

ICANN TRANSCRIPTION

ccNSO GNSO Council Discussion call on 16 June 2016

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of ccNSO GNSO Council Discussion call on Thursday 16 June 2016 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Ashley). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the pre-Helsinki ccNSO, GNSO council discussion on Thursday, the 16th of June, 2016.

On the call today we have Heather Forrest, Donna Austin, James Bladel, Katrina Sataki and (Steve Dayhike). We received apologies from Byron Holland), (Danny Getchgo) and Marika Konings.

From staff we have Mary Wong, Bart Boswinkel, (Yoka Blackin), (Kimberly Carlson), (Yeeshi Nasla), and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transmission purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, James.

James Bladel: Thank you, Nathalie and thank you for making the arrangements and for attending, everyone on the call, particularly those of you for whom this is perhaps an awkward time.

I'm James Bladel. I'm the chair of the GNSO. And we also have our two vice-chairs, Donna Austin and Heather Forrest. Katrina, perhaps you wouldn't mind introducing yourself and maybe folks on the ccNSO.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much, James. My name is Katrina Sataki and I am the chair of the ccNSO. And with me today on the call, there's (Steven Dayhike), who is also counselor on the ccNSO. Back to you, James.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, and welcome, Katrina and (Steven). The agenda that we had drafted for today is over on the right-hand side of the Adobe Connect screen.

And this is meant to be a draft. Certainly if there topics that you, Katrina or (Steven), would like to raise with us, then please, by all means just feel free to add those to this list.

But I think this is just meant to get us kicked off as a conversation starter on some topics that we believe to enjoy overlapping interests between the GNSO and ccNSO communities and leadership in council and wanted to discuss them with you in this setting prior to everyone getting on airplanes and heading towards Helsinki.

So if you don't mind, we can dive right into item number two on our list and then expand this agenda as we go forward. So the first item that we had is item number two, is IANA related, transitions related issue.

And I think primarily here we wanted to discuss the activities surrounding the establishment of the (slate) of members and liaison to the CSC and how that will impact both of our groups, as well as the activities associated with the implementation of the new bylaws that were developed by the accountability working group.

From the GNSO side, and maybe, Katrina, if it makes sense, I can just give you an update on what our activities have been and then throw it over to you for a similar update and then we can pepper each other with questions as necessary, if that's acceptable.

(Steven Dayhike): That works for me. (Steven) here.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, it's excellent.

James Bladel: Okay, great. So from our side we had just kicked off the efforts to select the liaison from the GNSO to be CSC. We have established the selection committee.

Both Heather and Donna, the two vice will -chairs are participating in that effort but I think the goal here is to have that selection committee (self) organize and stand itself up and prepare to evaluate volunteers for that role.

I think that we also have, and I'm looking for Donna and Heather specifically to weigh in on this, but we also have a parallel effort going on within the gTLD registry community to fill the role that they will have.

They have a role that is separate from the GNSO community on the CSC, and I think that that is ongoing. I don't know if Donna, if you have any specific updates to where that effort stands or if you wanted to just note that that is underway or planned for the near future.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, James. So we have had - Paul Diaz and myself have had two conversations with Katrina about, you know, how will manage the process that we have to do together. And we also have a conversation planned for Helsinki, so I think that's all I have from the - a registry perspective.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, Donna. And I should note, and I probably should have noted at the outset, that the liaison role that we're discussing from the GNSO

would be a non-registry representative recognizing that registries are already active on this group.

So that's where we stand. I think that we're noting that the selection, evaluation and in nomination process is on the line very well with our calendar of planned meetings.

So we're going to most likely conducted this work be a combination of (standing) meetings, both in Helsinki and in July, as well as perhaps some online discussion and perhaps a remote approval process in early August.

But I believe we're working backwards from the headlines that we have of August 10th and hoping that we can coordinate very closely with the ccNSO, particularly as we get close to the end of that process. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. I think on that point it would be really helpful to hear from Katrina, just the timeframe that they're working to and try to understand how we can, you know, have the GNSO selection committee working with the ccNSO in terms of organizing a time for the ccNSO and GNSO to have that conversation of full membership.

James Bladel: Yes, thanks, Donna. Good idea. And comment that, I was thinking perhaps it may be beneficial for us to share our timeline which I know (Julie) is working on after our call yesterday.

Once we have that timeline finalize, we can share that with the ccNSO and get an equivalent timeline from them and include, perhaps, a couple of Points between now and the deadline of August 10th to ensure that we are synchronized, the two organizations are working towards the same goal.

Maybe that's something that we can take a look at. But yes, to your point, Katrina, it would be great if you could give us an update on your activities with this group.

Katrina Sataki: Okay. Thank you very much, James and Donna. It's Katrina here. I just wanted to share the recent (news) with you. A little bit more than an hour ago, the ccNSO council adopted the guidelines which will basically tie the process of selection and (unintelligible) even a little bit close (to selection) of the CSC.

So we're basically set. We have also discussed what we're going to do, how we're going to coordinate (with you) and our approach also will be to have a selection committee, almost (unintelligible) six people, so five from each region and one a NonCom counselor.

And the role of the selection committee will be to coordinate. In our case, the selection of members is done by the (full) council but the selection committee will be to coordinate the work with registry stakeholder group and later with you guys (unintelligible).

Yes, well, (Steven), he was very active on - in preparation for this - working on these guidelines, so if there any questions regarding the guidelines, I think either myself or (Steven) will be able to cover it.

The guidelines will be published - if it's not publish it, it will be published as soon as possible so it will be available on our Web site, but (I'm sure) that Bart could send it to you.

So regarding the timeline, we expect - well, now we will inform our community about the guideline and, claims were rules, they have seven days to object to this guideline.

If not, the guideline is fully enforced. So we will run in a round of information, awareness raising, in Helsinki. And we expect the call for expression of interest around (30th) of June.

They will have two weeks' time to submit their expression of interest, so by 15 July we have all candidates. Then the council works - does the ranking of the candidates and then we come up with the names and then we, I think, consult with (RASG).

And - well, yes, after the 22nd of July, the selection committee will consult with the GNSO. We still have not decided on how we're going to adopt the full slate.

Either we authorize the selection committee and vote on the (unintelligible) or how it will be done by (the full council). These are the main areas that - are clear about the process and about the dates. So how does that sound to you? Any questions you have?

James Bladel: Thanks, Katrina. That sounds good. I think that we are looking at your timeline - we're looking at our timeline, we're listening to your timeline and we're just noting that there's probably going to be a point here in late July where we would need to plan for a joint session to consider the - or consult with each other on the (candidate). But I noticed that Heather has her hand up so we'll go to her. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, James. Katrina, apologies. I'm losing energy, too. I didn't hear you. Forgive me for making you repeat yourself. And you said you expect your expressions of interest call to go out when out when?

Katrina Sataki: End of June. So it's Helsinki - we will have a session dedicated to the process our community will have a chance to ask questions. If something is not clear, we expect on 30 June - 3-0, and the June, to launch the call for expression of interest. And will have a two-week window. This is our timeline.

Heather Forrest: Yes. Cool. All right, so you're having your - you expect the process, you said, would close on 15th of July, so then that makes James' point quite a good one, is at some point, we want to get that into the calendar rather than later to

coordinate some sort of a joint session with you folks in late July-ish. Cool.
That's it for me, James. (Thanks).

James Bladel: Thanks, Heather, and I'm just looking over the timeline from the ccNSO that Bart has put into the Adobe window here. And I think it's fairly aligned with ours. Obviously, we all have the same date of August 10th.

We note that there's the ccNSO and GNSO consultation the week of the 23rd through the 28th which will probably be the most opportune time to schedule and put a marker down on everyone's calendar for a joint session.

Unfortunately, I should note that already I can tell you that I'm going to be riding a bicycle across Iowa and I will not have access to Adobe Connect during that week. So maybe we can go a little bit more little bit after, we can work it out.

Then I'm just working backwards here. You know that you have the consultation with the registries the week of the 15th of July. And if that scheduling for that session already in progress, Katrina or Donna? If you have any...

((Crosstalk))

Katrina Sasaki: We're going to discuss that. We're going to discuss that in Helsinki.

James Bladel: Okay.

Katrina Sasaki: And Bart's got his hand up. Maybe he wants to add something very important.

Bart Boswinkel: Not very important. I think, James, you hit the nail on the head. It's probably rather sooner than later the joint, or at least any to be clarity around how the GNSO and ccNSO council intend to approve this slate. I think that's going to be the real critical point in time.

It depends very much on, say, unfortunately if, for example, the ccNSO council decides that it needs to meet with the GNSO council, we have what is called a quorum rule which makes it very difficult to, for example, take any decision during a call if it's not (unintelligible).

And this is a very risky time as you just noted. So maybe useful if, say, even if there is no a discussion that injustice, then at least you made up, say, the leadership of them GNSO council and the ccNSO council, in Helsinki to nail down a date because that's going to be the critical one.

James Bladel: Thanks for pointing that out, Bart. I agree. If we can get out in front of that, then we can at least prepare for the quorum rule one way or the other. I don't know if your rule supports having any sort of an online consultation.

I mean, one of the things that the GNSO is considering in that timeframe, between our July meeting in the August deadline, is that we would conduct an online vote via email just noting that we do not have a regularly scheduled GNSO call planned for that time and we don't want this deadline to fall into a whole there in early August.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

James Bladel: You know, I think if we can note that, then Mary and Bart, that one of the takeaways from our discussions in Helsinki needs to be the establishment of the dates for a joint session in late July.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and in addition, there is - and I think that's going to be critical as well, at least, if there is an understanding, that hopefully will not happen - if one of the two council approves and the other disapproves because there is no - in the charter it only says both the GNSO and the ccNSO council need to approve.

But what happens if one of them disagrees with the full slate? At least, there you have a way of dealing with it upfront even if it's at a high level. So that's a critical conversation to have as well.

James Bladel: Thanks, Bart and...

(Steven Dayhike): James and Bart, this is (Steven), if I can step in here for just a minute.

James Bladel: Please, (Steven).

(Steven Dayhike): One of the quirks of the guidelines is the selection committee that Katrina referenced, and the way the guidelines are written, the selection committee can have one of two mandates given to it by the ccNSO council.

The first is to sort out the candidates and when you've got that sorted out and talk to the registries people, et cetera, come back to council and we'll make the final decision.

And the second is for the council to give the decision-making of the final composition of the CSC to that selection committee so that once council has come through and ranked their candidates, they turn the rest of this process to - over to the selection committee.

We are - and certainly of the opinion that we need to go the selection committee does it all route. On our council call today, there is some pushback but I think we have a little bit of education/lobbying work to do with her fellow counselors.

But if we could get this process from the ccNSO side, handed over to the selection committee, I think it will greatly facilitate our ability to meet these deadlines given that we have, you know, high holiday season here in the northern hemisphere and the ability to get a quorum, as Bart pointed out, is going to be challenging. I just wanted to throw that in there.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Steven). That's helpful. And I don't know how likely or unlikely that is, but at least knowing it's an option is helpful (to Katrina).

(Steven Dayhike): The option is there. Whether we can exercise it, I don't know yet.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, that - I fully agree with (Steven). I think it we have the selection committee to approve the full slate, the probability of approval is much higher because the selection committee is the one that works together with the GNSO people to coordinate.

It would be really strange for them not to (unintelligible). But I do agree with Donna. I'm sure that both councils will approve the full slate. But, yes, of course we cannot do the timing highly unlikely event of the full slate not being approved.

So whether we should think about it now, I don't know. Bart certainly is right that this is something that we perhaps to discuss. I also hope it won't happen.

James Bladel: Thanks, Katrina. Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks, James. So I think what's missing from our timeline and also the ccNSO timeline is I think the 22 July is actually the cutoff date for all liaisons to be submitted.

So in addition to the GNSO, we will have potentially GAC, ALAC, SSAC, (RSAC) and ISO, so there five more liaisons (unintelligible). So that's the - 22 July is the cutoff date.

We don't have, to my knowledge, and Bart, you may know this, what is the date that the other respective SOs and ACs will be - what's their timeline for selecting their preferred liaisons? I think that's a critical date that - on both

timelines, so we understand when those (sections) will (be made), at one point in time we will have the full slate to consider.

Bart Boswinkel: It - Donna, this is Bart. Say, as far as I understood from the letter that was sent out, or the announcement, (protocol for) expressions, the 22nd is the final date for - and that's why it's included in this timeline and in the GNSO timeline - is the final date to select one or two liaisons or propose them and select the members or propose the members for the CSC.

Unfortunately, I don't know where the - or maybe fortunately, I don't how you look at it - I don't know where the others are. And to be - there are some rumors. People are already pushing the timeline to select people around the 22nd of July, the liaisons.

And it may be useful -- I don't know either -- through this quorum more through others, let's say, letters from the joint chairs, say, knowing that you need to organize the approval of the full slate, that the respective SOs and ACs who select liaisons are very aware of the timeline. Because if the 22nd is starting to slip, will have definitely issues around the 10th and 15th of August.

James Bladel: Thank you, Bart. That actually - I like the idea of sending a letter to reinforce the importance of making that deadline, in fact, encouraging the other SOs and ACs to design their liaison selection processes to hit that target, if not sooner. Katrina, you wanted to weigh in on this?

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you, James. Katrina here. Yes, just as Bart noted, that other SOs and ACs have the same deadline of 22nd of July, and I just wanted to say that a lot (the last week in) (unintelligible) I spoke to (unintelligible), and as far as I understand, the GAC, they haven't started the selection process yet but I'd like to explain why we asked - why, in the ICANN letter, they asked for two candidates.

Because it will be easier for us to ensure the diversity of the full slate if they submit to candidates. And, well, I at least hope that he did understand but he said he does understand the need for two candidates and how we're going to select them (unintelligible) and that we discussed the diversity of the full slate or some GAC do not have their candidates yet but they definitely are planning to work on that.

I don't know about others (unintelligible) (even though) I spoke to Olivier Crepin-LeBlond over the last week but he's not the chair of the ALAC anymore. But, again, as I understood from him, ALAC is also working on candidates. I don't know how far they are with that.

James Bladel: Thanks, Katrina. And I think - let me see what I can bring this in for a landing because I think we've got a couple of potential action items here to ensure that this process goes as smoothly as possible, noting that we have some hard deadlines that we're trying to hit and then a number of things have to happen between now and then.

So I think that - first off, thank you for making us aware of your quorum rules. I note that that's probably something I didn't fully understand and probably still don't. But a better understanding of that, I think, is helpful to recognize that that may pose a challenge for the ccNSO in selecting this - or filling this role between now and the deadline.

I wonder if perhaps we could leverage the structure or format of the liaison selection because each group that is providing a liaison candidate is, I believe, being asked to provide, (two).

And perhaps we can, you know, noting, I think, (Steven)'s idea that the ccNSO council would approve some combination of first and second choices and then the selection committee would be authorized to fill the slate of liaisons from that pool.

And I think that might (split) the difference between giving them full authority to make the selection versus working around the challenges posed by the quorum rules of the ccNSO and maybe the GNSO could look at doing something similar.

So - but I think that taking Bart's point, perhaps it would make sense to raise the idea in Helsinki of a letter to the other as SOs and ACs from the GNSO and ccNSO emphasizing the need to have the slate of liaison candidates in place by the 22 July deadline.

And then also noting or encouraging them to provide, or ensure, that there is geographic and language and gender diversity between their first and second candidates to give the ultimate selection committee the ability to balance the diversity of the CSC liaisons. And maybe if we can emphasize those two points in the letter that will give us a little bit more flexibility to address these concerns when we're at crunch time here in late July and early August. I don't know if you have any thoughts or reactions or maybe I've overlooked something some reason why that won't work. I think that's maybe a path forward that we can take between now and the meeting in Helsinki to at least recognize some of these challenges lay in our future and try build a path that navigates around them as quickly as. I don't see any thoughts here so I guess we're either good with that or we're completely off base.

Okay thanks Heather, Donna okay. Well that took up more than half of our time so but it was good conversation and I think it was important for us to exchange views on our proposed processes leading up to the selection these liaisons and numbers. Otherwise I think we can find ourselves in a, you know, in a lot of trouble so I'm glad that we're getting out in front of that as much as possible.

The next item that we had if everyone is okay moving on – oh sorry, one other item relative to IANA transition is the new bylaws and the accountability mechanism. I can report that the GNSO is only now starting to get our heads

around all of the work that's going to be necessary in order to fully implement the new bylaws at the GNSO level. And by that I mean that we are digesting a recently completed report from staff on the bylaws and how they will impact the GNSO.

And then we are expecting here in Helsinki to convene a working group or drafting team from our community members to take a look at that analysis and compare it against our existing procedures, practices and structures and understand whether or not we have everything in place to incorporate those new bylaws in the post transition environment or whether we're going to have to create something new as a reflection of the new bylaws and the new accountability mechanism. We're thinking, you know, particularly in terms of the, not the empowered community and the, you know, the functions about reviewing the budget and all of the new things that will be flowing through the bylaws. So that work is just now getting started. I don't believe this or at least for the most part that is not on the critical path between now and the transitions. However don't want to unnecessarily delay the launch of that product – project and it's going to be a long and complex body of work. So I can report that's something we're just now getting started on and will probably consume the second half of the year. Katrina I don't know if you had any updates from the ccNSO on what your actions in response to the new bylaws would be or if that's something that you plan to have capture tackle after Helsinki or indeed after the transition itself?

Katrina Sataki: Yes he haven't paid much attention to whatever we have to do but obviously we're so busy with the CSG and some other issues. But we certainly have working on the accountability things on some surveys asking what they expect from the ccNSO Council. That's one thing. Another that's been noted is that our volunteers are wearing out and we definitely have to do something about that. I don't know how is that at your end. Are you still enthusiastic and full of energy? And Bart wants to (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: I don't know if that was directed at me personally or for if you're asking...

Katrina Sataki: No it's (unintelligible). Yes because we really noticed that those active, were active they really getting tired of all this and we need something to (unintelligible) and help them to go on.

Woman: Yes.

Katrina Sataki: Bart Boswinkel:

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe Katrina in addition to what you said today one of the things we'll be working on over the next week or two is the say the guidelines to appoint members on the RzRc. That's one of those other committees that has been developed by the CWG stewardship. And secondly during the ccNSO meeting itself Helsinki so on Tuesday and Monday before 3:00 pm in the afternoon there will be two sessions, one on the implementation side of the CWG and the other one on the accountability and to – the purpose of those sessions is to flag to the community and to council and others what needs to be implemented over the next couple of months up to Hyderabad because there is a lot of work only for example if you just take implementing the empowered community structure. So that's what we hope to flush out or the way with the sessions at the ccNSO meeting in ccNSO meeting days are designed.

James Bladel: Thanks Bart and I really appreciate you giving me a new acronym first thing in the morning. That's – I can tell it's going to be a great day at ICANN. So I appreciate the update on that. I think can you give me some – and maybe I'm not fully understanding the relationship you mentioned to the work and the end of the ICANN 57 meeting Hyderabad. What is the timeframe there that the RzRc has to be completed by then?

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry no RzRc needs to be completed by 15 of August. And as far as I understand say (un) I know the ccNSO has to appoint one member. And if I recall correctly the GNSO has to appoint also a member. And that needs to happen before 15 August. So that's one. So what effectively needs to happen is the 15 of August is a critical date because if I understood it correctly ICANN needs to update the NTIA regarding where they're at with the implementation of the proposals.

Now as say between the 15 of August and the first of October assuming the transition will happen there will be – there needs to be a lot of processes and procedures in place. If I understood correctly Marika, (Julie)'s and others on the GNSO team has been working on identifying the processes and procedures that need to be in place. Beyond the say the 1st of October again there is a whole heap of processes and procedures and potential other things that need to be in place to make effective use of some of the mechanisms that have been designed. So there is a lot of work ongoing.

And what we say what I referred to was a - the responses with this in Marrakesh where the ccTLD community was informed about the progress on the implementation and what the community the ccTLD community could expect between say Marrakesh, Helsinki and just beyond that when people really started to become aware of the CSC but also of say for example the bylaws that needed to be changed. So there will be a lot of this happening between now and Hyderabad. That's what I refer to. I hope clarified it.

James Bladel: Thank you Bart. And I'm noting in the chat here that Donna's reporting that the – and will confirm but it looks like the Registries Stakeholder Group which is a part of the GNSO community would be selecting that our – the GNSO member of that RzRc group. So not necessarily something that the council as a whole needed to do and it's good because I – that's the time hearing about it. And I certainly want to miss that August 15 date. And Mary's confirming. Thank you Mary. Okay but we should...

Bart Boswinkel: Apologies for confusing you.

James Bladel: No that's okay. You just sent me into panic mode a little bit there but we're recovering so it's always good to have some adrenaline to go with your coffee so thanks for that. And then I think that we should probably just maybe circle back with the registries and make sure that they're on target for that date in August.

But noting here that we just have a few minutes left and more than half of our agenda. And I can see that we have a lot to discuss here. I'm going to ask that Mary and Bart if we could please capture this –the thread for revisiting and update in our session in Helsinki so that we can make sure that we have buy-in from our respective council that would be great. And then we can move on to Item Number 3 which is all of the – and this is not all of. This is a subset of the ongoing Cross Community Working Group. We have a couple here. We don't necessarily have to take them in this particular order. We can, you know, take them in whatever priorities you'd like to discuss them in.

I will point out that - first of all that Heather is one of the leaders of the CWG on country and territory names. So perhaps she can weigh in on that in a moment. But I also just want to note that we have asked our liaison and the leadership of the CWG on Internet governance to provide a substantial report in Helsinki along with, you know, they're anticipated work plan and milestone for the upcoming year.

The thinking here is that and not to put too fine a point on it but the thinking here is that this group probably needs to be – my understanding is that we have to as a chartering organization we have to reconfirm their charter at the end of the year at ICANN 57. And I think we need to use the time between Helsinki and India to understand the work of this group and whether or not it is driving towards any specific deliverables, whether or not it might be better served to convert it into something else or even ask these - the participants to continue operating in these forums in an individual capacity. But I think just

need to put this under the microscope and ask them tough questions of whether or not it needs to continue in its current form. And if so and if they can make that case then absolutely we should re-charter or renew the charter in India. But if we believe that there are better ways to accomplish these same objectives then I think that we should get the pieces in place now so that we can make that switch at the end of the year. So I'd be interested in hearing your thoughts on that and then I see Bart has his hand up and then after that maybe Heather if you had and can give us just an update on Item 3B as well. So Bart go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes sorry for – this goes back to a remark we just made. I want to point out that to date at least I'm not aware of it is there is no meeting scheduled between the GNSO and the ccNSO council in Helsinki. We tried it, say Marika and I tried it but it appears it is very, very difficult. So you'll refer to that meeting. And if the Leadership Team intent to have one we better get our heads together to yes to seek a slot because currently there is no meeting scheduled.

James Bladel: Thanks Bart, my mistake here. Initially I thought that that was the case and then somehow I got myself convinced in the last 24 hours that I was wrong and we were meeting and that this was a prep meeting. I think it was because that was how the invitation was set out as prep for Helsinki meeting. And so I assumed that we were and I was wrong and now I see that no I should've gone with my first instinct. And I think that we had discussed however, you know, if possible even having a, you know, an informal discussion with the councils or the council leadership in Helsinki or, you know, in the time after I think to follow-up on these issues that would be good. But thanks for pointing that out. Mary is also texting me seriously letting me know that I'm completely fantasizing here about this session that doesn't exist. Heather go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very James. I'm just wondering on this question of the IG, the Internet Governance stuff has - so one of the things that we're struggling with in the GNSO is really understanding what that group is doing. And I wonder if the

ccNSO has had any updates from its folks on that group that it could maybe – I don't mean to be facetious but it could maybe tell us if it has a better idea if it's got a better visibility as to what's happening. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: It's Katrina here. May I comment briefly on that? No. That's a short answer and therefore we do agree that this is something that needs to be revisited. And actually I liked your proposal, your proposed approach James very much. I think it's very pragmatic and if we can do it in the current format we'll do it. Let's change the - perhaps this – you know their charter or anything. But otherwise we do not see any results of the work of this working group.

James Bladel: Well thank you Katrina. If nothing else results from this call that I think alone is, you know, as indicated in the chat is a very important bit of exchange between our two groups, two chartering organizations which should note that – so I think our goal as we mentioned is to get a full report from this group in Helsinki, get an update on where they see themselves in the near and immediate future. And then as Mary pointed out we don't have just a binary option here of renewing the charter or canceling the charter.

We can also work to amend the charter and perhaps narrow the scope and focus of this effort and drive the CWG IG toward some tangible and measurable outcomes in the next 12 months. That might also be an option. But certainly I think what we're all saying here is that we need to greater visibility to what's going on and we're probably anticipating that there's a course correction in the near future for this group. So it's good to see how we are - it isn't just the GNSO that's completely disconnected from this effort thus far. It's good to see that's also the case for the ccNSO so we're not missing the boat here.

Then we had Heather did you want to touch on the...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...country and territory name? Oh I'm sorry Katrina go ahead.

Katrina Sataki: No I just wanted to say that I think there's objective reason why Internet Governance is now not so visible. And I think everybody can be so busy with some vision well that's Internet Governance for us. So now we're more or more or less with that I think we can get back to Internet Governance as well.

James Bladel: Yes agreed, good point. Okay we have just a few minutes left in our time and I think we could touch on either the remaining groups here or Heather also noted she can give an update on the country and territory names. But at first, you know, I just wanted to ask we came up with this draft agenda just on-the-fly. Katrina and (Steven) if there's something that you'd like to raise with us maybe we would tackle that first just to ensure that we have time to raise any issues that might be on your plate.

Katrina Sataki: I'm fine with the agenda. (Steven)? Yes just apart from the fact that we still need to decide about the meeting. Are we going to meet or not the – you know, officially I mean now and that's somewhere on the schedule. Maybe we could ask the – both secretariats to – try to work it out and to find if there's any slots current agenda that would work for both ccNSO and the GNSO.

James Bladel: We can ask. I think I already know the answer unfortunately but it probably doesn't hurt to take one last look at it. I think noting Donna in the chat, you know, maybe we can find some time to have, you know, to convert a formal meeting perhaps and do something a little more informal and social and more of a networking event. (Steven)?

(Steve Dayhike): I think we're going to have to meet. I don't see a way around. And I think this is also an opportunity to call out this meeting structure because it's really not serving our purpose here at least not in this iteration of it. But we've got to find a bar or somewhere, some restaurant or whatever. But I can't believe we can get in and out of Helsinki without having a sit down to go over some of this stuff because we are under very, very tight deadlines here. That's all.

James Bladel: Yes thanks (Steven). And I think let's ask Mary and Bart if you could please take back to our respective groups and find anything. I think we understand that we're scrambling for table scraps here on the schedule. But if there's anything available then let's see if we can put together at a minimum for those just with the chairs and vice chairs. Donna?

Donna Austin: So I know this is completely out of left field and I don't know how our GNSO councilor would feel about it but, you know, we do have the preposition on a Wednesday for the council meeting on Thursday. Given we do have an item to the CSC on the council agenda is there any way that we could maybe, you know, take half an hour out of that council prep session to invite ccNSO in so we can have that discussion around the CSC? I don't, you know, it's I know we're kind of probably pushing uphill but maybe we consider it the - one of the potential options anyway. There may be other options available to us but just a suggestion.

James Bladel: Yes thanks Donna. That would work for us because we're already getting everyone on our side in one place which with some snacks and refreshments so we could certainly allocate half of that time to a joint meeting and invite the ccNSO to attend maybe the second half of that.

I guess that would leave it to Katrina and (Steven) and Bart to see if that fits with their schedule and whether or not that's something that they can work around as well. Yes Mary noting first for 30 minutes or second 30 minutes. It's hard to bring people in for snacks and refreshments and then kick them out after 30 minutes Mary. I think, you know, if possible may be inviting them in at the second half that'll have the added benefit of keeping us, the GNSO on target for the first 30 minutes so otherwise, you know, we kind of take their drinks away and show them the door. It's not very hospitable of a - okay so let's take a look at that and Bart and Mary if you could capture that as an action item and noting (Steven) and Katrina's point about, you know, it would be really good if we could nail down some of these things.

Let's make a point though however if we can't do that or even if we can if we can't meet in Helsinki or if our meeting is abbreviated and more social in nature then let's make a point and follow-up via email and perhaps another call like this the first week of July sometime between the 5th and the 15th to revisit some of these items specifically as they relate to the selection of the CSC liaison and checking in on that and then planning for the joint session in late July because otherwise I think that we're going to let these thing slip and everyone's just busy with their Helsinki follow-up and getting ready for vacation that we might see some of these timelines go off a cliff.

Okay we have – most welcome Katrina. We'll just make sure we order extras. I hear that you ccNSO folks can really got to run so we'll just we'll prepare accordingly. Okay well we've just got a couple minutes left and wanting to bring this in for a landing and give everyone back their time. I know for some of you it's not a very convenient time of day. So any other items that we should cover now? I think we've got a – we've got a great conversation. We've got a healthy task list building here for Mary and Bart to help us follow-up on. And I think that we have certainly set the stage for some works in the Helsinki meeting as well as the immediate aftermath to get ready for some of these deadlines that are going to hit in mid-August.

So any other thoughts? Otherwise I can turn it over to Katrina to close it off.

Katrina Sataki: Well thank you. I think that's all for us and we also are looking forward to meeting you in Helsinki during cross-community sessions and hopefully managing these sessions or face to face sessions. So thank you very much for arranging this call. If there's nothing else from me if anything from (Steven) or Bart? Okay if not then again thank you for this very constructive discussion and information.

James Bladel: Thank you for making the time to attend and we will commit to further calls like this in the wake of the meeting in Helsinki and very much appreciate your

time. Let's keep the channel open because we've got a lot of work to do in the coming months so thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you James. Thank you bye-bye.

Woman: Thanks (unintelligible) bye.

END