments now, and see where we are at the next meeting.

Marilia Maciel:Agreed, Stephanie, extension seems like a good way forward.

Jonathan Robinson:@Bret. That's a very good point re September meeting and extension

Oswaldo Novoa:@Bret I support your suggestion, I think is a very good idea

James Bladel:No objections to Brett's proposal, but my guess is that on Sep 24 we will have rec'd minimal responses. Most wait until the last minute.

Oswaldo Novoa:@James, Yes but our constituencies will have a better idea on how they are going on the comments.

Carlos Raul:plus a webinar.....

Carlos Raul:Council position plus webinar

Donna Austin, RySG:The report is also based on a 12 month period of work undertaken by the Discussion Group .

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:A policy report effectively prepares the work of the PDP. We do not want to be in a position where issues have been missed and are therefore outside the scope of the PDP

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Olivier, scoping is extremely important

Mary Wong:@Olivier, @Stephanie, thank you - and that is one reason why public comment periods (of whatever ultimate duration) are mandatory for Preliminary Issue Reports.

Amr Elsadr:I would also prefer a 60 vs. 67 day PCP.

Amr Elsadr:Appreciate the work done by the discussion group, but community groups also need time to review/draft.

Tony Holmes:agree with Donna r.e. precedent

Marilia Maciel:Yes, 60 seems like a good way to accommodate views and give staff more time.

Amr Elsadr:Yes, it is.

Stephanie Perrin:+1 Marillia

Amr Elsadr:I mean it is actually covered. Not sure the public interest part though. Need to get back to the report.

Steve Chan:@Amr, there is a separate global public interest subject. I would have to remind myself actually how well they are linked.

Amr Elsadr:To be clear, my view on "the public interest" is that it is highly subjective what actually is or isn't in the public interest. The PDP WG should have the opportunity to make some determination about this.

James Bladel:We could do both. Respond directly and also note that this will be included as a Public Comment received

Marika Konings:Note that ICANN's strategic plan has identified 'Develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by ICANN's mission.' as one of its priorities.

Amr Elsadr:@Steve: Thanks, yes. I'm aware of the GPI topic as part of ICANN's general strategy. Still a long discussion to be had there too. :)

Marika Konings:my understanding is that that work will take place through cross-community deliberations.

Steve Chan:@Amr, I actually meant there is a GPI subject in the Issue Report as well

Marika Konings:The GNSO Council may want to consider asking the Board what the status is of that effort and how it is expected to inform the new gTLD conversation in relation to this topic?

Stephanie Perrin:Agree with Amr, this is going to be a long and fairly fractious discussion.

Amr Elsadr:@Steve: Ah thanks. I wasn't sure about that. Need to get back to that part of the document.

James Bladel:Public Interest = everything we do.

James Bladel:To Heather's point, acknowledging "Public Interest" invites additional GAC involvement in any issue.

Amr Elsadr:So many implications to "the public interest" that makes me somewhat uncomfortable about a "harmonized" view.

Stephanie Perrin:It would also be important to ascertain what the GAC's view is.....perhaps they already have one well articulated and I am just unaware of it.

Heather Forrest:I take Amr's point, but a discordant understanding of the concept is equally challenging.

Amr Elsadr:I've always preferred the GPI to remain subjective. Not a term to be appropriated by one group, and not a terribly good idea to negotiate a definition or framework either. Although I do appreciate the challenges in not working this out.

Heather Forrest:The legitimacy of the New gTLD Program is called into question every time we deviate from the Guidebook in relation to applications filed on the assumption that the Guidebook would be the applicable rules

Carlos Raul:Thank you @Donna for this background

James Bladel:Maybe we could get an update of the applications that are currently affected by this, and "on hold," and how the board/NGPC expects future rounds to operationalize "Public Interest?"

Amr Elsadr:In the previous AG, the specifics of what criteria were applicable to a limited public interest objection was clearly listed. Not sure I remember another reference to the GPI in the AG.

Carlos Raul:support @james suggestion.

Thomas Rickert:I need to leave the ac room now. Will remain on the telephone bridge.

Stephanie Perrin:+1 James, this would at least help us scope the problem

Amr Elsadr:@James: Don't agree that a definition of the public interest belongs in the issues report. The merits and pitfalls in a policy within the context of the public interest needs to be determined by the PDP WG, not the issues report.

Donna Austin, RySG:It might be useful to understand where the term has come up in the ICANN context previously.. I think there was quite a bit of discussion of this term in the Registry Agreement negotiation.

James Bladel:Not a definition, necessarily, but invite them to expand on this.

James Bladel:My prediction - they won't

Marika Konings:there was also a strategy panel that focused on global public interest

Amr Elsadr:@James: How about the expansion happen at the PDP WG phase? ;-)

Stephanie Perrin:Even a summary of what has happened so far would be helpful

James Bladel:@Amr - As if we could stop that from happening.

James Bladel:)

Amr Elsadr:)

Amr Elsadr:Thanks Phil. Great briefing as always.

Mary Wong:@Phil, apologies, I didn't mean to discount what you said, was just trying to highlight the outstanding action item for the Council.

Philip Corwin-BC:No need to apologize, Mary, and thanks for additional detail.

Philip Corwin-BC:Thank you Amr.

Mary Wong:@Phil, Steve and I really appreciate the appreciation, thank you so much!

James Bladel:Could even use data & metrics to repeal policies that were measurably failing to achieve their stated goals. :)

James Bladel:Thanks Jonathan. Didn't mean to interrupt.

Berry Cobb:It should be noted that this pilot effort targets the Issue Identification & Working Group stages of the policy process.

Berry Cobb:Recs 4 & 5 are dependent on Rec #3 to create these work product templates. We needed to find a home for 4 & 5, and the templates will serve that purpose.

Berry Cobb:Recs 6 & 7 are linked to introduce the concept of Data & Metrics requests. Ultimately updates the WGG within the GNSO Ops Procedures.

Berry Cobb:As noted in several bullets, a red-line version of the GNSO Op Procedures is included with the Initial Report of the Public Comment.

James Bladel:Can we see the Decision Tree?

Berry Cobb:It is listed in Annex C of the initial report. Posting here in the AC room is difficult to see.

Berry Cobb:<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-gns0-data-metrics-policy-making-initial-29jul15-en.pdf>

James Bladel:Thanks, B.

Susan Kawaguchi:great work!

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:Is this presentation downloadable?

Heather Forrest:Thanks very much Jonathan!

James Bladel:Thx Jonathan.

Berry Cobb:Slides can be found here:

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/presentation-dmpm-03sep15-en.pdf>

Jonathan Zuck (IPC):My pleasure. Thanks for the time on your agenda

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:Thank you @Berry!

Amr Elsadr:Curious about why the BoD concerns are only being communicated now. Kinda late, isn't it?

Carlos Raul:Very diplomatic indeed!

Amr Elsadr:To be clear, that wasn't really a question for Thomas. I don't expect him to have an answer to that question. :)

Carlos Raul:txs thomas

Brian J Winterfeldt:Happy birthday Volker!

James Bladel:)

Carlos Raul:What? Were are the drinks???

Amr Elsadr:Happy b-day Volker. Nice of you to spend some it with us!! :)

Philip Corwin-BC:HB Volker!

Heather Forrest:Best wishes Volker, good night all

Amr Elsadr:Thanks. Bye all.