**Joint GNSO Meeting Agenda Topics for Brussels**

As of 27 May 2010, Councilors who have suggested or expressed support or opposition for an idea are listed after the idea below.

GAC/GNSO meeting

Janis suggested the following:

1. DAG 4, including morality and public order
   * Support: Bill, Jaime, Wolf
   * Oppose:
2. AoC, including A&T RT and next reviews
   * Support: Bill, Jaime, Wolf
   * Oppose:
3. RAA
   * Support: Chuck
   * Oppose:
4. IDN ccPDP
   * Support:
   * Oppose: Chuck,

Suggestions from others:

Board/Staff/GNSO dinner meeting

1. There are rumblings that there are some on the Board who think this meeting has outlived its usefulness; in light of that, it might be useful to discuss the value or lack of value from both the GNSO and Board/Staff perspective.
   * Support: Chuck, Stéphane
   * Oppose:
2. What do Board members understand about the AoC commitment to promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace, with a particular focus on GNSO work
   * Support: Rosemary, Wolf
   * Oppose:
3. ICANN and Internet governance directions
   * Support: Terry, Bill, Jaime, Rafik
   * Oppose: Wolf
4. DAG 4, including morality and public order
   * Support: Wolf
   * Oppose:
5. AoC, including A&T RT and next reviews
   * Support: Wolf
   * Oppose:

Comments:

**Stéphane:** “Yes we can keep it formal, but when it's a social event it's often easier for people to meet and get to know each other. That then translates into real benefits for the organisation when it comes to formal work sessions.”; “As a new councillor, I found the first Board dinner I attended helped take away a lot of the awe and stress I felt . . . I would never have gotten that in a more formal setting.”

**Adrian**: “move away from anecdotal opinions towards firm requests from the Board members as to their want/ need to meet with the GNSO. Is there a way that we could actually survey them with a list of options and ensure we get the right mix of engagement?”

**Bruce**: “if the Council wishes to put together a simple survey I will be happy to distribute to Board members.”; “the dinners are at the end of a long day of workshops/meetings - so some members are too tired to give important matters appropriate attention”; “it is not always clear what the objective is - a general discussion about topics, a social event, discussion about a specific issues that the Board will be making a decision on that week?”; “If there is disagreement amongst the parties in the GNSO - the GNSO should work it out together - not try to get the Board to take sides.”; “There are some that would prefer a more formal meeting - not aligned with a breakfast/lunch or dinner - where there are materials provided in advance and the Board members can ask questions about the particular issue.”; “Personally I think a mixture of formal and informal can work. e.g A period of time for a structured discussion with documents provided in advance, and the ability for the Board to ask questions on the

documents. An informal eating occasion can then follow that is perhaps

optional for the participants to attend to get a better understanding of the issues.”

**Tim**: “might be helpful if there were less Staff at these dinners (not zero, just less)”; “I like Bruce's suggestion of a mix of formal/informal work.”; “avoid topics that are more or less just an oppotunity for parties on various sides of an issue to vent/air their arguments”; “focus on issues related to how Council/Board interact, issues/concerns Board/Council may have regarding use/availability of Staff resources, budget for GNSO policy activities, AoC issues, etc.”

**Bill**: “clarify the concerns in advance of the meeting, e.g. via Adrian's survey”; “demonstrate the value of meetings by having a good discussion of key policy issues, perhaps in Bruce's mixed format”; “I think it'd be more than interesting to talk with boardies about what's going on in the larger international political environment. That includes the ITU stuff, e.g. the October Plenipotentiary Conference in Guadalajara, for which there are various proposals circulating that could directly impact ICANN and its nexus. But it goes beyond this, as demonstrated by some of the government statements last week in Geneva at the annual UN CSTD meeting (including the reactions to Nick Thorne's comments). While I sat with Rod at the Nairobi dinner, which was helpful, I still don't have a clear take on how the leadership is thinking about and positioning viz. these developments. And while we tried to start a conversation along these lines at the Nairobi Council-GAC meeting, the less than 30 minutes available were quickly consumed by general statements from a few OECD governments, rather than real engagement. So trying to bridge a little the gap between the external debate on ICANN and ICANN's internal discussions could be highly useful, methinks...”

**Jaime:** “I think the issue of the roles of ICANN versus IGF, ITU or other UN bodies in the Internet governance is the single most important discussion item both with the Board (in the informal or semi-formal meeting) and with GAC (in the formal meeting).”

**Wolf:** “I'm personally not in favour of discussing those general "political" issues in meetings where we as GNSO councillors are officially involved like board/council dinner or GAC/council meeting. Our main focus should be policy rather than politics development. So I think DAG4 and AOC offer enough substance to discuss on board/council level.”

**Rafik:** “I endorse what Bill suggested about ICANN and IG in general regarding the relations with ITU etc .”

**Comments heard by Chuck**: “Board members may not have enough context to really participate in meaningful discussions on topics that are of concern to the GNSO.”; “some Board members may feel that they do not have enough free time of their own to choose which groups/people that want to talk to.”; “some Board members this may simply want to spend more time with their own communities - ccNSO, ALAC , etc.”;

ccNSO/GNSO meeting

1. DNS-CERT
   * Support: Chuck, Bill
   * Oppose: