

**ICANN Transcription
Board, GAC, ccNSO Preparation Discussion
Saturday, 5 March 2016 1545 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://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

James: Next up is - we have a couple - and we're just going to blend the next two items together into one agenda item which is preparation for our meetings with the Board -- the GAC -- the ccNSO and our discussion with the introductory meeting with the new incoming CEO, Goran, who will be joining us tomorrow as well.

So Marika has just sent around a document to the mailing list, but I think we also have it loaded up on the screen so we can go through this. And I think our agenda - or our goal here is just to review these agenda items -- they should look fairly familiar -- they've been percolating around on the list for, you know, maybe a week -- maybe a little longer.

And it's possible - I would love for this to not be a monologue if we could get other folks to raise their hand on particular topics -- particularly if it's a topic that you feel strongly about.

Or if it is very important to your community that, you know, that you were the one that raised it on the list -- and that you would like to take the lead on that

conversation with the Board -- with the GAC -- with the GNSO, sorry that's us -- with the ccNSO.

Then definitely raise your hand and we'll get your name attached to these agenda items and you can take the lead from that. So if we can dive into the list, we'll start with the Joint ccNSO, GNSO Council Meeting. This is not tomorrow's -- this is actually Monday.

And we sent this I believe to the ccNSO chair(s) and did not receive any concerns or complaints or really any feedback. So we're going to assume that this is fine and this will be our working agenda for that session.

We have just some welcome and introductions -- they've had some leadership changes on their side -- we have all new three folks up here -- we we'll just at least make sure that we can put names to faces before we dive into the meeting.

Then the second item is we'll talk about some of those joint efforts -- specifically the CWG principles, the country territory names -- which I think Heather, it would be great if you could lead the group on that. And then CWG on Internet governance.

And I think - is it the third one, Marika, that we want to also at least have an understanding of where that group is at and where it's going -- and when it will have some sort of deliverables or progress status updates?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Yes, I think that's actually one of the efforts of - the council hasn't recently reviewed or discussed and also I think - because there's maybe less involvement from a council. I believe Carlos is actually the liaison to that effort, so he may actually be in a position to provide an update on where we stand.

James: Sorry, I'm sorry -- Carlos -- what was that?

Carlos: I can, but Jonathan (unintelligible) coming tomorrow to speak about...

Marika Konings: Which Jonathan?

Carlos: (You) said to (unintelligible) to the review?

Marika Konings: No to the CWG on Internet governance.

Carlos: Not much to say about it.

James: Okay, so maybe just getting an understanding of where that group is and where it's headed because I think it is just something that we need to get a better understanding of.

Carlos: Yes indeed.

Marika Konings: Yes, but in that case this is a meeting that probably be good to - someone's in the room that would actually be able to give an update where they stand with regard to the charter and whether they're near completion or delivering on their milestone.

Man: Co-chair right there.

James: Oh, (Olivia), fantastic. Now would you be able to contribute to that agenda item tomorrow? Monday, I'm sorry -- Monday?

(Olivia): It's (Olivia) speaking. When Monday - because...

James: Twelve or 13:30?

(Olivia): Okay, I'll come back to you on it.

James: Okay.

(Olivia): (Rakita's) not coming. Right, (Rakita's) the other co-chair, so maybe he can...

James: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

James: Yes. And then the - and so Heather you're on the hook for B -- thank you for that one. And CWG principles - who is the - do we have a counselor that's the liaison or participant to CWG principles? This is the community working group to define community working groups.

You can't make this stuff up. (Mary)?

(Mary): This is (Mary) from staff -- also affectionately known as CWG-squared.

James: Of course.

(Mary): So the co-chair is a former counselor, John Berard, who will not be here but (Becky Bur) is the ccNSO co-chair.

James: Okay. Fantastic, so maybe we can put - maybe we can ask (Becky) to be in there. We don't know if John's going to participate remotely or -- no idea?
Okay.

Okay and then the general item Number 3 is Hot Topics -- this is just kind of an overview of where we are on the CCWG accountability process. And then implementation of those aspects of the CCWG stewardship.

So I'm wondering if we can - and I'd be happy to just kind of kick off the CCWG accountability, but I think we would have Matthew would probably be

in the ccNSO as one of their co-chairs. And then - I'm sorry, were you raising your hand right here? Sorry?

Marika Konings: I was raising my hand for Item B.

James: Oh, for Item B. Yes.

Marika Konings: You know this is Marika. Just a note on CW stewardship implementation. Because actually tomorrow morning, Jonathan was slotted to give that. Although he will be there, but (Trane) will also be there to talk about the status of implementation. So that probably will help -- at least inform the GNSO on the status of that in preparation as well for that conversation.

James: Okay, thank you. And then - oh look, Item Number 4 -- New Meeting Strategy -- Planning for Meeting B and the interaction between the two councils.

So we covered this earlier today and I think my understanding from yesterday is that the ccNSO is able to fit their session schedule within the four-day timeframe. They haven't run into the same depth or breath of conflicts that we've encountered.

So maybe it's just an opportunity to compare notes and understand where those, you know, where those conflicts are occurring and how they feel about the interactions as well -- or the outreach activities -- yes, very good.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Maybe one thing to add -- I think there is some concern or they're wondering if all the potential impact that Meeting B has on their attendance because I think Byron made the point that, you know, one of the reasons why many ccTLD operators come to ICANN meetings is on the sidelines of that -- to meet with their registrars.

So if those business meetings are not happening or those happen - these are not coming because it's a policy meeting, that may potentially over-time the fact - the interest of participation of the ccNSO.

And of course one specific question for Item 4 is as well -- and would the interaction that -- as we're having now at every meeting -- if it's something that those groups foresee for Meeting B or not.

James: Any other thoughts on Item Number 4 or in fact any of the agenda items that we've had here listed today? No? ccNSO just not getting peoples passion (unintelligible) up today.

Okay and that is again -- that meeting is not tomorrow -- it is -- and I misspoke -- it is not tomorrow -- it is Monday from 12:00 to 1:30. Okay, so (Lynn) let's move to the next batch with the GAC.

This one we have kind of already started to tag some folks with agenda items, so again we'll have to introduce the new leadership -- as well as understanding the leadership changes over on the GAC side -- either currently or upcoming.

Jonathan and Manal are still involved with the GAC GNSO consultation group. And we've got a few items here that we'd like to cover with regard to that. Jonathan, are you good with that -- going to be there (as she said)? Okay, fantastic.

So counselors, if you could, please just take a look at those four items here -- as well as understanding if there's anything that you'd like to have specifically addressed under this topic.

The third item will be led by Mason and that's a discussion of the ongoing active PDPs within the GNSO -- specifically the four that you see there. Are

we missing any there or that's -- and are you good with that Mason -- you have (unintelligible) you need and everything?

Mason Cole: Yes, I'm good with that.

James: Okay. Anyone have any questions for Mason on this section? Yes, Phil?

Phil: Yes, not a question, but just noting on the CRP for (Agios) as co-chair I'd be helpful -- I'd be glad to say something during that part of the session. And on the last one -- the RPS we haven't wrote it on the charter yet -- that's set for our Wednesday. So we can tell them we're going forward and we haven't quite decided the details yet.

James: Yes, that's a good point. It's in this weird state where it is an active PDP without a charter until Wednesday presumably. And then we have a Item Number 4 - status of -- status update on GAC advice activities that might be affecting your GNSO. We're going to ask them to speak to that.

And I think we had one specific item here that we captured earlier which was in discussion of the CW - ccWG noting whether or not their - it was part of the discussion that we had with that topic about the GAC being either explicitly a member of the (Howard) Community or not -- and I'm not sure where a good place attach that question.

Number 4 - okay, oh, sorry -- go ahead (Heather).

(Heather Fost): No I changed just - (Heather Fost). Just to clarify -- on Point 4, it appears to me the (doc) in parenthesis -- it seems like they're leading and want us to answer questions. Status update on GAC advice activities that may be (unintelligible) we asking them?

James: Okay, Marika, I think I know the answer but I'm not going to speak -- because Marika's got it right.

(Heather Fost): Oh.

James: But I could be wrong.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think this is the draft that we prepared from the GNSO side and these are the activities we're aware of. But we're assuming that they will speak about whatever they think would be (right).

(Heather Fost): They said, "Do we have any control of the agenda?" I think we'd be wise to expand the last point to geographic names and not just country and territory names because the GAC work in that area is not at all limited. We might even say geographic and cultural names or something like this.

And to the extent that we're asked to speak on it, I'm going to make sure we put -- on any of these things if we - if they're going to ask us somewhat - to put a place mark it down that we can ask them as well. Thanks.

James: Thanks (Heather). (Will Forek)?

(Will Forek): Thanks, (Unintelligible). Just a question. Could we add another point to that agenda, though, with regard to the accountability process? You know, it might be of interest for (unintelligible) change the information about the Process (530) on GAC side and GNSO side.

And in context of that, (it's changed) -- this question could be a waste -- which it came up in discussion today. Thanks.

(Heather Fost): Thanks James. Thanks (Will Forek). (Heather Fost) again. You're right James. The point that we had specifically -- and somebody needs to catch it in wording so that we don't lose it -- was this business about how the GAC sees itself in its role as a community participant.

We need to - (have been scared out). Thanks.

James: Okay, thanks. We'll capture that as a new Item Number 4 -- the existing Item Number 4 can move to Item Number 5. And it will be a status update on the process to review and approve CCWG -- Exchange of Views or Exchange of Process -- and then finally asking that specific question, "Does the GAC intend to explicitly participate in the empowered community?"

And I think the statement we heard from Steve and Thomas was that they're in until they say they're out. Yes, Omar?

Omar Kaminski: Yes, thanks -- it's Omar. So maybe we should ask them whether they plan on leaving the next (unintelligible) and ask them whether they plan on participating because technically they are participating until they say otherwise.

James: Yes, it probably makes more sense to ask it that way -- yes, good point. Okay so did we capture those changes? I think those are good adds. (Will Forek), (Heather), Omar? Okay and do we have anyone that wants to take some - I'm happy to drive on - well, we probably would want the GAC to at least do the most of the talking on Item Number - the new Item Number 5? But I'll be happy to take the lead on Item Number 4.

Any other thoughts, questions, things that we would like to discuss with the GAC and I would just point out that, you know, this is a pre-media agenda and we have an hour.

And if you have had some experience with these GAC GNSO sessions before -- sometimes their queues can get very long as countries want to weigh in and it happens to us too. But, you know, I'm just pointing out that we can burn up that hour fairly quickly without even getting to Item Number 3.

So, well, I'd hope we get through Number 2 -- Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm just wondering if it would make sense to, you know, what is currently here -- Item 3 and 4 -- whether to switch those around because I think it - don't want to take Mason's (mind hideaway). But I think some of those updates we could potentially share as well in writing because we know we have the policy briefings, you know, we have slides prepared.

So if we would run out of time, I presume there's maybe more interest from the council to hear about the GAC activities -- than maybe it is to hear again about the GNSO activities -- I'm being selfish there.

James: Thanks, that's a good idea. Mason, would you be upset if we moved you to the end and kicked you to email if we run out of time?

Mason Cole: No, not at all.

James: Okay. Any other objections to that or everybody on board with that idea? Okay, great -- let's do it that way -- good call.

Okay, next is our discussion -- I believe next up is our discussion with the Board -- is that right? Yes. We have just a couple of points here. We received two questions from the Board and we sent two questions to the GNSO. Waiting for -- there we go.

So we have the specific question here -- diversity regarding diversity being a challenge at ICANN and how is our SOAC doing with regard to enhancing diversity in all dimensions -- and what can they do to support that effort?

So I think that we should come up with some very crisp responses here and I'm throwing open to the table -- if anyone would like to address that -- not only with the GNSO -- or perhaps even give some specific examples within the stakeholder group. And then maybe we can stitch that together into a common response. Susan?

Sue Prosser: I don't think we should limit it to geographic diversity, but gender diversity also.

James: I didn't see geographic - it - does it say geographic?

Sue Prosser: I think it did in the email.

James: Oh.

Sue Prosser: Yes, so we'll just say diversity.

James: Yes.

Sue Prosser: Which would include gender and any other diversity we...

James: Any gender, geographic -- I think, you know, in the commercial side business model, you know, I mean it, you know, sometimes I think folks speak of like for example registrars as if there's one kind of registrar. But there's - but everyone knows there's eight -- and three of them are bad too, so...

But, no that's a good point is we should not limit it to just geographic diversity. So what would be a good response here as far as responding to this question? I think that if we could get a couple of specific examples of how each SG ensures that its membership or its ExCom or its council delegation is as diverse as possible -- both in gender and geographic and, you know, business models.

Anybody want to volunteer? (Ed)?

(Ed): Yes, (unintelligible). I believe the (NCSGNS) (NCAC) is a component of probably the most diverse groups within all of ICANN. I mean I'm looking at

the numbers now -- we have, Lord knows, I think the (NCSG) is over 500 members from over 100 countries.

Looking at the (NCUC) where I have the data in front of me, Europe has 150 members, North America 107 -- and the rest are from the (unintelligible) world -- or other areas.

So I think we'll try to put together a package where can actually use some percentages showing how diverse we really are to try to let the Board know that we have been working on it -- and we've had some success and the growth's fine.

James: Thanks, (Ed). Those are good numbers if we can come to the conversation with those - prepared with those I think that would be helpful. I think -- and I'm going to put (Jan) on the spot here. I think that I remember there was something similar floating around - similar to the breakdown that Ed just gave of the NCSG.

There was something similar going around with registrars regarding our membership -- where they were located and the different sizes of the businesses. Maybe we could pull something like that together or dig that up for tomorrow.

(Jan): Certainly.

James: And then any other groups Susan?

Sue Prosser: Well, one of the challenges we have in the BC is with geographical. Diversity is actually the Visa problem, so we do have extra funds that ICANN provides. But in two instances -- one for this meeting and one for a previous meeting -- the candidate we selected from our, you know, developing country could not get to the meeting because they could not get to the Visa process.

So that's something that -- even though we're trying hard to bring in those individuals from our businesses -- from developing countries -- it's very hard to do so. So I'm not sure what ICANN can do to solve the Visa problem -- but I know it's a problem for people in general.

Man: I know that's a great concern to NCSG as well -- we've got a lot of members in similar situations.

James: And is the Visa problem specific to Morocco or - I've heard this about, like, Buenos Aires as well and maybe the US, Canada? Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible) problem.

James: Yes, (Stephanie)?

(Stephanie Baron): (Stephanie Baron) for the record. I don't understand why we can't throw this problem at the GAC. I understand that the members who show up here represent countries and they are not the border services folks. But they can discuss AT HOME -- in capitals as they say -- and address this problem because if they are participating in making this a global outreach -- the global outreach isn't working because our people can't get in because of their Visas.

It's a nightmare and the more we do outreach, the more frustrating -- and in my view -- hypocritical it is. So you get people all involved and clean and at the last minute they can't - they are permitted in. There has to be a way that the GAC could help us streamline that -- whether it's (letters) within the GAC to encourage the host country -- early alerts on Visa problems.

There must be something they can do because they get the people into government meetings.

James: Do we want to perhaps raise with the - in our conversation with the Board, that this Visa issue -- as a function of our geographic diversity -- this Visa

issue that we keep running into and then maybe indicate that we intend to raise it with the GAC?

Is that the right - if nothing else, the GAC, I think, could give us some advice here because as, you know, they don't seem to be -- at least not visibly encountering the same limitations that we and other areas of the community have.

So I don't think that it's to the Board to solve that, but I...

(Stephanie Baron): No, it's GAC that should be giving us some help on this.

Man: Really government representatives (or) will have official passports...

James: Yes.

Man: ...it may - (Visa), so it's really out of their scope.

James: But if anything else, at least we can make them aware of the issue. So okay and then what is your feedback on that - so - it - well, let's back up to the first bullet point. It sounds like we have the beginnings or the seeds of a response, which is -- we can talk a little bit about the diversity efforts that are occurring at the stakeholder group level and then what that's - the challenges that that presents overall to the GNSO -- and one of the big ones being obtaining Visas.

What can ICANN do to support that effort -- I think we can ask them specifically -- we intend to raise this with the GAC -- but we're looking for you, ICANN, to help us navigate this Visa effort.

Is that starting to sound like a cohesive response to this question -- do we need more -- I'm going to go to Edmon first and then back to you, (Ed) - Edmon and then (Ed). Thank you.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Edmon Chung here. So I'm curious what the context - the Board is asking us on - in some of this question. Because the reason I ask this is -- is this related to the GNSO review stuff that came out last year from the (Westlake Report)? Is this any way related to that?

If there is - if that is the context and we probably should address some of those items in terms of diversity that was raised in the (Westlake Report) as well.

James: Yes, I'm not sure about the context and I don't know if they're asking it of other SOs and ACs as well. I don't know if Marika has a - any update. You have a response to this, Keith? Okay, we'll let Keith respond directly -- and then go ahead Keith.

Keith: Thanks James and Edmon. It's entirely possible the Board is asking in the context of the CCWG accountability Work Stream 2 discussions. So I would expect -- I don't know -- but I would expect that this is probably a question that's being posed of multiple groups in the hopes of maybe establishing a baseline or some understanding of what might be coming in that diversity Work Stream 2 item. Thanks.

James: Yes I kind of had a suspicion that that was part of it as well -- and not only Work Stream 2 -- but also just Work Stream - is Work Stream 2 where the internal SOAC accountability lives, you know, so that's probably part of it.

(Ed)?

(Ed): Yes, hi James. The (week of) activity - the Visa issue which is a very important one to the (NCSG). For example, at the (NCPA) we have in Los Angeles two of our members (weren't) there -- two of the people that were invited.

There are firms -- particularly when we're talking about US Visas -- which Puerto Rico is part of the United States -- there are firms that are specialists in obtaining Visas.

So one of the concrete suggestions we could make to ICANN -- to the Board or in some way -- is saying, "For problem Visas" -- instead of saying, "Contact (Joseph) who has enough to do -- as they reorganize the travel department -- maybe we should track one of these firms -- see how it works."

See the professional Visa acquirers can help us out.

James: Yes, I think that in - let me just personally note that we recently got one of these firms in my company -- and night and day -- letting these folks run that interference versus, you know, you Fed Ex somebody your passport and it comes back with a Visa as opposed to jumping through all those hoops yourself.

And having that -- I think that's an excellent suggestion and now -- since it was such a great suggestion -- you're on the hook for bringing it up with the Board -- you've earned it -- and I think it's a good one and I think -- (Donna)?

(Donna Austin): Thanks James. (Donna Austin). So this was discussed quite a bit during the meeting strategy working group. And it's probably worthwhile to get some insight from Nick from our side.

I mean ICANN has been running these meetings now for 15 years or something -- having three meetings a year in different locations around the world. So I think it will be useful to get an insight from Nick about the challenges that they have.

I don't think this sits with the GAC. I think from memory (Marcus Coomer) could do the public session in government. You know, the United Nations have these same problems when they have meetings around the world.

So this isn't an issue that just ICANN has problems with -- this is a - an issue that other organizations have trouble with as well. So I think some insight from Nick would be really useful. It's not a problem that's just a problem for us. I think it - a lot of organizations have this problem.

James: Okay, thanks (Donna). (Stephanie).

(Stephanie Baron): I totally agree with (Donna's) intervention. However, when governments host a meeting, somebody is tasked with streamlining the Visa for a process and helping to figure that out.

And the GAC is hands-off when ICANN does it. I think hiring a private firm to help is going to make probably more tangible progress. I would just like the GAC to care that we have an issue here because as someone has indicated -
- government people just travel on their own passports.

So it's not their problem -- it's our problem as the stakeholders.

James: Yes, exactly. Okay. Second bullet - so I think we're starting to get where we want to go in terms of a response for that first question -- and I think it's a good one then -- at least it prompts our thinking.

But to Keith's point -- I think you're right on where it's coming from and I don't think it's something that they're just targeting the GNSO -- I think it is coming out of that Work Stream 2 question.

And then the final feedback on CCWG accountability, you know, I can take that -- I can answer as honestly as possible. I don't know that we'll be much further along tomorrow than where we are today -- but at least I can give them the update of our conversations prior to today -- and then our conversations from this afternoon -- and (Donna)?

(Donna Austin): Do we think it's a lot of questions?

James: I think they're counting noses -- maybe -- no, you think - I...

((Crosstalk))

(Donna Austin): I think it's a (fake) assumption.

James: I think they're counting noses to see if they can identify where, you know, where the problems and potential pitfalls might be -- unless I'm just completely missing some other designs that they might have -- do you think?

Yes, go ahead.

Man: I think you're right -- they're counting the questions -- does the Board actually want the transition. So I think they're counting, but I personally have some doubt as to what they want the final outcome to be.

James: Any - anybody else have any thoughts on this? I think - yes go ahead (Donna).

(Donna Austin): I think they want the transition -- it's the accountability they have the problem with.

James: Yes, they'd love to take this with no strings attached. (Will Forek)?

(Will Forek): Thanks to that question -- likely. So yes I like that question also in the context -- which of the meeting which very sorry and now - and I was asking - and they did a statement that they - also (unintelligible) and certainty with regard to the NTIA (unintelligible) - overall.

They put all their efforts to bring the transition to a success often. So - and I was asking for them - they would appreciate if they could - in answer to properly conform to their statement -- and they agreed to do so.

James: Okay, so, you know, I'll do my best to give a accurate and fair characterization of our discussions to date and I expect that you will all throw something at me if I go off track -- I'm kind of hoping for that. So that's when I say, "Please" not in front of the Board, right, so.

Okay and then we have our two questions -- which was we have the impairment of effective policy work in Meeting B into Board scheduling. You know, I don't know if we can say - do we want to be as pointed as saying, "Board scheduling?" I would say, "Conflicts," you know, with the Board and other groups -- it's not just the Board.

We could point out I think what's been identified earlier -- was that this -- we're running into this because of commitments to local outreach. And we're wondering if we had to choose between the two -- it sounds like we're coming down on the side of policy development versus abbreviated outreach -- particularly given the last-minute change of venue and location for this particular Meeting B.

And then the other part being that we are encouraged by some of the discussions about an optional Day 5 and we are definitely one of the communities -- perhaps along with the ALAC -- that would take advantage of that.

Volker, do you want to lead this conversation as well with your discussions of Meeting B -- or just want to stand in the - in - and be ready to be tagged in if necessary?

Volker Greimann: I think the latter.

James: Okay. You got it. Any other concerns or big points missing with Meeting B conversation? Yes (Donna)?

(Donna Austin): And so I want to go back to my statement that I made earlier. I think we're looking at this the wrong way and I don't know whether others think they're on the same page with me. I'd like to see if - look at Meeting B from a topic perspective -- rather than - and see what it is we want to cover -- and see how we can do that.

My concern when I look at the schedule is that it's filled up in silos and I, you know, with the meeting strategy working group -- we're thinking about this. This is more about having discussions with everybody in the one room -- not having those discussions separately in your own room.

And it seems like we're - you're - and I don't know how the schedule has been put together, but it seems that it's moving away from the intent of what the meeting strategy working group report was.

So I don't know how other feel about it, but I think, you know, can we kind of turn this on a (table) a little bit and just identify moving into Meeting B -- what are the big issues that we want to talk about? And I think we've identified, you know, two policy efforts that have recently started, so the (text) next-generation (unintelligible) and subsequent rounds.

And can we identify chunks of time where there is no conflict -- where no issues are being discussed? So there are no Board meetings going on at that time. ALAC is not having meetings at that time. The GAC is not having meetings at that time.

But everybody is in the same room to get an update on what's happening with those efforts -- to get an understanding of what the challenges might be along the way -- and to get some input and try to make some progress with

everybody in the room on these issues that, you know, will take two years to play out.

So let's use Meeting B as an opportunity to make some progress on what we think are the top policy issues that we have to discuss and make some progress on in the next 12 months.

I'd like to see this turned on its head, to be honest.

James: Thanks (Donna). I think - I'm not sure that - I don't disagree -- at least with the intention. I'm not sure that - how, you know, if we have time to do that for this particular meeting that's coming up.

Well, one question is -- and I just wanted to bounce this off of you. Yesterday, there was a discussion about something called a Town Hall as opposed to a public forum or one-on-one meetings with the Board.

Or, you know, let's say GNSO, ccNSO -- that we would get all of the SOs and ACs into one room and then go through the different topic things. And I think what you're saying is you'd like to see that kind of the whole theme for the entire meeting -- as opposed to a session or a day.

(Donna Austin): And to be honest, that was where the meetings started to working group came down to -- is that most of the discussions would be in the one room. So you wouldn't have silos necessarily.

This meeting is supposed to be about more interaction between various constituencies in the community as a whole. It's not supposed to be about, you know, the council sits in this room for a full day of the four days.

I mean I can see some real value in updates that we've had today on the various policy issues that begun in a Town Hall setting. It doesn't have to just an update for the GNSO in order for it to make it to the session. It can be -

the GAC should be getting along for those sessions that we have with the updates.

Rather than we, you know, Mason has to go in and give the five-minute run-through tomorrow on what these efforts are. Why can't they be in a room when those updates are being done, you know, in Meeting B?

So in addition to -- let's try to prioritize the topics -- one of the things that the meeting strategy working group was trying to get some more cohesiveness around with that community interaction.

So it was more about, you know, you have one or two big rooms and everybody's in those rooms for the most part of the day to try to get through some of the policy discussion that's happening.

James: (Heather)?

(Heather Fost): Thanks James very much. (Heather Fost) for the record. So a comment and a question I guess. Comment -- I couldn't agree more in consolidating, if you like, these general updates to the community.

They're helpful, but a waste of time to have to do them several times over the week. And then some of us leave this meeting -- we see it here before going to (unintelligible) on Monday.

Then we see it during the week, and then we have potentially a presentation to our own senior (SD), so that's quite duplicative -- and it's a comment that I make every time I fill out the survey at the end of a meeting we get from our support staff -- our GNSO support staff -- what can we do better?

On the flip side, let's say - I mean that's one point and that's not entirely revamping the Meeting B schedule. You're suggesting, you know, stream

Meeting B in topic. And I could be way wrong here, but (Donna) were you on the committee that - the new meeting structure working group?

Was there - I mean was that raised there -- was it discussed -- what was the sense in that and why? If that's the case, then why don't we have that in what we have (unintelligible)?

(Donna Austin): So yes, (Heather), it was from the meeting strategy working group and that's what I said to start with. I don't understand how we got to this point where the schedule as it is because I don't think it's consistent with the recommendations that we came up with.

So, you know, I don't know how we've ended up down that path. But I - maybe I need to go back and read the report, but I certainly the discussions that we had -- and it was a - was a multi-stakeholder process. There were, you know, two representatives from the GAC and other representatives from the other communities on this -- so I think we had good agreement.

So I don't know how it ended up the way it did it - the way that it has.

James: Chuck, did you want to weigh in on this?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes. And I'm coming at this from a very biased perspective because I am chair of the RDS PDP working group. I mean there's no change of direction in terms of what the group recommended by having a session that doesn't have conflicts -- so that we as the working group could actually get input from people that aren't part of the working group in that session.

It would be a fabulous opportunity to do that and we're only having one of these types of meetings once a year. So I strongly endorse what (Donna) is suggesting here. I think it would be invaluable and maybe the only time once

in a year where we could really get that kind of input without a lot of other conflicts.

James: Thanks Chuck. So just from a personal perspective, I've only been doing this for ten years. And I know some of you go way back. It sounds like what (Donna) is proposing is very much akin to some of the earlier days of ICANN where, you know, the entire meeting -- there weren't separate tracks and separate silos -- and everything kind of happened in one room.

And I think that -- if I'm understanding you correctly -- the goal of Meeting B was to try to focus on policy and get back to that smaller focused, you know, community-wide effort. And somehow in the translation between the Meeting Strategy Report and the actual schedule, it turned into something that looks more like a chopped up version of what we have today.

And some of the things that have been chopped -- I mean to Chuck's point, you know, facilitated face-to-face meetings of PDPs -- something that we've added on here recently -- but that's something that maybe we're not willing as a GNSO to part with just yet because we've seen the value of that over the last couple of years.

So if I'm catching everything, I've also got the note here that, you know, how much, you know, how relevant is the outreach effort -- given that we've changed the location so dramatically here the last minute. And then also just seeing if we can continue to explore this option of the optional Day 5.

Want to kind of start to move on here, but I see David -- and anyone else want to speak on this -- we'll just close the queue after David? (Ruben)? David and (Ruben) -- okay -- go for it.

David: Yes, it's just a short comment. I mean (Donna), you said a lot of - your opinion (unintelligible) you had this sort of planned out - kind of get lost. My experience in dealing with the, you know, almost every discussion we've had

about the new meeting strategy has been that the highest priority recommendation on Meeting B has been that it be short -- and concentrated on a - the, you know, keeping its length down quite (reachably).

I think as soon as we do that, we've put all - we've ended up - and we - and then we've add - tried to add a few extra things in. And inevitably we keep losing every - the combination of restricting the length and trying to add a few of the other things has meant that actually we've just hacked away so that there's less and less actual policy in Meeting B.

And less and less room for us to do interesting, you know, just some innovation and or, you know, return to things that are changes to how we handle policy as well. I think it's been a real disappointment the way it's been handled and the original vision of a (foot) policy-focused meeting I really liked -- and I don't see how we can get back there with the constraints in which we are now operating. Thank you.

James: Thanks David. (Ruben) and then we're going to move on to the next bullet point.

(Ruben): (Ruben) for the record. (Unintelligible) been changes shouldn't change our way of structuring the meeting. As most people know, most programs and efforts start as a pilot program -- a better program of some sort. So we should try doing exactly the same thing as we would do in Panama.

But measure accordingly, but we should try achieving our goals even the benefit of any changes -- we shouldn't structure the meeting -- anything differently just because we are moving to our (thinking).

James: Okay, thanks (Ruben). The next bullet point was submitted by (Yule) and yes, go ahead.

(Heather Fost): Hi James -- just one more question. To the extent - so who do we - maybe I missed this - who are we going with our comments about Meeting B2? I mean are we just sitting here having a (unintelligible) -- because, you know, at the end of the day, if Meeting B is about policy and that's what we do -- we being the GSO.

Surely we have a valid concern that we're raising -- I'm not trying to slight ccNSO, but, you know, I've listened to a lot of comments here that we all have concerns about this. But what are we going to do about this -- is there an action point? (Unintelligible) about speaking to the Board about it because the Board is just going to say...

James: Okay.

(Heather Fost): ..."You're the community -- do something about it."

James: Yes, that's exactly right and I think it kind of goes back to we need to have - really who we need to be speaking to, I think, is the meeting planning staff and understand where they're at in terms of moving this thing from Panama to presumably Helsinki is their primary focus now. But I think that is where we need to - we raised these issues yesterday and I think we need to raise them again before that schedule becomes (fate).

((Crosstalk))

James: Yes. And I - we'll report that they had - there were a couple of ideas floated. One was this bonus day and the other was the Town Hall which is not exactly what (Donna) was recommending -- it was more of a session than a structure for the entire meeting. But maybe we can expand on those two ideas.

Yes Phil?

Phil: Maybe I'm missing something, but we got this tentative schedule for Meeting B and I'm not aware who set that up. I mean we certainly didn't set it up as a council, but why can't we just go back to meeting staff and say, "Just give us the block -- we're the GNSO -- we make policy for gTLDs -- give us all the time slots that are allocated to GNSO and we'll decide how to use it in Meeting B."

Why do we have to negotiate with someone else to decide on how to use our time at the policy meeting?

James: Yes. Very good. (Racha)? (Racha) can't tell us why we need to negotiate.

(Racha): That - this is (Racha). Just a note that the actual skeleton for the GNSO was put together by the GNSO.

James: I think what Phil is saying when we receive this response to that, that was incompatible with the schedule that we came up with on our own. Where did that come from and why did we accept it? I might catch...

(Racha): Well, this is (Racha). I don't think it's accepted. I think what basically the status is at that each of the SOs and ACs have gone back and said, "Okay, let's look what we think Meeting B looks like. The meeting staff has not put that together and now it's actually at the stage of - well, actually they're conflict - so how do we resolve them?"

And it did - probably that should have happened a while back and I think the GNSO was way ahead in this because we - we've prepared them a long time ago. But other groups, you know, needed more time -- they're including the Board -- which means that we only have that information now.

And again, the - is the question is, you know, why does that leave us?

James: Okay, so we're running out of time and Meeting B is starting to look like the place where schedules come to die, so whether you're talking about it or attending it. So Volker, quickly -- and then we need to move on to these other bullet points or we're not going to be prepared tomorrow.

Volker Greimann: Exactly, as (Racha) said -- nothing has been decided yet. This is a proposal from the Board that has not really taken into account what we proposed -- we are free to organize our schedules as we like. However, it would be beneficial to the entire community if, of course, all the schedules were aligned in some form that -- for example while we are doing our policy work -- the Board isn't twiddling their thumb and waiting for us to come by and say, "Hello."

There has to be some interaction there and we have to do some figuring out of how to make this work for all groups that are ICANN.

James: Okay, thanks. And I think, you know, to your point (Heather), this is being prompted by a response from the Board on what their schedule is going to look like from Meeting B and that's where you've identified all these conflicts. So we need to communicate back to them that the schedule that they proposed isn't going to work -- and here's why, so...

(Heather Fost): Yes, and I think - and the here's why, James (unintelligible). And here's why - - we say, "Look, of all the communities, we're the one that's most affected by this." I mean we're the drivers of it. But bylaws say we do policy, so hence we need a stronger role in Meeting B.

And I think we - maybe we as a point for Meeting B -- we've taken up this practice of responding to GAC advice. Maybe we somehow -- at the end of Meeting B -- consolidate all of our comments about how Meeting B went.

And we get that to somewhere where it matters and we say, "Look, we're the GNSO -- this is how we assess Meeting B" before we have another Meeting B.

We need to get that into train immediately -- because otherwise - just - I mean I appreciate the fact that we're having a discussion -- and I appreciate the fact that (unintelligible) concerned -- and I appreciate your comment, James, that we, you know, that we go back to the Board -- and it's prompted by the Board.

But we have an opportunity to do something here and I'd like to see us do it. Thanks.

James: Yes and I think Phil is kind of showing us the way here to what you're saying, you know, we're the, you know, the bylaws have set us up -- we're the policy development -- this is a policy-focused meeting.

And Phil's point about, you know, this is our schedule -- we're sticking to it, you know, you're welcome to come and join this -- but we really can't afford to bend it around and twist it to fit everyone else's constraints, you know.

Okay, so (Yule), back to you again. We were talking a little bit and we've just got a few minutes here. We were talking a little bit about the Board and their role in determining policy versus monitoring the implementation of policy.

And I was hoping that you would want to kick this off and take the lead with the discussions with the Board. And specifically what sort of a response are we - because, you know, they've - hey I guess on some of these very pointed questions we sometimes get very loose and squishy answers. So maybe we can set out exactly what we're looking to get in terms of a response.

(Yule Spinks): Yes, this is (Yule Spinks). I don't know if I actually really have a sort of certain answer in my mind. I think it's more of something where we actually make some of the Board members aware of this dilemma here.

I would be more than happy to talk about this point, but my concern is that because I'm such a fresh member here, I don't have enough history and they will immediately stop asking for examples.

So I'm hoping maybe we just ask somebody else who could actually be the one talking to this point that would actually have concrete examples to (chat) with them when start (unintelligible).

James: Does anyone have any specific examples under the second bullet point of areas maybe -- or do you have a specific concern that we can maybe find examples that shore up that concern?

(Yule Spinks): Well, I think there's a first concern is it's really where it's clear that the Board is (soft) in the fear and in determining the main policy where they really shouldn't be -- they should actually ask us to do that.

So that is 1/2 of it -- the other half of it is of course -- is whenever we try to (unintelligible) it is not policy -- so don't bother with this.

James: Any other thoughts from the table on getting into - yes (Unintelligible)?

Man: Yes, thank you. I'm wondering if you're reading this question. Wasn't this the triggering of what we have done in the policy implementation working group and the task we have fulfilled? Or I think two years working in this group, so which is now, you know, the recommendation of that group - now in the implementation.

So - and - so I wonder whether we are mature enough to reflect on that at the time being and coming up with these really issues with regard to that what we have done in that group. So I'm looking around to all the other members of that group that (times) them.

So it is still - it is an issue still, you know, to be monitored -- sure because there wasn't big (sic) issue, but I'm not probably really sure whether we should have really enough at the time being to talk about (sic). Thanks.

James: Okay thanks. David? Okay, I was looking at the Adobe room -- even older. Okay, you know, I'm trying to think of some specifics -- I'm sorry, I'm coming up blank. But, you know, I don't know if there's a way to articulate better that we're talking about the policy implementation working group -- or we talking about any specific cases that come to mind that we want to highlight as underpinning this particular concern?

(Yule Spinks): I mean it could well be that it is actually -- as you said -- that we have a recommendation and we haven't seen really the results yet. And we might want to drop this one (unintelligible) wait for now (unintelligible). I mean how do people feel?

James: Well, I think we can keep it -- I think maybe we just let them respond -- put it out there and just - as an open-ended question and see what we get back in terms of a response and how they see themselves in that role. I have Kristina and then (Ruben). Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Hi, I'm Kristina Rosette speaking my personal capacity. I'll certainly defer to (Donna) on this, but it would seem to me that the ongoing saga of two characters would be a very good example of exactly this issue.

James: There's a good example, if we want to run with that. Too hot to handle?

(Donna Austin): Sure, well no it's not too hot to handle. I guess it's just a question of - I guess - so the fly in the ointment was the two character thing that's being the GAC advice. So - and I guess when they - the GAC - it - when the Board - when the (NGPC) or the Board is considering GAC advice, that kind of becomes quasi policy in some ways or it's an implementation of something and that gets messed up with the policy stuff.

So I don't know that it's a bit more nuance than - yes, I - sorry.

James: Maybe we fall back to the idea of just kind of seeing what they come back with in terms of describing their role. We have (Ruben) and Paul in the remote and then Phil and then we're going to have to draw a line there because we have one more topic and we're already over time. (Ruben)?

(Ruben): (Ruben) (Unintelligible). See most of this makes sense -- I can't remember -- I've actually stopped determining policy and then using the Board to pass that policy. For instance, (trade) (unintelligible) 50 for one such examples.

So most of the time it's actually stopped (unintelligible) policy development through the Board. But - and not something organically coming from the Board.

James: Thanks (Ruben). Paul, you're up.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady for the record. So yes, without going through the litany of items that changed and implement - implementation in the new GNSO program - even from the way -- even from how the guidebook was written.

You - our next bullet point from my point of view sort of affirms the point above it. So for example, new gTLD the option proceeds -- that was part of the new gTLD program the council set the policy for that program whether or not it was implemented (in a way) that was consistent with that policy.

There are various examples of outcomes where people might say, "No." But the option proceeds themselves, again, flowed from that program and yet we have a cross-community working group looking at it. It seems to me squarely it - a gTLD issue and squarely a GNSO issue -- and there's a lot of money involved in it.

And again it seems like that, you know, we're invited to participate, but something like that is policy that I didn't - I don't see why we're not driving it. And so again, the problem with bringing up specific examples is that you might set the Board back on their deal and then they get defensive.

But the problem is if we don't bring up examples, then they're going to - they may be concerned that we're sort of, you know, there's not a problem or a real concern and it is. So maybe the option proceeds is a way to be in dialogue about how all that went down. Thanks.

James: Thanks Paul and I think that's a good example because it has its own category. But I just wanted to see if there were any other thoughts here. We've got this one -- we have the discussion of trademark -- plus 50 -- which I think (Ruben) (unintelligible) to the staff-led effort. Phil, did you have any thoughts on this?

Phil: Well, I wanted to state another recent example and I'll note at the (unintelligible) that various team colleagues on the IPC have a different view. But what - we're about to start a PDP on the RPMs and one of the key questions is whether the new TLD RPM should become consensus policy.

And last year we had done three legacy TLDs -- we had GDD staff impose URF through contract negotiations. The great majority of the public comments on those contracts -- and it was unusual to get public comments on renewal contracts -- said, "Don't do this -- this is a policy area."

They went ahead and did it -- the Board approved it -- and then the BC and the NCSG filed a Joint Request for Reconsideration which is an event that occurs about as often Halley's Comet.

And you would have thought that got their attention and the BGC came back and said not only did we do the right thing, but one of the things we asked

them to do was to look at the actual record of how that got in and they said, "That's not our job to review how staff does their job."

If you read the answer from the BGC -- so I think that's the clear example where just the community was - in the opinion of many members of this council -- the staff created policy by contract and the Board backed them up rather than intervening and saying that's - should be reserved for the council.

James: Okay, that's a good one. Thanks Phil. Okay and then the last bullet point here was a discussion of new gTLD option proceeds which you heard a lot about already this afternoon. And I think we want to specifically ask the Board a very similar question -- how do they (unintelligible) -- particularly given that this is very early on in the process with the charter drafting team?