

**ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
Joint ccNSO / GNSO Council
Monday, 7 March 2016 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

James Bladel: March 7, 2016, this is the joint (ccNSO GNSO) council meeting. We are located in Diamant room, this session will run from 12:00 to 13:30 local time.

Okay, good afternoon. Hopefully everyone has a plate with some lunch and ready to and excited to get started as our joint session. The enthusiasm is palpable. I don't know who is welcoming whom, I guess we were in this room all week. It feels like we're welcoming the (ccNSO GNSO) but if it's rude of me to say that way, I apologize. For those of you who don't know, I'm James Bladel the Chair of the (GNSO), Heather was here just a moment ago, I think she stepped away. The Vice-Chair from the contracted party house is (Donna Austin), over here from New Star and (Heather Forrest) is the Vice-Chair from the non-contracted party house.

As you are aware, I won't delay for the point some of you have been around the block more than few time but you know that the (GNSO) is comprised of registries and registrars in a contracted party house. And non-contracted party house comprised of intellectual property, business constituency, Internet service providers, commercial stakeholder group and then a non-

commercial stakeholder group with members and organizations and individuals from (unintelligible) society and other advocacy groups.

We have an agenda here, we sent it. I don't know if that's okay with you or if you had any edits to that, otherwise we'll turn it over to Byron for introductions of the (ccNSO GNSO).

(Byron Holland): Hi for those of you who don't know me, I'm (Byron Holland), and I'm the Chair of the (ccNSO GNSO), this is my final meeting as Chair at least serve, I served three years and my term will end at the conclusion of this week's (ccNSO GNSO) Council Meeting. So, it's been a great three years, very interesting, obviously some big blocks of work have happened during that tenure. And I think that the (ccNSO GNSO's) relationship with the (GNSO) has - is one of the real collateral benefits that's come out of these two processes because the nature of cross community work -- while that has been around for some time -- has certainly taken on a new tanner over the last 24 months.

And I think that that is actually been really good for the community -- and certainly for the (ccNSO GNSO) and (GNSO) -- where we have -- in some part -- forced to work together a lot more, but also done a lot of good work together in a very intense and meaningful --- and I think, hopefully by the end of this week -- a fruitful. So, I just wanted to say as somebody who's been in the Chair role over that whole period -- apart from the actual substance of the two tracks of work -- I think the effort has been really good for the community to truly get to know each other, to work together, to understand each other better, to understand each other's structures and processes better.

I think that's one the collateral positive benefits to come out of all the work that we've done in the past 24 months. I also wanted to introduce Katrina, our Vice-Chair and (Keith Davidson) who couldn't be here in Marrakech with us. Has been a long time member of the (ccNSO GNSO) community and actually he's stepping down as Vice-Chair, virtually in this meeting as well. So, it'll be

a little bit of a turning tide in the (ccNSO GNSO) leadership between this meeting and next meeting.

And I also wanted to welcome James, is a relative newcomer to the Chair role -- good luck in the coming years. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks (Byron), we're all new here and we're learning on the job but it was crash course, certainly over the weekend. If you don't mind, we can proceed with our agenda. We have a number topics here laid out. Unfortunately, I think (Becky Burr), who was slated to give us the first update is not yet with us in the room. Is that correct? I'm looking to staff to confirm, I still don't see (Becky). So if you don't mind, we will proceed with item B and that - (Heather Forrest) was going to provide an update on the use of country and territory names.

(Heather Forrest): Thanks very much James. (Heather Forrest), I'm here just to provide a very brief update. We initiated -- perhaps now more than 18 months ago -- a cross community working group to develop a framework for use of country and territory names as (TLD) is rather coincidentally that group met in this room immediately prior to this meeting.

And the very short summary of where we are and where we've come from, really this group is really the follow on from an earlier study group on this very same topic, that study group recommended the formation of a cross community working group. This study group was itself chartered by the (ccNSO GNSO). And we have understood our charter to mean that we interpret country and territory names -- which of course could be interpreted by many ways -- as two letter codes under the ISO 3166-1 standard in three letter codes under that same standard and names. Our recommendations on two letter codes, we - (Anabeth) and I would've presented some time ago, perhaps back in Buenos Aires -- and just this morning and we had -- let's say in our last meeting, which would've been perhaps three weeks ago --tasked

staff with developing - a stroll, in factor of pulling the stroll woman proposal, in the spirit of diversity.

We've drafted a stroll (unintelligible) woman, gender of your choice. On three letter, alpha three codes, and how that framework might look. We've only just seen it this morning, only just started to discuss it this morning. Anyone interested in seeing that, I think your best contacts in the (ccNSO GNSO) is (Anabeth) or (Bart) certainly or (Paul Cinder), and best contact in the (GNSO) would be myself or (Carlos Gutierrez). We serve as Co-Chairs on that group. I'll leave it at that, James and the interest of everybody.

James Bladel: Thanks (Heather) and wondering if there's any questions from the table or questions from the room? Must've been a very comprehensive update, so thank you (Heather) and know that - sorry (Becky) we did start, jumped ahead a little bit. But (Becky Burr) has now joined us and can provide an update on agenda item 2A, which is (CWG) Principals. So, (Becky) if you don't mind.

(Becky Burr): Thank you very much and I apologize for being late. I was extricating myself from a high-level meeting where they are talking about the accountability proposal. So, this is the (CCWG) on (CCWGs) or (CCWG) squared. John Berard and I Co-Chair this, and the notion here was to provide a bit of a toolbox for the community for cross community working groups to support and facilitate further work -- which and seems to be an increasingly important and, I think an exciting, part of our work here at ICANN.

What we looked at was cross community working groups in the past, some of which have been contentious, and some of which have been less so. And try to develop a kind of toolkit of best practices for (CCWGs) principles. It was chartered by the (ccNSO GNSO) and the (GNSO) in March of 2014. So I guess, we're sort of two years down the road. And we have published a draft framework for comment on the 22nd of February.

One of the reasons that this (CCWG) did not go faster -- in terms of final recommendations -- was we had so much material from the (CWG) and the (CCWG) accountability, that it seemed a shame to skip that. The public comment forum is open through the 2nd of April, and we hope to complete final framework in May. What we do in the proposal is articulate sort of the characteristics of cross community working groups, what should be contained in a charter in terms of the scoping and membership, working methodologies and alike with some (strawmen) there.

In - we have endorsed after consultation with the community the concept that is widely used, that on each member, each chartering organization with a plaint on its own members according to its own rules and procedures. Those members are responsible for reporting to their chartering organizations in accordance with their own rules and procedures.

So, what we have - done is very much preserved the autonomy and independence of the chartering organizations to establish whatever their rules are for participation, and review, and approval and not have any sort of standardized format for that. And it provides for the manner in which working group deliverables are submitted to charting - chartering organizations for adoption and approval.

The - and also sets out opportunities for public comment and alike. You know, it isn't something as formalized as a policy development process, (unintelligible) of policy development process but it attempts to outline those kinds of steps and tools that are there. We also include some critical threshold questions to help groups decide whether a cross community working group is the best vehicle or whether something else might be an alternative that would work better.

And there are also some suggestions -- and these are really just suggestions -- for post closure implementation steps in this and alike. There are some open questions that we've asked the public to comment on, and I think these

are - I think that the toolkit itself is - will be familiar and welcomed to people because it really is based on our experience. But there are some questions that we've asked for comment on. One is, what - at what point is - does the work of a (CCWG) got the ICANN board? Are there things that come out of that that...

James Bladel: Sorry (Becky), can I interrupt you for just a second?

(Becky Burr): Yes.

James Bladel: If could ask the folks having the conversations in the back, we're getting reports it's difficult to hear at the table. Thank you.

(Becky Burr): Thanks. You know, one way of dealing with the outcome of a - of the (CCWG) is for each chartering or - you know, for people to go back to do a policy (PDP), and that is a technique at the (CCNS) has used or is about to use. But there may be things that where we want ICANN board action or acknowledgment, short of a policy development process. And so, we've asked for input from the community on that.

Our operating procedures that we suggested are quite flexible and we've asked whether a more formalized operating procedure should be developed. One question that we have -- and I think this is a question that we first looked at. Fortunately haven't yet had to confront head-on is -- do we need additional mechanisms in case there's disagreement among the chartering organizations or there's not, you know, strong consensus? How do you operate with that?

And how do you decide to close a (CCWG) at some point, when it becomes clear to people that it's not going to produce results? That, you know, its time has come and gone. So as I said, the comment period is open. We know we are competing with enormous amounts of very important policy and other

work here, and - but we hope that we get a little bit of your creative attention to the report that's out there and we'll welcome any input that any of you have.

James Bladel: Thank you (Becky). Questions from the table? (Unintelligible).

(Marili Marchese): Thank you very much James, this is (Marili Marchese) speaking for the for the transcript. This is that particular working group that I had been interested to follow more closely but I couldn't so far, because I have been so full of other things to follow, but my question is related to the dynamics of creating (CCWG) seems to me that is such a very interesting and important instrument and that continues to policy development and now we have. It's proven as a model that works with the (CCWG) accountability.

At the same time I feel that that there are so much constraints and procedural steps that need to be followed to create and to follow through of having a (CWG) that sometimes the community decides to create other sorts of structures -- such as the discussion group, as a cross community working body. How do you see that? Do you see that they - these instruments are complimentary? How can they work to get there? Do you see them at all fitting into the reflections that you have made about the (CWG)? Thanks.

(Becky Burr): So, I definitely believe that there needs to be a spectrum of engage - community engagement processes, discussion groups are totally appropriate and useful for things when you're kind of brainstorming. Where you have a particular problem to solve -- that is a cross community problem more or challenge -- you know, it depends a lot on what the nature of that is. But we have tried to really maintain the, sort of, formalities to keep them small.

But we do think that having a workable charter is a critical feature of any cross community working group that's going to produce an output, a report in the end just to sort of keep - understand what scope is, understand what the authority that you as a representative from one organization or another come

to the table with. In a discussion group, you may want to have a much broader range of issues to discuss. But when you get to the point where different (SOs) and (ACs) want to - are willing to engage in a discussion but want to understand what the bounds are for that discussion, then something like a (CCWG) that has a standardized charter and that is accountable back to the chartering organization.

So I guess, one way you could cut this is where those interactions need some level of accountability back to the chartering - back to the respective organizations and something more formal like a (CCWG) is appropriate. And we're not, you know, we are increasingly building bridges across (SOs) and (ACs) and increasingly finding commonalities in our work and our interest here at ICANN. And to me, as somebody who's been involved in both -- a (CC-NOS) and a (G-NOS) -- that's really exciting and wonderful and we should really encourage it in - at the most informal level to in other formal levels.

James Bladel: And other questions from the floor? (Unintelligible).

(Carlos Gutierrez): Yes, thank you, (Carlos Gutierrez), I don't know if we're recording or not. (Becky) we just had a meeting of an ongoing (CC- NOS) and (G-NOS) cross communities working group, the one on the use of concurrent territory name. And it has been amazing, it's wonderful and it hasn't reached us on the (G-NOS) site a lot because the experience comes from the (ccNSO GNSO).

To put it negatively, I mean, we have been working on terrible information asymmetry. And it's just taking a long time to homogenize the level of information for both sides. My question to your report --which I haven't looked but I will look into that -- is, do you have some ideas how to -- not only have a charter and accountability for the group but a level playing field in terms of information? ICANN has reached, they always provide us with wonderful stuff, and rooms, and Adobe connect rooms, and things, but my questions, have you dealt with the importance of a high-level of common information

before you start working? Because normally you lose a lot of time until you get everybody to the same level of knowledge and information. Thank you.

(Becky Burr): So, I think there are times where something along the lines of an issues report -- which establishes baseline information -- will be very, very valuable and that is something that can be part of the (CCWG) process, not an issue's report in the same way that we mean that with a (PP), but a background documentation. It also is something where, you know, there is some part of the work of building a charter is to identify what the issues you want to discuss are, and in the process to identify the information, the background information that you need to bring to the table.

And then, it would be up to the working groups themselves to decide what the appropriate vehicle for getting that information to the table. Sometimes when you information asymmetries, is just having one, you know, party dump a lot of information on the other is not the most effective means to do it. There is some value in the exchange to make sure that people feel comfortable, that the information that they're getting from the other party is neutral and objective, and there some trust building that needs to go along in there.

So we don't recommend a particular outcome, but that I do think as part of the charter, really understanding sort of what resources need to be available to the group -- including background and informational resources -- are something that should be considered.

James Bladel: Thank you (Carlos) and (Becky). Additional questions for (Becky)? I have one question, and I just noted that your comment period is open until April 2nd, that's correct? So, if you'd like to submit a comment on this topic there's an opportunity at ICANN's comment forum. It seems -- I don't know if the issues are becoming more complicated or impactful -- but it seems like the concept of (CCWGs) and (CWGs) is proliferating.

I think it was only a couple of years ago we saw the first one, and now we're having (CWGs) about (CCWGs). And so my question was - and I'm saying that's bad thing, I was encouraged by your statement that there's a test to see if it falls within a (PDP) remit or policy development for one of the (SOs). I think that's encouraging to make sure that the - that it's not - the (CCWGs) aren't a sponge that are absorbing issues that belong elsewhere.

But my main question is, are there any plans or proposals to incorporate these principles into the ICANN bylaws so that (CCWGs) become an actual function of the bylaws or are they going to continue to be sort of this -- I'm trying to train to choose my words carefully -- this sort of, you know, ad hoc structure that is created by the (SOs) and (ACs) organically?

(Becky Burr): So, I mean, as some you could see this as a first step to making things a little bit less ad hoc on the - but I hesitate to say that because, in fact, the ad hoc nature of this is sometimes quite valuable. One of the reasons that this came up is that the (ccNSO GNSO) has a much longer history, given its relationship with the (GAC) and the sovereignty issues. So in a (ccNSO GNSO), we really have a long history of these working groups that are pro-consistency, in the sense that we bring that bring the (GAC) in because, you know, they are preliminary to building a policy. And you want to make sure that you sort of developed consensus across stake - important stakeholder groups, and you've informed the process.

I don't think at this point we have either, you know, necessarily enough learning or really the need to sort of create a bylaw's provision that locks them down. One of the things that's great about them is they're flexible and they can be responsive to the work that needs to be done and so, it would be a shame to lock that down prematurely. So then, you know, I can see as we become increasingly interdependent, we are going to need increasingly robust ways for dealings in cross community world. But if we haven't done a lot of that in the last two years, I don't know what we've been doing, so.

James Bladel: Thanks (Becky). Any other questions or thoughts?

(Becky Burr): If I could just say, there is an engagement session on this on Wednesday. The time of that is kind of floating because it was scheduled to coincide with our discussion about the (CCWGs) in the (ccNSO GNSO). So, we're looking for a time that is not in conflict but if anybody is and interested this, there will be further discussion on Wednesday.

James Bladel: Awesome, thank you (Becky). Yes?

(Anna Betlang): This is (Anna Betlang) from the (ccNSO GNSO). And I just want to share the - my experience with these cross community work groups, we've - I've been with ICANN since 2000 and worked in the (GAC). At the time when we started to work with the delegation and re-delegation principles for (CCT-LDs). And the way - our experience by working with the (GAC) be (CCs) at that time, diminish the difference between the silos in a very good way. So, and now I'm sitting in the cross community working group on (unintelligible) territory names.

I also feel that it a way to getting closer to each other, to learn to respect each other's views and to understand why we look differently on a lot of the things that we have the same goal but we have different ways to go there. And to learn what other people from other constituencies think, this is really very valuable. So to make this more formal, by making best practice for the working groups will be a very good addition to what you are doing today. So thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you. Okay let's move on then to agenda item number 2C, which is the community working group on Internet governance. And for that, I see you two gentlemen are Rafik and Olivier sitting next to each other, does it - do you have an idea of who will be presenting first or?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes, thank James. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. I'll be the first one speaking and then Rafik will follow up afterwards on anything (unintelligible).

James Bladel: That's perfect. Take it away gentlemen.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: So, thank you very much for this I am Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, I'm one of the Co-Chairs of the cross community working group on Internet governance for the (ALAC) for the (GNSO). Next to me is Rafik Dammak and next to him (Yong-om Lee) who is the Co-Chair for the (ccNSO GNSO). The three of us are here, there's also the (AFAC) co-chartering organization but they haven't appointed a Co-Chair so it's just the three of us.

This working up a little bit different than the standard cross community work groups -- which have a starting point, a middle point, and an end point with a set of deliverables -- it acts as a watching brief or a liaison with the staff activities, and the board activities of ICANN outside the ICANN meetings. In other words, relating to other for a - Internet governance forum, (CSTD-UN) processes, (ITU), et cetera, et cetera.

It was created a while ago -- already over year ago -- and part of its work has been to also bring some input into these different processes. I think we have a slide which gives you an idea of the amount of - the number of (unintelligible) that are out there -- ICANN staff and ICANN board members, and also many members of our community attend these meetings. And the often it is difficult to relate what's going on outside with what's going on inside of ICANN.

We've had some input into these external processes, one of the things were workshops that we have organized to explain processes taking place at ICANN. One was last year at the (Wiese's) forum in Geneva, where we had a workshop explaining the process behind the (CWT) stewardship and the way that the community came up with a proposal. That workshop was repeated

slightly differently with the help also of other communities like -- of course the other operational communities for the (CWT) stewardship -- at the (IGF) and (unintelligible), it was very well attended.

And this year we are planning again to be present at the (Wiese's) forum, and this time we'll be looking at the process behind the (CWG) accountability proposal, because again, it's a good way to show the multi-stakeholder model in action and operational multi-stakeholder model in action -- which actually reaches pretty important and strategic decisions. So we felt that was particularly important.

Apart from this, I see we still haven't managed to get the slide of so, it doesn't matter, it's on our wiki. I'll handover the floor over perhaps to Rafik, who can tell us a little bit about the activities that we're having here in Marrakech and a few of the things I might've missed.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks Olivier. So as usual, for each ICANN (unintelligible) we have our face-to-face meeting for the working group, and that will be tomorrow at 10:45. So we are trying to see what we can do in the coming months and maybe we have some question to our charting organization, and tell them if we have the ability or we need to make some statement in the future. And for Thursday, we have the public session and if I can maybe just to look through the agenda. So we will get some updates or report from the (GAC) high-level meeting.

And then we will discuss about the (unintelligible) process and the (unintelligible) it will be about Internet fragmentation. So, this is the kind of topic we are trying to talk in our public session, and this is the kind of cooperation between the community within - from the working group and the ICANN staff, so.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: And before we open for questions -- it's Olivier speaking again -- before we open for questions, I just wanted to add that we've had a very good

relationship with ICANN staff in being an effective sounding board for the statements that ICANN has been sending to many of these conferences. So before sending a statement out, the first draft is usually being done by staff due to the time needed to write such statements. But that has been - then, with the input of our working group afterwards, so it's been very helpful indeed. And we can give examples?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I think like the (CSTD) report, (Oasis) plus and some (unintelligible). So, now it's kind of practice for the ICANN staff who deal with Internet governance issue to consult with us and share a submission, and for comment and feedback, so. Yes.

(Yalom): I would just like to add that this group...

James Bladel: Sorry, could you speak your name for the (unintelligible)?

(Yalom): Sorry, this is (Yalom) from (GNSO). I would just like to add that this group started as just a volunteer group of individuals and then each -- as you know, most of you know -- each (SO) and (AC) plaintiff approved the three of us as being Co-Chairs but the (unintelligible) open to anyone who would like to participate. And so this is a community effort not to represent any specific constituency but to show groups outside of ICANN better and are interested in Internet governance. What is going on in ICANN as Olivier has just said. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: And so (unintelligible) just have another 20 seconds of your time, the calendar of forthcoming events and post-events for 2016 is now on the screen. Going across, these are all the events that ICANN itself is taking part in. So we're bringing input as a group and helping bringing input into these different events. Things of note, the (Wiese's) forum 2016 -- I'm not sure if you can see it from here, can we just zoom in one more, please -- so that's on the 2nd to the 4th of May -- from what I see here.

And if we scroll towards the right -- I have no idea who's in charge here -- but if we scroll towards the right, would be seeing the forthcoming Internet governance forum, some (ITU) events also that are taking place. And all of these events have the potential to affect ICANN in the very important way, so we - I think it's very important to have the input from the committee of this. That's it, thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you for that update. Questions from the floor? I have a couple questions, if you don't mind. And then apologize because as (Byron) indicated at the outset, I'm new to this role and so some of the things I'm seeing for the first time. So, I'm going to ask some very almost childlike questions about this effort because I'm just coming - getting up to speed.

So what is the work plan or what are the milestones for deliverables for this particular working group? And does it have a beginning and an end or do you kind of see it become - being an ongoing process?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes, thanks James, it's Olivier speaking. As I was saying it's an ongoing process. So, it doesn't have a starting point, middle point, and an endpoint. Internet governance continues happening around the world, the calendar is endless. There are always more things coming up, more conferences, more challenges coming ahead of us. So the work plan is effectively built at each conference where we have a face-to-face meeting and we look at what we need to do until the next face-to-face meeting.

And what we usually have to do is to get ready for responding to either consultations that are done in other locations -- so (IQ) consultations, let's say, or (UNCTAD-UN) consultations, (Weise's) consultations -- and then when we then meet again 3-4 months down the line, we then come up with another work plan to continue the work. But there are some long-term plans, of course, and one of the long-term plans is to see whether we could agree to some kind of a formal interaction with staff.

So, it's to actually have more inputs than just having - behaving as founding board from staff. So we could have more volunteer-led and community-led input into these processes, rather than what we have at the moment where it's very much board and staff-led.

James Bladel: And do members of this (CWG) attend all of these events as a consultative effort or?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I wouldn't say all members, no. I mean, there are some members, of course, of the working group that attend these events. There is no budget, per say, to send people to these events but the members of the working group in general are very active in those circles. So they will attend anyway. What we then tried to do in building panels, is to have a mix between people that are members of the working group and others who might be high-profile speakers that would be able to provide another angle, if you want, to what we're doing.

As I said, the next thing is the (Weise's) forum in Geneva. We will be discussing ICANN accountability, and I'm sure that there will be several members of the cross working group and accountability that will be present in Geneva anyway. In which case, it will be great to have their insight into what's happening and the one after that will, obviously, be (IGF) Internet governance forum. But that's way down the line, at the end of the year.

James Bladel: Okay, last question, I promise. And I don't know if there's - I'm jumping in front of others. Is - so, thank you, I mean, this is helpful for me to get my mind around this because I get - I honestly didn't - wasn't very clear. So are still - if there's - it's a good idea, I mean, if the folks are already going to be present at those events and participating in those other organizations anyway, and getting them - getting the overlap in one room at ICANN is a good idea -- to get those coordinated. I don't think anyone would question that.

My only question is -- given what we heard from (Becky) -- is the (CWG) the right animal for that work? Is it - or should it be something else? Should we

invent something new? For - I always thought that a (CWG) would have a beginning, a charter, and then a comment, and then at an end. And then the charting organizations would say, "Yes, we agree with what the output was."

But if it's something that's kind of more of an ongoing indefinite effort, then it seems that there might be other ways to do that. So, it's just a thought here from the table that probably has been covered many times within this working group but as I mentioned, I'm coming at this fairly new. So, I don't know if there's you (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: (Unintelligible) on this, it's Olivier speaking. It's a very good point that you're making, and at present it doesn't appear to be another formal vehicle for being able to have this type of collaboration between (DSOs) and (DACs). So, the (CCWG) model was the one that was taken, and it's actually is using a model that is slightly wider than the typical (CCWG) model. We interpreted the charter in the way that the (CCWG) - (CWG) accountability was interpreted and that it has members, participants but also a large number of people that are just following the working group as it does its work.

If there was another model that could be used for formal interaction -- and we need something formal because, of course, when you interact with staff or with the board there needs to be a formalized part to the community interaction -- if we had that I'm sure there would be a way to evolve into that kind of structure. I don't know how my colleagues there think about.

James Bladel: (Marilia).

(Marilia Macias): Thank you James, (Marilia Macias) speaking. Actually, I participated in the creation of the (CWG) and the reason why it was created as a (CWG) effort, I think it was because there wasn't at the beginning a very clear output or product. It was created when ICANN started to participate in the organization

of (Net Mundial) in Brazil. And they wanted to make sure that the voice of the community would be heard, at least in the (unintelligible) issues that we could get a consensus on that that would be an outcome coming from the ICANN community into the meeting.

And through the first months of the (CWG) that was the main project that we worked on. And after (Net Mundial), I think it was somehow re-purposed. We have in your eyes the possibility to contribute with a formal output into this process if we feel there is need for it. Right now we are more kind of following up what is going on outside, and coming from the (UN) space into ICANN -- as I have in my professional life.

I think it's very useful for us to keep track of these moving parts outside the ICANN (acro) system. I think that many of us, do not have the time to do it. And knowing that there is a part of the community that is monitoring this and making sure that we know what's going on, and that you have this resort that you can go, and follow the meetings, and keep informed of what is going on outside, of course, making sure that staff and ICANN speaks on behalf of the community and that we know the messages that are being conveyed by ICANN, by the (CEO).

I think it's important for it to exist. I think that your question is a very good one. When we created the (CWG), we did not have the (CWG) accountability experience yet, may be one thing that we could have in our agenda is to think if this is the best format to carry out this discussion or if another format will be more advisable. I think that from the moment we created the (CWG) until now, other efforts have appeared and taken shape as a discussion groups, or cross community working parties. So maybe there are more options on the table now that we did not have back then. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you (Marilia), that's helpful background. (Ruben)? No, I'm sorry, I thought you were getting my attention. Any other questions? The queue is

clear and... Okay, thank you for that update. And for the remainder of our agenda. I will turn it over to (Byron) for agenda items three and four.

(Byron Holland): If we could just ask for the - if I could just ask for the agenda to be put back up. But for item 3, there are agenda items A and B. The first one is regarding the process and procedures within each of our respective communities around the (CCWG). What's happening right now, and how are we bringing it to conclusion one way or the other.

So I'll kick it off just walking through what the (ccNSO GNSO) is planning to do. And I'll go back in time a little bit, and that in Dublin, for the third draft we had considerable discussion face-to-face as well as on list et cetera, of four members of the (GNSO). We and the (ccNSO GNSO) have two days of meetings -- Tuesdays and Wednesdays -- and we devoted significant time during our face-to-face meetings in Dublin to reviewing and discussing their draft the proposal.

The outcome of that was, there was a general -- though certainly not unanimous -- consensus support for the third draft. In the interim -- like many, we are members of the (CCWG) -- have participated in all the calls and lists -- which we heard some of the facts and figures in over the past day or two -- the 33,000 emails and hundreds and hundreds of hours of calls, and face-to-face meetings. As we come to this meeting -- as much possible -- we will focus on the deltas between the third draft and the fourth draft over Tuesday and Wednesday this week.

We again, have devoted substantial time on our agenda in three different blocks of time to the discussion and review of the fourth proposal. And during that time -- of course counselors will be in the room with the broader (ccNSO GNSO) membership -- having a discussion, debate, dialogue, and listening to our community's views on the fourth draft. Our council meeting is Wednesday at 5 o'clock, where we will take it up as the (ccNSO GNSO) counsel and

depending on the outcomes over the next couple of days, we'll take a decision whether to support and recommend it to the board.

And that will happen, as I said, on Wednesday at our council meeting between 5:00 and 6:00 pm. So, for us that's the basic process and how we're approaching it. And we'd be very interested to hear how the (GNSO) is doing it. But before we do that, if there are any questions about how the (CC) is - (ccNSO GNSO) is conducting itself, I'd be happy to entertain those. Seeing none, I'd be very curious to see how the (GNSO) is doing it.

James Bladel: Thanks (Byron), James speaking. In the (GNSO), I think there's a high-degree of overlap between our two approaches. And that we are focusing -- at least this most recent review -- on the changes that were made between the third draft report -- which is the subject of extensive comments from our stakeholder groups and constituencies -- and the supplemental report.

I believe, as a participant of both, that some of those changes were the result of some of the comments that were submitted by (GNSO) participants, members, stakeholder groups, and constituencies. We have set aside quite a bit of time this weekend to discuss both the substance of the report as well as the process that we will use to examine it, and ultimately cast our votes in favor or against the materials of the supplemental report.

We have -- I have, you know, at risk of made to foolish -- I put out a process - proposed process that would -- I believe during our Wednesday session -- allow us both the opportunity to comment as the council on the supplemental proposal as a package as well as giving counselors, stakeholder groups, and constituencies the ability to extract individual recommendations out of that package for a la carte examination and a vote.

That doesn't necessarily mean that we would expect the outcome of that to be a kind of a mixed proposal where (GNSO) support certain recommendations but doesn't support others. That's certainly not the goal

here, we're very keen on sending a clear signal to the (CCWG) Co-Chairs. But it does allow us the ability to establish -- and I think similar to the note that we saw from the (ALAC) yesterday -- that they approved the different recommendations with different levels of support, some were widely supported some less, so.

And then, we have also offered each of the counselors or organizations to submit rationale supporting their vote. I think originally we called them, "Minority Statements," but don't know they could be majority statements. So we're calling them rationale. Where are we? I'll give the same message that I gave to the (GAC) yesterday, we are - some of our stakeholder groups and constituencies are ready to go, others are still discussing and need more time.

All of our groups are meeting tomorrow, Tuesday, for most of the day -- and I suspect that's where a lot of this - these final discussions will take place and the expectation, of course, being that there really is not a day after to consider this after Wednesday. Wednesday is the day that we will conduct our vote. So, I suspect - we our meeting is a little earlier than yours. I think our meeting, our public meeting runs from -- I don't know, I don't have my calendar in front of me, it's like 1:00 to 3:00, or something like that?

And yes, so we'll probably - you will probably know going into your meetings how our meeting went -- would be my guess. But again, you know, having tried - I don't hold myself up as a participant of the (GN-NSO), certainly not the level of others like (Keith) and (Becky), and (Nigel), and some of the others who've been actively involved and tried to hold on to this tiger by the tail as much as possible.

But I know that the contributions from these two communities have been extensive. And I believe just -- you know, even being one step back from the action -- I believe a lot of what you see in the final result is the result of work that's been done in these two communities. And so I would say, you know,

it's as much is our effort - we own this as much as anyone else these two communities.

So, I'll just leave it at that, I hope that addresses your questions. I think the bottom line is that we are on track, we still have work to do but our schedule has laid it out between here and Wednesday.

(Byron Holland): Thank you, any comments or questions for - by anyone for anyone? Still considerable work to do in both communities, I think, over the next couple of days from what I can hear. Anything else on this subject in terms of process? Okay, well with that, then seeing none, I will turn it over -- pardon me -- to Katrina, our Vice-Chair to talk about item 3B. Katrina?

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much Byron. Katrina Sataki, (ccNSO GNSO). So, assuming that we smoothly enter the implementation phase, it looks that (ccNSO GNSO) and (GNSO) will -- as Byron put it in his welcoming remarks -- we are forced to work together. And - well, let's take an example, for example, costumer standing committee.

According to the plan, it's supposed to be submitted at least ready or formed by something around mid-August -- which means that the by June we need to - well, the processes need to be in place in both communities. That's one thing, that's how our communities choose our representatives. But at the same time, it looks that both communities have to vote and accept the (CSC) as a whole.

So, how are we going to do that? So the clear need for us to work on some common policy, we have our own policies plus we should -we need some common policy, and we need it's really passed for June is very, very close. How are we going to know that? So, one of the ways we could have some representatives from both councils -- for example -- or for - not necessarily councils but from both communities -- that could find these common grounds

and - so that we are ready and deliver by mid-August. So, what are the thoughts on this issue.

(Donna Austin): Thanks James, sorry Katrina. (Donna Austin) from New Star on the registry stakeholder group. I was closely involved in developing the (CSA) with (Martin Boyle) and (Stephan) from (unintelligible) at them unless you have us on the registry stakeholder group. So, little bit of news today in the implementation plan ICANN provided about an hour ago, that they have a time frame of 18th August that we have to have the (CSA) together.

Now, in terms of requirements for - and I'll do this for the council, the (GNSO) council, because I don't know that we haven't had any discussion around this at all. The (CSA) is a customer standing committee or a customer service committee -- I can never remember which one we decided it was -- essentially it is representatives from (GTLDs), (CCTLDs) and non G or Cs -- I can't even remember which one that is -- and the liaison from (INS). So, that's kind of the minimum structure that we want.

And then and we have liaisons that can come from a lack - another from (GNSO), (AFAC), a few others. So the requirements in terms of - so the registry stakeholder group and the (ccNSO GNSO) need to sign off on the representatives that they want to be on this customer standing committee. And basically, the customer standing committee is the committee that will manage the - whether the (INS) - whether (IN) function is actually being managed in a way that is - meets the (SLAs) that have been developed as part of the working group on - for the (CWGL) on (INA).

And it's kind of a rolling thing, so a monthly basis I'll go back and I'll have a look at the (SLAs) and see if (INA) is actually meeting those (SLAs). And if there's any other, you know, stuff that looks out of the ordinary then I can deal with (PTI) and -- which is the new (INA) and try to resolve the issue. So, it's - I'm trying to give the really short version of how this all works. So the

registry stakeholder group and the (ccNSO GNSO) will sign off on their candidates full this year's (unintelligible).

But there's also a requirement that the (GNSO) council needs to approve, the slate as well. So, and I think it's the case that the (ccNSO GNSO) council needs to approve the full slate as well. So, there's a process that we have to develop to enable that to happen. So the registry stakeholder group will have to develop a process for signing off on their representatives the same (unintelligible) for the (CCs).

So, Katrina, to your point, I think it's probably worthwhile putting a small working group together from the registry stakeholder group and a (ccNSO GNSO) and try to work on how we're going to manage this progress in order to, you know, pull together - complement the slates and the (CSC). And then, the (GNSO) will have to think about what mechanism we want to use to -- that I see as a tick-the-box exercise -- it shouldn't be too controversial. So, we need to - but we do need to work out how we're going to sign that off. And now we know that we have a time line of 18 of August, it's a little bit more compressed than what I thought it was. So, we do need to start having a conversation. Thanks.

(Byron Holland): Thanks (Donna). I think that presses upon both communities on how urgent actually that piece of work is to get the (CSC) up and running. And given that right now we don't - it sounds like neither of our communities have any structure in place to actually select the members, et cetera. There's certainly significant work to be done. Please go ahead.

(Yuko Green): I just want to make one comment...

(Byron Holland): Can you just state your name for the transcript?

(Yuko Green): Sure, my name is (Yuko Green) from the Strategic Programs Manager. I was at the presentation that (unintelligible) has stated that the date, August 18th,

however it is actually August 15th when we have to transmit the final report to (NTIA) -- which is August 15th. So everything the implementation or post-petition of the (CAC) must happen by then and (unintelligible) has misspoken the date of 18th. I just wanted to mention that. Thank you.

(Byron Holland): Thank you. So, it's even slightly more urgent. Okay, any other comments or questions on that? I think probably, certainly for our council or community discussion -- at least speaking for the (ccNSO GNSO) -- it's something we're going to have to address as while we're in Marrakech or at least get that started. Presumably there will be some initial conversation with (GNSO) and we will have to figure out a way to bring up that back together in the very near term. Okay, Bart. For those of you who don't know Bart, he is the ICANN Staff Member Decision (unintelligible) Secretary.

Bart Boswinkel: One of the things as part of the discussions around the transition - around the (CCWG) accountability is on Wednesday afternoon - early Wednesday afternoon. There will be update and discussion on the implementation of the (CCW) or (CWGs) stewardship aspects. So, in preparing for that session, ICANN staff responsible for the implementation will provide a full list of areas where the (ccNSO GNSO), at least, needs to act in order to enable the timely creation of not just the (CSC) but potentially in other areas as well.

So, it might be useful that we share this afterwards with the (GNSO) as well so they have a full picture of what really needs to be done on the side of (GNSO) and (ccNSO GNSO) in order to enable creation of the (CSC) but other areas over the (CWGs) future as well in a timely fashion.

(Byron Holland): Thanks Bart. Any other intervention or discussion on this topic? Okay, then we'll move to agenda item number four which is around the new meeting strategy. And maybe I'll just kick that off in it. As I'm sure most of you know, on Fridays prior to the start of the official meeting the (SO) and (AC), and (SG) Chairs get together for a working session around the various issues of the day -- whatever they may be.

And this past Friday, when we had that meeting one of the topics brought up - in fact by ICANN -- was the new meeting strategy. And the concern raised by the meeting planners was effectively that, even though there had been a fairly lengthy working group process and approval by the board to change the meeting structures to the A, B, and C format meetings, that the communities that had consistently and regularly come back to the meeting planner saying, "We need more time, we can't do it in four days for meeting B -- please give us more time, meeting rooms, facilities, et cetera."

So ICANN meeting planners came back to the chairs to actually ask honestly, "What do you want to? Do you want to live up to meeting B strategy? Which community working group came up with and the board approved or do we want to do something else?" B plus style meeting, as it started to become referred to. So I just put that out there because it is a topic of discussion. I don't think any changes have been made, at least from ICANN planning perspective. But they did reach back out to the full community with that concern.

But within that, assuming that it is still a B-style meeting, a four-day meeting, I think one of the things that has come up is how will the various communities interact in that compressed timeline. From the (ccNSO GNSO) perspective -- as I have already said -- we have all-day meetings Tuesday and Wednesday. We could continue to do that, we may find that we need to compress some of those meetings in order to meet with other constituencies. There has been some discussion and dialogue around the broader town hall-style format one day because as is often the case with these kinds of meetings, where it's a one-to-one meeting -- (GNSO) TO (ccNSO GNSO) in this case -- we tend to repeat those -- (ccNSO GNSO) does this with (GNSO), we do it with (ALAC), we do it with the board, we do it with the (GAC), and I know (GNSO) does the same type of thing.

So, we all have these single point-to-point meetings where --as James very recently said -- we tend to say or deliver the same pieces of information three and four times in a row. And surely there must be a more efficient way to do that in terms of the interactions between the various communities. So how might we better execute those interactions? And instead of having a one-to-one relationship, how can we have an effective potentially many to many relationship where we can share the similar - the same information, learn from each other's communities in terms of what's happening or the issues.

But not necessarily have to have for one hour or 90 minute meetings, which in a compressed four-day meeting structure, those hours become increasingly valuable. So, I just wanted to provide a little bit of laid land and kick it off in terms of discussion of any thoughts on how we can continue to interact and share and exchange but in a meeting B format. James.

James Bladel: Thanks (Byron), that's helpful. And this is James speaking. So we had - I think similar conversations over the weekend sessions, and we were running -- I think -- into the same obstacles. I think - we also use the term town hall -- and just for the record -- over the weekend I was asked, "What's the difference between a town hall and a public forum?" And I think - and I don't know that there's an official definition, but my response was the town - the public forum is everyone lining up to speak to the board whereas the town hall, we're all speaking to each other.

And that maybe helps paint - it helps paint a different image. I think that we also noted the challenges of meeting the dual objectives of the meeting strategy be of how - focusing on policy work and policy development as well as getting into different venues and locales for outreach efforts and bringing newcomers into the ICANN process. Bolker was very involved in planning, unfortunately he had to leave but our Vice-Chair (Donna) was also involved not only in our discussions this weekend but the meeting strategy working group as well. And she had some -- I think -- some important thoughts on that. So, if you don't mind.

(Donna Austin): Thanks James, (Donna Austin). So, I think the (ccNSO GNSO) representative was (Keith Davidson) on the meeting strategy working group. Yes, and somebody else. So - (Margarita Valdez), yes. I remember, but she was at the back. I got a little bit concerned when I saw the agenda come up on the screen, when we were having a discussion around this on whatever day it was, because it looked like - the way that the agenda essentially is being structured now is that is all back in silos.

So, ICANN has a room, (ccNSO GNSO) has a room, (GNSO) has a room, the board has a room and that's not what we intended when we thought about meeting B. So, the idea is that they'd be opportunities to address pretty much what you said (Byron). Rather than having the same conversations multiple times, let's just get everybody in the room and have the same discussion and get a better understanding of what, you know, people are on certain issues. One of the - this is supposed to be a meeting that has a strong focus on policy.

And for the 9GNSO) that there are two significant policy efforts that the council has recently agreed to kickoff. One of them is on next (unintelligible) of (GTLDs) and the other one is on next-generation (unintelligible). Which I suspect is probably both those efforts and the interest of to (unintelligible) (AIA) group as well. So we see meeting B -- or certainly I see meeting B -- as an opportunity to have substantial discussion around those issues and make similar progress.

So if you have a four hour chunk of time where you have a discussion around the (PDPs) and you made some, you know, some real progress rather than, you know, getting the participants in a room on regular basis who are actually (unintelligible). You are more or less having an interactive public comment period on the spot rather than going through the normal process. So, that was the intent of what meeting B was supposed to be about. It was a, you know,

let's get rid of all the bells and whistles and let's try to get rid of the duplicities sessions but also the conflicted sessions.

So, we have -- personally as part of the registry stakeholder group -- we have found that we have not been able to attend a lot of the substantive topics being discussed on a Monday because of all the (GGD) that they're running in parallel. So, it's been really, really difficult to - for us to get to those Monday sessions. So, this is supposed to take-away from that as well so you don't have - you're not pushing up against other sessions. So, you try to have one string and everybody gets in the room to have the discussion and so that was the intent.

The registry stakeholder group perspective, the month before the next - the month before meeting B, we have a (GDD) summit in Amsterdam and that is where registries registrars come together for three days to discuss - we haven't worked out the agenda but it's kind of around operationally (unintelligible) and maybe some of the policies stuff that there will be opportunity for business discussion as well.

So, the question that we need to discuss within the registry stakeholders group this week is, what's the value in attending the Amsterdam meeting and then turning around and attending meeting B the following month. Do you send the same set of people or do you just a couple of policy people to meeting B? So, it's possible that we will have less attendees at the meeting B than what we would have at meeting A and see. So, that's kind of the summary of where we're at. You know, the intention of meeting B is a policy focus and to get everybody out of their individual rooms into one room to have good substantial discussion around issues.

(Byron Holland): Thank you, that's a very helpful explanation. Any comments or suggestions on this topic?

James Bladel: There's a comment from (Keith Davidson) in the chat. He's agreeing with you on what the original intent of meeting B and it was for cross community work on policy.

(Byron Holland): Maybe (Donna) can I ask, did you have a particular - in the working group, was there a particular flow in mind as in Mondays was more interaction oriented, Tuesday, Wednesday back to communities to think process, work and back out to Thursday for more community - I mean was there any flow like that considered?

(Donna Austin): We didn't necessarily have a flow. I think because this is so long ago now -- I tried to find the report yesterday and I couldn't find it -- but I think what we had in mind, it wasn't that - certainly we had four days. And just to comment on the outreach, the idea was - one of the challenges for ICANN in doing, you know, the ICANN meetings these days is finding a venue that can hold the meeting. It's very, very difficult because you need a certain amount of rooms, we now have translation booths in a number of the different -- you know, for the forum we have in the (GAC) room, I think there's some other rooms that they also have translation services.

So, the technical requirement is such that you can't have them in - there's not many places in Africa and South America, in particular, that you can hold those (unintelligible) meetings. So, one of the ideas with meeting B is, let's make it smaller, let's have a policy focus on it but also use it as an opportunity to do outreach in those local communities. So, if you Panama as the example, that makes sense but now that the meeting has moved to Helsinki doesn't necessarily make sense but that was the intent with the outreach. So, you know, you could go out, take people to local universities, tell kids about it, encourage them to come along and see how it works. So, that's the outreach.

In terms of structure, I think what we looked at was - I think it was slots of time. So, you know, from 8:00 to 12:00 across the four day, we talked about,

you know, the opportunity for discussion on different topics. And then from, I think, was from 4:00 to 6:00 in the afternoon, that's the time that you go back to your individual constituencies or groups and have a conversation about, you know, what's happened during the day. And so, I think it was more about chunks of time rather than separate days being assigned to constituencies.

(Byron Holland): Thank you. (Anabeth)?

(Anabeth Lang): (Anabeth Lang) for the record. This is a challenge, of course, there's only one hand we want to have a free conversation and people are talking to each other, town hall meeting in a big room to try to exchange views. And at the other hand, we don't encourage many people to come. We say that this is a small meeting and just the essence of who you're sending and meeting should come. Because how can you put it in a place where it's - we see this meeting it's in the big room today, it's so many people, and how can we have a room where all these people will discuss things together? Which would have been perfect.

For example some stations around, that we've had the (ccNSO GNSO) station, and then we have (GNSO) station, and a kind of a public forum in the middle. I think you can find models - the most challenging will be to flock - to kind of restrict the people coming. If not it will not work the way that you really wanted to be, I'm afraid.

(Donna Austin): I think that while we assume that there would be less people coming if it was just a policy focus -- we kind of thought of it might reduce the number of people coming. But one of the other things to take into consideration if you - if (Nick) just had to find one of those rooms as opposed to five or six or seven, it's much easier for him to do. But when you're trying to find, you know, because (GNSO) meets with (unintelligible) on Sunday so we need a big room for that.

We've been in this room for the last two days. The (GAC) has an extraordinarily big room with no windows that, you know, they need to find. So it's a lot about logistics, so I don't know - by making it a policy focused meeting we thought that would reduce the numbers in coming. But the smaller - to take it to those regional locations it's more about the location. So, if we can find one big room that's, you know, that's great. Yes, and that's much easier for (Nick) to find in those locations than having to find five or six. I don't know if that answers your question (Anabeth) but that's.

(Anabeth Lang): Yes, if we could hold it for B and that kind of discussion then we need perhaps one or two big rooms?

(Donna Austin): But if in addition you should have a retreat to your own room to discuss afterwards, then we again have the problem how many people will be in the different meeting rooms if each constituency should go back between 4:00 and 6:00 to discuss among themselves. I guess, you'd just have to be a little bit more flexible. Don't expect a room like this that's all mic-ed up and ready to go. You might just have, you know, a much smaller room where everybody just gets around and has conversation.

So, it's about, you know, logistic requirements as well and just being a little bit more flexible in understanding that you won't have the same facilities that you for (INC).

(Anabeth Lang): Perhaps we just have to try and how the Helsinki meeting works.

(Byron Holland): And that was one of the comments of the Friday the Chairs working session. We should at least try it before we start to fiddle with it. Katrina.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you (Byron), Katrina Sataki, (ccNSO GNSO). I have feeling that when you discussed these issues and many came up with the idea the meeting be smaller format and focused on the policy work -- I'm sure you couldn't foresee that the stewardship transition thing will hit us, right -- and well - exactly that

was long before that. But now I feel that it's a little bit premature, we still have many issues to discuss within our communities - with our communities.

Maybe next year - that's actually what the happened in the season, so we have this program - working group and when we looked into this issue, they proposed to the council, "Meeting B, let's wait and see." Because this meeting B -- it's supposed to be meeting B -- will not be normal meeting B, as - just tried - because they are still things on the on the table.

(Donna Austin): I mean, I tend to think that it is a good time to do meeting B because we're going to in a little bit of a hold pattern. And, you know, once a proposals have gone off to (NCIA), we're not going to be doing - you know, obviously staff are doing some work in terms of implementation and we need to monitor that, but I don't know that we'll have the need for the, you know, two or three days to get into substantial discussion on the issues because we're in a holding pattern. So, maybe Helsinki is a good opportunity for meeting B. Maybe people are going to have a holiday instead of (unintelligible).

(Byron Holland): Okay, does anybody else - would anybody else like to make a comment or intervention on this subject? Recognizing it's almost 1:30, which is the conclusion of our meeting. I just want to offer up the floor to anybody else who has a comment on this subject or the previous ones? Yes sir, (Carlos).

(Carlos Gutierrez): Yes, (Carlos) for the record. I have a question to the Chairs. Would be ready to sacrifice the Saturday-Sunday meeting for the Helsinki meeting? I mean, we have discussed these B meeting around a lot. I really like the focus of the work group, I mean, it's very clear, staff has a problem scheduling it but that's not my problem. But the final result is that we are scrapping the private time that we got traditionally assigned -- Saturday and Sunday -- to - for our individual face-to-face meetings. So, James, are you ready to sacrifice Saturday and Sunday and (Byron), I don't know, what the equivalent is in the (ccNSO GNSO), I would be very interested in your frank opinion. Thank you.

James Bladel: So, I guess -- this is James speaking -- to address your question correctly, I say, if the council informs me that they want those sessions then we won't go back to the - to this group and insist that we somehow make accommodations -- at least -- for partial weekend sessions, probably the B plus structure with a plus one optional day. For me personally, having now set here but also having given the updates from (PBPs) and other working groups, I think that some of that can probably either be delivered via webinar or via email.

And I think that probably those of you -- although we had a, I think, a good and productive weekend session -- I think that, you know, at a certain point we can probably say that some of those working groups are in a different state of their evolution and maybe not ready to occupy an hour or two hours on a docket. Particularly given that there were just a dearth of questions coming from the floor on their subjects, so maybe we weren't ready to take those on. So perhaps those would be fodder for that.

And then the other day is -- and again, I'm speaking personally -- the other day is interactions with all the other different groups -- of course the (ccNSO GNSO) being the most important one -- we have to keep that. But some of those other groups like the board, or (GDD) staff -- that was humor for the transcript -- but some of those one-on-one interactions, I think, could be folded into these other ideas like a town hall. And then we wouldn't need to go the bulk of the time that we currently set aside for Sunday.

So I guess the answer is, I will -- and I guess, speaking for (Donna) and (Heather), the Co-Chairs -- we'll fight for whatever scheduling the community instructs us that they need as a the bare minimum to get the job done. I understand the sentiment that we should try it first before we start complaining and criticizing. However, there are things that could probably be cut from the weekend schedule, if we want to get creative about having those updates delivered in different ways.

(Byron Holland): Thanks, (Byron Holland) for the transcript. You know, there's a personal answer and there's a Chair answer. From a personal perspective, I have family and kids, staying home with them for a weekend as opposed to in a basement room somewhere, I'm okay with that. That said, as Chair we haven't had a fulsome discussion on this yet. So I'd be a little bit remiss to be speaking for the council. That said we had members on the working group, it has certainly been discussed a number of times at the council level and it has generally been supported.

We don't use Saturdays as a (ccNSO GNSO), we use Sundays for working groups and council prep and that kind of thing. Could we find a way to get that work done using a four-day week? I certainly think it's possible and other methods that James just articulated -- be the webinars, or online, or different methods -- I think we should explore it before we say we can't do it. So, you know, personally from a Chair perspective, I think there's ways that we could structure to still deliver the value and the work that we need to while trying to work within the confines of the B meeting. And I also -- as I've said -- really we should at least try it before we start modifying it and are complaining about it.

With that, trying to keep us time because I know that we all have busy schedules. It is now 1:32 or so. Thank you everybody both from the (ccNSO GNSO) and most certainly (GNSO) councils for this meeting. I think it's - it was a good exchange, and I think it highlighted that there's still some key work to be done in a very short term. Particularly about the (CSC) and ways the two communities are going to have to work together immediately try to start sorting out those issues. So, thank you very much everybody for surfacing those discussions and I look forward to working with you in the coming days and weeks.

James Bladel: And thank you (Byron) as you're stepping down. I hope it wasn't us, but we look forward to continuing to work with you and your - you know, as council, I

understand you're remaining on the council? That's correct? And then we look forward to working with the new Chairs as well.

(Byron Holland): Yes, I will be staying on the council. If they'll still have me, I would certainly consider staying as a Vice-Chair, if they'll have me. We'll see how those elections go. The one parting note I will make is, as we all know the two councils had often had a later in the day meeting, this meeting later in the day, with an informal cocktail afterwards. I know we were challenged of logistics, I would just like to say, I thought that was great format because not only could you have the more formal meeting like. The opportunity to get to know each other, and have more involved formal chat -- I thought as a Chair - - was very valuable. I'll leave that as my parting thought. Thank you everybody, have a great week.

James Bladel: Thank you, we can pause the recording.

END