ICANN Brussels Meeting
Non Contracted Parties House Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 19 June at 0900 local

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

Woman:	So we're beginning our - since I'm talking I'll keep talking for a short bit. But then I'll pass it over to my co-chair. We're beginning the non-contracted parties' house meeting where we are recording the call. I don't know if we have any remote participants yet.

I was told that some people would remotely participate so I'm hoping they do. And (Steve) you sent around the agenda so perhaps you want to talk through the agenda... |
| (Steve Mattel): | Okay. |
| Woman: | ...to get us started. |
| (Steve Mattel): | Thank you. Yeah, there is an agenda that's posted on the site, the GNSO site. And I'll just quickly run through it. First is introductions and approval of agenda which I hope will not be (unintelligible). Two, process for selection of AOC review teams, role of the stakeholder groups.

Three is FY 2011 budget and operating plan, an issue that is for decision at this Brussels meeting. Usually the stakeholder groups. Fourth, election of board seat number 14, how to generate a proposed selection process. |

This is I think of all of the things on this list, this is the only sort of constitutional duty of this group which is this house selects one of the board members that is selected by the GNSO. And so we have to figure out how to do that or get a plan going for how to do that.

Fifth, future communications within the house fix any other business. So I guess I would ask if anybody has any additional items they would like to place on the agenda or can we have a motion for approval of the agenda?

Man: So moved.

Woman: Second.

(Steve Mattel): Any objections to approval of the agenda? Okay. Then we'll consider it approved. I don't know that we need to go around and introduce everybody sitting around the table. But certainly when you're speaking, because it is going to be transcribed, please introduce yourself.

(Alex), from the commercial stakeholder group...

((Crosstalk))

(Steve Mattel): Rule number one right there.

Avri Doria: And this is Avri Doria. And (Steve) and are kind of co-chairing this and I'm from the - we should probably not only say - you said from IPT. I'm from the noncommercial stakeholder group.

We should probably not only introduce ourselves but make sure that we say which of the groups we're from since not everyone will necessarily know.

(Steve Mattel): Right. Okay. Our first...

Woman: Yes?

Man: Point of order.

(Steve Mattel):   Yes?

Woman: Thank you.

(Steve Mattel):   Thank you. Thanks. Our first substitute item is the process for selection of AOC review teams. And this is something that's occupied the GNSO council quite a bit recently. And I think it was discussed at the meeting - the council meeting on Wednesday.

I'll - just - if I could just kick this off with giving my two cents worth here I think this is - this issue is really a bigger one - a part of a bigger one - it's the tip of an iceberg of a bigger one which is what's the role of the stakeholder groups vis a vis the role of the GNSO council?

And especially - in the GNSO improvements world that we live in now the role of the GNSO council as I understand it, is to be the manager of a policy development process. That's not the role of the stakeholder groups. That's the role of the GNSO council.

But there are a lot of other things the council does that I don't think fall within the role of managing the policy development process. One such example of such is preparing the slate for submission to the selectors of this - of the GNSO review teams.

Now I don't really - I don't know if we really need to get into the specifics of what's in front of the council now and I'm not suggesting that what the council has, has eliminated the role of the stakeholder groups or anything but ultimately the gate that you pass through before that slate is sent forward to the selectors, is the GNSO council.

And I guess my question is what does that have to do with the management of the policy development process?

So with that introduction I mean this is how I think this has got on the agenda but I think as I said, it is a bigger question because it's not - there are other issues that fall in the category of things that are important to the GNSO but that are not management of the policy development process.

So I would open the floor to any discussions either, you know, this is something that's going to be discussed in our stakeholder group later this week. It has been discussed within our executive committee rather extensively.

But we wanted to get the issue on the table and we're eager to hear any views from the noncommercial stakeholder group pro, con or other on this question. So would anybody like to provide any observation?

Avri Doria: I'll kick off sort of a response on - we did have some discussions also on the general theme - this is Avri Doria again in CSG - on the general theme of this. And first of all - and I think the opinion comes into other - you said pro, con and other.

In that the views that the MTSG has taken to its council members is that they are representative elected to listen to us do their best because we're very diverse. We don't have one common viewpoint on almost any issue. You know, we get into a lot of discussions.

We have a meeting before every one of the council meetings. It's an open meeting for the membership to sort of talk about the issues, you know, all kinds of opinions fly.

And then the council members are basically expected to go off and in some way, represent the views of the noncommercial stakeholder group. And so there is certain trust that's put in them to go off and do the right thing. And if you don't do the right thing we'll yell at you.

We won't elect you again and if you really, really don't do the right thing we may even vote you out. But basically as opposed to any sort of directed effort.

So I think - and when we've talked about these ideas I think we've largely been comfortable with the notion of managerial extending to adding a couple of names to increase the diversity as long as it comes out of the group of names that we've all added.

That some of these - these intermediate activities that are sort of very difficult to do in any other way because that - those certainly are permissible within the extended broad meaning of what it means for the council to be managerial. Certainly managers are picking people to go fill roles in things all the time.

And if the managers can't do that then we really have a mess because there's - in something like this the (iterative) process of going through many, many times to finally get to something that's sufficiently diverse - if we can't have our few managers sit down and figure it among themselves, seemed to us that this was the easiest way to do it.

So I just want to say it's not quite pro or con. It's sort of other. So I'll stop speaking now.

(Steve Mattel):   Thank you. Let me ask if anybody else has any thoughts on (unintelligible) topic. I see (Marilyn), I see (Christina). Go ahead (Marilyn).

(Marilyn):   Hi (Steve). I had - I had thoughts about the concept and then thoughts about the particular incident, sot eh particular example. I think the concept is a very important one. And it's hard for all of us right now to read all of the documents and published statements about the role of stakeholder groups, etc.

But they're - I think one of the things that we're all going to need to really sort through is a better understanding of what the functions of the stakeholder groups are.

And the -in realizing that each of the stakeholder groups will have some unique characteristics and (unintelligible) than the CSG I envision, perhaps even more uniqueness than as some of the other stakeholder groups.

So we'll say that there's a very diverse set of opinions within the constituencies themselves and within the CSG. And sometimes I'm not sure that's understood by all of the other stakeholder groups.

But there is a fair amount of diversity of interest in the - in our stakeholder - in our stakeholder groups. The need however, to understand that according to the bylaws, the function of the council is about GTLD policy, it's not about governance of the GNSO, I think is an important distinction.

I just secondly want to say that recently I've observed that staff and others have begun to write the word GNSO when they often mean GNSO council. And the supporting organization is different from the council and is a sum of now maybe four parts. And I don't think we've had a chance...

(Steve Mattel):   Thank you. (Christina) do you want to - please identify yourself for the...

(Christina Rosette):   I'm (Christina Rosette), IPC. I think one thing that just in the context of this particular motion, I think perhaps might be helpful in understanding a little bit more clearly where we're coming from as at least I understand it, is that it is certainly the case that in much the same way Avri that the MTSG trusts its

counselors to represent its interest as (ESG) trusts its counselors to represent its interest.

But what you have here is a situation where candidates are potentially being approved subject to a 60% threshold in each house. Which means as a practical matter counselors in the other shareholder group in that house could potentially effectively veto.

So it's really more that, you know, it's not so much that - I guess it's really more that you all didn't elect me to represent your interests. And we didn't elect (Mary) to represent our interests.

So once you start making voting thresholds that are going to crossover that's where I think you have a greater potential for concern about gee, at that point maybe we need to send it back to the stakeholders.

(Bill Drigg): I chair the (drafting) team that put together the process and - help with something that would be the stakeholder based (household) (unintelligible).

A figure that's based on experience with the initial efforts around ATRT where we have had (unintelligible) that developed into competitive selection through elections.

It gets people kind of agitated about various issues that the thing to do is to either (stamp) all that down by basically saying in effect, you know, the baseline here is each stakeholder group has one representative and that's the end of the (unintelligible).

The problem is of course that - adversity (unintelligible) at the front end that somehow stakeholder groups were in coordination with each other to try to achieve diversity at the front end. So then we thought that would be difficult.

So why don't we at least have a mechanism whereby if the - it turns out that the four bottom up selection - certain kind of baseline criteria there'd be at least a mechanism optionally available if people agreed to add others.

Now the idea there was - I'll refer to what Avri said, the council members are elected representatives of their - they can collaborate together and try to work something out in a (50%) (Unintelligible). That would be reflective of general stakeholder will.

Now if you don't trust each other enough to do a voting procedure for those kinds of diversity additions then basically it becomes very difficult to imagine how you're going to (unintelligible). Also it's (unintelligible) additive to sort of constrain that a little bit by saying a preference to those who were planned.

And I can understand the argument for doing that from your perspective. It raises though - I mean as we got into the discussion on the (unintelligible) it became clear that that was based on that it's a reflection amongst you guys about exactly what the role for the council has to go on.

That indeed we did not have the conversation about it because there's a lot of ambiguities in our collective understanding of exactly what the council's role is.

I mean for example, to me as you had suggested (Christina) that a vote like this would be sort of above the stakeholder groups, separate from the stakeholder groups.

I have a hard time getting my head around that because it think - so there's - you - it brought some forward some underlying full (unintelligible) questions about the role of the council that would have to be addressed.

I'm not sure whether trying to cancel that through the vehicle of this particular vote is the best way of getting at them. So it's a much broader conversation.

And pending resolution of it I'm not sure that this is the best way to go about trying to (unintelligible).

Personally, you know, I think it's a process that the drafting team came up with was (unintelligible) - better although it's not in a huge difference - it's not like I haven't heard the argument that makes you understand why it's - issue (unintelligible) issue. I don't know.

(Steve Mattel): I know Avri wanted to be recognized. Let me just see if there's anybody else who wanted to.

Avri Doria: Listening to what (Christina) said it seems like it's almost less - and if I'm understanding correctly which of course I might not be, it's almost left of what is the task of the council, what is the management task versus what is the role of a noncom appointee to break a tie.

And should this be a higher threshold? In other words, because what you - the issue that you specifically brought up was that one stakeholder group plus - one stakeholder group plus the noncom appointee could make a decision that didn't represent your stakeholder group's perspective.

And the argument was more that of you don't trust - or you should trust - have to trust you, you shouldn't have to trust (Mary). Of course you do and that's why I picked - and that was the example you used so I had to go back to it.

Yes, I did have the impression that was saying you didn't trust each other but that you shouldn't have to trust the members of another stakeholder group to feel that the decision was made. And as I was listening to you the two things that occurred to me is that the threshold is really more a problem.

And the reason the threshold is a problem is because it could be just one stakeholder group plus the noncom that made the decision that the other stakeholder group was not comfortable with.

And I'm almost wondering if we're attacking the wrong solution as it were, to the issue that it's not really the - it's not the role of the council to make these decisions but rather the representation is not working out.

(Steve Mattel): Yeah. I don't think we can - yeah, I think that everyone's - all of the speakers are recognizing there's actually some larger issues here that go beyond this particular matter that the council is going to vote on and bog down in the weeds of the particulars.

I will just recognize myself just to - yes, Avri as you said, the function of GNSO council is the management and a manager has to be able to select people and so on and so forth. But it's management of what? It's management of the policy development process.

Nothing in my mind, in the AOC review team is the policy development process. It didn't come from the policy development process. It might lead to a policy development process.

But basically it's happening because ICANN entered into an agreement with the United States government and with some other governments and the result is among other things, these teams. So to me - and some of them deal with policy issues and some of them don't.

And obviously policy development might come out of it. But I don't see - if this is the policy development process then everything ICANN touches is the policy development process and I don't think that's correct. That's my view. I'll ask (Marilyn) to be recognized.

And then (Bill). And anybody else, because I think we do need to try to wrap up since we have other topics.

(Marilyn): I fully agree with everything you've said but also that this is a larger message topic for us that I think we need to have a short term solution to how we deal with the selection process for the who is and the (FSR).

And then have the longer discussion about the (meta) issue and what is policy that is within the bylaw assignment - what is - about ICANN. I do think that while - and I think the three examples we're looking at immediately - AOC, review teams, (FSR) and who is are good illustrations.

(FSR) is not a GTLD policy issue. It's not even just a GNSO issue. Who is - is. Affirmation of commitments I think is not - it might lead to.

So if maybe we could focus on the interim solution or the approval of the process for the selection process and on one other topic that I'd like to mention, I've spoken to some of you individually.

It's my personal view that we need to - that I would like for us individually or collectively, to strongly push forward on the need for one representative per SG and all of the ITs regardless of whether there are independent experts.

I think that the SGs are each disadvantaged by lowering the number of appointees to the review team.

(Bill Drigg): I have to just say that I strongly agree with (Marilyn) on this particular point. You know, the council tried to say this to be honest, but was getting a lot of pushback. But I think we could try to take a second blow at it.

Just two other real quick points that I just wanted to - first, I mean on the point about, you know, if it's policy development process we're trying to draw a bright line around it. And I can understand the rationale of testing.

On the other hand, if you think about it, a lot of what eh review teams are doing is really - they're looking to GNSO and they're looking at (unintelligible). And so if - to me they're not completely separable activities (unintelligible).

The second point I guess I would say is, you know, the one thing to bear in mind, what we're talking about here in this particular case, is the possibility of adding primarily (unintelligible)one or maybe two names to the pool from which the selectors will pick.

In reality it's probably likely the case of the selectors will invariably pick the ones that were endorsed in the first instance by the stakeholder groups. That's what happens in the first instance, right? We put forward a broader slate with some other names for diversity.

But of course they picked the ones that had the backing. So the practical effect, you know, the changes of us ending up with somebody being on a review team to represent the GNSO who doesn't really enjoy much support, frankly is fairly minimal, you know.

The last point I would make is there was another dimension of the amendment that was being suggested by (CSG). It has to do with not making it a permanent process. Okay?

The mandate that we originally had was to try to design something that we would use going forward so we wouldn't have to go through this reinventing the wheel each time.

And I guess the argument is well we want to make sure through more experience, that this is the precise formula before we continue with this.

But I would suggest to you that there's nothing that would preclude us as the GNSO council or the GNSO more generally could, to come back and review

the process and change it again if we felt we had to. So I don't really see that it's - from my standpoint - it's necessary to limit ourselves.

It's a question of what's the baseline. I'd like the baseline to be that we tried to make this work. And if we decide that it doesn't work than we fix it rather than saying well everything is so tentative, we can't make up our minds so we'll do another cycle of this.

That's why for me it'd be better to be done with it.

(Steve Mattel): Thank you. And maybe it comes down to whether people feel the wheel is round enough yet. So thanks for that. Okay, unless there is any other comment on this topic what I would suggest is that we move on - I think there have been some good points raised.

I think obviously a number of council members are here and we'll be talking with our council members further about the specifics of this issue and about the issue (Marilyn) raised about four stakeholder group representative - there's one representative from each stakeholder group, I'll put it that way, on each team.

But if - unless there's anything further on this let me ask Avri if she wants to share the discussion of the next item.

Avri Doria: Sure. I'll do it, especially since I don't have a personal opinion on it at the moment. So it makes me quite good. So the next one is the 2011 budget operating plan used as the stakeholder groups.

So since I don't have a personal statement to make on it who would like to start with a personal statement? Yes, go ahead. For the recording name and...

(Christina Rosette):   Okay. (Christina Rosette). The diplomatic way to putt this is that (unintelligible. I think that frankly it's inexcusable that when you look at the budget proposals that you continue to see all of the specifically targeted moneys and funding going to the contracting party house.

It's been that way for the past several years. You know, I certainly - I can't speak for anyone else but I know that the IPC has always noted that in its comments to ICANN. That doesn't seem to have made much difference.

And frankly I think this is one issue where with a united voice we can hopefully achieve some change.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think one of the reasons that I've never had a viewpoint on it is there's never been any money for noncommercial but we just never worried about it. So we probably could get a united voice. Yes (Marilyn)?

(Marilyn):   You know, there are two ways of looking at it. One is we insist on changing the titles to support for noncustomer contracted parties which is what it is. And that will - that also makes a very clear point.

But the other issue is that actually the base of support to the constituency is just not there in terms of the toolkit, the idea of providing secretarial services. The fact that it stretches on and on and on actually creates a hardship for all of us.

And I, you know, I think it's - I think it is worth addressing. I also think that actually the reprioritization of funding - when you talk to staff whether - and I won't name which staff.

But when you talk to staff they're continually being asked to cut the things that they do that supports the broad work of the constituencies and policy development in both Kenya and here.

Not all of the subject matter experts were allowed to travel which means that policy work is actually disadvantaged when the one time - the rare time when there can be face to face work with the community I think there are lots of indications that although - that there's not sufficient commitment to the robust support.

And I would include enforcement and compliance in that as well.

(Steve Mattel):   Yeah. I have little to add to it, this is (Steve Mattel) from CSG, to what the last two speakers said. But I think if you look at the overall picture of the budget it's - the rate of revenue increase for ICANN is - it's flatter than it's been in many, many years.

And this has to do with the terms of the contract with VeriSign more than anything else. So it's a period of austerity. And we hear that certainly a lot in the GNSO as (Marilyn) pointed out. At the same time there are a few budget lines that are receiving 80 - 70% increases.

And they have to do with the security issues of DNS (cert) and some of the other activities. I'm not necessarily opposed to those activities. But first, I don't think it's been well explained what that gigantic increase in funding is actually going to.

And second, people who understand these security issues better than I do have raised a lot of questions about the plans for ICANN and the proposal for a DNS cert and so forth.

And I'm not sure, you know, I'm not shocked to find this but I don't think that ICANN is necessarily listening to that any better than they have listened to comments from many of us on policy issues.

So I think to put it in that larger context I do hope that we can, you know, I'm not suggesting that we - exactly how we should do this. But if we can speak

with one voice on some of these budget issues - unlike a lot of the other things we're talking about, the budget will be decided at this meeting.

And so it's very timely both from the public forum and other interactions that we have with the board to embrace these points.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I have J. Scott and then I have (Ron).

J. Scott Evans: J. Scott Evans from the (IPC). I just think it's abysmal that an organization that is getting ready to, by its own estimates, take on a larger percentage of contracts that it has to maintain than it's ever had in its history.

It gave a basically flat increase to the one department that had made strides yet it still has been always underfunded and understaffed. And they're going to take on even more contracts than they've ever had before and flat line that actual department.

I think that shows a tremendous lack of commitment to what they keep telling us in writing they are extremely committed to. And that is to insure that people to make obligations or take on obligations for the benefit of operating within the DNS, are living up to those obligations.

I think it's severely problematic from a planning standpoint, that they've done that and that needs to be pointed out.

Avri Doria: Thank you. (Ron)?

(Ron): Actually J. Scott stole my thunder a little bit. That's exactly my point. And it has been - there are a number of us who have heard that the - in fact the current compliance department staffing is not up to the amounts that they anticipated it would be.

In fact, we're only running at about 66% today. So roughly - don't hold me to the numbers but what I am saying is that that department is 1/3 understaffed and there's no increase in funding and they've been told to slow hires. So this really is abominable.

Avri Doria: Okay. I have a question because I want to roll this one up and get to the next one. We only have an hour. Is I understand the speaking with one voice. Is there a desire from those that put this on the table, for a common statement that could be drafted and agreed to at our Tuesday stakeholder group meeting?

So do we want to right now have a couple of people from each of the stakeholder groups raise their hands and say they will work together on a common statement? Were you raising your hand for that or wanted to comment?

Woman: I'd like to raise a - I'd like to offer another approach which might be consistent statements - the statements that allow any prioritization of subject. I think it would be difficult given the schedule we have in the CSG, to take on approval of a co-drafted statement.

But I think, others may have a different view, I think it would be possible to have a consistent philosophy underpinning statements that then offer - because I'm suspecting that even my own constituency may wish to say something all into its - we should hear from others.

Avri Doria: I wasn't precluding that everyone would make their own statements from their own perspective.

But I was thinking that it might be possible to get a relatively stakeholder group neutral, almost the first paragraph that came out of (Christina's) mouth, which was it really isn't right that all the money goes that way instead of this way.

So something that made the statement from the stakeholder groups, from the house, but still left it open for each of the groups, obviously to bring up the specifically - whether it was a compliance issue, whether that - or what have you. Yeah?

Woman: I'll volunteer but I guess I would like a little guidance from the group just to come back to (Marilyn's) point. Is the point that we want to be on par or do we want to say look, you're going to give all of the money to contracted parties, call it contracted party, you know, contracted party house funding.

What - which of those two do we want?

(Marilyn):   Could I - it's (Marilyn), I just clarified but I also went on to say that we do want funding for the drill kit and we do want adequate resources. So I was just making a point, (Christina), that there's - there is a - if it is all going to be contracted party funding, call it that.

But I'm not saying that we should not call for adequate funding for the things that are needed for the full set of constituents. And we get a group - I mean obviously you've already volunteered and I think that's good.

If we could get - and then if we can't agree to a statement at least we'll have something that will serve as talking points when people are getting up there. But yes?

Man: I think rather than having a joint statement, if we could just have a couple of bullets on the issue that we have found some commonality on that we would all make sure we hit when we spoke. So rather than having a joint statement just - we all say and in agreement with X, Y, Z we would like to say what?

And that way it takes less time for everybody. We just sort of have a common set of ideas.

Woman: I guess - all right, I'll volunteer as well. To the extent that would it be worth it if there's a couple of, you know, that want to just try and put something together to send back. And if we succeed in making a brief, agreeable joint statement we'll make that plus the (mike).

And if for some reason it slips through the cracks it will still make the statements at the (mike)?

Avri Doria: That's - normally we have two people. Is two enough? Two's enough for me.

Man: It probably is.

Avri Doria: Two's enough for me. Are you guys willing to just be two? So you trust each other. And we settled that at the previous...

Man: It's already been established.

Avri Doria: Yeah. It's already been established. Okay, fantastic. So we'll move onto the next slide in which I'll pass back to (Steve).

(Steve Mattel): Thank you. And I'm pleased that we've gotten some progress forward on that last one too. I'm very - selection of board seat 14. As I mentioned, the only constitutional duty on our agenda here is this election. Board seat 14 is (Rita Rodan) - (Rita Rodan Johnston's) seat. It expires June 2011.

I recall seeing, although I don't exactly - the council adopted a resolution about the election for the last seat and the procedures for that.

And I recall for that that they set some kind of timetable that basically the election has to happen three months prior to the expiration of the term so that - which makes sense. So that brings us back to March 2011.

And obviously it takes some time to get - to have an election and candidates to be considered and so on and so forth. So basically I think it is timely for us to start - well this isn't an urgent item. I think it is timely for us to start working on our constitutional duty here.

And I suppose what I would like to suggest is that if we can identify maybe not just one person from each stakeholder but two or three, who would agree to work together and try to come up with a procedure I don't think this needs to be anything very complicated to be honest.

But we do - we have to have a timeline. We also have to figure out how we're going to vote. I mean how is it - how is this house going to - I mean this provision in it for, you know, what thresholds have to be adopted or excuse me, what - put our candidates forward.

I think there are provisions about that in the GNSO restructuring. But there may well be voting questions and the other things that arise.

So I just think it's worth having a small group put their heads together and circulate something that - the latest I guess we could try to agree on at the Cartagena meeting and perhaps we could even have the procedure worked out earlier if there's a method for.

That's my suggestion and I guess we just - I guess during - at least before the end of the Brussels meeting and if we can today, let's put that team together and they can get started working on (it). I guess I should ask if there are any further - other views on this number one.

And number two, if there aren't and people think this is a good way to proceed, are there any volunteers to work on the...

Woman: (Unintelligible) having - to think about. And I think it's also something we should spend more time talking about but not necessarily - if you have not yet read the self review of the board I would urge you to do that.

I would also urge you to ask yourselves whether with the challenges this organization faces, we are actually thinking strategically about looking at the expertise and qualifications of board members to insure that we are bringing into the board the kind of board members who are capable of adopting more of a governing role rather than a managing role.

While also understanding the responsibility of ICANN to fulfill its responsibilities and acting in the public interest in what it does. Now I'm not suggesting that necessarily changes our procedure.

But I think you really, if you haven't had a chance to read that self review, you might find it very illuminating. And then you might do your own private tick-off and see if you actually agree with it.

The other point I would make is that in the - in the enhancement of the GNSO there is a requirement - I think it really is a requirement that the communications between the SGs and the council increase and the communication flow between the board members and the SGs increase.

So I'd like to focus on that and I'd be willing to have a further conversation about that because I think it's something we also have to think about. We've really benefited from (Bruce) being very available. But we have to not think about people and personalities but about processes and structures.

(Steve Mattel):   I think that constituted a second volunteer to work on this because certainly the criteria - this process suggestion could come up with criteria and things we should be looking for and prioritizing in the...

Woman: So to anyone interested in reading that fascinating report that it was generated (unintelligible) ago by members of the board at that time.

(Marilyn): I guess I should say it's (Marilyn). That in order...

(Steve Mattel): Okay. Are there any other volunteers to join - but I think we can certainly take on the (unintelligible) of finding more volunteers. I mean if I ask your group to come up with another name or two - right.

Woman: We'll see if we can find a guy to join the group.

(Steve Mattel): Okay. We'll see if we could find one or two other people. Yeah. Okay. Are there any other - any other comments on this? If not...

Woman: The next one is - that one came up in terms of it's really - even getting this meeting organized was really sort of a oh, okay who's talking for your house? Oh, okay, who's talking, you know, and sort of the bootstrap of getting to the point where we could even plan and request a meeting was difficult.

So it basically opened up the question since I had the ability to build mailing lists I said oh, okay, well I can build one for, you know, the combined leadership so at least there's a communication path. And essentially well thanks for the offer but we don't want to get that formal about things.

So there's a question on the table as sort of how do we - I mean okay, (Steve) and I know each other and, you know, but I don't necessarily see (Steve) always. So yes, so that's the question (unintelligible).

Man: This - I mean would it be impractical for each stakeholder group - prior to (unintelligible)? Because that would be their task, would be to -o don't want to have - I mean I'm not opposed to having a list that's just the two executive committees.

But what I think what happens then is it just adds another layer of email coming in (unintelligible) because most of those people are so engaged on so many other things it might be easier to have one person to...

Man: I think - (unintelligible) another mailing list because - our core structure that we created. I mean essentially what we see as (unintelligible) organized because having an executive committee - ICANN - that creates a natural - structure. That strikes me as the two - of communication.

And it's simply up to them to cascade it down.

Woman: So but okay in the - but it is - yeah, that is one of our criteria (unintelligible) too disagreeable. Always civil please. But so basically when do you - and so I have no problem keeping in touch.

But I was at a point where I didn't know who should be in touch with other than the list of six names or the, you know, and then (Steve) got in touch with me and I knew that it was (Steve) for now. But - and so that's fine with me and - the people on the - (unintelligible).

The other thing I wanted to bring up in terms of what I've heard is it may not be processed.

We may not have to wait for a face to face meeting when there's an issue like whether it's the budget or some other where there's an assumption that here's something that we may want to do some coordination with to be able to sort of raise that flag other than just among the council members.

But of course anything that's a policy issue is probably best raised.

(Steve Mattel): Yeah. I would just - this is (Steve Mattel) again preempting the discussion within the CS - up with our point person and I just want to keep this as

lightweight as possible. So I think - fair for us - I will say that soon after this meeting we will be - someone will be in touch with you to say...

Woman: Right. And I'll go back to the NTSG executive committee and ask - (unintelligible) and - the next thing that we had and we had and we have five minutes left and we never thought we'd get there - was anybody else - did anyone have any other comments on that? No. Was there any other business - work on together?

Man: No.

Woman: Should we call it done - talking and meet again - have two little groups. We each have to find another member. The other member - yeah, it can be two but at least one other member for the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) and because by the time we meet next time we really should know what we're doing. Thanks. It was a pleasure.

Man: Operator?

END