

**ICANN Dakar Meeting
ISPCP- TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 25th October 2011 at 10:00 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.

(Michael Authorige): (Michael Authorige) from the German ISPS Association (unintelligible).

(Jeremy Wagnum): (Jeremy Wagnum) from Brazilian ISP Association and also presently (unintelligible) councilor.

Man: (Icnovan) from Deutsche Telecom and councilor (unintelligible).

(Yuka Tokarama): My name is (Yuka Tokarama) from the (unintelligible) Japanese aid to national IP registry in Japan.

Man: (Unintelligible) with (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) association in Japan

Man: (Unintelligible) Public Interest Registry.

Woman: (Unintelligible) from IP (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Rob Zolmus): Here we go. (Rob Zolmus) (Momentus).

Man: (Unintelligible) (unintelligible) Communication (unintelligible) Association.

Man: Thank you.

Man: We need to talk after as well just a reminder. (Unintelligible).

It's the line open now? Okay. So is there anybody on the phone link? Don't know what - okay. Thank you.

That may change hopefully during the course of the - I don't know what the time difference is from Argentina but that might have something to do with this.

Man: It's (unintelligible).

Man: Yes okay. This is not the best arrangement for the ISP meeting because we have to break. We have a hardstop at 11:00. We have to be in the room C12 to meet the Board at 11:15 as part of the commotion stakeholder group.

So we are going to have to make sure we are there on time and interrupt this meeting. I would urge people to come back once that meeting ends pretty quickly. So we can resume.

We are currently scheduled to stop at 1 o'clock but I think some of you heard there is the ability to overrun a little. If we need to do that if that encroaches on our lunch time. So let's be as effective as we can.

The agenda for this meeting to start with we're going to have some discussion with the GNSO toolkit and very pleased to welcome Rob Hoggarth to (unintelligible) for that. You are always welcome at our meetings. Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Again prior to the CSG session with the Board I think we should look at some of the issues that are on the agenda for that meeting to make you aware of what the discussion should be about.

I may cover the next couple of items. The revolving door process and that the issue on the JAS group is important to this group but it also is likely to come out as part of the discussion on (unintelligible) with the Board.

Then they will be a report back from the CSG Budget group which I'm going to be representing the ISPs on and we need to look at all of the issues that arose from the recent GSNO Council meetings.

So with that are there any other agenda items for (unintelligible)?

Man: Yes we are speaking (unintelligible) Tony as we have this combined meeting with the CSG and the Board which you are going to cover here there will be also parts we have the CSG. The CSG we can separately.

Man: Yes.

Man: So I think we should also cover some points which are going to be stressed there for example, chair election and these things.

Tony: Okay. I think that's a good point. I mean some of those are already within this agenda. The ones that aren't I'll specifically pick up as we work through.
Thank you.

So with that let's get underway a little late and if perhaps I could ask you as an introduction to this to just give us a quick overview of where we are currently with the implementation of the toolkit.

I know that we did give you a response on what our priorities were and there are still some elements of that that aren't available and like to better understand what the situation is. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly thanks I'll give a broad overview and then we can talk about the specifics Tony that you identified in your agenda.

The toolkit is a part of the GNSO improvements and GNSO review effort that started three and a half years ago.

And the toolkit, the GNSO tool kit was a response to recommendations from the independent reviewer that were approved by the Board that said the key is to give as many possible resources to the individual community to help the leaders, to help the members of the community really focus on the substance of issues and not have to worry so much about the administrative aspects of things.

The concept of the toolkit was developed because there was a recognition that there were additional resource, the dires on the part of the community.

And so what the GNSO Council did was set up a committee which basically set up a structure of committees and work teams that would develop recommendations for what should be in the toolkit.

The ICANN staff conducted a survey and identified ultimately 12 substantive areas either the community wanted to see in terms of incurring administrative support.

And that was approved by the GNSO Council last December. We shared with the community and (unintelligible) the list of the toolkit items and implementation plan for putting those in place.

A key aspect of that was reaching out to all of you as a community to say we have a menu toolkit item and there's a total of 12 that refer to things like telephone calls, election support, Web site hosting, minutes of meetings, recordings of meetings, general support of in person meetings and invited the various groups to say this is what we would like.

First in FY11 and then in FY12. Their leadership has done a good job of reaching out and I think you already seen some of the benefits of that toolkit. I think it's important to recognize that that toolkit included some services that were already being received by the community particularly for example, an ICANN meeting.

The ability to have a phone line, have the meeting presence and the rest. And it also included other components that we're looking for input from you all. For example, in person meetings, outside the regular ICANN schedule. Things like that.

And so the implementation plan went out last December we received checklists, toolkits requested back from the various community numbers.

And Glen DeSaintgery, GNSO Secretary basically responsible for implementing all those PCs. You all I guess are getting today the phone link presumably you guys are using those phone capabilities. I don't know too many of you but in your transcripts and the recordings but all those pieces that sort of have the infrastructure.

But there are a couple of glaring gaps in terms of what was available to a community that we have been trying to work through.

The key element there the Web presence because a lot of the feedback we got from members in our community was we have difficulty keeping our Web site up to date. We aren't sure what organization records we should keep.

There are expectations about membership lists and keeping those up to date. What should be the right way to really develop that?

Tony advised me that one of the areas that you are interested in is the Web site hosting. And what we've done there is internally been working with our IT team to develop a plan basically to develop a template or an infrastructure that we can offer as a basic service to all of the communities.

Most of you are familiar with the GNSO community now exists and we've got eight different groups, four constituencies and 4 stakeholders groups and our ITT told us we can't both customize environments for everybody so can we identify some common infrastructure and common tools for all of that.

That was in many respects dependent upon redoing the GNSO.org Web site which has had some of its own challenges. And there have been some internal delays there.

But we're at the point now where a couple of us had made recommendations to our IT Team. I was hoping I'd be able to share them with you here but I haven't gotten approval from (unintelligible) while explaining some general sites.

What we've developed is a recommendation that says, that ICANN will utilize the new confluence wiki system. They have individual real estate set up for all the eligible GSNO structures. In a sense give you that real estate.

A metaphor I apologize this is a real estate metaphor but the concept is basically is to give you a site on the confluence wiki system that would be supported by staff with a specific standard template, developed with your input as well as other communities.

And then keeping up and keeping that up to date. Basically going in and providing house cleaning on an annual basis. Make sure that all the basic infrastructure is updated and consistent with the latest technologies.

That's still in the discussion phase with our IT team. What we expect in the next three or four weeks we'll get there, thumbs up or a-okay. And what we ask from all of you is one or two volunteers who are familiar with what you are going to want to do with this space.

Basically sit down with some of our (unintelligible) and some of our IT folks to design it. Tony I hope I'll have some - something that I can share with you by email that you can share with the rest of the group.

We've got, if you look at my screen I just can't officially share it with you. That shows some of the templates. It shows some of the screenshots about what a site might look like.

Many of you are probably familiar with the former ICANN social tech system which was not pretty, very difficult to work with, hard if somebody who's not trained in detail to really do anything with.

And the new confluence wiki system that we put in place is much more user friendly. You can do a lot more with it. We've got graphics and things like that that can be used. You have somewhat of a proven technology that large communities are using it.

So it's sort of a takeaway for that toolkit item. I'd like to identify somebody from your team from your community that would participate under discussions, give us some input and sort of act as a liaison with all of you.

I can't commit or really give you a time table right now other than to say that other groups had come forward, the NCSG is an example. (Unintelligible) is

very active wiki user has been playing with their space for the last couple of months.

And one of the things that we discovered was that it's really important to come up with a template because if you don't in the wiki environment people can create all sorts of challenges, detours, dead ends, difficulties in finding things.

So we hope that we have broader community discussion. You'll get a template that everybody can be comfortable with.

The other piece that we talked about Tony was support for elections. That's a toolkit item that Glen has been providing to other groups and we would be more than happy to do that for you.

There have been various scenarios and a couple of circumstances Glen had been an election officer a couple of circumstances I've been an election officer. Basically just creates an independent third party to help you with your internal process.

I will show you all some confidentiality or transparency depending upon your own individual mechanisms. So we're more than happy to do that. As you know generally any of the toolkit items Glen is very happy to coordinate, tweak, update or help you with.

She has in fact played a role in helping to improve a number of them already in terms of delivery mechanism, making things a little bit more efficient.

So it's literally if you want to identify one or two people again just to play that role of interface with Glen or with me, we can really streamline some of those discussions as well.

I'm sorry I wasn't (unintelligible). Finally, the last piece that you talked about and one of the 12 toolkit items was direct grant funding to the individual communities. And I don't recall precisely, I don't know if you guys asked for it officially last budget round. I know the BC did.

And Tony took advantage of his spot at the breakfast table today to meet and talk at length with the new ICANN CFO. That's still a challenging area. A number of members in the community have expressed an interest in the grants and in that sort of mechanism.

It wasn't approved by the Board of Finance Committee for the FY12 period and so it would be something that we'd be looking for again to try to make a case for in FY13 time period which is only several months away.

The key challenge or stumbling block in terms of providing that is trying to understand what level of transparency the committee is going to be comfortable with because as I understand it some of the concerns that have been expressed, some of the obstacles to achieving that sort of model is what sort of reporting function goes along with any of these sources or funds that are provided?

You know what's the expectation in terms of how funds are accounted for? How funds are dispersed from ICANN? You know all of those fine details that maintain the ICANN spirit of transparency.

There are a couple of groups who said, I don't want a dime from ICANN, I don't even want any administrative support because that would suggest, you know, some control by ICANN.

On the flip side, there are those who say, yes I'd like the funds but just give you my bucket and let me decide what to do with them. As we've seen already with some other groups that is potentially problematic when you get into disputes over travel funding.

When you get into complications about action by groups that may be asking for ICANN funds. So that's a real challenging area but again if you have one or two people that want to devote themselves to some broader discussions I would suggest to them the mechanism for that would be in the CSG or in your house.

Where you coordinate your points of view, where you coordinate the logic and the arguments for moving in that direction because frankly from a staff perspective, there are very potentially positive aspects of that but we don't have to worry about all the administrative stuff. That you hire a secretariat, you know, provides you whatever the appropriate level of resources (unintelligible).

It's just that the real challenge I think is in how do you put across I think (unintelligible) that makes sense for that. And that's again I think something that's really important for there to be a community coordinator response and effort rather than some one off requests.

And so I'll stop there and invite questions, identify places where you think I haven't touched on.

Jaime Wagner: Just to make sure that I understand, Jaime Wagner. The Board didn't approve the funding for FY12 or FY11?

Rob Hoggarth: FY11 is done. We're in FY12 now. There was a new process that the finance team instituted coming out of the Brussels meeting and some of the concerns that the community expressed in terms of being able to provide input. And this is back in Brussels with respect to the FY11 budget.

So for FY12 finance team came out and reached out to the leaders of the supporting organizations, advisory committees and constituencies and said why don't you give us a list of what you would like?

In the context of that, not all of those requests were accepted. One of the classes of requests that were not accepted was direct funding.

Tony: Thanks Rob for that update and as usual you hit all of the parts of this I specifically wanted to refer to. And I think we should rather than concentrate on what the list - have some broader discussions. And it goes back to Jaime's point as well.

My understanding of what happened last time around is that there was a sufficient from the IPC for an amount of money that they requested for their own use and there was an alternative proposal which we supported in the ISPs made by the BC for an allocation for all of the constituencies.

And the outcome was exactly as you said that that wasn't agreed. And I welcome the fact that you invited us really to have that discussion at the CSG level. Because I think that's where it needs to happen. So we actually do have some coordinated approach.

But one of the elements I wanted to discuss with you is I do understand the concerns that some people raised about that funding model. Allocated sum of money to some constituents they say you can use it for what you think are your priorities.

And agreed there has to be the correct level of accountability and transparency and how we do that has to be worked through. But within that figure, whatever that figure is. I think there's almost a subset that could effectively be diverted towards some of the issues on here, some of these 12 points.

And one of the first questions on that line to you would be that I know some people are because of their needs and we all have different needs within the constituencies.

Some people are utilizing this far more than others and some people are making quite large demands on various elements of this. And I've don't know whether there is a cap on any of that at the moment from a constituency level. How that's being assessed.

My own view is I think there should be some reasonable cap on that that we will work with it but I don't know whether that's currently happening now. Can you comment on that?

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly. The answer to that is part of I think broader philosophical financial discussion which says, you know, who owns and manages the ICANN budget? Is it the staff? Is it the community and what's the correct dividing line there?

The way I understood it and the contributions that the staff made to the last several budget cycles is that we've looked at community activity which is telephone calls as an example.

And we coordinate because internally from a budget standpoint the policy team doesn't own that budget. David Olive is not responsible for that. That's how, you know, leader of IT. And so as a result the IT team comes up with a budget on an annual basis of blank hundred thousand dollars or whatever for telephone calls.

What I'll be asked on an annual basis is, well Rob how many calls do you think are going to take place? And we'll provide an estimate and we go crunch the numbers and go back and just provide - basically just provide the service.

You know David Olive has never had a running counter that says well it's now March and there have been \$20,000 in telephone expenses. So there's a

potential gap there but the way that we've handle it to date is to say, and what we did for the FY12 budget usually responses to the checklist.

Well is to say, okay looks like you guys for example are going to have two calls a month and you're going to have a call at each ICANN meeting and we expect you're going to have about 20 participants on the call.

And then, you know, the IT goes back, does the math and says okay that's \$200 per call. And so we're going to need and you'd be shocked from these numbers, how many ICANN telephone calls took place on an annual basis.

They'll go back and say okay we are going to have 5000 phone calls at \$200 a piece so we're going to set aside, you know, \$100,000. That's sort of how that process has worked.

Part of the implementation plan was an acknowledgement that we didn't have all the information. You know, once you have the toolkit and you begin to utilize it you might say, I want three calls a month now and we just didn't want to set up a system where Glen or David Olive, you know, had a foot on a meter.

And so the concept and what we tried to do is say we're going to use FY12 as an example. It's going to be the first year the people are actually utilizing this. What's the take up rate going to be on phone calls?

A major part of the expense of the phone calls is not so much that the recording but then transcribing it and providing that to (unintelligible) to you. So, how much did that add to the calls?

And although and this was Rob Hoggarth from the back of the napkin basically saying, okay ISPs, give me a call a month on average.

Now we'll learn after a full year and say, oh now that's actually four calls a month and then we go back to the IT team and say okay for next year we want to budget for that.

Your concept I think about having a cap assumes that we've got a ledger that says, okay you guys just did that, that was \$200 and we don't do that. I think it's an important discussion, should we do that? Is that going to be more effective?

Can management do that when you've got not only eight GNSO groups but in ALAC where you've got (raylows) and executive committees in different levels. Where you've got, you know, GNSO with their (unintelligible).

So I think that's why we're delighted to have (unintelligible) on board now because those are the types of things that he's going to help us understand and sort of plan for. Was that response...

Tony: Yes it was and let me explain my reason for asking that. I wasn't suggesting that we should have arbitrary caps but what I would like to see would be a way of taking some of the contention out of the discussion about allocating funds to constituencies.

And I believe that all of the hot issues around that are about funding things like travel for participants whoever they are. I think it's required and I think it would be really helpful to add but recognize that there's a lot of discussion that needs to go on before that happens.

Now if part of that figure, whatever that bold figure is could be said to provide issues here from the toolkit and there was a slight of that budget where you could say to us well roughly on the toolkit there's an element of the budget you can use for all these things.

I think it would be helpful for us to have additional flexibility for instance, where there are things on here which we currently struggle to do because not everything is available.

If there was an element of budget that could actually help us provide them in a different way. So it just provides the flexibility we want because what the ISP wants is probably totally different from what some other constituencies want.

And if we could have a general indication of what we could use for toolkit, I think that we could make it work much more effectively recognizing whatever that subset of that figure is we need to be accounted for. We need to actually make sure that it's only used for the toolkit and be able to provide details of how we've used it as well.

So I just think it provides us with more flexibility because at the moment we do do some of these things but we don't do them at our own cost.

Rob Hoggarth: Right and I think that's the - that's one of the challenges in blending. I'm not a financial guy so I can't really speak the lingo that well. But the concept of the toolkit was at the very least to have a baseline because the friends from the Independent Reviewers and from community feedback was that it wasn't a level playing field.

There were groups that had more resources than others and so the toolkit was a response and a framework response to say, well at the very least we can get what the minimum is.

We have a level playing field where at minimum you know that you're going to have these available to you. Recognizing that some groups will then say, well yes maybe we want to, you know, do additional things and some groups have, you know, membership dues and things like that.

The idea was to take as much of that - take as much of these basic administrative costs out of your other operating budget and then give you the flexibility to do with what's left.

So that's one piece in terms of the overall pie. And this toolkit was a response to let's create the floor. Now what you're sharing with me is, okay we see the floor now what adjustments can we make in that.

This is not in stone and so I mean now that you all are having some of the experience you can come back and say, you know, we really don't need that.

And then the challenge upon staff is to say, okay how do we manage that when you guys don't - you guys all slide to meeting and do things face to face. Others do it all via, you know, a video conference. And starting to see the differences in how much some of that stuff might cost.

The other piece that and I want to make sure I capture this. The other element that you touched on in the course of the third rail of (unintelligible) ICANN budget things is travel and travel support.

That has always been viewed at least on the management standpoint as begin something completely separate. It's a separate budget item, it's a separate piece.

And I think when we start to get into discussions about here's what I need or here's what, you know, we're handling. Part of the discussion has to be should those two things be blended or should they remain separated and managed in a separate way?

And I think again with sort of the new finance team in place now with folks who can begin understanding that there's going to be a much broader, philosophical and strategic discussion about that.

In your conversation with (Xavier) this morning, you know, there's that sense about where does the budget framework and strategic plan come into all of this? And what's the right blending?

My perception is that the overall discussion is around how does something like this support the strategic plan? How does it, you know, blend into the overall sense of the budget?

And the challenge here is how to keep away from that pitfall, that wolf comes up and says, I have a proposal it's only \$10,000. The ICANN budget is \$80 million. So come on this is nothing.

But the management challenge is you've got 300 people or groups offering and saying the same thing.

So what again, what's the right mechanism and balance for getting those requests, getting the Board and the CEO to fully understand what goes on, where they fit into the process and why it ultimately makes sense for the community organization to take them on?

And again my only previous advice was it's better to have, just again my personal perspective, a coordinated approach, a coordinated strategy to getting that information in front of people as opposed to feeling like, oh well I got this, well I didn't get that and they got this. And then that creates, you know, really, you know, diverse feedback and it diffuses all of the real sort of focus leverage that you may have in CSG or in the other group.

I mean maybe the GNSO that goes forward as opposed to the CSG. I'm not quite sure of what the right strategy would be there. Was that response?

Man: That's very helpful.

Man: (Unintelligible) just a very practical question. So you mentioned (unintelligible) hosting and as I understood there are at least eight groups should have requirements to be covered. So this is for us an important point really so and we would like to go into that as soon as possible.

So I understood you need a contact person. Is that what you said? And the question for me then is then if (unintelligible) point of view. So that means that we could (unintelligible) but if in case we have (unintelligible) pair we come up with the requirement in regards to templates or so from your side that then this whole issue could be covered.

So if I refer to other Web pages already done so I (unintelligible) certain standard which you could achieve with that which you have provided to us and this would help us a lot. And I would like to get into that really soon.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes I mean through the course of today, you know, volunteer and you can just send me that person's contact information.

The arc I have in my head is that shortly after this meeting our IT team comes back and says, looks good. We can handle that because they've got their own, you know, staffing and other issues in terms of support.

My plan that I'm going to them with is that just a couple of (unintelligible) from the policy staff are in a position under our current model where we can manage this.

Well what I need that contact person is somebody who is going to have enough familiarity of what your constituency wants and enough technical facility to understand, okay using the wiki environment versus the static Web site if ICANN is hosting it. I'm seeing some of the templates.

Ken Bour had done some fantastic work. He's been doing some other projects on the new confluence wiki. You can do graphics, you can do other

stuff and you can almost build a Web site. The key being from our perspective that you then have somebody on your constituency who's going in there on a monthly or quarterly basis updating things.

Then at the end of the year we can go in and change the overall template, you know, now it say 2013, you know, there are some basic - adding a couple of extra modules that confluence that developed.

But there are a wide variety of tools that we can go over in a presentation that I'm putting together that I think will provide you a combination of ease of use, a link to the overall GNSO Web site and then ultimately to the ICANN Web site.

And then, you know, when the next review comes along, you know, we'll be able to look at it and evaluate a full sort of (unintelligible) of community activities that are all very evident to the reviewers.

So yes I mean in the short term is I may need an email address I would hope that we would be able to bring this group together in the next month. And the first step would be to share this.

Whoever's interested and if you identify them early enough in the week we can sit down and I'll show you what I've got on my laptop. I just don't want to get behind the - or create expectations and then IT comes back and goes no we can't do that and we can't do that. So that's my only caution. Okay.

Man: I think (unintelligible) before that we need also from our side kind of organization in order to interact with the (unintelligible) in order to build this toolkit and make it operational because as things are now we are (unintelligible) and list and we don't know who has participated or not on that list.

Man: But we do know that.

Man: Well I don't and there this kind of demonstration you should have at least and I think also the record keeping side of should have some very positive guidance as who is responsible for this.

And I don't if it is staff or it's from outside. I know that this is just a (unintelligible) until we require from a (unintelligible) chair position or vice chair position. So this is the kind of definite answer at least on responsibility that should be taken as soon as possible.

Tony: Well one of the thing I'll just share with you Rob is that what we have done in constituency is recognize that some of the elements are listed here and some of the way we handle some of these. It's not currently the best way.

And we've been in an awkward situation for a long time because we just had an intrinsic (unintelligible) as well. And what we are looking to do is to work with the members of the constituency who are the most active and we've actually got a schedule now to have a call to run through some of the items on here and some of the other items.

Because I think we need different answers and at that particular stage that would be when I see us coming back to you with the more definitive information on issues like the template.

So it quite keen to get a contact person for you but I would suggest that we would be in a position to come back with the details of some of those things probably in three to four weeks from here.

The call is in schedule for a couple of weeks' time. So it's going to take us a while to actually refine some of those elements to a greater degree.

Rob Hoggarth: Well I would say, you know, whatever ends up being produced in (unintelligible) I'm going to be sending it directly to you in your capacity as the chair of the group.

For any immediate issues, I know you've had contact with Glen. She's learned a lot over the course of the last six months in terms of improving, making things better. There are times and again you don't know until you are actually doing it where we then go to the IT teams and a couple of groups have said, well can we have a separate, you know, we understand we now have an archived list this is great.

Thank you very much but we also want to have a list that's not archived that's separate for our executive team. Can we get that too? And then we can get IT to go oh yeah, guess what we just got this new application, we can do it.

The technology is evolving so quickly, it's getting so much cheaper that, you know, every six months it seems that the IT team has something new or different.

In some respects that's complicated this whole process because it's hold off because, you know, in three weeks we're going to have something really good. And so at a certain point you just have to move. The great thing about this wiki concept is that it's I don't know, scalable in that there are modules that are consistently and constantly being developed.

And there's no extra cost as (unintelligible) pointed out and Jaime pointed out yes there is a human cost there. Our approach is to in this discussion about the Web presence I think that will answer some of the organizational record keeping issues.

And again if you already have an archived list I apologize I can't - I don't know if you guys have that. Once Glen activates it, it's starting and immediately,

you know, available and people can look at it, you have to be aware that it's open to everybody to look at.

But you know those sorts of things can happen fairly quickly. So whether it's you or Tony or another designated person because you know, Glen is more than happy to collaborate and work on any tweaks or improvements.

And she can at least typically, well not right after an ICANN meeting which you know can typically turn things around pretty quickly.

Tony: The elements of this (unintelligible) really is. It had from the start, it's been great on every front and certainly appreciate that. But there are clearly elements that we're not utilizing fully. And they are the bets we need to come back on.

Rob Hoggarth: Well I know you're delighted (unintelligible) monthly calls, you know, you've set up okay, here are the five minutes. Feedback, working great this is, this isn't we just decided we want to do this or that. Please let us know because we are more than happy to do that. It doesn't have to be just, you know, (unintelligible).

Tony: That's great. Thanks for joining us Rob. It's always good to have you here. So we will do that and we will come back to you. Thank you.

So with that and bearing mind now we've got briefly ten minutes. There are the issues which we are going to raise with the Board and there are certain aspects of the detailed program that I think is going to be the first item on that discussion.

And some of that is going to focus on the aspects of the program that currently (unintelligible) for instance, there are still concerns that the (unintelligible) will probably has or constituency has with the clearinghouse functions.

And what I would see happening here is an opportunity for anybody from this constituency to raise any issues you have with the detailed (unintelligible) program. One of the concerns I've had on that right away through and my fears weren't dispelled yesterday was the JAS working group I think that is an incredibly important part of the program.

And I still don't really understand how that's going to kick in and provide the level of support that it has to for those needy applicants in the timeframe that we have.

Maybe I could ask our two councilors to just tell me whether discussions are currently in GNSO because I wasn't here at the weekend and I know that the recommendations hadn't been approved at GNSO level.

The report has gone to the Board and the Board are expected to make a decision on JAS implementation here. But does that now go forward with the support of the GNSO or not?

Jaime Wagner: I think it will be hard to have full support for the entire report from all the houses during the council. So what I think we should do at least today is to have - to try to reach a consensus if there is something in the report that is undeniably approvable for us.

And I submitted to the list, suggestions that we could approve - we could take a consensus on the lowering of the fee to needy applicants that this was uncontroversial and not for us to approve that was my suggestion.

And I would like to hear your considerations about - I think (Massa) was the only one that responded on the list but that is my proposition and I think we could pass this message on one of the vice chair.

And in meeting preparations here with the GNSO council, with the Board, advance in some positions from the noncommercial stakeholders group that had three points. One of them being the lowering of the fee.

Tony: Thanks Jaime. I almost wanted to turn that on its head though because the point you raised on the list was really relevant one about offering support for that. And I've never heard any discussion against that. That's all.

Jaime Wagner: (Massa) was the one that...

Man: I think the original request by the Board to the - that group is not intended to lower the application fee. That is because the - probably because if we take such kind of system then someone will exploit that.

That the - the developed countries, the applicants from the developed countries will just fake themselves as a (unintelligible) developing countries. That is the (unintelligible) scenario.

And that is something that we have to be very careful about and probably because of that reason there's no lowering fee. Instead the Board proposes that some kind of the alter resource for the money will be subsidized for the needy applicant. That is something that the original idea. That is my understanding.

But just lowering fee by ICANN is a very dangerous situation I think and my question is that there's any kind of safeguard for such kind of exploitation?

Tony: I believe that there's a need to separate out the principle of what you want to do and how it operates because I think your - what you're really saying is that in principle you're not against lowering the fee if it helps needy applicants. But your concern is about the way it will be exploited if that's brought forward.

And one of the concerns I have with JAS the way that was supposed to not happen is that they would have this group and I can't remember the acronym. But they would have this group that basically assessed all the applications for support.

And that panel of experts would have the expertise and the noise to assess each one and to make a decision. So what your fear is doesn't happen.

I don't understand how that's going to work if I'm honest. I don't know how they would start such a group and I don't believe that will recognizing some of the innovative minds that are out there. I don't understand how they'll stop it from happening.

But for me that isn't the same as saying no to a reduction in fee because I think that for needy applicants and developing countries the reduction in fee is something that's really required to help them along the path.

So I share your fears but I'm not so sure that I would say I don't support lowering the fee. What I'm concerned about is how it's going to work and I think we're on the same page on that one.

Man:

Yes I participate here quite a bit in this JAS working group since it was originated and basically getting the (Massa's) point I think that the reduction of the fee would only apply to those applicants that are validated by this evaluating panel which will say which applicants are entitled to receive assistance.

So basically the reduction of the fee in my understanding would be part of the package that they receive of assistance. Another part would be some money from the \$2 million which ICANN has put up for the program.

And I guess they have to figure out how they are going to divide that up amongst the applicants. But that's my understanding.

Man: So it's - can I put in this way. If the panel, assistance for the panel is giving them for give the judgment. (Unintelligible) such kind of exploitations that is my question.

Man: Well the (unintelligible).

Man: The problem - I agree with you the problem - who defines what a needy applicant is because the whole concept is not for developing countries who earned (unintelligible) automatically. No it - the definition is of a needy applicant. I agree that the panel how it will work. I have the same fears that you expressed.

But what I think we should put is that I favor lowering the fee more than giving assistance any other kind of assistance that is, you know, different and would be subject to many more judgments that would be done by anybody.

So the lowering subject to the (unintelligible) who the decision or who receives is another thing. This I think we could express both. (Unintelligible) how we call - two parts, the lowering of the fee and to express our fears about how needy the applicant is selected.

Tony: Okay we need to continue this discussion and we need to get some advice to our councilors on where we stand on this.

We have to break now. We really have to break the meeting and move to C12 to meet with the Board as part of the CSG and we can pick up on this immediately when we come back.

But hopefully there will be some debate on this issue as well. So please feel free to raise that.

And we should hurry along the corridor now to C12.

Just at the end.

Man: Is it okay if I start speaking as you're unpacking because we're....

Yes we're up against the - we've got to leave in about 10 minutes. So I'll - if I give a very - yes exactly.

So we'll get, you know, I'll send you - Tony I'm going to send you something with some questions right now which covers what we're doing.

The background to what we're talking about now is I'm the current nominating committee chair and as I expect you know we have the accountability and transparency review team process ongoing. (Unintelligible) you know very well.

And one of the recommendations or set of recommendations had to do with the nominating committee and looking in more detail at the type of qualities that are needed in the Board of Directors.

And they specifically refer to the Board of Directors because the terms of reference for the accountability review team came from the affirmation of commitments and that only refers to directors.

As the nominating committee as you know we also elect people for the GNSO for the CCNSO and the ALAC. So we would also ask for your advice on the type of skills and experience that are needed for those positions.

But our formal requirement is really only for directors. That's the sort of mandated requirement from the ATRT. So my sorts of questions and I just sent this little list to Tony is asking, you know, what qualities and experience are needed on the Board.

What are the types of skillsets, that's the language that the ATRT uses of an ICANN director. And, you know, you could go down the whole list of attributes which maybe experiencing in the international board having experience running a company of X number of people.

Whatever it may be, you can imagine a whole set of criteria that you would look at.

A second set of questions would be about what qualities and experiences are already covered by the Board? So where are the gaps? And are there too many lawyers? Not enough lawyers?

Should there be more technologists? Less technologists? Does ICANN Board have enough access to technology expertise through its liaisons for example. That would be another set of questions.

And then something looking forward because the nominating committee and Tony Harris is joining the nominating committee for 2012 from your constituency.

You know the people that Tony's involved in recruiting and selecting, they will take their position at the AGM next year and they'll probably, depending on who they are, they may not really get up to speed for another six months off the bat.

So you're looking to - you're not looking to solve a problem that's happening to ICANN now, you know, because the person won't really be joining for 18 months.

So it's a forward looking sort of exercise. What are the challenges that is going to be - what can we expect ICANN to need in 18 months, 2 years, 3 years time? Because, you know, the period that they are serving as a director is a three year term.

So you're looking forward into sort of two three years out from now. What are the challenges that this director should be, you know, have the skillsets to address?

And those are the sorts of questions that we'd like your advice on. Don't really have time to take it but perhaps one thing that would be good, you know if you have any questions if I could clarify what I've just said that's great.

But perhaps you could just have that conversation and then feed it back through Tony.

Man: Yes thanks that's a great overview. I think and I appreciate the way are helping us utilize our time. Just a clarification I do have on what you said.

When you talk about the requirements of an ICANN Board Director are you specifically focusing that on the appointments that would be made through the nom com?

That's how I assumed it was because they had a slightly different, they are bringing something different to the board. That's what we aim to do anyway rather than those that come up through the other ropes. So it's purely focused around that.

Man: Yes the ATRT recommendations are specifically for the nominating committee's appointees and it's - I don't know how they are addressing the supporting organizations and advisory council and how they, you know, hopefully, you know, they will be educating, you know, use the same sort of information but it's specifically for us.

And to try and improve, you know the type of person that we want to better inform the nominating committee of the needs. That would be how it is.

And having been on the nom com you could imagine that this would be quite useful information when we're thinking about who to select or even how to recruit because that's the important thing.

You know you actually have to have the candidate pool there to select from. So you really have to go out looking for people with these types of experiences and qualities.

Man: Just one personal comment. I don't know whether this is the right place to make that but it may be helpful to you and (unintelligible). Last time around we - personally I'd say we did appoint some pretty good people to the Board.

And in fact my experience as a nom com right away through is that's been the case. We managed to appoint some pretty good people. And they bring that level of independence that's required but, and it struck me here when I had a brief conversation with some of those people we did appoint.

I think we are very guilty of just throwing them in cold into the whole discussion. And because these people, they don't come up much very often through the stakeholder model and some of them have little engagement although they would have followed ICANN to some degree.

When you actually step into the heat it's sort of a lot different. And one of the things I think a nom com should look at doing is enabling or helping them to make that initial step from hey there's a good result here, you've been through the process and you're now going to be appointed to the Board and then just waving them goodbye.

I think the nom coms should actually think about how I could help them make that transition.

Man: One of the ATRT recommendations that is - it is not nom com specific but it's about the directors which is actually a Board task is to devise and come up

with a better training for directors and identifying areas that need training on and that could be anything from finance to risk management.

But it also should I think be probably better introductory methods. They do try and introduce the Board members almost as soon as we - as the nom com select them.

But the GNSO members, the ALAC members, the CCNSO members they're pretty much just dropped in and left to run or not run as they can.

And so but this is not really specific to the ATRT but a recommendation that I think that the nominating committee and ICANN should hear is take more care over how you introduce these people, you know, introductory sort of courses or even just meetings.

You know I'm sure nobody's introduced all of the new, you know, the seven or eight people that we selected. It would be quite good if they came around meetings like this and were just shown to you. It sounds a bit strange but, you know, to be introduced to you. Perhaps that would be useful.

Tony: My view is slightly different from that and that was there's a specific training requirement just for the nom com but for all the appointments from the nom com. And I think that that requirement needs to initially be done prior to their first ICANN meeting.

So that when they turn up here they have a somewhat better idea and it isn't therefore they don't have a better idea but they have a better of what to expect when they get here and what some of the issues are before they just start getting involved in the work. I think that's missing.

Man: I have to go in a moment but so if you could have a conversation or it could be here or in email. I mean how do you do that's, you know, great.

And Tony can bring that into the nominating committee process. I imagine and I'm not going to be part of the nominating committee next year but I think you will - the nominating committee will probably spend the next month developing its procedures and then beginning the recruitment process around early December.

That's the typical sort of timeline. So there's about, you know, there's about a month to start getting some of this input from you into the nominating committee.

What I'll also try and do is some of the people have been trying to list up some of the attributes that are currently on the Board. And there's probably, you know, there might be 10 different things that people have looked at so far.

I'll try and get that document to you and you can do - what I'm suggesting that the constituencies do is look at the list and say is there anything missing? That's the first thing. And because there may be attributes of directors that have - are not on that list.

And the other is perhaps to prioritize saying yes this is very important, this is less important, the ICANN Board is well covered in this area. I know I'm talking about something that's completely abstract that you have not seen. But once you see the list perhaps it will be apparent and that would be helpful to do.

It says things like legal skills or experience in international board. Trying to remember some of the - yes...

Yes, you know, financial management skills and I think one was risk management which is of course important, you know, the Board does have particular committees that look at these issues. But I'll try and send that to you and hopefully it will be, you know, inform you.

Man: If you could send that to us and what I would say in return is that having heard what you said we should add that item onto our next conference call. And then we can try and get something out of that but we pass to Tony to bring into nom com. We can do it that way.

Man: If it can be done before recruitment that's better but it is an ongoing process. You know it's going to carry on not just for this month but even the months ahead and future nom coms.

So, you know, it's not finished and done. It's an ongoing process like many things in ICANN that we'll be talking about this next year I'm sure.

Man: Yes well I think nom com is one of the areas that's improved in ICANN so that's got to be good. Not all there is has. So thank you very much.

Okay. Thanks. So returning to our agenda I just wanted to make sure that we have got to a situation where simply our counselors when the issue of JAS is going to be picked up again.

The – we have an agreed view of what's important in terms of the (unintelligible).

And I think the point that you raised (Massa), which is the concerns how this can actually work is the issue. It's not inherently that we don't support reduction in fees, it's the fact that we have to have a way of making that work that is pretty effective in terms of stopping it being gained or abused.

And at the moment we don't have that level of confidence. Is that what you would agree with?

Man: Sir, I think the – at the very beginning of the (unintelligible) to appoint the JAS, what are the – the board itself or the item itself would not like to make decision about the (unintelligible) applications are qualified or not.

That is some kind of the conflict of instance in this issue that they are thinking.

So that the – what I believe is that the board expected the JAS that they have own criteria and they have their own system of judging the kind update qualification.

I'm making judgment about the qualification. Is the (funding) be the subject that the JAS working group itself I believe.

So if the current report that not mentioned about that part the board will not approve the JAS report. That's what I believe.

So whether or not the support itself (worth) the report or not, it's probably not a significant thing.

What (unintelligible) happen would that the board will accept that part.

Man: I think that's a disaster first point.

Man: Disaster (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, because if the recommendations or the bulk won't approve at this meeting, then I can't see how the detailed gTLD program can go ahead because at the very worst scenario if you take a high level view of this, the very worst scenario is that lows applicants require some support to help them with putting in that because they don't get that.

Then I think ICANN is open to a real high level of criticism that is going to hurt the organization.

Man: Yes.

Man: If they don't look after the less privileged you're in this process and we go ahead with the program so that those with lots of money to spend can put in their applications and get in there first.

Man: So the real problem...

Man: Integrity of the whole organization is at risk particularly with some of the other events that are coming along into the ITU it gives them all the ammunition they need.

Man: Yes. So...

Man: I wouldn't want this constituency to take position in the GNSO (unintelligible) that says, we can't go ahead with the program.

I think what we need to do is to basically make sure that what comes out is effective.

And it needs a lot of work to be done between now and the launch date because it's the port due approve to JAS recommendations, it's November and the application window starts in January it's hardly enough time to do it anyway.

Man: And so that the another thing this way is the real problem is whether or not the support is (unintelligible) or not. The real problem is that the we can I mean the ICANN community can have the good applicant support program or not.

And the current just report is not enough for that. That is a real problem.

Man: Right.

Man: So this is the – we are living in total and the – as you know the – that graphic is (living social) so we (unintelligible) in our position and that will (suffice) for time of this issue.

Man: All right.

Man: (She's) at it always like this. We the JAS the JAS group will recommend the several recommendations to the board and the board or the ICANN will decide how to do that.

That is all it seeks answer. I'm quite satisfied with that.

Man: Yes. I understand.

Man: So we cannot hope anymore with the JAS groups that is we have it. So how can proceed with the JAS board that is a very big issue.

We have to give some kind of additional recommendation to the board or else the board cannot decide. That is the real (unintelligible).

Man: I understand what you're saying. (Jaime).

(Jaime): There is a problem that is required in ICANN. It is warrant policy and implementation begins.

And there is a blur line and moveable line. And I think the voluntary part of ICANN is not nobody asks for us to be part of implementation upfront but only to recommend the general rules.

So it think the what is expected of the JAS group working group is the (shift) that recommendations and not implementation part.

And I think our part in this is exactly the same – to be very clear about what we as a group believe it is right and recommend this and what we can recommend that the implementation should take very good care because I think at least I think that the idea of lowering the fee for me the applicant is something that is good.

It's something that is fair from the part of ICANN otherwise we will be favoring those that are have the ability to that are already favored by the market.

And the other point is that we – and I agree with you is that we should caution the implementation part it may be subject to gaming and this should be taken very good kept.

This is not our night of the JAS group's responsibility.

Man: Could I ask what the process is now with regards to council because as I said I wasn't here for Saturday and Sunday, but I believe that there is going to be basically a proposal made to GNSO meeting this week on JAS from council, is that correct?

(Will Forek) do you know the answer to that?

(Will Forek): I don't think there is. I don't think there is a motion in to the JAS report. There is no motion. There are being discussions.

Man: Can I ask what the...

Man: And...

Man: ...situation on this end because...

Man: What we were required to do is to say what is something in the JAS report we support.

Or people are not supportive of anything.

Man: But that has to be a motion surely because my understanding is that the report is before the board, but it doesn't have GNSO endorsement at this stage.

And that was going to be considered here. Is that not the case?

Man: The last communication by the GNSO chair was I can't read it – the GNSO council has not had the chance to review the final report nor digest any of its contents.

However, the GNSO council does not wish to delay implementation of support programs for applicants from developing regions.

So we (rego). GNSO thank the members and (unintelligible) groups for forwarding the final report of the ICANN board for review, but whether it's right to provide comment to the ICANN board or null of the recommendations contained therein.

The GNSO council request ICANN (top) the development and implementation plan following the JAS looking group recommendations subject to the comments received from GNSO community not anymore the GNSO council.

So the community will is being asked submit comment on which parts of the JAS recommendation they should be taken care in implementation.

Man: Thanks, (Jaime), that's really helpful.

Man: Yes following up on what (Jaime)'s been saying. Apparently the NCUC have – has issued a statement of support and so has the new constituency the (NPOC) the (NPOC).

So obviously the community is expected to present their opinion, their comments or their support.

Man: As I said in the morning they pinpointed three points and one of them is the lowering of the fee and I submitted to them to IATF only this one.

Man: Okay. What I'd like to ask is for a few people to get together to develop a statement on behalf of the (ISP)s on this that we should submit.

I think it's appropriate which we should comment particularly having at this focus here and listen to the concerns of (Massa).

What – obviously (Massa) I'd like you to be involved in that because I think you'd want to see your concerns reflected.

But I mean what would you – thank you. And we'll forward it with you. Okay.

And (Tony) it might be –would it be helpful to transfer so. Do I need and (Will Forek), (Massa) and yourself and if you could formulate something and send it to the list so we can discuss it.

And we really need to do it fairly quickly I would think.

Thanks for that.

Now at this stage I just wanted to open up whether there are any other concerns other than JAS with regards to the (new) gTLD program because again this stage which it's our last chance as a constituency to raise any other issues on that.

My concern was certainly JAS and other than that I don't have anything I wish to raise, but this is an opportunity for others to pick up on any other aspects of that whether there are remaining issues.

It's – there is no meeting. We should just move on (to clear) time's passing by.

So the next item on the agenda is a report from the CSG project group and currently working on that is Chris Chaplow from the (BC), Steve Metalitz from the IPC and myself from the (IS) space.

And we've got to the stage where we did an initial review of trying to link the budget with the strategic plan. And it's quite a hard task to actually provide that link.

So what we've decided to do from here on end is to separate the budget into three elements and were each going to take a piece away and through that work through what is important for our particular constituencies to look at the requirements that we have as a constituency.

And it goes down to things like the talk (unintelligible), part of the travel budget to how the meetings are arranged right down to that detail level the impact on us as a constituency.

And then look at the overall elements of the budget where we have some concerns.

So we haven't got to say where we actually divided set up yet, that's going to happen on a call we've got scheduled in two weeks time. I don't think it's appropriate that it should just be me doing this.

So I was going to ask for another person to join that particular thing. And the same conversation is being held in the other two constituencies that we actually look for some broader support.

So first of all I should ask if there's any volunteers. And if there aren't any volunteers I don't see anyone jumping up and down, I was going to ask Elaine if you'd help me.

Man: I had volunteered I have volunteered first.

Man: You have?

Man: I have. But I never received (it).

Man: Great. You have...

Man: Out of the three part that you have in mind.

Man: There are...

Man: The three parts that you have divided budget.

Man: No we've only had that discussion at the moment as to the fact we're going to do that in principal we haven't actually split that up yet. That's the conversation that we now need to have.

(Unintelligible) only (Jaime) and ask (Jerry) I'm happy to share it with you if you're willing to help which would be great.

We have all dived into it to some degree and I've certainly got it mopped up pretty well, I've got concerns on, but we then decided on the last call and it was only our second call at that group that it wasn't the way to do it.

But we needed to probably focus in across the three constituencies for initial throw around.

So I'm happy to share that with you. And really welcome you, you doing that so.

The intention of that is that we intend to put the results of the workings of that group into the CSG meeting or the next ICANN meeting. That's what we're aiming for to try and get some broader approval.

So moving swiftly on. Recognizing people are at lunch this is where we turn over to our two GNSO counselors for any specific issues that came out of the discussions over the weekend or that you need to raise in terms of the current policy development issues.

I have one issue that I'd like to raise at the end of that but I was hoping for you guys first.

Man: Yes, it's (Unintelligible) speaking. Maybe later on it's (Jaime) could cover last survey that I couldn't attend...

Man: Okay.

Man: ...this meeting so he's just (unintelligible), but if I recall I'd like you to have three motions before the council.

At the meeting them all, but first is not critical it's about the last acceptance of the (UPP) the choice created over the last two years by the (CPDP) working team.

So it was sent out for public comment already so I don't whether or not any critical things anymore about it.

I don't think there are the problem was asked to be accepted. Then there is a motion with regards to the RAA which is not in – we really don't have and I think we won't find (consensus) about.

It is about the question you remember that that there was an RAA working people last year to stay out, it's a yard watch kind of amendments could be done in the future with regards to the RAA.

And there was a plan and an alternative plan to come up with a priority list about this (CI temps) which could be amended. And there will be for the council (unintelligible) in motion then for by end by the IPC and it's also supported from our side that the council should come up in your group it's very set up is priority list and (unintelligible) there's a time schedule of the next time how it is how to deal with that priority list.

But this is not agreed by the (unintelligible) party house about so.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. Okay. And so we will see.

So we would be reported up so that it will be properly discussed and see what is going to happen whether they really reject that and it's one of the points which was raised this morning the board (unintelligible) that's will in question this house construction.

Man: Yes.

Man: (What this is about so). This is critical. The third one is (unintelligible).

Man: Just for the record, what you did say, but we're supported for that motion.

Man: Yes.

Man: Right.

Man: And supporting that they trying to (unintelligible) actually checked out I can check still after maybe (Jaime) can complete (unintelligible).

Man: The more controversial this RAA, but I would like to report something that happened in the last council call and the vote that was made by us I would like to (fight).

The point is that the registrar constituency had some direct meetings with law enforcement authorities. And mainly of the (night) state of other (unintelligible) and they have been given I think it was of the previous meeting in Singapore a list of 14 demands to as set by the GAC there was hope that at least nine of these demands would be implemented by the (registrars) as well.

The registrars came to propose a motion with four of and maybe these four requirements for each registrar to have a valued contact information published in its Web site and this would be requested in the future revision of the RAA for each registrar to have a valued contact information.

So this is all. It was something that we – was a move of hand that during the discussion the IPC (Saheed) or, you know,...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: The (BC) I think (Saheed) and opportunity the IPC they voted against the motion. But saying that these four were not everything and I supported proposal by (Saheed) to postpone the decision to Dakar and where for the registrars to give a list of what were the requests from law enforcement that they were not satisfying.

And but (Team Luis) from the registrar refused to accept the deferred and since it was already deferred if we didn't vote then it would be rejected or reject.

So me and both sent to vote for a yes for this small amount of require to symbolize and move ahead it's not block.

So it is so and the motion was approved. But in the meeting here with the GAC from GNSO and the GAC expressed his disappointment with such a small move of hand and the (inextracted) and doing nothing about the other things.

Well GNSO council said that it's still open o move other things, okay. But registries and us explain it our vote at go ahead with something that was small, but it was something.

Man: I wonder if we should be put in a statement out just explaining why we decided to support that motion and the fact that we still feel that the other issues need to be addressed.

I wonder if we should make – because your explanation is great but it's only within this room. I wonder if we should be...

Man: I agree with you. I think it would be mark our position and that is...

Man: I would suggest that the (depo) sit together, (Jaime) and myself. I started to draft something about this position here.

Man: Where we should we – there's only at the council ever I don't think so.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes. Since I won't be able to attend the public forum, I think somebody would – that's what would be my suggestion. To make a phone – and I think I will advise you to join because I think you should rid this as a challenge.

Man: Sorry from the constituency we're due to make an input and the request that came through was from (Jeff) asking that constituencies make a statement on possibly covering what we talked about today.

I'm going to do that well my intention is to do that, but only to provide headlines and to my (viewism) and need to discuss this here is I think that's a complete waste of time.

It's turning the clock back to the way that GNSO used to operate 13, 14 years ago when you basically go along and present what we did in our constituency meetings.

I don't see a need to do that in the GNSO council for two reason. The first is that the GNSO council is only responsible for gTLD policy.

And what we discuss here is far broader than GNSO in detailed policy. So other things we discuss here they have no responsibility for whatsoever and I don't see why we should report to them on that.

And the second is that they idea to my mind of having those GNSO meetings here, public meetings, is to engage with the public on the issues that the GNSO started dealing with and to have that interaction.

Not to do it on constituency basis because what we discuss here we provide basically a forum where we can help you as counselors to understand what the constituency position is and you take that into your discussions in council. You're our representatives there.

So I don't know why we need a separate forum where we should be going on telling them what we do.

And I will make that point tomorrow if everyone agrees with that starts.

Man: I don't quite understand. What would be this other forum? It's this first time it's (going)?

Man: This three – well the GNSO always used to do this before it turned into GNSO. They used to give five minutes to each of the constituencies to report what they'd actually done.

And the – by the analysis is to turn the clock back and say, 13 years back and do the same thing again.

So during your meeting they're now asking for a report back from what happened, what was discussed in the constituency meetings.

I don't think it's appropriate, I think it's a waste of time.

Man: Okay this I know I understand it's because the (unintelligible) of this thinking several times about how to improve participation and in the action with community during those public meetings and so there might be also the those ideas came up.

So it might be helpful so trigger some more activity on the floor in case, you know, this happens so that's the – and people were thinking about the old times and those European – okay that might be.

I think it's a test if that fails, it's not a verse or (unintelligible) skips that and discuss it on council again.

Man: So I should ask at this stage is anyone uncomfortable with us taking that message back or with me or taking that message back.

Man: There's another point on this that goes as I am remember now I understand the whole situation.

There were some items that could be in the agenda for the GNSO council meeting – formal council meeting.

And the public interaction in the Saturday or and Sunday would be enough would be a one way and the to the public to receive what is being and out of the constituencies to be acquainted with what is being done in the council.

And the this would be the other way around a way for the constituencies once they discuss this in their meetings like this one to give the information back to the council how the details of the discussions got into the constituency.

Is there I would say it's a double check on the fidelity of the counselors.

Man: So much space, you're going to have no qualms about our counselors anyway. I don't think we've ever been in a position where we've been misrepresented as a constituency.

So I don't think that those additional checks are required. But that is something for tomorrow.

So we're at this stage now where any other business and I just wanted to mention for (Forek).

(Will Forek): At the very last point the very last motion I mentioned is about just to complete here about the charter for the Outreach Task Force. Remember that this was also implemented by a draft working team under the guidance of Olga Cavalli.

And they elaborated a charter for that and it's about that to implement this charter.

Man: Okay so it's not contentious.

(Will Forek): No.

Man: Okay. Thanks for it. So just for the record and (AOB), there's other things first is to say that I mentioned earlier this morning that the intention is for us to review our processes the way the constituency works, the way it functions, and to improve the way that happens.

And what is the plan to do that is to engage with the most active artists in the constituency to come up with a plan or a list of issues that we need to do in a different way.

And then out of that to bring some recommendations to the full (ISP) list prior to the next meeting and then to look to implement those changes certainly from the next meeting we have.

So that's work in progress.

The two other things I want to mention. One I've just been made aware that (Oswaldo) has joined by (telegram). I think that's correct. Can you hear us (Oswaldo)?

(Oswaldo): Hello.

Man: Maybe he isn't there. I don't know whether he was there, but I was told he was there.

(Oswaldo): No I hear I you. I don't know if you hear me.

Man: And the other thing that we really must do is to thank you (Jaime) for serving on council. Really appreciate all the work you've done there.

And I know from (unintelligible) experience how hard that is takes a lot of effort, a lot of work, and many hours.

And I think we should all offer you our thanks. So I'd like to thank you very much.

Man: I would like to thank all of you for the confidence and trust and support you gave me.

So it was a great honor to represent you all. And I look forward to participate to continue participating in the (ISP) (CP) and I think we can bring more power and participation in outreach to this constituency and I look forward to it.

Man: It's great to hear that. Thank you very much for that.

(Will Forek).

(Will Forek): That brings me to another point which doesn't concern (Jaime) anymore in the (unintelligible) election because we know we don't have election this week that's protect, you know, separate (contra) session after the last one.

And but it would be important also to have (Oswaldo) connected here because he is the one who should vote for that.

Then on the stand in the following for our meeting right now on CSG you'll have in one hour that is a point of this caption because Stefano joined us here this Q&A session and after that it maybe his cast the election itself and I wonder if we should have repetition on that a composition on that.

There were rumors in the air that okay and people will point out their support or less support to Stefano depending on what the problems may have been in the past with him.

And I wonder from our perspective in the eyes of (PCP) from your perspective for example if you could if he his counselors could get some input whether (Lucy) how you see the chairmanship in the future.

And how about voting. I would like – I personally would like to first refrain from giving you my opinion my personal one. I would like to ask you if you could give us some input about that your feeling about that and then I will come up with my opinion on that if you agree.

Man: Yes. Sure. Actually before I do that, I'll open up for anyone else who wants to give an opinion on that particular issue.

But it's not – (Jaime), please.

Man: I am not a voting party anymore and now I could give guidance from the outside to our counselor. I would say that there are two possibilities. There is only one candidate so an abstention would imply some degree of the rejection.

And presently I think Stefano made a great job and partial job in sharing the council.

So I don't see the need to make – I think the point we made that we are again is what made the discussion with the board. I mean the structure of these council is – or the house or this (SO) the (OSO) the GNSO is not good.

So this is the point and, but given this situation the fact that the chair is from the contracted party he didn't use this position as chair this is report I can make in the benefit of any of the houses so.

Man: So that's really useful input. The point you make (Jaime) is very true. It's from (unintelligible) job in GNSO. The structure of it and the way it works does make it really difficult for any chairman from either side.

And I think we do need to recognize that. I have heard certainly reports from other parts of our house that on some particular issue is that it was felt that the approach that Stefano adopted was sometimes questionable in terms of whether it was stoked by violence or not.

And that's always subjective. It's a very easy accusation to it's a large.

The situation is that exactly as you say, the vote is either a vote for Stefano or a no vote. Against for an extension is the other option.

And I believe that by coming along to the CSG session this afternoon as Stefano has agreed to do there's an opportunity for those who do have some concerns to actually raise those concerns with him.

From our constituency point of view, I don't think it sends a good message at all just to vote against Stefano and I don't see that there's strong enough evidence to do that.

What I would suggest is that we listen to what others have got to say this afternoon and we then adopt our position after that.

But I think the starting position is that we're going to be part of the group that has a discussion with Stefano. Everybody who has any concerns has the opportunity to raise them.

And failing substantial evidence that Stefano hasn't really been a fair chair and certainly I haven't seen that substantiated at all, then we should offer our support.

That would be my idea.

And I think even if people do have concerns about the way things have gone in the past, I think asking Stefano to come along to the CSG session will certainly send a message to him that he probably needs to act within even greater care than he has in the past if that's required.

And I silence again it's a tremendously hard job to do that job.

Man: Yes, I think working against Stefano will be really one message on (unintelligible) side.

Man: Thank you (unintelligible). I can go with that, thanks.

(Will Forek).

(Will Forek): Yes, thank you for the supplies. I – so from my experiences on the council and from what I've seen under the leadership of Stefano, there is for me it's one point essential and questionable, but maybe not towards Stefano only, but wholly the GNSO council including the vice chairs.

And that is he questioned how communication is done (unintelligible) council and the GNSO with Stefano to, for example, if (unintelligible) agenda's council there Stefani he is looking, he is dealing as and showing his neutrality, you know, in all aspects.

So he is relying on the vice chairs of the houses, but they are going to communicate all these (unintelligible) to their respective houses.

I wonder whether this was enough from a perspective of a chair that the results could be as expected so that's really in action is in the houses.

So I would like to raise this point because all this fee chairs as vice chairs are (atm) and phase on the bylaws they are leaders for the whole GNSO council not only for their respective houses and so on.

So it also has Stefano in my view an obligation to take care about that the houses entrance are covered not only by the vice chairs, but maybe even more to control that.

So this is the only point I would say I would raise during the sessions so and ask for his response to that because for the future I would like to have that better communication and this has to be also triggered by the chair.

It's a better communication within this regards between the both houses and within the houses as well.

So on the other hand I do not have any – anything against his leadership so he is he was doing well, really well.

So and it's really a big one and then he (unintelligible) very well. So I from now on at the time being, so I would like also to vote in favor of him.

I don't like about the come up as any extension of this because just we as our house, we didn't have a candidate. So we didn't come up with any candidate for that so why should we then come up just now, you know, even if we don't like you.

So this is the long (unintelligible) we are sending to the outside world. This is just my opinion.

Man: Well you have had first hand experience you and (Jaime) better than any of us as to how Stefano has operated.

And I think in summary the results of this conversation is that unless after this afternoon's session in the CSG anybody comes onto the list and objects and the position we should adopt is that we support (Jaime).

But again (Will Forek) raising that point about what's expected from the vice chairs in terms of taking the message back to the houses should definitely raise that because I don't think it should just be the responsibility of a vice chair to do that.

It should be the responsibility of the whole council to make sure that happens. So it's what's raising that.

Man: (Unintelligible) what you mentioned was (unintelligible) position in the Sunday morning when there was a interview with Stefano which is a point you mentioned was a point your read during that meeting.

And I mentioned that I could agree with you and that's an important issue and that's something you've raised with Stefano (unintelligible).

Man: Thanks, (Unintelligible). So with that recognizing we now have just 30 minutes before the CSG session.

Then we should aim – Alain sorry.

Alain Berranger: I'm really sorry, but there is an issue that is important in my view is the ...

Man: Ugh.

Man: ...(Unintelligible) contract.

Man: Yes, we mentioned that to the agenda, you're right.

Man: Yes. Thanks on that. The information that was given during the (IGS) meeting in (unintelligible) yes aboard that the NTIA was willing to ensure (NFP) and open (NFP) (posing) the contracts and the information I got to that with this (unintelligible) would be announced very soon.

The contractors should respond between the fourth of November and the fourth of this December.

It's a very, very difficult issue. I'm not sure we (eyeball) to respond all points and there is a various thing goes there.

Some pretty ones I mean they got one like you. And then they get this side I think the fact that there is a contract is a negative point in my view because I see that as a fully consistent with the (unintelligible) and even with the (unintelligible) agenda.

Is it positive side angle in that my (unintelligible) that the contract there is three function in easy contract there's one easy items inside and one which is a (critical) side, and there's one in the (unintelligible).

And there was some request on the NTIA that (unintelligible) could be unbundled with (unintelligible) will remain as one in the contract and (unintelligible) might you a good thing?

The difficult...

Man: Sorry to there are different...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...proposals there are only one.

Man: There will be only one contract it could be (unintelligible) in one. It will be bundled, not unbundled, but bundled functions.

In the (RFP) and that in my view a good thing. I owe ICANN will be the contractor and (unintelligible).

But I think it's an open one. So we cannot be absolutely sure that ICANN will be the contracting party.

And it makes me a bit nervous.

Man: Well you need to think about who's offering the contract to start with.

That's (unintelligible), but yes.

Man: The (unintelligible) can be easier that if ICANN is the successful contractor after the (AFP) it could be in the more of a (unintelligible) than before the.

A lot if you can (read) that with if we should on that happen to support maybe to ICANN.

Man: Yes the problem we have I think when you get outside of ICANN you just part of ICANN.

So it's almost and so support for ICANN's coming from inside ICANN. That's where our constituency that's problem I have, but I think we can do that as our organizations we can offer support.

Then certainly from where you sitting in this constituency and I think that note would in a position to actually offer support.

But it's really hard to do it as a constituency of ICANN offering support and...

Man: Did (unintelligible) there was some (unintelligible) two (unintelligible) from (unintelligible) which (unintelligible) or be used as also as a (PCP).

Man: Yes.

Man: But we are not requested no.

Man: No.

Man: As it ever seen it's third now and the CIA is going to launch it's (RFP).

Man: But there was no timeframe for (unintelligible). You are right – you're right with the issues you raised, you're right with the concern, but I don't think as part of ICANN we're in a position to do anything now.

I think we can certainly send a message to NTIA from our organizations. And from the dialogue that I've had with the owner, I think they actually welcome that although there isn't an open site so that they'll actually comment on it.

I think you can still submit direct. So I just think it would be really awkward from...

Man: Even for (unintelligible) like (unintelligible), you know, or (unintelligible). It is that he will react because we are not passed to provide any command.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: It's very, you know, yes.

Man: I mean my take on this one personal view is I share your concerns about it particularly to weigh the contract could go if it went the wrong way, but when I

look at who's offering the contract I just don't see anyone else getting a look in other than ICANN personally.

Man: I agree with you, but I agree with you and it is the case. I still will have some concern that there is a contract and it is fully consistent with the spirit of the ISOC.

Man: Yes.

Man: I will be happy to see that the process is more transparent if it was before as I said. And I (unintelligible) contract with more agility.

Man: Yes.

Man: Because it was more transparent.

Man: Yes.

Man: And but until you became comfortable because this is – I don't know how it can be expressed.

We got (unintelligible) status we know that there will be an open (RFP), but it was announced in the risk (unintelligible) eight will be (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: We (unintelligible) to commence in any way and I agree with you that I can denounce this place to (unintelligible) back it's would (unintelligible) there is a two (entity).

Man: Yes.

Man: And I don't know exactly how to react to NCA because there is no it was for (command) and anything in the way. It should be difficult and I want to keep to share this (reflection) with you.

Man: (Unintelligible) is that something that you think should be aired at the public forum that concern or is ICANN the place to do it's my question because ICANN is potentially in a situation where they want to react to the contract so I'm not sure if there's any point.

Man: I don't think we – I have no response to that I wasn't to share my feelings.

Man: (Was it this ask) which is the news from inside?

Man: I would suggest off the record one of the things that what doing would be for you to actually have a discussion with Fiona.

Just to ask if there's any sense in commenting. I think she's here, yes. I was told she was coming, but I...

Man: I got to from the (unintelligible) is (Larry).

Man: No (Larry)'s not here but Fiona's here I think.

Man: Fiona's here?

Man: Yes. But I'll check with the GAC, but I don't think we can do anything on that one and though I share your concerns.

Okay so we are going to wrap up now and you have 20 minutes I think before the next session.

Man: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Man: (Tony) I saw on the check of (Oswaldo) was writing that he could hear us, but he was of the opinion that we couldn't hear him.

Man: And he's correct.

Man: But he raised his hand on the Adobe Connect here...

Man: Right.

Man: ...so maybe he could be heard right now.

Man: Okay. So if you can hear us (Volvos) sorry, we weren't able to have a dialogue with you, but we really welcome your participation and look forward to you joining us in the next GNSO call – sorry the next (BYCPC) call which will be prior to the next GNSO council meeting.

So we haven't set a date for that currently. Perhaps we should do that now. When is the next scheduled meeting (Will Forek) after here?

(Will Forek): The GNSO that (unintelligible).

Man: The council meeting – no.

Man: Do you think we'll be in this one?

Man: No you mean the council meeting?

Man: No when is the council meeting after Dakar?

Man: From now I'll actually check. Yes it is scheduled for the 17th of November.

Man: Can I propose we have a call on Monday the 14th of November?

How is that?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Man: And if we say 1400 UTC is that okay?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Is that too early for Argentina?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: It's noon time.

Man: Eleven o'clock is okay. Are you okay for that (Jeremy)?

Man: (There's nothing left, no).

Man: Twelve.

Man: Yes, but it's okay is it because.

Man: Is that okay, fourteen hundred UTC?

Man: The fourteenth November. Maybe it's (Oswaldo).

Man: Yes it's okay for me. Thank you.

Man: Excellent. Thank you.

Man: Thank you. Okay glad you're with us. Thank you.

So fourteen hundred...

((Crosstalk))

Man: That's my phone didn't work.

Man: Okay thanks.

(Tony): (Oswaldo) can you hear me, it's (Tony) here.

Man: Yes perfectly.

Man: Yes just remind you that this council meeting tomorrow is important that you participate because there is a vote for the vice chair and the candidate is (Will Forek).

Man: Do you know (unintelligible). Tomorrow there will be no vote for the vice chair which we saw on counter with the assistant (unintelligible) in town but the house will vote on the chair tomorrow.

As tomorrow afternoon at the end as I bend you the message you will vote on the chair and it is supposed to be an open vote that means a voice vote so (Klem) will ask everybody and you personally as on the phone about your vote.

So that's a (unintelligible).

Man: Okay I'll be present tomorrow. Yes, sure.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Do you have the dialing details for the call?

Man: Not yet. No I haven't received them for tomorrow.

Man: Okay I'll make sure that you have them.

Man: Okay thank you very much.

Man: Okay thanks. And we will end now and try to grab something quickly to eat before this ESG session. Thanks.

END