

ICANN Dakar Meeting
Staff Update on Ongoing and Pending Projects - TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 22 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.

Coordinator: Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Stephane Van Gelder: Well thank you. Welcome everyone to Senegal. Welcome to the GNSO Weekend Sessions. Sounds like a mixed tape but it's actually worked. And we will start straight away with an update from staff on our ongoing pending projects. I think Liz Gasster is going to give us that update. So Liz, if I can ask you to get us on our way, what would be appreciated. Thank you very much.

Liz Gasster: Good day everyone. You can.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: You going to say something?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: Ah, good day. Good day. Just one sec while Marika pulls up the Adobe Connect. Okay. What's happening there? Nothing.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: Yes. Well this is weird.

Marika Konings: Maybe you just need to restart it yourself.

Liz Gasster: Okay. And (that's) how you do this? But why is that so big (unintelligible)?

Woman: Mine's always that way. I have no idea (at this point).

Liz Gasster: There is a presentation in Adobe Connect for this room if you care to follow along. I was asked to talk briefly about pending and ongoing projects. You'll see that my report has two titles. One of them is called the Staff Update on Ongoing and Pending Projects. And my other title is It's Hard to Prioritize When Everything is Important.

We have had some challenges prioritizing in the GNSO related to policy work. The first page of my presentation in Adobe Connect looks at all of the working groups and projects that we've completed this year so far. You'll see that the first about eight or so projects were completed prior to June and then I've put in bold and italics the working groups and other projects that have been completed since June.

The reason why I've provided this list in this context of what's pending is to emphasize how much we've actually done already this year, an astonishing amount of work that's been completed. So as much as we're focused on the enormity of the pending tasks, we really need to recognize our accomplishments as a community in terms of the number of projects and working groups that we've actually closed this year.

So I'm not going to read them. But I encourage you to look at that list and consider the amount of community work and staff work that's gone into those activities.

I have included on the second page a list of pending GNSO working groups and projects. There are 21 different projects on this list. And some of them really when you peel them back are, you know, several projects in one. Again, I've used the same formatting to show projects that were pending prior to June and then in italics and bold projects that we've initiated since June.

A couple of comments that I'd like to make about this list of current projects. First of all, there are for the working groups quite an array of - or variation in the amount of community participation that we have in our working groups. So we are still very much plagued by lack of participation - of community participation in our working groups.

And many of the groups that are listed here as currently under way simply have not have the community participation that they should. The PDP work team has now just about completed its work but I think it was really a core group of about four or five people at most that were involved in completely rewriting our policy development process.

Some other groups had maybe better participation from the community but still not what I would call diverse or complete participation. So I think it's important to note with many of these current projects that we're still really looking for much greater participation from the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And then the other point I'd really like to make about this pending list is the amount of work that is staff related work built into this. I'm sorry, was there a question? Stephane, do you want to manage the queue?

Stephane Van Gelder: Adrian, you have a question?

Adrian Kinderis: Yes, Liz, Adrian Kinderis, Registrar Stakeholder group for the last time. I was thinking about this the other day actually and I was just wondering whether we've ever done the analysis on the participants of the working groups and seen whether - what the percentage of new participants versus existing participants is.

Liz Gasster: We haven't actually done a statistical sample to provide to you today. But what I will tell you is that if we did not have James Bladel, Paul Diaz, Alan Greenburg, Mikey O'Connor, Chris Chaplow, Avri Doria - if we did not have those core people in pretty much all of our working groups, we would not have working groups (roughly) at all.

Adrian Kinderis: Right. So...

Liz Gasster: So, have...

Adrian Kinderis: My point therefore is if we're not widening the circle of participation, then it seems to me that one of the pressure points ends up being not only the staff's bandwidth and the ability to respond but indeed these participant's ability to respond.

And maybe we need to keep that in mind when we're prioritizing our work and indeed injecting more into the work stream because it's not necessarily just those that can participate - not just the staff but the ability for those to participate if they're already at the limit of their available bandwidth especially as we're not widening the circle.

And I think that that might be some helpful analysis to do is to see where we're getting new people from, how we're going to get - grab these new people. I've seen, you know, ICANN is certainly working harder it seems.

There's a lot more publication about working groups and comment periods and so on and so forth. But I think we really need to address the widening of the circle. Otherwise we are going to have the issue of bandwidth from the participant.

Stephane Van Gelder: Alan, you had a question.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. The issued raised by Liz and by Adrian I think really merits some work. And I hate to put more things on our table but this is a really critical one. We need to get - from a staff bandwidth point of view, if we make enough noise and make a strong enough case, we can get more people allocated. That problem can be fixed.

Fixing the volunteer ones is not nearly as easy and we really need to figure out what we need to do to attract more people and whether it's what they're doing with the Board and paying them or some other incentive. I think we would - we the GNSO and the Board need to look at it heavily.

There's a forbidden word in ICANN called capture. And we're always worried about capture. Our working groups are all captured by somebody or other and we're openly letting them capture it. Now in some cases that may be a good thing and some cases it's a bad thing. But I really think it's one of the work areas that we need to put real focus on because it's a critical problem.

Stephane Van Gelder: I have Marilyn then Adrian and I might put myself in the queue.
Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. And I'm going to speak representing the Business Constituency on this particular point. I want to be sure we're parsing this part of the discussion properly. And I say that because participation within the GNSO includes the active participation within constituencies as well as then participation within GNSO working groups that are focused on policy development.

And right now what we're talking about is the ability to recruit active participants in working groups that are focused on policy development related to gTLDs.

I think I'm going to ask us to think about the broader issue of participation within the constituencies which may be where people who are neophytes and not familiar with policy issues are first socialized to information about topics. That's a broader topic I think that probably cuts across the GNSO, not just gTLD policy that comes under the purview of the Council.

So in having a discussion about participation within the broader GNSO which I think is a very important thing to do and I think we face an opportunity or challenge with the massive expansion of the gTLD space that there are going to be a lot of new people coming in.

So there may be a lot of new volunteers if our process for participation isn't simpler than it is right now, we're probably not going to be able to retain them once they are recruited into a policy development process.

But I still think there are two legs to this participation issue. One is the active participation in the constituencies, which help to inform people and secondly how people broadly, not just from the constituencies are recruited into the policy working groups.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Marilyn. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: I think if I understand Marilyn correctly that I'm - that I was about to say something similar. But it's early. So yes, I was going to say that in discussions with a few people from the NomCom, I think it's a similar issue there as well is to find quality folks across the industry to get to participate. It's a challenge not just in the GNSO but everything. And I think that's what Marilyn's point was.

And so, you know, I know that it's an intimidating industry to get into and it casts my mind back to when I first started attending ICANN meetings some ten years ago that, you know, there's a hell of a lot going on and to get ramped up.

So I think there's a whole range of issues we've got to do there. Number 1, find the people. Number 2, get them ramped up with respect to their industry IP. And then get with IQ even and get them working from there. And I agree with Alan that this is certainly something that is important and I think we should dedicate some time into addressing as an industry and not just as a GNSO Council.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. I had a question for you Liz on this topic. You said that those are core people on the working groups. Now we're talking - just to go back to what Marilyn was saying as well. Working groups are GNSO community entities. They're not GNSO Council only. Obviously they're open to everyone.

Actually I'm not sure that it's difficult to participate in terms of how do I participate. I mean that's just raise you hand and say I do kind of thing. But do you find that the core - I mean the situation that you're seeing when you say there are - there's a core number of people that will be on every working group, is there - you tend to always see the working groups going in the same direction because of that and you feel that you lack diversity of views for a better - want of a better phrase?

Or do you just feel that because it's always the same people, they're just exhausted at the end and it's just not fair on them?

Liz Gasster: I'm not making any judgment at all on the outputs of the groups. That's for you as the Council to do. What I am comment most on is calls we've had to

cancel because there hasn't been enough participation, calls that only include a very few people and so there is a limitation in the diversity of experience.

There are occasionally stakeholder groups or constituencies that are not represented at all in working groups so that can be unfortunate when an issue then come before the Council and there isn't a depth of understanding about what's actually under way.

And of course, you know, I am concerned about just burnout among those community members and the recognition that, you know, we have a very open process. We're trying to be very inclusive but somehow it isn't generating additional participation.

But I want to be clear that the points that I'm making are both concerns about staff load and concerns about community load. That I'm not just - just to Alan's point, not just talking about the staff situation at all.

But the one point I do want to make about staff work and if you look at this pending work list that is Page 3 in the Adobe Connect, you'll see at least 1/3 of the projects that pretty much are 100% staff work right now.

So there are some very intensive staff activities. The studies of Whois, the implementation of the Web design, the number of new issue reports we have, the - so we have new issue reports on thick Whois, on uniformity of contracts, on assisting law enforcement related to the RAA.

These are all staff functions to perform. So we're at - it just so happens that many of the work activities that are underway right now are incredibly staff focused in terms about outcome.

So the last thing I did want to mention in terms of the pending work is that I have not yet responded to all of you about what our plans are for the new

issue reports that we've just been asked to prepare. And I do want to let you know that I have assigned each of those issue reports to staff.

So Marika is the lead on the thick Whois issue reports. Rob Hoggarth is the lead on the uniformity of contracts issue report. And Margie Milam is the lead on the issue report on assisting law enforcement in its efforts to address Internet based criminal activity.

I do not today have commitments on when those issue reports will be complete but I do want to emphasize that we're using the new PDP model to try to gauge how quickly we need to deliver those issue reports. And we are going to be trying to do so in about a 45-day to 60-day timeframe but that's just an estimate at this point.

And I'm happy to continue to provide the Council with updates as we've done before. We are working on them with a lack (of days). There's just, you know, so much we can do.

And if there's any - and again, the philosophy that I'm using in terms of current work is in a sense first in first out. In the absence of specific direction from the Council that says no, we have a priority that needs to supercede some other work, we are operating and just trying to get, you know, the old work complete before we start new work. So that's the kind of philosophy or objective that I'm using in the absence of any other direction from the Council.

And then just very quickly to complete my presentation, the very last slide identifies some working groups that are kind of in queue that we know anticipated work is coming. And I - at the very end of that I asked the question other and question mark.

And it is always helpful to have your insights as to additional policy work that you think may be - that we may be seeing in the not too distant future. So

sometimes there's hesitancy to convey that. But to the degree that you all can share anticipated work that we may not be aware of currently, that's always helpful in the work planning as well. And I'm happy to answer any questions anyone has. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much Liz. I have (Kristina), Chuck. If anyone else wants to ask a question or speak, please raise your hands. (Kristina), thank you.

(Kristina): Thanks very much. I was wondering, you know, I'm wondering whether there's any consideration been given or whether we should consider not to put another burden on staff but perhaps to put in some kind of benchmark that after the first three weeks that a working group has been formed to get just a one paragraph from staff in terms of what the level and scope of participation is.

Simply because that would almost serve as an early warning that look, these stakeholder groups are not participating or these constituencies are not participating and, you know, this is - we really need you all to get people involved. Because I can say that at least in the IPC experience there has been at least one occasion that I'm aware of where, you know, leadership had been led to believe that somebody was in fact participating and that simply wasn't the case.

And in other circumstances where we were not aware that there wasn't participation on another working group and I think that might be very helpful because at that point we can say, okay, this is what needs to happen so that we avoid a scenario where six months from now, eight months from now the working group is finished and people start raising questions about the breadth and depth of participation.

The other thing that - and it won't be the first time Stephane so I apologize. But I actually really strongly disagree with you on barriers to entry. I think this

is an extraordinarily difficult community to break into if you're not from a contracted party.

There is a very strong culture of people who've been here since, you know, ICANN was founded, et cetera, et cetera. And newcomers frankly you don't treat them very well. And I think we're going to have to change that. I think we need to make it easier for people to participate. I think we need to frankly abide a little bit more by our code of conduct.

And I think this organization is really, really going to change. And a lot of the type of behavior that has been tolerated in the past simply won't be by some of these new participants. And I think the sooner we come to terms with that and the sooner that we as a GNSO kind of take the lead on that, I think the better off we're going to be.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. What I meant actually was mechanically it's not difficult to, you know, I didn't mean that it was not a closed community. I actually have - I'm sure it is. Chuck, (Adrian), I'll put myself in the queue. Chuck please.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephane. Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. I'm going to reinforce something that Marilyn said. I think I'm got to agree and disagree with (Kristina). I like here idea but it's no easier for a contracted party - person who's new to integrate in than it is anybody else.

The - but I think we as stakeholder groups and constituencies have a responsibility to help people integrate into the GNSO and ICANN in general. And if we don't do that, it's going to be an insurmountable barrier because it is hard. You're absolutely right.

(Kristina): I understand that. But what I'm trying to talk about is something slightly different. You know, it's a hard sell for me to go to people in my community and say, "We need you to volunteer three to four hours a week of your time

for the next at least six months. And oh by the way, everybody on the call is probably going to be really rude to you."

So, you know, that's a really, really hard sell. And, you know, you all - we can get into whether or not it happens. I can tell you that we have people on our constituency who refuse to participate in any more working groups because of that.

So we have got to change that. And if we can't change it, I don't know where we expect it to change from.

Chuck Gomes: Well taken. I understand that. But the responsibility, and I think Marilyn's right that this is a stakeholder group constituency challenge that as hard as it is if we don't keep trying and we don't work on it and try and get new people,

Hey, we can't - we have a small percentage in the registries that will participate too and we have to keep pushing and keep pulling because they are busy people and don't have a lot of time either. So - but if we don't do it in the stakeholder groups and the constituencies, it's not going to happen.

And the ALAC. I'm sure Alan has to reach out and try and get new people and try and I'm sure he has the same challenge of getting people willing to volunteer. So but I think Councilors first of all need to continue to push within their constituencies and stakeholder groups to get new people involved so that the - a small group of people is not overloaded. It doesn't scale to have just a few people doing it over and over again.

And I like (Kristina)'s suggestion and I think these kind of specific things at least will give us information and that is that, you know, report on the level of participation across the GNSO. Doing it early in a working group is very helpful but I wouldn't stop there. I would, you know, they may volunteer at the beginning and never participate again.

So this is going to be an ongoing problem. It's not an easy one to solve but it needs to start within the constituencies and stakeholder groups for us to try and continually get some new blood in there to get new volunteers and to make sure we have representation in as many of the working groups as possible.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Chuck. Can I just say (Kristina), I think it's also our responsibility to treat not only newcomers but people have given a lot of their time already to this community and to treat them well as you were saying. I think that - you know, if we - I mean it's a hard sell for me to do this. I'm sure it's a hard sell for you to do this because it's a lot of our time that we could be spending elsewhere.

And as you said, if we're going to get shouted at or insulted on calls, I forget what you said, then it becomes even harder. So I think we should also set an example and treat the people that are already putting a lot into this community as well as we'd like to treat newcomers so that they don't feel that they'll just keep on being insulted all the way through their time here.

Anyway, I have Adrian then Alan, (Jonathan), Marika. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Thanks Stephane. I just wanted to pick up a point that (Kristina) said with respect to reporting on the working groups. I don't think we need to necessarily wait for three months.

I think that should be part of the, you know, on the regular Council calls that we should be getting feedback from all staff at that time as to how each of the working groups are going and maybe look for some sort of succinct reporting mechanism and whether that's a slide that I can pull together that lists all the working groups number of participants, you know, and so on and so forth.

Something that's very short and sharp that can easily be talked through in five minutes to give us, you know, and then maybe coded - we do a lot of this

in our organization, as we're getting busier and busier. Coded red for a discussion point that this working group is flailing and not getting the participation it needs and bring that to the attention.

And just something that's maybe a visual stimulus for us to be able to act and then go out and dig down in our constituents. So I don't necessarily think that we need to set a point in time but I think it should be part of our regular reporting.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. A couple of things. On the contracted versus non-contracted parties, I have to disagree with Chuck. To be involved in a working group you first of all have to be semi-involved in ICANN and that's an awful lot easier if you actually get to a meeting or two occasionally.

Contracted parties at least have someone who will pay for their trips and can tell - you can tell them to go. Non-contracted parties often are not in that position. Now it's not only non-contracted versus contracted but it's a general trend.

Now there's no question if you're involved in a workgroup you're going to put personal time into this no matter who you work for, no matter how you're compensated. So there - it's a labor of love. I don't question that.

But to get to the point where you feel you want to do that you have to first be familiar with the organization. And it's a lot harder doing that because someone who has only seen a Web site or maybe participates in a mailing list. So it really is a big issue.

In terms of feedback that (Kristina) mentioned, I can't support it more. It's really interesting to be managing a working group and when you go out for comments you get salient concerned comments from groups that did not

participate and continue to not participate in the future or in some cases they participate on paper because there are people who list them as their affiliation in who even participate in the list but there's no active participation.

So the first time you've ever heard these comments is at the end of the process in the comment period. And obviously from constituencies that care. So it's broken and we need to stop denying that it's broken and start looking at how to fix it. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Sorry. Lost my list. (Jonathan)'s next.

(Jonathan): Just a couple of comments and I'm not sure I have a constructive or a way forward. But it does strike me that it's astonishing that we have evolved in something which many people would find very attractive, in other words, the opportunity to participate in the international development of Internet policy in and around the domain name system or however you like to phrase it.

It's a very attractive area to get some experience and some interest in if somehow there's a gap in this participation. I haven't experienced this sort of - the rudeness or difficulties that (Kristina) referred to.

But nevertheless, I think that every one of us has experienced either difficulties in and around the level of acronyms, the complexity, the history or whether it's - so I find that there's a real struggle to marry the two where this looks like a really interesting area to participate in to cut your teeth on some experience and get some experience and yet somehow we don't manage to do it.

So I'm afraid I don't offer an answer but I do see that there's - I can't quite believe that we are unable to sell this - the opportunity to participate in this.

One thing I did see just on - in terms of the monitoring of participation, when I read the JAS report and you saw at the end it was very, very interesting to

look down everyone who had participated and that against their name the number of calls in which they had participated.

And we could very easily produce a little matrix like that for any given working group that had a roll call of activity. It would be very easy then. That was just part of our ongoing reporting. Of any single week they call who's in, who's on the working group and who's actually participated. And that would be a useful reporting tool. Reporting doesn't solve the problem but at least it illustrates where it is.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks (Jonathan). It's useful unless people feel that they're being singled out. And then it becomes counterproductive of course. But it's a problem. I have Marika, Avri, Tim. I think he's joining us remotely and then (Jaime). So Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just a couple of points. First on (Jonathan)'s point on attendance records. We do keep attendance records. After every call Gisella or Glen send out specific email noting who was on the call and also at the end of a working group that information is included in the working group report where it's listed who has participated and which calls.

You can see as well listed according to stakeholder groups, constituencies. So it provides quite a clear picture on who was present. But agree we can maybe check that data or extrapolate from there, you know, regular participants or how those are divided.

On the issue of raising whether a group is under represented. We've done that on various occasions. I know in the PDP Working Team (Jeff) has made several please for additional participants. And on post-expiration I think that has been raised on various occasions that maybe there should be more representation, you know, across the board. But that hasn't resulted in more participants.

So I think one question is okay, so how, you know, maybe - I think those calls for participants were made at the Council level. Is that not the most effective way? Should I go directly to constituency stakeholder groups? What kind of mechanism should there be in place for getting those additional participants?

Another question would be the role of the Council liaison because I think someone said oh, maybe it's up for staff to, you know, alert the Council when that happens. But my question would be isn't that one of the functions the Council liaison should possibly fulfill.

And, you know, updating the Council on activities of a group, highlight when that person feels that there's not enough representation or participation in general in that group. Also noting that there are quite a few groups that actually currently don't have a Council liaison.

I know that's something maybe to look at the wrap up session and just go through the list of projects and working groups and make sure that there is a Council liaison. Also noting as (there are) kind of new Council members coming on and maybe switching over to make sure that there is that continuity.

And there was one last point I wanted to make.

Stephane Van Gelder: We'll come back to you.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Stephane Van Gelder: On the Council liaison I think we do look at that. You know, the pending projects list is very useful for that. And there are gaps there and we, you know, we - as a Council I think we look at that when we can. It's not always easy to find someone though.

Marika Konings: Right. No, just to make sure because for example, IRT (Part C), I know Tim offered to take that role but he said as well acknowledging that he's leaving the Council, it'd make more sense to fill that role with someone else. And as that group is starting, it might make sense maybe on the wrap up session to see who's willing.

And just one more last point I wanted to make, if there are newcomers that come to a group, I just want everyone to know as well that staff is always available just talk that person through what the working has done, what the issues are on the table and really try to help them to get up to speed even if it's later in the process or even at the start.

If there are - really that, you know, might feel overwhelmed by everything that's going on, all these people that know exactly what's going on. You know, staff is always willing to, you know, help a person and walk through the different steps of the way.

Stephane Van Gelder: Sorry. Yes.

(Jonathan): So Marika thanks. I appreciate exactly what you're saying about the way attendance is recorded and that's great. And the way it comes out in the final report. I'm suggesting simply one practical change there.

And when the minutes from the call come out each time, there's a table of those that are in the working group and a record of attendance. Because even as someone perhaps leading the working group, you can then perhaps contact people directly and say, "I didn't see you participate" or you could, you know, you could just - and I don't think that's too big brotherish.

It's just the same as when we're doing any corporate meeting or Board meeting or anything else. It's who's supposed to be on the call and who was or wasn't there along with - and I think you do something similar to that but just to, you know, kind of tabulated form so you could see who was dropping

off the group and so on. It doesn't solve the bigger problem but it solves a little bit of management issue on a smaller scale.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. So I - next just so people don't get worried, I have Avri, Tim, (Jaime), Marilyn and Zahid. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. A couple of things. One, I've been in a lot of working groups and I actually don't really have much recall of people being rude to other people in working groups. So a statement like everyone is rude to you in the working group kind of surprised me.

There's certainly been rudeness perhaps outside of working groups and I've certainly experienced some of it myself. But, you know, within working groups I've never seen it and certainly have been in more than - a lot of working groups.

I think one of the things we have to look at is that a lot of people to participate passively. I think a lot of people do comment when the first reports come out. I think that's one of the reasons that the PDP group decided to put in more periodic, you know, reviews and more times of going out for commentary.

And the ability of any group to say, "Hey, we haven't heard from a lot of people. Maybe it's time to put out something for comment." So I think that that's one of the things being addressed.

I came into ICANN halfway through its life. Certainly I'm not a newcomer at this point. But when I came in ICANN was already well established. And I found that if I reached out to people for help, there was always help and it wasn't that hard to get involved. But it did require me reaching out to somebody.

And I think that we could help the people in our constituencies and stakeholder group. When we get somebody into a group, have somebody

from the constituency or stakeholder group mentor them and be available to answer their questions and volunteer to be on call for them. That as we help each other get in it gets easier.

As I said, I've been doing it okay now seven years. Time flies when you're having fun and all that good stuff. But I know that I was a newcomer and getting involved within six months was not that difficult.

And in terms of the reporting, I agree with Adrian and I think (Jonathan)'s suggestion was a really good one in terms of look at who's participating in the groups, see it in the reports, report it to the Council and know which ones you have to get. Again though it's each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups' responsibilities to get their people there. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Avri. Tim. Can you hear me?

Tim Ruiz: Yes. Can you hear me?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes. We can hear you fine. Please go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Great. Yes I guess (unintelligible) have been touched on. But just to kind of reinforce it, I - as Avri was pointing out that just the - looking at the active participants in a group isn't necessarily the whole picture.

And so I don't want us - I don't want us to miss that sometimes there are more people actually signed up for the group that are actively participating and they may be monitoring what's going on and not contributing very often, only when they feel there's some interest or concern or need or perhaps even towards the end when, you know, there's comment periods and that kind of thing.

I do get a little concerned about that and that I've seen a couple times where at the very end, you know, someone steps in with comments and concerns that threaten to totally up heave everything that's just been done.

So there should be some caution there in - especially with the Chairs and how they manage that so that doesn't happen. But I do think that there might be in some cases more participation than what might be readily evident right on the surface. Now we shouldn't miss that.

And then I think too I agree - that I think the liaison might be able to play a bigger role. I know, you know, I've been a liaison in a couple of groups and quite honestly, you know, paying a lot of attention to, you know, how balanced or whatever the participation is. It wasn't exactly something I was really looking at closely but I think perhaps should have been.

And, you know, reporting back to the Council with any concerns there or working with the Chair to try to, you know, encourage better participation, work with the Council to do so. So I think the liaison can play a bigger role in there as well. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Tim. I have Marilyn next.

Marilyn Cade: For the record my name is Marilyn Cade - for the transcript. I'm struck by a conversation that we are having about tweaking a participatory process in a landscape that is dramatically changing, dramatically changing in the very near term. I'm also struck by I'm not exactly sure where we are in our review process.

My recollection, and I'm glad (Bruce) is here. My recollection is long ago and far away the GNSO Council undertook a improvements process on its own came up with a list of 20 some improvements which could have began to improve our work in performance but instead we were overtaken by a heaven sent top down Board restructuring realignment. And we struggled for three

years to actually come up with improvements and now we're talking about whether those improvements work.

I'm kind of thinking maybe we should figure out what we need to tweak and then figure out when we actually would need to assess the kind of major changes that are going to affect the GNSO and look at systems and procedures that would work in that new environment we're going to face in I would say beginning January and hitting the GNSO broadly across all the constituencies and the stakeholder groups within the end of the year.

But the other thing you need to factor in to your thinking -- I'm going to introduce it in the BC -- is wherever that review - that heaven sent Board mandated review process is, we need to understand whether the timing works or we want to propose a change in that timing or all of our efforts to tweak and improve could be overtaken.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Marilyn. (Jaime).

(Jaime): Oh, I was thinking in the written form in order to make a more - a better participation in English. Well, I would like to add a person note here. And I would like to begin commenting what (Jonathan) said. When I came - when I first came to ICANN, I was very excited with the opportunity to participate in it and that policymaking.

But I remember I think it was in Paris at the open forum. Somebody said or make a comment that we are not here to talk about Internet. We are here to talk about DNS policies. And that struck me because it was true. And I think no one here - we are here to regulate the market. That's the truth.

And those that make money in this market are not only those in the contracted parties. I would say that we have also another (houses) direct interest involved. I beg your pardon for such a materialistic view but those

that have a vested interest in participation is very different from participation out of pure love for the cause.

And I think we should not point fingers to require the same level of participation among all the community. Far as that - far as that - of us that are not directly involved or affected by the DNS market, it's not only difficult to participate in terms of money to come here.

For instance I came here through a 30-hour flight. So and I pay part of my budget here. So it's not only difficult in this sense but also it's very different to - difficult to understand how we are indirectly affected and to figure out of the letter so that is the (unintelligible) how I would be affected indirectly by the things that I am participating in the decisions that I am participating.

So this is just a statement that we should not require the same level of participation of everybody and to judge people in the ways of only participation. But also we should make an effort if we want to be just - we should make an effort to increase participation from all the parties and I would say parts of the world.

Stephane Van Gelder: I have Zahid and Alan.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you. I want to agree with Alan on the structural issues. They're starting to show and I think we need to sort of start accepting that fact. Stephane raised the point about whether there was burnout or whether just, you know, something else. And I think we are feeling stressed in our different constituencies or stakeholder groups.

And so obviously you've come to the new next question and naturally saying well how do we get newcomers. And what I think is very important is ICANN's role in assisting and itself doing outreach.

Now we've seen a fellowship program, which is very good. There needs to be tweaks to it I think and maybe we can get some more information from the fellowship program and how it's doing that because many of the fellows that we are seeing coming here, I'm not sure how many of them are actually interacting with the stakeholder groups, et cetera. That's one metric I'd like to sort of look at subsequently as we go on.

The second is I mean there was a - GNSO has mandated a four month outreach program for the new gTLDs. I'd love to hear tomorrow how that's going because that could be a vehicle to try to get people really interested.

And I think on a stakeholder group level, and I know that the Chair of the - the leadership of the BC is sitting here. I think they're interested in this to see how we can actually do outreach and how ICANN can help us and generally itself do that. Unless you're going to get new blood to come in, you're going to have difficulty trying to, you know, deal with the stretch issue.

And in addition to that I think the way that outreach is done has to go - if it's going to go into the Arab peninsula, it has to go beyond Dubai. You know, as an example. It has to really be proper outreach. It's just a point I'd like to make.

So, you know, maybe we can look at those and maybe we can get staff to give us some idea because I don't personally know how that outreach has been. Maybe that's a solution. It's not a criticism. It's just I'd like to know maybe we can give our thoughts and our suggestions to that whole process as well. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Zahid. Hope you getting all of this Liz. Lots of useful ideas I think. This is a very good discussion. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. One quick comment with respect to something (Jaime) said. He used the term judging constituencies or stakeholder groups. I don't think it's an

issue of whether we're judging them or not. I think it's an issue of whether the policy we end up enacting is adequately representing all of the stakeholders who should have been represented in creating that policy.

That's really the issue. It's not whether they're doing, you know, whether they're meeting the job requirements. It's whether the policy ends up being good and good not only from the point of view of those with money and gain but the rest of them also.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Alan. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Stephane. And just for the record I've started to lose track of what's the focus on the discussion here because I thought we would be discussing the current projects on the way in which we have 20 plus items. And I will expect maybe Stephane or the staff would let us know, example being - actually a relative newcomer to the Council maybe I'll be having now one or two subjects. But so far I haven't heard that part. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: What we're doing is what we generally do at these weekend sessions, which is just kind of brainstorm. I think that's really useful. You're right. We've gone slightly off track on the initial discussion. But I think this kind of discussion is useful. And often these weekend sessions are the only times that we can have this sort of thing because we're all in - most of us are in the same room and we're able to brainstorm.

But if, you know, if you Councilors want to get back on the pending projects list, by all means let's do so. We still have ten minutes left in this session. Then we'll have a short half an hour break from 10:30 till 11:00 and then we start again.

Woman: (Now) we're late.

Stephane Van Gelder: Sorry, yes. We're late. Okay. My watch is wrong. So we're in the break already. So we can stop here, have a half an hour break and then rejoin in ten minutes.

Man: Stephane, excuse me.

Stephane Van Gelder: (Kristina).

(Kristina): I just have a quick question getting us back on track. Liz, to the extent that you can answer off the top of your head, looking at the projects that are listed on those that are currently under way, what would be your kind of best estimate as to how many of those are reasonably likely to be completed in the next six months?

Liz Gasster: One moment.

Stephane Van Gelder: Can I just - because there's transcription issues and everything if we run over too much and we kind of let this run over. Apologize for doing that. So can I just stop us here? Perhaps let you take that offline and then I'm sorry, the break's going to be ten minutes instead of 30 minutes. That was a joke.

But let's try and start again at five past 11 just to give everyone time to. Sorry. Five past 11 just to give everyone time to have a short break. Thank you very much. Sorry. Operator, this session is now closed.

Coordinator: The recordings have been stopped.

END