

**ICANN Cartagena Meeting
GNSO Council Wrap-Up Meeting Cartagena
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 9 December 2010 at 1230 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.

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much. Welcome everybody to Council wrap up meeting. Welcome to the new Councilors (John) and (Jeff). Looking around the room. I see old people but (Carlos), where is he? Oh, hi (Carlos).

Welcome to all. The agenda for this Council meeting is in front of you and on the Wiki so you can see what we're going to talk about. Traditionally we have these meetings to look at what's happened over the past week and see what we want to - what issues we want to look at going forward.

Now we will also discuss this being the last meeting of the year. We will discuss some administrative matters such as meeting time of going forward and so on.

So let's start with Item 1. Glen, can you do roll call please?

Glen DeSaintgery: Certainly Stéphane. Tim Ruiz, Adrian Kinderis, Edmon Chung, Wendy Seltzer, Jeff Neuman...

Jeff Neuman: (Yes).

Glen DeSaintgery:Stéphane Van Gelder.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah.

Glen DeSaintgery:Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Jaime Wagner.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah.

Glen DeSaintgery:(Unintelligible). Mary Wong, David Taylor, Mike Rodenbaugh, Andre Kalashnikov. And absent is Olga. (Kristina) will be coming late and have I missed up anybody?

(Terry): This is (Terry). I'm on the phone.

Glen DeSaintgery:And (Terry), thank you. And we have Rafik on the phone as well.

Alan Greenberg: And Alan's here.

Glen DeSaintgery:And Debbie Hughes and Alan Greenberg and Han Chuan Lee and here's (Kristina) and Chuck's coming.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks very much Glen. Any comments? Anyone want to review any items on the agenda? Hearing no one, let's move on to Item 2 and the decision making process. We had discussions about this during our weekend session on how to best take this forward.

There was a suggestion that a group of us get together and continue informal discussions on some of the items that we looked at during the weekend session. So does anyone want to add anything further to what we talked about?

Yeah. Jaime. Jaime's eating but as soon as he's done with that mouthful, he's on the mike. Anyone else?

Jaime Wagner: I just would like to more conversations we had in the ISPCP and consider the meeting with reason and voiced our - both -- and I'm talking for myself -- some sort of disappointment with the work (unintelligible) that no decision making we are doing.

And I would like to bring forth something that I sent in the - our meeting here - our current meeting that we must and I - since we have now new leadership work, I would urge the leadership to take decisions and (why should we) put on hold our differences and we must make these decisions. (Unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jaime. Can I just respond? I'm sure that the leaders are probably willing to do that but still have a question on whether the Council would be willing to accept that because that is asking the Council leaders to well, take some kind of an executive decision on certain projects.

I think - I agree with your (particular) view that - this is a personal view. I agree with your view that that is needed as I stated during the weekend sessions. But it is something that we need to look at - we need to look at how we can put that into practice. Tim and then Edmon.

Tim Ruiz: No that was pretty much my comment. I just felt that we could better utilize our weekend working sessions - well I don't - maybe that's probably a bad way to put it. I think that they're utilized well but I think we need to add to that an opportunity for the Council itself -- whether it's open or now that doesn't concern me one way or the other -- but for the Council itself to consider and discussion some of it's work.

So some of the things that we do at the open meeting we can do and resolve before we get there. I think that's a better place for it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah. I think - I'll add you Wendy. That's actually something I wanted to discuss further down the agenda but it's certainly something that I

think we all need to discuss today. I think we all felt yesterday during the (unintelligible) Council meeting that we would be best served and we would make better use of our time if some of those conversations that were going on we could have had before.

And perhaps we could do that I agree during the weekend sessions. I mean that seems the ideal time to do it because it's the only - you know, we see each other three times a year. It's not something that's easy to do either by email or by phone. But it is something that we could do quite easily when we're all in the room together.

So I'd like with your permission to look at the way we organize the weekend sessions going forward for San Francisco. And perhaps put aside more time for straight Council conversation. I'm a bit lost on the queue. I've got Edmon, Wendy, Jeff, Olga, Debbie, Jaime.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I guess on that yeah, conceptually it's probably good to do that. We have a logistical issue as well which is that the constituency in the stakeholder group meetings are on Tuesday and, you know, that's a huge change in, you know, swap everything around.

It might not be as fruitful as we hoped it to be. That's I guess just the...

Tim Ruiz: It's really just the opposite because when we - many of the discussions we had during Council last night, they stalemated because we couldn't go back to our constituencies - our stakeholder groups and clear things. So if we had had those discussions over the weekend, you know, like for example the splitting of the RAA event or motion.

If we'd known about that specifically before, we could have discussed that in our stakeholder group. We could have had a much better outcome. So I think - so it might be - go both ways. But I think there's a real advantage in it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Wendy.

(Kristina): Stéphane actually can I (unintelligible) record. I had reached out to Mary, Jeff and Mason on Tuesday to indicate that I had gotten (IPC) support to split the motion. So I realize that there may not have been time to add that into the stakeholder group agendas but there was as much notice as I was able to give in light of the timing (issue).

Stéphane Van Gelder: That's just a comment (Kristina). That's not a point of order is it?

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. Yeah like in the spirit of those suggestions, I think we might want to consider something even like the Board's workshop before meeting. One of the sessions is a session of discussion about the items that we have on our agenda, discussion of the places that we have commonalities and differences.

If there's a way to schedule it that's sort of even before the drafting of motions and discussion with - to include constituencies in the discussion of viewpoints and - because I think that would be helpful. Because at the moment we have sort of the summary of the issue from staff at one point and the voting on the motion at a second point and we often don't have the intermediate where do we end our (unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I agree with Wendy on kind of the notion of a workshop. And in fact I know this will be an unpopular suggestion to go like our social time but maybe the GNSO Council dinner could actually be a working dinner -- sorry to suggest that -- where actually substantive topics can be discussed.

I think one of the other issues that, and Tim had brought it up on email even before we got here, is the whole notion that because of this eight day deadline all of a sudden motions just come out of nowhere, right.

Motions that maybe groups had thought about, it would really help if there would be some way, and maybe this is a Vice Chair, the Vice Chair or other manner that it would be helpful to know what's coming down the pipe so that we can discuss these things.

And not even the exact working of what the motion is but just the concept behind what will probably be in a motion. It shouldn't really come as a surprise and certainly not as people are getting on airplanes coming out here.

And lastly, I do want to stick up for (Kristina) because yes, she did send out a note that did say exactly what was written. It's just hard during a meeting to read - you know, the words matter. And especially to a lot of people who are lawyers and even not lawyers.

Every word has a meaning and it's hard while a meeting's going on to read a really long motion like that but yeah, Kristina did send around something the day before. And I know my question kind of sounded like I was dumb but, you know, when I said, you know, what is this.

So, and one other thing we should consider is how to write motions and maybe getting together with staff to figure out the best way - the least complicated way so that they're equally understood by anybody.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. I've got Olga, Debbie, Jaime, Adrian, Mike and (Kristina). I'd like to cut the list short at that point please since we've already spent quite a lot of time on this. Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Stéphane. The sitting I had yesterday it said we needed more informal dialog before the Council - the open Council meeting. What happened during the coffee break is that people were finding a wording that were comfortable for everyone should have been done before.

And maybe we could have done that during the weekend and perhaps it's (unintelligible) Chair and Vice Chair with the interest people promoting the text. That's what I wanted to say.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you. Debbie.

Debra Hughes: Very quickly all I wanted to add was to piggyback up what Tim and Wendy had suggested. I would think it would make a lot of sense for the staff to do the presentation and then for us to have those subsequent conversations. So in the interest of time that's all I'll say.

But I think from an organizational standpoint it would make sense for us give the staff updates then have the debate about the issues and then we would have the information we need to take back to our groups.

Stéphane Van Gelder: (Thank you). Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: First I would like to come back to the point I was making. I think that to step down a project is a difficult decision and this kind of decision should be submitted to the Council if it'd be taken by the Council. But it is to be brought here by the leadership. And I think the first thing in our informal meetings should be this kind of approach to evaluate what - which work is - could be stepped down in order to provide a complaint of staff and everything.

Well, on the second point, I would like to point out that deadlines are the main source of desperation of human kind. So we should - it's not - it's informal. It doesn't work. I mean it - we should bring the motions to be discussed in our first meeting as if it were the one to decide. Then I think things should - could work much better because I will present an example.

The best wording was for Mary's motion was achieved in the (unintelligible) the amendment you made to yourself, yeah. Yeah. Okay. So if we will have this kind of rush in the first meeting, then we would achieve much more.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jaime. Just to clarify, the first point you're making, you would like the Council leaders to suggest to Council items or projects that we would consider less important. Is that correct?

Jaime Wagner: A proposal to suspend or even to drop, definitely.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Is that not made through a motion?

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. It could be but I think it should be a leadership initiative.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Thanks. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Two things. So Number 1, this notion of discussing motions at (unintelligible), we do - we have meetings all day set by (unintelligible). Perhaps the period should be eight days before that. And allow those meetings where we spend two solid days together to allow some back room exchanges and even some of that from some formal time to discuss those motions rather than having the date set for the actual meeting itself.

And then if you agree with that knowledge and you say, okay, well we're going to work through that and lock down our decisions before and some folks said, you know, there's a dinner where we're going to go and talk about this, you know, have a working dinner and whatever else comes back to my sort of point that I brought up at the meeting which is what is the purpose of the open mike then.

If we've already locked in a decision beforehand like the Board do, then all they'd do is the Board come out and I've already decided what they're doing on the Thursday night and walk out and read through the motion and it's all, you know, formalities.

If we do that, that's fine. I got no problem with that and it would look a lot cleaner certainly than having open arguments the way we did and then having the community frustrated at us. We just need to then maybe look at (unintelligible) where the meeting is.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah. Thanks. Actually I think - I don't think what you just said - should discuss that just for five seconds. I'm in personally in full agreement with what you're saying. And I think it would - we would be very well advised to look at a - going forward to look at a format whereby we would be functioning more like the Board in that respect.

We thrash out the issues beforehand and we basically know more or less. I mean there can always be last minute surprises but we basically know more or less what's going to happen when we come to the open meeting.

The open mike is a good thing but perhaps not during deliberations on motions. I mean, you know, I'm in full agreement with you on that. I don't know what the rest of the Council thinks. Perhaps we can take that discussion offline. But...

Adrian Kinderis: If you - Stéphane, if you do have the conversations on a Saturday and Sunday, we allow open mike then. And that's where folks can do it. Think about the way the Board works. They have open (time) or public forum today to get taking to the deliberations tonight. That's how they get their input at the last minute. Yeah. Clearly they get input leading up to that.

So why not set ourselves in the same way such that if anyone wants to talk to us about the motions or anything else at that time, they can do it on the Saturday and Sunday. We could do our Sunday night dinner where we come in and we try to pull it all together. And I agree with having work - I don't agree with organizing another time to catch up. I think our bandwidth here is already fairly well (chopping block).

But yeah, so use the time in - we can get community input here on the Saturdays and Sundays, tighten it up and move on.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I was going to make a very similar suggestion about extending the time before - the motion deadline for public meetings because I think it's obvious to everybody, unanimous that we need to be better prepared in those meetings and not look so disorganized at times.

I was thinking more like 20 days for a public meeting though so that - because, you know, it's been a common complaint of our constituency particularly the organizational members in our constituency that we really never have enough time to get the full input that we ought to be able to get.

So I don't necessarily believe there ought to be a great distinction between our teleconference meetings and our public meetings but in reality there is. You know, we do have some semblance of an audience at these meetings. So I think that's important.

The other thing that I was going to suggest is that you do a lot more by email. Even voting. You know, do more email ballots like things like commissioning or approving charters.

There's just no reason why somebody needs to read that out and then take an up or down vote. Voice - I mean that could have been done weeks ago and therefore not delayed the working group's (next) meeting Number 1 and not wasted a lot of time in our public meeting, Number 2.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Mike. I'm actually also wondering whether we need to read out the motions. I mean this comes from yesterday. I actually thought that was extremely necessary before because it goes into the transcript and people can read the motion there. But I mean they can read it on the Wiki as

well and it takes up so much time. I can see people nod off while we're doing it. So I'm just wondering that's another question which I think we ought to look at. (Kristina).

(Kristina): A few things. I agree that perhaps for the public meetings we need to set the motion deadline earlier. I think 20 days frankly is going to be a hard sell to some folks. I think 14 would be fine.

With regard - and I think we do have to recognize that here we - in this - for this particular meeting we had an unusual set of circumstances at least with regard to my constituency, namely that we had a very important public comment deadline tomorrow.

So, you know, for a lot of folks getting comments put together embedded both on an individual organizational level and as the constituency took up a lot of bandwidth that we would have otherwise been able to spend discussing, you know, the motions at issue.

I do think that we could try and integrate more of the kind of public forum section of our meetings into the Saturday and Sunday work. However, I think we also need to recognize that it is not always going to be possible for all members of the community to be here by Saturday morning. And that in many cases the ability to do so is going to be affected by the location of the meeting.

If it's a meeting that takes 20 hours to get to, I think we need to recognize that, you know, that most people are going to have to take multiple flights. There's going to be a lot of travel time. I think what we may have to do is still have the public forum portion of our meetings on Wednesday but perhaps limit participation that to those people who are physically not here on the weekend and unable to otherwise participate.

And finally, I think we also just need to recognize that we can make our very best effort to get everything nailed down as far ahead as possible but that there will always be issues and particularly the difficult ones that I think it has in the past taken and (so) literally right before the meeting.

Even though people have been discussing them very seriously, very substantively throughout; but it has taken into right before our public meetings to come up with a negotiated resolution. And I think we just need to be realistic about there will always be that - those one or two (sensitive) situations where no matter what we do ahead of time, it's still going to happen.

And I think to not take that into account I think we're being overly hard on ourselves frankly.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. I guess I don't have too much more to say because everybody's pretty much said it. But I do agree with (Kristina). I don't - and I never - anything I said meant to imply that we'd never do that at a meeting I think is probably unavoidable to some extent. But I think we could probably reduce it considerably.

And just in regards to the number of days, 14 days, 20 days, both those sound good to me. Eight is just problematic because it by nature includes two days where it's difficult to get a hold of anybody because in one place or another there's going to be two of those days that are weekend. And like it or not, people take time off. They don't look at their email, you know, seven days a week, 24 hours a day like some of us might. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Chuck, why are you giggling over there? That wasn't aimed at you.

Chuck Gomes: No, I know. I didn't think it was aimed at me. I was - I of course was doing email in the hospital.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Oh, yeah. Sorry. Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Oh, is that the indication that I'm up next? Yes. Thank you. So acknowledging both that we want people to be able to speak at general public input at our meetings and that constituencies are often directing their Councilors so it's not useful for that public input to come on the day of the meeting.

Perhaps we can separate the functions and have space for public discussion of items that will be on the agenda of upcoming meetings so that we can get early public input into those items that are on future Council agendas rather than comments directed specifically on things on which (unintelligible) people they won't have any impact.

I don't think that using Saturday and Sunday is substitute because the meeting doesn't even officially start until Monday. So if we're looking for community input, that's another reason that's less likely to be successful.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Mary.

Mary Wong: I want to agree with (Kristina) and I think following up on Wendy's point that the Saturday and Sunday sessions I agree could be better utilized. And I agree that we do need to figure out a way to run all our meetings during this week more efficiently while gathering as much community input as possible. On the Saturday and Sunday point, there are (issues) of travel schedules, there's issues of time off, there's issues of the cost for a lot of participants.

So one suggestion I wanted to make is because a lot of us really find it hard (with a lot of their) constituents to focus on certain issues, maybe not all, until constituency day if there's a way to harness some of these suggestions such that what we talk about constituency day a lot of which sounds to me with the

other SGs is also about the vote can be streamlined and harnessed into a public forum which we then take into the Council meeting. It might be a timing issue.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Margie.

Margie Milam: A timing issue - I just wanted to remind you guys that we have - from a staff perspective we have a deadline for document production. And you don't want your period for motions may not want your period be before the date that the documents get published prior to the public meeting. You know, because that - all those documents may impact the motions that you're going to consider at the meeting. So just wanted to clarify. Might want to think about that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. All right. Well as a - you know, considering what next steps we do here, may I suggest that the Council leaders take onboard all of the very good suggestions that we've had, perhaps thrash them out, come back with a short list to you guys and take it on the list and see what we want to implement and what we don't.

Man: It might be unpopular but I think you've heard our opinions now. I think you had it, you know, I don't you need to suggest it to the list or whatever else. Take us on a journey and show us what the next meetings (will be like).

Stéphane Van Gelder: We're okay with that? You asked for it. In the interest of time, Glen's telling me - I mean this meeting was scheduled for an hour and a half but Glen's telling me that people might want to stop in half an hour to get to the public forum. If that's the case then I will skip through some agenda items with your permission.

Roll up of Council is one I'd like to get through because we had some questions there that arose from the weekend session. They're on the agenda. We can look at them and discuss them on the list.

The new GNSO Web site I don't think we need to discuss much. I'd just like to get an idea from staff on - well I'd like to get an idea from you guys on any comments that you think would prevent the Web sites as presented from being put online. I mean are there any big stumbling blocks that you see there that would mean that we don't?

Man: Just the opposite. I thought it was brilliant. And I thought the (present) way they presented it was really good, concise and they did a good job. And I don't know the gentleman's name that did that. But I think it's good, so, all the way.

Stéphane Van Gelder: So yeah Jaime.

Jaime Wager: Just wanted to stress once again the need for appointing a (constable) from each constituency to the Web site, maintenance group.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah. Thanks. But that's not something that would stop the Web site from being put online. I mean all the tweaking comments we can make once the Web site is (on), right Jaime? Correct? Yeah. So I just need an idea from staff on when that Web site will be a launch and then we can take it from there.

Next. One thing that I would like to spend just a few minutes on is the meeting format. We've talked a lot about our impression on the format in this meeting so perhaps we can skip that. But we do need to look at a few things - or a few questions that we needed to look at for the next meeting.

Just two things that I'd like to stop on for just a second. First of all I'd like to ask you if you all feel that the informal Council dinner is a good idea. We just heard one suggestion of perhaps from Jeff that it should be a working dinner. So that's something new. Thoughts on that?

Mary Wong: I've been chewing my food. I apologize. I understand the impudence of Jeff's suggestion. I think the problem is that we will always have new Councilors coming on board and people getting to (unintelligible). So I actually think that not having it as a working dinner but having it as more of an informal session works a lot better.

Stéphane Van Gelder: (Thank you). (Kristina).

(Kristina): I agree with Mary but for a slight disagreement. That is by the time of the day that we actually have these dinners, you've already been working for eight to ten hours. And, you know, I can't obviously speak for anyone else but at a certain point, you know, I need to take a break. And I think because of that we may not have the level of productivity coming out of those dinners that we would expect to have if we make them (unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: It's just to subscribe to Mary's position. Again, just motion.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Someone who sat at a table of only ICANN policy staff who I love, it wasn't really much of a social event with other Councilors. But it was fun. I want to stress that.

You know, look, I totally understand that it was at the end of a long day and perhaps a working discussion could be at a different time. I just didn't - as much as I like all of you and I like going to dinner, I just didn't get really anything out of it or not need for a separate GNSO Council dinner especially the night after the GNSO Council's last Board dinner.

I don't think we need that many pretty scheduled dinners. I think a lot of us have other things that we want to do or other people that we like to connect with. And I like to hang out with Adrian alone, just the two of us.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah. I'm in violent disagreement with what you just said. I think the Council dinner, which we've introduced recently, is a very good social event. You do not have to come. I, you know, happen to have friends. You know, you can sit by yourself.

I know you weren't - I know you weren't sitting by yourself. But some people didn't come and that's fine, you know, but I think we should have that avenue there for informal discussions. And I do violently agree with what was said - I don't know who by. We - I think it was you Adrian. We've already worked so hard - was it you?

Adrian Kinderis: No it wasn't me.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. I think we already worked so hard and so long. I think we are - often we just, you know, push ourselves too hard. Indeed we just task ourselves too heavily. So I think we want to keep that in mind. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: No. I support the social event. Some people shouldn't come late. Then they wouldn't be alone at the table.

Jeff Neuman: That was policy staff's fault. They took me out for a couple drinks.

Alan Greenberg: In any case - in any case, the only practical way to have a working meeting is in a room like this with microphones. And I think the last thing we want on our social event is to have yet another catered event in the place that we're holding all the meetings.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Alan. I think - if anyone else has - I mean I think we've all agreed that we're not going to go with Jeff's suggestion. So, you know, if there's different comments, please make them. Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. No different comments. The only - I (meet) with Adrian this evening. Because I remember very well that meeting and I joined the Council last year. He moderated this evening in a very brilliant way. So just introducing the concept, we took to each other and that's what I was thinking. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. John.

(John): I may feel differently in a year but I am the new guy. I really appreciated the opportunity to - and I don't want to just - I want to thank Jeff because of his advice about the meeting the day before about not being asked questions that then - a Board member asks you a question, you respond, all of a sudden it's some constituency's policy.

It wasn't ten seconds at the dinner when Bertrand asked me if - what I might think of the new rights protection mechanism (unintelligible). I said, you know, I think there's some IPC people here you should talk to about that. Thank you Jeff.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks (John). Mary.

Mary Wong: Two quick points. I think actually even at (unintelligible) like having the policy staff there because getting to know them is part of the joy and also part of our work.

Secondly to add to the earlier point, I think it's not just new Councilors. I mean there are cultural issues that some people feel much more comfortable speaking in a room like this into a microphone that they actually felt they knew the people they were speaking with.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Very good point. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Thanks Wolf. A lot of respect. So first of all I think any time we get - may even be such a good to push it this time of the week when we're going to wind down a little bit. But there's no reason why we can't have both discussions. Is there a motion?

If we pull that deadline back, I think you'll find any time we get to hang out together even if it is in a social environment, the conversation would naturally go to those motions that are out there because we know that we've got a, you know, sort of get them locked down.

And (this day) before the meeting I think you'll see that, you know, in that environment the conversation will naturally go that way. So I don't know that you necessarily need to call it a formal event.

My second point is that somebody said that the meeting - I think it was Wendy said the meeting doesn't start until Monday unofficially. That's a legacy thing to hold the opening ceremony then. As far as I'm concerned, the meetings now start on Saturday.

And we have a Board dinner on Saturday night or, you know, or Sunday depending on what happens and you want to be there for that. So, you know, in my mind I always try to be here for Saturday and I start my meeting on Saturday. I don't start on Monday even though that's when the opening ceremony is. So I think we got to get our heads around that and be prepared to put in some (unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Andre.

Andre Kalashnikov: Yeah. There are a few things that are (social). There are no mikes, no records and (which) should really help to keep the discussion going and solve

some problems which we would like to resolve at (unintelligible) and also
yeah, of course.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Yeah. Just to briefly respond to Adrian. I wasn't referring to Councilors but to
members of the general public many of whom don't arrive until Monday.
Members of the ALAC aren't permitted by their travel budgets to arrive until
Monday. And others that we might want giving input for Council, I agree that
the meetings start when our meetings begin.

Andre Kalashnikov: Point taken. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Thanks. So I think we're agreed that we'll keep that going.
And what about just any comments on the Board - the formal Board session. I
mean that was - this weekend, sorry, this meeting was the first time that
we've done that, split the two. I thought it went well. The Board session was a
bit strained but - the formal one. But that's possibly because it was a new
thing.

But I think the - having that opportunity of having a total (unintelligible) casual
discussion during the Board dinner with no agenda items, no, you know, just
little song and dance to start with and then we just get into it. And having a
formal session on the Sunday as well. What do you think? Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I think the formal session worked real well. I think they were very
receptive to hear what we had to say. I think there's some good action items
that came out of it. You know, even if - I remember the point about having
staff and being more responsive to us on some of our working groups I think
is an excellent outcome and one that I know they're going to follow up.

And I think all of the other Councils of each of the other supporting organizations have similar type meetings. And so I would recommend that we continue that practice.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. Can I just say to (Terry), Rafik, I know that it may be hard for you to step into this discussion so please just, you know, speak out if you do want to because I'm not using the Adobe Connect. I may not see you raise your hand. Adrian. Oh no, sorry. Mary.

Mary Wong: I agree with keeping the formal meeting of the Board. (I think it's a good idea and I think the committee welcomes that as well. I do agree that we're constrained and I think part of the reason might have been either format or setup. But personally I think I would find it even more helpful if I knew what the Board was trying to do.

It's not just - to me I think it's enough to have a list of topics but if Board members are going to come in with a set of questions, I'd like to know that. If Board members were going to come into to ask our views on thins, I think it'd be much more helpful and make for a more lively discussion.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. I'll tell you one thing that we tried in the registrar stakeholder group day which went very well, was just - I think it was an idea that Adrian had. We decided that when they came in we just - each of us would not use our laptops. We'd just close them.

And, you know, so we were in full attention mode. And I think that helped. I mean may not be something that's viable for you guys to do for now but maybe it's something that we can do. Hang on Adrian. Got two- well I've got two. I'll come back to you. Can you hold one thought? Yeah. Bill.

(Bill): I don't want Adrian to explode. Your head going to like scanners or something - is that okay? I found it a curiously dull meeting. I mean maybe I'm wrong. I

don't know. I mean Mary thought that it was a little constrained - it was a little constrained. I thought it was dull.

I thought the dynamics in the room...

Mary Wong: I was being polite.

(Bill): Yeah, okay. Usual then. There's moderation - Mr. de-moderation. It just didn't seem like it was going anywhere. I was sitting there thinking my God, we have all of these pressing issues on the agenda, we have all these big things hanging over our heads, we've all kinds of areas of agreement and disagreement and controversy and turmoil. And we're sitting here and we have this kind of like halting repressed anal-retentive discussion.

And I couldn't figure it out but somehow - I mean I certainly think we have to - I think we should continue doing it. Okay. Because I think that separating that from the dinner is a good idea.

But we have to find some way to have some larger prior engagement or something to - or maybe we should get a professional facilitator to come in and tell us, you know, we have to wear funny hard hats or I don't know what the - we have to find some way to make the format marked genial to people kind of relaxing a little bit and speaking more freely and openly because it just - I just really felt like it wasn't working.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Andre.

Andre Kalashnikov: Already said everything I - but I'd like to hear what (unintelligible) probably just, you know, to - wish people to speak because it was like sleeping.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Just on the laptop thing. I really forgot it really. The idea that we did that was when I speak at the public forum, it drives me mad that all the Board members sit up there and type away just as I do when I'm on the Council and not listening and I can talk about watermelons and they wouldn't care. And in fact I might do that today.

But, you know, so I thought I'd suggest that the registrars when they come in we're all going to shut our laptops, even the audience, every registrar - well because of the way we were seated in the room, you know, the (excom) and all the registrars. We said well all the registrars when entering we close our laptops there. We're going to pay full attention to the Board. We're going to give them.

And (Bruce) opened up this laptop. But (Rita) gave us full attention and I think really it had a big impact there to say well we are watching and we're listening may be something you want to consider. I just sent a really cool message out to them. I just said we're very (unintelligible) about this.

And what I would like to gauge is what it sounds like, you know, from my (position), (unintelligible) where they just go through the motions (unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Thanks. Before we move on to the next topic, Chuck you wanted to say something.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Well this isn't my main point but I continue to be impressed with how constructive these wrap up sessions are. And maybe it's because (unintelligible) and so forth but this is great.

I wanted to go back to the public Council meeting Stéphane. We have several people here in the - as observers here today that were in the public Council meeting.

I'm curious if any of them just in very brief, maybe one minute, tell us how they perceived that meeting yesterday. Tried to make some changes in it to make it palatable for them and (unintelligible) any of them would share their thoughts, that would probably be good feedback for us as we consider (unintelligible).

Stéphane Van Gelder: (Unintelligible).

Amber Sterling: This is Amber Sterling. I'm glad you asked. It was rather painful to watch. I imagine it was probably even more painful to participate in in the sense that with all of the amendments being read and all the (unintelligible) and results, I really couldn't track what the motion was actually saying. And I can't - I'm very impressed with you guys being able to actually follow that because it was very hard to connect those dots.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Well I don't know where you got the impression we were able to follow it. (Pete). You're being called to the mike.

(Pete): Thank you. I actually thought that some of the back and forth in those debates that was going on during the meeting wasn't all bad. I think it actually showed the, you know, the ability of the Councilors to engage with one another. Don't always agree. You don't always agree on issues and that there's (some) healthy lively debate.

I think that there's a limit though where that, you know, sort of crosses into - could may have gotten some of this resolved beforehand? But I wouldn't suggest that, you know, having that debate and that back and forth was necessarily a bad thing or inherently a bad thing.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Let's move on if we're going to make that deadline. I just want to take two more items - agenda items and - sorry. Can I - well...

Woman: I would suggest that to reading the motions that whoever it is that is moving is introducing the motion has to instead give a two sentence summary of what the motion is intended to do.

Stéphane Van Gelder: And making them write then. You want them to write a summary.

Woman: To introduce the motion presumably as it's been purposed (well enough).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. (Tony).

(Tony): And my observation goes (unintelligible). The current confusion we have is the kind of transparency.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: A practical suggestion and we only did this I think once, maybe twice yesterday. The voice vote is so much quicker than the other. But you can do that and still get a record. You don't have to have a roll call though to get a record.

The way I like to do voice votes and you saw how I did it yesterday was have people identify themselves with their name and you save ten minutes on every motion if you do that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: (Pete).

(Pete): Thanks Stéphane. Just one other point about the comments of, you know, sort of modeling that session similar to how the Board does. In other words, the Board makes their decision prior and then they basically just come tell people what they're doing or, you know, go into their - maybe their public Board meeting and just sort of read the decisions. That's been a frustration for me for years.

Decision making process and debate sort of happening behind closed doors. So I would caution the GNSO Council to sort of not take that model or follow that model too strictly or too closely. But if the debate in the GNSO Council or among the GNSO Council happens prior but also in a public forum. In other words, if a meeting is public and that debate happens prior, then my concerns are less.

I would be more concerned like if it was as if the Board were doing it sort of making - having that debate behind closed doors. I would not support that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Let's move on to - this is something that we have to look at. There's the meetings, the agenda going forward. I think Glen has already sent a proposal to the list. So part of the questions that were asked in the agenda are already moot. They're still on the three-week system - once every three weeks.

I would ask you to identify any clashes that you may have going forward. You know, we - as you know, we have a requirement to post our meeting schedules for the year in advance. So this is something that we need to do now. And I had a suggestion, which was that a meeting scheduled in the middle of August, which is like a sacred month in France. Absolutely no way anyone can (unintelligible) in France in August.

So I was going to suggest that we skip that one and just for that time have a six-week break. I'm sure all of you would be happy to do that. Yes, Tim. Tim, you want to pick a month. Maybe that one's not such a good idea.

Tim Ruiz: Actually I was just going to mention it seemed to me on the list that January 6 was looking pretty bad so I don't know if that's something we want to try to resolve quicker - sooner than later or whatever.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah. That's a good point. Glen had - Glen was able to speak to that because she's looked at that.

Glen DeSaintgery: It does seem as though January the 6th actually five people have told me that they won't be there for that meeting. Six. Okay. And would January the 13th be very (conflictual) for anybody. Can you say quickly? If not, it would be so much easier to - Adrian. But it would be so much easier to be able to say two days. And our next meeting is on January the 13th rather than sending around Doodles, you know, waste another two weeks on this.

Stéphane Van Gelder: That okay for everyone? (Unintelligible) okay if a voice votes.
Okay Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: No, I think that - I was going to say January 6 and on the voice (they only) asked for one that - an important issues I think certain votes should be taken by voice just to make a point. And I thought the one that I asked might have been an important one.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Sorry if my joke offended you. Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. At least we got the meeting plans. So I'd like to have at least - just to know where the meetings are. But in addition wouldn't be possible for those who are preparing the meeting plan and the meetings maybe Chair and Vice Chairs could also outline in advance so sometime ahead what could be of interest at that time (before the) meeting.

You know, we are deferring a lot of tasks, shifting it from one meeting to the other. Just know that - just knowing that we cannot (cope this) at the next meeting. And it's (our business). For example, talking about the PDP working team outcome also. Maybe in correlation is communication with Jeff so you can get a deadline for that or an idea and then just add it to that meeting plan so we have a rough idea over the year what could be dealt with at certain meetings.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Any further on this? Oh, sorry, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. It's maybe for a date and I think GNSO teleconference in the first September maybe can - not easy because it should feel that they (unintelligible) celebration and I think that we are diverse in the Council and maybe to change the date of that conference call.

Stéphane Van Gelder: That's very useful Rafik. Thanks very much for that. Glen has taken that on board. So we will - Glen will send a revised proposal to the list. And we'll take it from there. Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: I would like just to pass through the dates because - that will remain here instead referring it to a list. Just pass through the dates that will remain. Can we?

Stéphane Van Gelder: We can. But may I suggest doing it this way? May I suggest that we just work through the rest very short items that I wanted to cover because I want to let those people go that need to go at half past and then come back to this just after that? And I agree with the suggestion.

So what - I mean one thing that's important is that you need a volunteer to work with Glen on drafting our next open - our next ICANN meeting agenda. As you know, I've been doing that for the last year with Glen. Olga has volunteered. Thank you very much Olga. Adrian. Thanks very much Olga for doing that. So that's solved.

And just one thing that I wanted to maybe address is just to give Jeff a chance to respond to some of the comments on the possible or not conflict of interest him being Chair of the PPSC and voting on that yesterday. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. And I don't know if the complaint was being Chair of the PPSC and the PDP Work Team or one or both of them. I don't know exactly what the complaint was. But someone had raised on the list that serving on - as a Chair of a working group and also serving on the Council was an inherent

conflict of interest and was suggested that not only voting on that would have been a conflict but even discussing the issue at all.

I don't agree with that and I think that would be a first since, you know, some - there's a bunch of precedent even in the recent history of, you know, Olga had chaired the travel group and the constituency ops group. Alan chaired the PEDNR, even though he doesn't have a vote but he still participates in the discussions on the Council. Avri when she was on the Council headed up part of the fast flux group for a while.

And a number of people had chairs of new TLD groups. So I think their complaint - it's odd that it was just directed towards me. But that said, if the Council does believe that there's an issue, I have already said on the list that I would absolutely step down as chair of either or both of those (groups) but I think that's fine. I think that might hamper the world a little bit and make a late thing.

So I think it's kind of odd that - to say I want you to go quicker but then I want to get rid of the chair. I don't think that has happened. So if anyone has an issue with it, just let me know. You know, I could use some more free time anyway. So if you want me to step down, that's fine. But I don't see an issue. I checked with ICANN staff. They responded (unintelligible) there's no bylaws for anything that would (unintelligible).

Tim Ruiz: None of us are going to want to be Councilors because we're going to find it too important to be able to participate in these working groups and have something fit. Then later have to restrict our ability to vote or have any opinion on the Council.

So I think we need to be very careful about how far we take that and I personally see no problem with Jeff maintaining his chair of the PPSC.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Tim. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: You know, where's the requirement that a Councilor needs to be neutral on anything? Is anyone here neutral on anything? When I am the chair of the PDP Work Team and the PPSC, I will challenge anyone here or anyone out in the community to come up with an instance where I have not been neutral in serving as the chair of that group.

And what I did yesterday was I think act like a chair of the group in defending my group that was being attacked and that was the timeline - if I didn't do it, who would have. So absolutely I was not neutral in no way, shape or form. My vote was actually the vote of the registry stakeholder group and not my own person vote; although it's obviously in this would have been the same.

So if anyone accused me of not being neutral on the Council, 100% absolutely correct. I defended my team and I gave you the timeline honestly. And when I saw a motion, that was to try to limit me to a date that I knew the team could not meet. And I presented over the weekend including the person that complained, not one person said we had to take something out or we - or your dates are absolutely wrong. So yes, absolutely, was not neutral.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. That's an important point. The only requirement that I know of for someone to be neutral is the chair actually. So Bill.

(Bill): I don't think we need to debate this much more. And hardly anybody here suggests that there was a problem in terms of the two positions. So we don't need to (unintelligible) or not.

The only point I would make Jeff is that even the way you're framing this right now that the group was being attacked is part of what - we're talking about perception here, okay. I don't believe that Mary's motion was attacking your group.

And I think the people had had a running conversation for a while about what is the best way or organizing a set of activities and people had come - some people were coming to a certain view. And so there is a motion about that and I would have thought that we could discuss that - the merits of it in a kind of straightforward way. And you seemed to take it as a personal affront.

And so that's where, you know, that's where the (presumptual) thing comes in. When people are playing both roles then that kind of thing can arise. That's all. This is not a big deal. We (don't) have to debate at length. I'm just saying how - it's how the dynamic went. The conversation was not a kind of mellow well (cost bent) analysis; let's have a rational discussion about what's the best way to do this.

It quickly locked into kind of framework, which seemed kind of inappropriate to what we were actually discussing. I didn't think anybody was trying to off anybody's heads or anything like that. So it didn't seem like it required that level of intensity and reaction. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. Alan, can you wrap this up?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'll try. All I saw - what I saw Jeff doing yesterday was trying to avoid spending time passing a resolution knowing we would have to spend another 20 minutes in January, February or something changing it again and trying to save Council time from doing something completely redundant. That's all I saw.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Alan. I think Jeff the message I've heard from Council is very clear that no one expects you to not be in the position that you're in right now. I hope that's helpful to you and that the final decision is yours obviously.

Right. I'll close it off here. Let people go off if they want. Those people that want to stay with us through the agenda, please do so. I just want to thank

you all for what's been a very enjoyable week, very productive. Have a nice weekend if you're staying on. Safe travels if you're flying back.

I also want to thank staff for their constant and valuable help. Margie, Liz, Marika and of course Glen. I want to wish you all the best holiday possible as we go into the New Year. And I say now to just once again give Chuck a little wink and a round of applause because once again this is his last meeting. Sorry, last meeting as GNSO Councilor.

And is there a light on for that? Do we want - Liz.

Liz Gasster: I'm sorry. This is really sort of another - any other business thing. We can talk about it at the next Council meeting but I want to make sure that everyone is paying attention to this process for taking SO and SG and big capital C input on the 2012 budget because even though traditionally that's something that the stakeholder groups and constituencies weigh in on individually in terms of what their stakeholder group needs are.

I believe there may be interest on in the Council in considering what Council needs above and beyond what's been done before might be requested or required. And I'm thinking of things like if there is a need for face to face meetings and other working groups or, you know, for WHOIS studies or for anything else that you're stakeholder groups and constituencies may not be identifying themselves. I'm just really concerned about that. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Liz. Chuck, do you have a follow up?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Thanks Liz. And I want to encourage everybody in your stakeholder groups and constituencies to look at the budget for fiscal year '12 in light of the GNSO improvements too. You know, they weren't able because of budget restrictions to implement all of the - for example, the toolkit of services.

And we don't all have the same needs with regard to our stakeholder groups and constituencies. Look at that and provide some input. I know we're going to do that in the registry stakeholder group because, you know, budget limitations restricted what they could do.

At the same time, most of us have I think have been hoping to have some of those services available to help us function more efficiently in our groups. And so that's a very important area of the budget to take a look at.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks. And just one final comment I wanted to also thank (Terry) and Rafik for taking - for making the effort of participating remotely sometimes at inconvenient hours for them. Thanks to you all. This meeting is adjourned. And see you all next time.

(Terry): Goodbye all. Hope to see you in San Francisco. This is (Terry). Bye.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Bye (Terry). Thanks.

Man: So we maintain the 27 January meeting, having moved the 13th? Aren't they too close?

END