**Registries Stakeholder Group Meeting
Part II
ICANN 58, Copenhagen
11:00, 14 March 2017**

Note: 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.

Cherie Stubbs: All right, we're ready to reconvene for the remainder of the morning session. Do we have anybody on the teleconference bridge? No, we don't. So with that, Paul and Samantha?

Paul Diaz: Yes, thank you Cherie. Welcome back everyone. It's Paul Diaz for the record. I spoke to (Cyrus) and his team before we broke. So (Francisco)'s still here if there are specific questions, but I can provide the updates they were going to. And it'll just save us a little time. I think we'll move through quickly. Also for the record as you all remember, Samantha our vice chairs taking the chair leadership training program now. And so, I'm going to turn the chairing duties over to her for this next module. And (Sandra) her coach is there. So be sure to ask a couple questions. Give Sam the full experience. Help her for the training, nice experience.

But going back to our agenda, the final two items that we didn't get to when (Cyrus) was here. They did receive our letter. And as (Cyrus) explains it, staff had already worked out the response, but everything is with (Yuron) right now. Okay so it's in his office. Next steps are really going to be decided by him. And course with the preparations and whatnot for Copenhagen, nothing to report right now. But they have it. As you know, it's been published on the correspondence page. And we will look forward to the next step shortly after Copenhagen and we'll advise everybody on that as soon as we have information.

The final item just a quick update on the GGD summit. Okay so the next ICANN meeting is at the end of June, but we have our summit the 9th through the 11th of May in Madrid, Spain. ICANN created a microsite. We can get the link for everybody. I encourage folks who are planning to go to register. (Cyrus) told me that we have over 200 registered already. That's about half what we expect given last year's attending. But if you're thinking about it, please go ahead and register. It will help with the planning and logistics.

Let's see. We've posted- ICANN posted the working schedule for the 2-1/2 days that we'll have in Madrid. There are big chunks of time, the morning of the first day and all morning of the second day, for policy and operational concern discussions. Day 1, that 90-minute slot is with staff. All day of Day 2 is effectively closed session with registries, registrars. It's at our discretion if we want to invite board members, ICANN board members to sit in and listen with or without staff that is on the second day. Right now, we thing we're going to have 10 board members and (Yuron)'s going to try and attend the first day as well. So, as we look at the large number of topics- potential topics for discussion, I posted them to the list.

We collectively need to prioritize what options we want to talk about, what issues we want to talk about. There is a planning committee, but it really needs to be bottom up in this case. The Committee's very represented, but at the same time, we need to be sure that, in this case, registries have prioritized whatever the key issues are, registrars as well. And that we can mash it all together and come up with a final agenda that touches on as much as we can possibly do in the time that we have. Quite honestly, the number of issues that have been identified is well beyond the time available.

So when we get back from Copenhagen, our first scheduled biweekly call is not until the 5th of April so we have to continue those conversations on the list. But every important that we begin prioritizing. Ken?

Ken Stubbs: Two quick questions. First questions, (Sam) did you bring baklava with you today?

Samantha Demetriou: Next time, Ken.

Ken Stubbs: And secondly, is there going to be remote participation at the GDD?

Paul Diaz: Yes, I believe there is remote participation that will be set up. I'm not sure if it's Adobe with video or if it's just an audio bridge. But that is the plan. The facility is similar to last year. We're still trying to get a sense of if we can manipulate it a bit to make it a little more conducive to exchanges as opposed to talking heads, talking a the audience. To be determined, we'll get back to everyone. But certainly the ability to participate remotely will be there.

One other thing, the travel support that both stakeholders receive or the regular ICANN meetings, the summit is considered something separate from that. So there is not automatic travel support. And we never requested it as part of the supplementary or the exceptional budget request. (Cyrus) has managed to pull together resources to fund four slots. So there will be two registry and two registrar slots available. We'll put the call out for expression of interest in those slots. We'll treat them like we do for our regular ICANN meetings with a preference or a waiting. If you're from Europe and you're putting it forward, we're going to give somebody else a higher priority. It just seems it's there to assist people who otherwise couldn't go and obviously, it's going to be far more expensive coming from Asia Pacific than somewhere else in Europe.

If you've attended, if you've traveled on travel support to this meeting, you're not eligible for Madrid. Okay, again we just want to try and encourage participation, not to send the same people all the time. I'll post that to the list, but the good news is we have two slots for Madrid. Ken?

Ken Stubbs: You could always split the slots between travel and hotel accommodations. That could hypothetically help someone from Europe even who could afford to get there, but couldn't afford to stay there. So it's something that should at least be left open there.

Paul Diaz: Yes, that's a good point Ken and we'll make that clear in the call for expression of interest. Is it the full ride, hotel, airfare and per diem or is it something split up? I know the registrars almost- split almost all their slots. Stephane and then Donna

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Paul. Stephane speaking. Another suggestion would be that normally the order is that the GNSO councilors are funded anyway. Then we look to ExCom and then we look to the membership. I'd suggest that we don't do that order for this one. And just encourage participation as you've just indicated. We are looking for people that might now otherwise be able to come, people from further away. So, for example, I myself, won't be going, but I wouldn't request travel funding to go because I could go. I'm from Paris. But people that are further away- because we've only got those two slots, I encourage you to participate.

The other thing I wanted to say is that for similar summits on the ALAC side of the community, I believe they get a lot more funding- funded slots. So we may need to continue the conversation with ICANN. I know this is relatively

new. I'm not, you know, pointing any fingers. Just maybe we need to continue that conversation to see what we can do for the follow up summits.

Paul Diaz: Yes, thank you Stephane. I agree as far as the priority that's normally accorded our councilors and officers, that we waive that for the summit since we're only dealing with two slots. That seems very fair. As far as the getting travel support, I noted the summits are not considered part of the regular support for meetings. And it was on us to submit an extraordinary request. ALAC and the noncontracted parties group have done so in the past. So yes, they get a lot of slots, but they've asked for them. It's in part of that public review process.

We've missed the deadline for next year, for 2018 summit because that request should have gone in. I've been told; however, we can make a request by the comment period and we will. And hopefully we can convince staff as they are looking to approve the budget to consider the late request and have more support for 2018 wherever that summit may be.

Samantha Demetriou: I think we had a question from Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Sam. Donna Austin. This may not be possible for the summit this time around. But I wonder if we can do a hub location as well. You know, given that we will probably end up rotating between, you know, Europe and Asia Pac or even North America, whatever. Maybe having a remote hub location might be a way around it just to increase participation and, you know, get over that problem that we're going to have. We do this once a year. We're going to do some franchise people, so it might be a way to get around that.

Paul Diaz: That's a good thought, Donna. In particular, there's (Cyrus) has already

indicated he's under pressure to have future summit someplace other than

Europe and preferably not North America as well since we've already been

there. That likely leaves Asia. And the challenge many of would face is that,

for example, three days in Asia. It's a long flight, an expensive flight for the

vast majority. And the time zone differences are extreme. So even a hub setup

becomes problematic because you're asking people to participate from the hub

at o'dark hundred. So a suggestion and again, this is for 2018. So it is

extremely preliminary. What about splitting the difference? In ICANN's

(unintelligible) Asia Pacific goes from the Eastern Med to the Hawaiian

Islands. So how about Dubai or something like that? So it's not as long a

flight for everybody. You know, it becomes a little easier, possibilities.

So as we move forward in thinking and planning, let's get Madrid nailed

down because that's coming up pretty soon. But those are all excellent points

that we can take back to ICANN in considering 2018 beyond.

Ken Stubbs: I'm assuming that we keep statistics on participation because this not one of

those functions where if it was being held in Antarctica, you'd have a 500-

mile radius of people who would be newbies. These are people who have

clearly identified as contracted parties going to a contracted party meeting. So

we need to make sure that if we're going to offer global diversity, then we

need to benefit from the global diversity. If we're having it someplace so that

one registrar in Ulan Bator can make it, it may not make sense.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Ken. I also just want to remind everyone because we do have a

few remote participants, to state your name before you speak and, Reg, you

wanted to respond?

Reg Levy: This is Reg Levy from (Mind Machines) that's speaking in my capacity as treasurer, right? To the point about global participation, I think we shouldn't be looking at raw numbers. There are members who are based in Asia Pac. There are members who are based in the United States and there are members who are based in Europe. And there are members who are based in Africa. And some of those numbers are just already more engaged and are going to show up, broadly speaking, to most or all of the meetings. I think that the fact that we're having the meetings in a rotated place on a regular basis, is a good symbol of our attempt at outreach and will encourage more participation from people in those regions. But not necessarily immediately or in the moment.

So I don't think that we can say, you know, the attendance at the Madrid meeting is the same as the attendance at the Ulan Bator meeting and so we failed in our outreach goals. So I just want to keep that in mind for everybody.

Ken Stubbs: Can I respond real quickly? I appreciate the idea of global outreach and as an accountant, I look at the impact of that. You could be talking about in a constituency like that of somewhere between $1 million and $1.5 million in additional travel cost to go someplace. Now if that happens, what you're going to start to see, depending you know, the (unintelligible) sales go through the roof, that's great. But if the market stays as it is right now, you're going to end up with the severely diminished participation because a lot of companies are going to say hey, I'm sorry. We're not going to spend $8,000 a ticket to go to Ulan Bator or we'll only have one guy instead of the normal four. So like it or not, I'm all in favor of global diversity, but I don't know where you-whether you can justify it in the basis of the GDD. That's all.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Ken. I've got a queue for Cherie and then Stephane and then I've got (Karen).

Cherie Stubbs: Thank you, Samantha. This is Cherie secretary for the record. I just wanted to let everybody know that, excuse me. We are- (Sue) and I are working with (Valerie) about tracking and really detailing the participation in the upcoming GDD summit to understand our geographic diversity for the registries and registrars. And as well the registry stakeholder group is going a special outreach to the registry operators tomorrow morning at 8:30 and we're putting a different spin on it. And that being to find out from them what their challenges are to engage in our community. So that will be another resource to further vet out what makes sense and if that's a barrier. Because there are a huge faction of registry operators in the Asia Pacific region who are not at all engaged in the community yet. So at any rate, that's just a little bit of side information Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Cherie. Thanks, Sam.

Stephane Van Gelder: Stephane Van Gelder, if we're talking about participation, I think there's one clear barrier that we need to look at for participation apart from finances and that's language. And I don't quite know how to fix it so far, but I believe ICANN had language resources that perhaps we should, at least, inquire whether they can be applied to us or used to help us. I can assure you that language- the language barrier both in terms of ICANN speak and English is strong for global participation. So that is a major disincentive for anyone to participate. And if I now, switch to French, you'll understand that that is a real-- I won't do it, obviously-- but that is a real barrier.

So I would suggest that we continue the conversation with ICANN to find out, once again, taking a leaf from ALAC. Their meetings are- they have interpreters. And that's a real help. So can we do the same? I don't know. I realize it's very expensive. But that's a real barrier for participation, Cherie and the work that you're looking at.

Cherie Stubbs: This is (Shery) again. If I may respond, we do have audio streaming for this

meeting in French, Spanish, Chinese and English. We're working with

ICANN staff on further translation of what we feel are critical documents to

help educate and take some of the mystery out of acronyms for instance,

technical issues in another language. We just received translation in six UN

languages for our high level frequently asked questions' sheet. And it's

another way to engage and take the mystery out of who we are. What do we

do? How can you become involved? And for those individuals to go back to

the leadership of their organizations to then be able to validate why they

should be participating in these sessions So hopefully we're on a reasonably

good track address some of these issues. Thank you.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Cherie. We've got (Karen). Jordyn's got his hand up and then

(Michael). Oh, sorry. Maxim, and then (Michael) and then we're going to

have to draw a line under this one because we still have to dig into our GNSO

council motions before we break for lunch and it's already 11:20 and the

comments, the public comments that are currently open. So, (Karen), Jordyn,

Maxim, (Michael).

Karen Day: Thanks, Sam. This is Karen Day for the record. I just wanted to remind folks,

especially those that are communicating with (Cyrus) as planning for the 2018

summit. That prior to the decision on this summit, a poll was conducted not

just of the stakeholder groups, but of all contracted parties. And that poll

asked are you likely to want to participate in a GDD summit? If so, where

would it be easiest and where would you be most likely to go? And you got to

rank your choices. Those choices were very clear. Europe was Number 1.

East Coast US was a very close second. Then there was the West Coast US

and then APAC was very far away. While it is, I thin, it is a laudable goal to

want to include diversity and to make it easier for new people to participate.

I'd like to also remind you that I think we should look at who is willing to participate and who wants to participate, not just who is in that region? Because if you just look at the raw numbers and say there's a huge amount of people in that region and you spend all this money to got here, but maybe that particular region people aren't going to come. While I know that there are many of you who will be at every meeting regardless because your company's set that as a priority for you. You're going to be a GDD whether it's in New York or Abu Dhabi or Melbourne. There are many of us who really want to work in this group who are working hard for the registries who don't have that opportunity. So I would just ask that we consider who wants to be there and who wants to work when we locate these meetings. Thanks.

Jordyn Buchanan: This is Jordyn Buchanan. Just a quick thought about translations. I agree with Stephane that it's like that, especially when we look at the Asia Pac Region that language is a barrier for participation. I think it may be that we want to rethink our approach to translation though. I think if we look at the places where- it may be that the model for the registries isn't the same as the model for broader ICANN. And so for example, translating into European languages, while we do have a lot of European registries, it may be that participation in English is not as much of a barrier for those registry operators. It would be good to get some feedback from the operators as to that effect. Whereas it may be a huge barrier for those participating or attempting to participate from the Asia Pac region. So maybe shifting the, sort of, focus.

One thing I thought about when (Shery) mentioned the audio streaming that's happening at this meeting, is maybe we can just look and see like a count of- can we see how much they're being consumed? Like it would be good to try to get some data around where translations services are actually helping as

opposed to just, sort of, blindly translating stuff, sort of, using the traditional ICANN model. Thank.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Jordyn. Cherie's assuring me that we will try to collect that data. And also just I'll issue a call to the membership if there are translation needs that any members feel like we're not meeting. That's also good feedback because you guys are the ones that are going to be using it. All right Maxim and then (Michael) and we're going to close out this topic.

Maxim Alzoba: About translation to different languages including UN nations. Please be- we offer our help in looking at the documents after they've been translated by ICANN. The reason to do so is that they- we raise this with them that the base on their translation of the registry agreement that you haven't contacted the businesses who establish business practice there. You invented your own terms. So they're not very relevant to the locals. And why did you do so? And we offer our hand we were never contacted. So yes, we will help you with checking what they've done. Because Russian, and as I understand, Chinese translation were not so perfect.

Michael Flemming: Michael Flemming for the record. Just a few points and I'll try to be as brief as possible. To echo what Karen said and what few others have stated. You can't look at the sheer numbers of registries and the APAC region or elsewhere to determine to move and then all of a sudden decide to rotate the GDD summit in that region. I don't think that will actually help you very much. I think you need to look at other resources and other ways to actually go and engage with them if that is the goal. You will do better to have that GDD summit in where the numbers reflect participants. But at the same time, not to ignore the people in that region. Look how you can- the road show, for example, was very successful, I think, in the APAC region before. I would look at exploring that.

That and the language issue, I don't want to- to echo Jordan's point, I don't want to insult the ICANN model, but it's not really that helpful for a lot of us. Because if you- I come from the APAC region. But if you just look at the only UN language that is helpful with us is Chinese. And that is helpful for those participants, but there- the culture is not only diverse, but the language diversity is so vast that it's- I wouldn't rely on just the UN languages and looking at that. But the other factor that I would really strongly urge people to look at is who are the people that are participating? What are the registries? Because a lot of those registries in those regions have a consultant that actually is contracted with a lot of those registries that represent them and I do see them here. I do see them participating.

Like I said, I don't see them participating, but I do see them here. So it may be it's about reaching out, finding those consultants or finding those people. If you're not going to find it in the public data, but we have a network here and I think those of you who know those people do know them. So getting them to engage, being more friendly and participating might be a good idea.

Samantha Demetriou: Really quick Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes, I'll plant a bug in people's ear and please don't laugh, okay? Madrid is relatively exotic. If you want to compromise for Asia Pacific, use Honolulu. Because it's only 8 hours from Australia. It's easy to get to from Asia. It's incredibly economical for ICANN because they can fly. It's only four, five hours. And like you said, it offers some diversity. It sounds sexy, but who the hell cares? If you're going to be getting on an airplane for a three-day meeting and you might as well try to make it work. That's all.

Samantha Demetriou: Okay, I think (Michael) was just joking that it's a long way to swim. But I, for one, would throw my support wholeheartedly behind any ICANN meeting in Hawaii. I think some of you would agree with me. All right, thank you very much. Very good food for thought. We Cherie especially and (Sue) have been doing a lot to build up the registries outreach. Obviously, understanding that registries by definition are limited to those operators who own a gTLD registry and are contracted with ICANN. So any feedback that you want to give them for how to focus and make more efficient their efforts, I'm sure they would welcome.

And now, we're going to move the conversation onto the discussion of topics and motions for the upcoming GNSO council meeting. That meeting I believe is taking place tomorrow at 11:00 am. And just to begin this discussion, Donna Austin circulated an email to everyone yesterday, discussing the motion about approving the charter for the council to set up a standing selection committee. Specifically, about whether the makeup of this committee should involve representatives just from stakeholder groups or representatives from both stakeholder groups and constituencies.   So, Donna, if you don't mind, I'll turn it over to you to quickly give us some info on that and we can open the discussion.

Donna Austin: Thank, Sam. Just a little bit of background, so the council has become like a number of other groups in the community, we have to provide candidates for a number of working groups and review teams and whatever else. So it's become somewhat of an administrative burden. So we thought it will be helpful if we set up a standing committee that could take some of that load and then make recommendations to the council for the council to approve the nominees or candidates or whatever it happens to be. Ed Morris and Susan Kawaguchi were the ones that put together the, kind of, framework that we're

working to. We've had two or three discussions on the council about this so far. And we hope to close the loop on it at this meeting.

As is always the case in ICANN, the contention is how many people do you appoint to the committee to make the decision about how many other people do you appoint to the working group or the review team or whatever it is? So at the moment, I think the original proposal was that the smaller option would end up with eight members on the selection panel. The larger groups would be 11. And I think we actually have a suggestion on the table at the moment that would take us up to 13 people on the is review committee- not review committee, selection committee.

So I guess I just wanted some feedback from the group about, you know how strongly do we feel about this? And I'll just make the point that I think Keith made it in response to my email. Is I think this is one that we can probably give a little bit on. Understanding that the selection committee itself is not making the end decision. The end decision is made by the council itself. So if we're prepared to give a little bit here, and so that the noncontracted parties house can serve the needs of their different constituencies, then that would be helpful. So I think what Avri proposed during discussion we had the other day was that each constituency provide three members, I think Keith from memory, yes. So think that's yes. So anyone's got any, you know, really strong views on this, now would be the time to let us know. And Keith if you've got anything to add?

Keith Drazek: Keith Drazek, no you covered it well. I think, you know, the challenge for those that don't follow the council and the other house very closely is that they have constituencies and the constituencies within their stakeholder groups don't always agree. They often have, you know, polarized views and they have a hard time agreeing on individuals when the number are limited.

When it's smaller than the number of constituencies. But as Donna said, I think if we have, you know, six representatives from the contracted party house, six representatives from the non-contracted party house. That allows them the flexibility to assign their representatives based on constituency. And it doesn't negatively impact us in any way. And as Donna noted, you know, the council makes the ultimate decision on what comes out of the selection committee is simply a recommendation. So I think if we can allow them to avoid those fights in this instance, that's probably a positive thing. Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks. Go ahead Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks. Sam. Donna Austin. One of the things I'd add. I didn't mention and I don't know whether it's explicit in the email that I sent around. Is that the members to the standing selection committee wouldn't necessarily be Keith, Rubens and myself. We can actually see if there's anyone interested from the registry stakeholder group to actually fill that role. And we would- and if it ends up that there would be three slots there, we would turn to you first to see if anyone was interested. (James), (Heather) and myself would be part of the committee's ex-officio members anyway. So, I'd be party to that. So I just wanted to make that point.

Samantha Demetriou: Thank you, Donna. Stephane had wanted in the queue. Go ahead.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, just have you guys finished your? Yes. I had two questions. One on the upcoming council chair election. And if any discussion had started around that. Obviously (James) being term limited, I believe, he won't be able to run again. So perhaps we ought to give some thought to that. Perhaps that process is already started. I don't know. And the second one was on- I've been hearing discussion of or complaints of the amount of work that working group chairs have to do. And the lack of funding that they get. Has that been a

topic of discussion? And if so, could you perhaps tell us what's been happening? Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Stephane. So there has been some discussion which resulted in something quite practical in that we've put forward a submission for the FY'18 budget consideration. And I think it's in the order of up to eight slots that we could- that the council could approve travel for specifically for leadership teams within a PVP working group. So, does that answer your question? On the discussions around the chair leadership, there's been no open discussion about that that I'm aware of.

Stephane Van Gelder: Perhaps then, can I make a suggestion? That we look carefully or consider carefully whether it's time to be a bit accommodating about allowing the NCPH to have some notion of rotation? We have had the chairs for, I can't remember when there was- Avri was not. Avri was a (noncom) appointee. So Chuck will know this better than I will.

Chuck Gomes: So I was chair in 2010 and I think we've had the chair slot ever since.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, right. I was chair after you and then someone, Jonathan, sorry. And then (James). So, perhaps it's time that we ought to consider, you know, rotating this around for optics, for politics, for whatever reason. And I can tell you, although a person from the NCPH has approached me asking if I thought they would make a good candidate. So they're obviously thinking about it. I won't say who, because the person asked me not to. But the process over that side of the room has already started. Thanks.

Woman   Yes, thanks Stephane. This is a very personal view given what happened the last time around. (Heather) still has another 12 months to serve after this term. And I, certainly in my mind, I consider her to be more or less the chair

in waiting. But obviously, that may have some complications on the other side of the house, but that's my personal opinion.

Samantha Demetriou: Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, thanks. Stephane, I think it's really good that you made that suggestion. Most of you know my philosophy, I think, with regard to the council chair. And it is that we want someone who's competent in terms of leadership and fair. I know some people- I don't think we're so much this way in the registry stakeholder group, but some people are so worried about a chair being biased. And it's an important consideration. I'm not minimizing that. But I guarantee you if we- if somebody becomes chair and they show a bias, we're going to get rid of them. So I don't think we have to be too worried about that. We need to question them on that. Make sure they're committee to neutrality. Doesn't mean they represent your- still can't represent their group. I think they need to be able to do that as long as they declare the hat they're wearing at the time.

But I hope that the registry stakeholder group won't get too uptight about that. I think we have somebody from the NCSG or the CSG as long as they're competent and I agree with (Heather)--with (Heather)-- with Donna that (Heather) is, I think, could do a very good job. So if we look at it that way and some may disagree with me on that, but I think that's all manageable and I appreciate your suggestion, Stephane.

Samantha Demetriou: Okay, thank you Chuck. Keith, I see your hand up. Do you want to respond directly to Chuck because I also have Ken and Kurt who would like to make some comments? Okay, Ken go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Thank you. It's kind of, like we live within the nominating committee. What you're really looking for, and Chuck made it clear, you're looking for skillsets. And independence and the ability to stay unbiased is part of that skillset, but I'm more concerned about the ability of a chair to organize and also to be able to stratify, to keep the control. Because with that many people on the council, if you can't shut it off, which is a skillset that Stephane and Jonathan and Chuck and other people have, it, at some point in time, you just have to say okay. Like Paul says, draw a line under it. Let's move on. And that's what I'm looking for in a chair.

Samantha Demetriou: Kurt go ahead.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, Kurt Pritz with dot Arc. So I want to echo what Ken just said. Thinking back many years ago, it took (Bruce Tonkin)'s full moxy and skillset and talent set to wrangle the GNSO really- in a really careful, strategic manner to finally get them to vote that we should have a new gTLD program and vote yes. And we need- we should take the year we have to try to identify a leader with that skillset and talent set that can move this forward. Right now, we have, you know, several different working groups all being managed by different people. Some of them, you know, all hard working, but not necessarily with the skillset to drive to conclusions. And so this is an opportunity to look around at us and see who can drive that forward. And I think that would be the bestselling tool for us as far as the candidate of our choice.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Kurt. I think that's a good practical suggestion. So, I've got Keith, Jonathan Stephane and then Kristina and (Jeff).

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Sam. Okay, thank you. Yes, just follow up Donna's comments. You know, if Donna as our contracted party house vice chair on the GNSO council

is prepared to recognize or anticipate (Heather) as a possible next chair, then I would certainly support her in that. I think (Heather)'s done a great job. I think she would be imminently fair and I think she's well-respected on council, has the experience. So I would support that.

But we should not that going into the last election cycle, that the registrars were pretty vehemently opposed to supporting an IPC candidate. They had obviously, the history coming out of the 2013 (RAA) process. You know, I think there was some bad feelings there. I expect and hope that that will have changed a bit over time. I think we've got a really good working relationship on council right now. But we shouldn't underestimate the, you know sort of, perhaps a different view from our customers, the registrars. But I think that in this instance, based on Stephane's comments as a rationale for rotation, at least at this cycle, would be a positive thing. Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Jonathan over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, I think my comment follows along in a similar vein. I would be thinking about skills, competence and experience. And then probably overlay some of the politics on it as well. We have to be realistic as Keith has said and recognize that it's not necessarily a completely or as others might have suggested, it's not necessarily a completely objective and logical exercise. There may be some with feelings or prior positions. But nevertheless, if you look at the experience test in that, perhaps, notional matrix or even a matrix that we actually seek to build to evaluate perspective candidates, I mean certainly being a vice chair of the council is one key qualifier. So I think it seems that (Heather) would be, you know, in the past, that's often been a route, as I understand it, to council chair. And so (Heather) would obviously qualify well in that respect. So that's a useful point. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. Stephane Van Gelder again. I forgot Chuck, sorry. Yes, first of all, just a bit more info on who approached me. They were from the NCSG. So my first response was before seeking any support from the CPH, get your own house in order because in the past, the real problem hasn't been our side. It's been their own in-fighting. But I would note that first of all Ken's point, I think is spot on. Skills should be the first requirement. And I also think Kurt's point is spot on, but this comes down to politics as well. And if we want to get some goodwill on the new gTLD process, then I suggest we ought to look for ways in which they feel we've given them good will as well. So that may have an impact on the objectives that we're trying to get to. This is all- this process is probably more political than the (noncom) process that Ken was talking about. Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Stephane. Kristina?

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette for the transcript. Picking up on a number of different threads in terms of the composition of the GNSO team that will recommend candidates for the review team. I think it's perfectly fine. I don't see any harm in allowing the CSG- well the noncontracted party house to allocate to have seats based on constituencies. After having been in that side for a long time, I do know that they feel quite strongly about it. And where we can make a concession on it without any impact- adverse impact on our own interest, I think we should.

With regard to Stephane's point about considering the possibility of a council chair from the NCPH, again, I think for as long as I know, it's either been a contracted party house candidate or a NCA. So I do think it is time. I certainly think that (Heather) if she is interested, has the skills. But I would actually suggest that we take a really hard look at what support mechanisms are available to the person serving in that role in terms of administrative support,

logistical support and the like. Because if the support isn't there, you could have somebody who A, is really interested, B, would be really talented, and C, we'd support. But if they are a one-person operation, or a one or two-person operation, then it just might not be realistic. And I think it would be unfortunate to lose the opportunity for somebody to have a council leader that we all thought would be really productive and helpful and to lose out on that person just by virtue of circumstances that neither we nor they control.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Kristina. Just a note on a little bit of time management. I have Jeff and then Chuck in the queue and we'll want to close this out, so we can turn back and ask if there are any other motions or topics that our councilors would like us to weigh in on before the meeting tomorrow. And I also will just switch to my non-chair, to my personal hat, and say that I agree with Kristina with what you said about- I think for the standing committee, sorry, the selection committee. I think having representation from the constituency level would be fine. I think that's an easy, kind of, give to have. All right so now, over to Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jeff Neuman. I think certainly if we look at the vote the last time for the chair, I think the registries were semi split on a bunch of people had supported (Heather) in that. And I think it was fairly- it was pretty close. But I want to just respond to what Kurt said about pushing for new GTDLs. It's going to be important. I actually want to emphasize a different but related point which is I want someone who's going to make sure that the bottom up process is respected. Which means a council that doesn't get involved in the deliberations of what they PDP working group did. That's not the role of the council and something disturbing that I heard yesterday was from (Phil Corwin) who was speaking actually at the new gTLD reviews.

And it wasn't intentionally meant that the council was going to deliberate. But he basically said when was asked about timing of the next round, he said well, you know, we got to finish our work. He was talking about the rights protection mechanism for PDP. The sub pro needs to finish their work. Oh, and then the council needs to, you know, deliberate and who knows if the council's going to adopt it and what discussions are going to take place there and he went on. And the reason it was disturbing was because there was an assumption that the council was yet another layer to discuss and potentially revise the work of the working group below it.

So while I agree with Kurt, I want someone, you know, who will push for what we need. I also want someone that and I know (Heather) would be perfect at this as well, who would push for, you know, the work was done in the bottom up process and the council's not there to renegotiate aspects of the working group report. Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Jeff. Donna, did you want to respond directly to Jeff? Go ahead.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks Sam. Donna Austin. So, Jeff, I don't want to speak for Kurt. But I will speak on behalf of the, you know, the council leadership team and (Heather), (James) and I have actually been having some discussions about other mechanisms available to the council in order to prioritize work to meet timeframes. So, you know, one of the things we discussed yesterday was if, you know, if new gTLDs is the priority, do we actually take, you know- this is an example only, right? So don't get too hung up on the new gTLDs that I'm using. But if that is considered the priority and Chuck you might get upset by this too. Then we stop the work on the other PDPs. We focus on that and we bring that to a conclusion. Because we're very conscious that the PDP working groups that are working at the moment, most people are spread across the three of them, three or four of them. So that creates a challenge.

So in terms of the council in managing the work that we have in front of us, what are the other options that try to, you know, manage that much better. And that's one of the reasons that we put forward the, you know, proposal in the budget. That we actually have- the council actually has the opportunity at the beginning of each year to understand what it has on its plate and what it's trying to get through in that 12 months or 6 months or 3-month period. So that we can manage those processes better. Because it doesn't seem that the council has actually had the opportunity to do that previously. We, you know, have a little bit of a hold hand session at the end of the year to get to know the new councilors, but we never actually stop and have that opportunity to look at what's coming down the pipe. How we can manage that better and, you know, use the resources and volunteers that are available to do the work.

So that's something that we've been discussing. We haven't taken it to the broader council yet, but we really are conscious of the fact that when, you know, everybody's concerned about volunteer burnout. How do we get the work done? You know, the scheduling at ICANN meetings doesn't allow us to do the PDP work, so how do we manage that better? And we do see that as the role of the council.

Samantha Demetriou: Jeff, did you want to respond directly?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. I'll try to- I know you just used that as an example without, you know. But what I do want to say and while I appreciate the council's role to, kind of, manage the process, unless people in the community are asking the council to stop work in certain areas, I would, without any disrespect, I would say it's not the council's role to just stop work on a PDP- any PDP. So unless people in, I'll use the RDF, unless people in Chuck's group are coming to Chuck and or the liaison to the council and saying you got to stop this work

because we just can't do it. Unless that happens, it's not the role for the council to put, you know, its own thoughts and views into stopping the work. But if that did happen, then absolutely, the council would and should step in.

So I would think you would take the cues from the community first before the council would consider any kind of action. Thanks.

Donna Austin: I'm not going to disagree with you at this point, Jeff. But I think, you know, we do have to find ways to manage the, you know, the capacity of volunteers that we have and the fact that we are trying to manage, you know, an extremely high workload for some of those people. So I would- I don't think the council would every make a unilateral decision on anything like that. They would seek input from the community to understand, you know, whether this is a feasible way forward or not. But I think we do need to start turning some of this stuff on its head because we are, you know, we have a finite amount of volunteers and bandwidth to do this stuff. And we are pushing up against, you know, the end of the road for some of this. So I think it's important that the council does look at this kind of thing seriously and see what other options are available.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Donna. Chuck, thank you for being patient.

Chuck Gomes: No problem. It's been a great discussion. Chuck Gomes speaking. And I don't disagree with what Jeff or Donna said. So I think it is a council responsibility to deal with that. So I'm fine with that. I wanted to comment on three of the comments on this topic, starting with Kurt. Pick on you first. If we want a chair to be neutral, I don't know that we need to look for a chair who would push one particular PDP harder than others. I think that needs to come from the council and the community. So just a qualification there. I'm not totally disagreeing with you, but I think there's an arrow. If we really do

want neutrality on the part of the chair, trying to pick someone who might push one PDP over another is probably not the way to go. So it would be inconsistent here.

Kristina, you talked about capacity. You know, you're the first one that really mentioned that. One of the qualifications of a GNSO council chair is capacity for workload. It's a heavy job. And we have a couple people here that will verify that. So you're absolutely right in bringing up capacity. Let's make sure they have the capacity and I think those of us that have been chairs, totally respect the staff support we got in that position. And it's great. And I think it's continuing. And even with (Glen) going, I think there are people filling in for her and we all hate to lose (Glen) but capacity is really important.

And then last of all, I wonder with regard to the point that Keith raised on the registrars and how they voted last time and so forth, I'm just throwing this out. I'll let the executive team decide for themselves. But maybe we should start that conversation sooner rather than later with the registrars and assuming there is, kind of, at least informal support, depending on a specific candidate, for giving a shot for the chair position to the other house. If we're leaning that way, maybe start the discussion soon. And just see where they're at. And start vetting that, not that a decision has to be made right away without specifics. But I just throw that out for the ExCom to consider.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks very much, Chuck and for everyone. This is a really good discussion and we have a lot of food for thought. And Chuck, specifically we'll take it as an action item, as the ExCom can go back and discuss, you know, when we should start bringing this up with the registrars. So we're very well prepared for when the election time does roll around.

We're getting very close to when we have to break for lunch. So before we do that, I want to just ask Donna, Rubens and Keith, is there anything else for tomorrow's meeting that you need our input on? Donna?

Donna Austin: I'll just go through the agenda in a minute. But I just wanted to- I don't know how many of you were in the meeting with the GAC and the council on Sunday. Was that Sunday? I don't know, whatever day it was. (Unintelligible) is still a very hot button issue. So to the extent that you're actively promoting those, it might be a good thing to do sooner rather than later. I don't think we're finished with GAC advice on this. So just a heads up.

On the council agenda, so I think there was some discussion earlier this morning before I arrived about (Erica Mann) being identified as a replacement for Jonathan so that's on the consent agenda. So I don't know think we have any concerns with that. There's an updated charter for the cross community working group on internet governance. This has been a little bit of a sensitive issue within the council itself because there are some council members who do not believe that a CCWG is the right vehicle for this internet governance group. And as a result of that, we actually- the CCNSO council and the GNSO council, I believe, requested that the charter be updated. So we'll be looking at this tomorrow as well.

So I'm not sure whether those sensitivities still apply, but I think, you know, one of the concerns is that internet governance is, kind of, a- there's no obvious end to the CCWG or output. So I think that's a concern that some may have. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Donna. Just to build on that. There was a CCWG on CCWGs that produced a report essentially defining how a CCWG should be structured. So

there is a template, if you will for CCWGs. And the GNSO council basically
recognize that the current CCWG on internet governance does not fit that
criteria. It does not fit the model. So the message was essentially, CCWG on
IG, you have an opportunity to update your charter to fit the mold. Or the
GNSO is considering withdrawing our support as a chartering organization.
And so I think the CCWG on IG is now going through that process attempting
to meet the model or take on the model, but it is a challenge. Because as
Donna said there's no, sort of, no final output and there's not regular
opportunities for the CCWG to come back to the chartering organizations with
an initial report to get feedback, to get input. It's, sort of, more like a
discussion group.

And so I think there's some real serious concerns about whether they will be
able to become a formal CCWG in the appropriate mold. And we'll obviously
be keeping an eye on that. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Keith. Any other questions around that? I've just got a little bit more
to go through with the agenda. Keith, did you want to handle the request and
relations to the letter on thick WHOIS?

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks Donna. So there's coming out of the thick WHOIS
implementation review team, there was a recognition that things had changed
quite substantially as far as the legal and regulatory landscape in Europe in
particular related to privacy and data localization requirements. And so the
implementation review team suggested that the council ought to consider any
policy implications of that and whether to request an updated legal memo
from ICANN. The previous legal memo from ICANN on the topic came out
in June of 2014, I believe or '15, sorry '15. And quite a bit has changed since
then.

So the council is considering and I think leaning toward requesting an updated legal memo on the questions of WHOIS privacy and data localization requirements. In order to feed into the RDS PDP working group deliberations. The thick WHOIS is moving forward. The thin to thick transition common net is moving forward. So the updated legal memo request, what we would get from ICANN or an outside counsel or outside expert would be then fed by the council to the RDS PDP working group. So that's the topic and I think the council is leaning toward supporting that. I haven't heard any negative, you know, or any pushback to that, but we'll have further deliberations on that probably tomorrow.

Samantha Demetriou: Rubens did want to get in. Unless do you want to just say something quickly in response? Go ahead, quickly in response to Keith.

Man: Just to give one additional sentence to just what you said. It is not only concern to European registries. It's concerning any registry that has one single European customer. If you're, let's say dot global, dot shop or whatever and they have one European customer, you have to have these provisions for this customer. So it's concerning literally everyone on. Thanks.

Rubens Kuhl: I'd just like- Rubens Kuhl for the transcript. Like to further elaborate on what Donna already mentioned about (unintelligible) domain. This is something that is taking, generating a lot of heat between GAC and the GNSO. And this is actually our fight. So politically it would be very interesting that (unintelligible) stand up and say hey, this was our request. It's our issue. Don't take that with the GNSO because this is just a contract arrangement. That's something that Donna mentioned in the session, but GAC members have actually listened to that. They still believe that to be a GNSO decision. So while the GNSO has to sort out many things with the GAC like IGO-INGO

like subsequent procedures and so forth, it would be politically wise for us to take this heat for us.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Rubens. Just a quick note on timing. We're going to move the public discussion to the first item during our working lunch. So let's try to wrap up with the GNSO stuff now so that we don't keep you guys from your food. Donna- do you want to ask a question before Donna wraps up?

Man: I wouldn't mind a quick follow up and it can be picked up later. But it just reminded me with Rubens point. There's some work being initiated by (Yuron) to draw up this various- he seems to have two projects going. One is documenting everything that goes on with ICANN. And the other is creating these flowcharts of key processes. In one of the flowcharts or in highlighting the flowchart, there seems to be- he's got these red bubbles where he thinks things have got some kind of incoherence or a lack of common understanding.

I think we need to keep a very close eye on that because, for example, and I had very little to do with this and I have a very cursory understanding of what exactly is going on. But in one of those red bubbles might be a common understanding of GAC advice which I think is particularly pertinent to us and to that topic. So I just urge all of us to be aware of it. If you have an opportunity to go and talk with any of the senior staff about what's going on or just ask questions about it. And let's try and understand what's going on. Because we- I mean just because there isn't a coherent answer from the community, doesn't mean that it isn't well understood. And so if you've got to ask three different people what the consequence of GAC advice and you get three different answers, that doesn't mean that it isn't ultimately- I'm just not sure that creates a red blob. All right. Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Paul, (unintelligible) and then Jeff to this topic.

Paul Diaz: Just to update everybody (Yuron) does a quarterly call with the various chairs. I've always tried to include my fellow offices. The call we had at the beginning of the month, it was just before we travelled. (Yuron) touched on this project that Jonathan just mentioned. And basically he asked (Teresa Swanhart) to lead and (Dave Olive) is also heavily involved. Their goal was to share initial findings at the Johannesburg meeting. I told them that's way too long for the contracted parties to understand what it is they're focused on. What they're considering those sticking points or impasses or the red blotches on their timelines. So they committed to update us at the summit. That's still a ways off.

                 So, you know, yes, you should talk to people and keep ears and eyes open. I happen to bumble into that room and if you see it, it looks like a political war room with these massive flowcharts and all this stuff and you're like who's coming up with this? It's something we have to watch closely because definitions and processes moving forward will definitely impact our interest. We need to keep up on it.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, I want to go back to the GNSO council and, kind of, touch on or add to Rubens' point. And I thought that the GNSO discussion with the GAC. I understand the two characters was brought up by the GAC. Obviously, they're still angry about it. I think it was a mistake for councilors to address that issue in any other way, other than to say loo, that issue's not before the GNSO right now. It's with the board, if there's any issues, you know, you have to take that up with the board. I think in getting into the discussion and the details, I think it just fueled the fire to have GAC members then pile on as to, you know, their beliefs and their unhappiness with the way that the board pursued that issue. Even though it wasn't the GNSO council.

So to the extent that issue may come up with the council, I would strongly urge the registry wraps to basically say, look. This is not- the two characters is not a GNSO council issue. It is a done, decided issue. It's with the board and the only thing to tell the GAC at this point is look, we know this is an issue with you, but at this point it's with the board. I think that's the most productive way forward for us. I- just as a note, this whole geographic names issue is incredibly controversial. Many of you have already heard this. It will be a face-to-face session between GNSO members or actually the community, GAC and other interested parties to talk about the geographic names issue in Johannesburg. And hopefully, that will be a productive working session.

But again, if something like the two characters were to ever come up in a discussion with the GAC again, at this point the only answer is, look this is not GNSO issue at this point. You know say it in a sympathetic way. You know, we understand you have feelings about this, but really it's between you and the board at this point.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Jeff. Donna, can you bring us home with this one?

Donna Austin: Yes. So Jeff, just to respond in my own defense, I didn't realize what I'd walked into. You're right. I should have closed it down. And I didn't understand where it was going. So lesson learned, believe me. Sam, just to wrap this up. So, we do have a session with the GDD during the council meeting this afternoon which is a bit unusual. We usually do that on Sunday and I think the discussion will be around IRTs. But I do want an opportunity at some point to brief on the facilitated discussions that we had this week on IGO-INGO and Red Cross stuff if I can- if there's, you know, a 15-minute window to do that sometime today.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Donna. We'll take a quick look at the schedule. We are also going to be talking about council items when we are with the registrars. So if that's relevant to the registrars, perhaps it's something we can slot in there. All right, that bring this section of the agenda to a conclusion. We have lunch. Please help yourselves. Before you can eat though, we are going to take a group photo. So please line up against the wall on that side of the room. Anybody that is sitting at the table, please stay from (John) over to (Marie), I've got light. So and then anybody else can stand behind. We're taking a photo of anybody that's a member of the registry stakeholder group. And then that's also the same group that gets to eat. So if you want to eat, you have to get your photo first.

Keith Drazek: Nice job, Samantha.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks, Keith.

<div align="center">END</div>