

**ICANN San Francisco Meeting  
GNSO Wrap-Up Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION**

**Thursday, 17 March 2011 at 12:00 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.

Stephane

Stéphane van Gelder: (Unintelligible) a formal discussion which is (unintelligible) on the week and take that forward to what's on (unintelligible). So that's what we'll be doing and we'll start in five minutes. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes.

Man: I fly out tomorrow evening.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: Are you Seattle or Portland?

Man: Portland.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay, thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Councilors please make your way to the table and we'll look to start in five minutes. Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay I suggest we start. There's a lot of people in the room and we've got an extremely high turnout so I suggest that we just make this an informal discussion for this wrap up meeting. And one of the questions we might ask ourselves is do we need to have a wrap up meeting.

But, yes? Go on, Bill. Oh, meeting adjourned, thank you very much everyone and see you all in Singapore.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Sorry?

Man: But lunch continues?

Stéphane van Gelder: So joking aside we have a few topics that we've been discussing in the leader's list that we might want to talk about today. Once again this is a very informal open discussion; please, you know, feel free to get onto any other topic that you might want to discuss.

I suggest that the (unintelligible) that's in an hour's time and but obviously we have a (unintelligible) be there but (unintelligible) this

meeting if you want that so we will see how that goes maybe (unintelligible) no further discussion.

So some of the items that we were considering deciding, the first item is just the usual how's the meet gone kind of items. So a summary of are we (unintelligible), our work session during last weekend. Is there anything that we think we should do differently in Singapore in terms of the agenda? I will be (unintelligible) to work on.

At this point I'd like to make and stress is that - and this is something that we've been doing behind the scenes all week is that (unintelligible) stand extremely strong on the way the Council meeting fits into the general agenda.

So for this meeting because of the disruptions to the meeting obviously with the security concerns and requirements due to President Clinton's speech we had to move out of the main room which is a first since I've been on the Council.

And we almost didn't have scribes; we had to fight tooth and nail to retain our scribes. We had our sessions with other groups disrupted. Each individual stakeholder group and constituency during constituency day which was Tuesday, you had your sessions I think disrupted as well; certainly ours was for the registrars.

So in general that is something that I intend to be extremely watchful of for Singapore. The work that the GNSO Council does, which I feel is crucial to the community and has a crucial place in this community is given proper - a proper forum. And I don't think the way it happened this time is something that we want to accept going forward.

And so - and one last point that we might want to discuss and then I'll open it out - I'll open it up for discussion is our weekend social event dinners. So for this meeting because our dinner was the Board was cancelled we just had one event which was a Sunday. I felt that actually (unintelligible) because it freed up some time and it was more comfortable.

But that of course may change because we rotate with the Board now at the other meeting I believe. I don't know exactly. So in Singapore we could end up having once again the two Saturday (unintelligible).

I certainly continue to think that the social dinner is a great event. It's something that I always look forward to; I enjoy the social free unwind time that we spend together and it's certainly something that I'd like to see going forward.

So with that let's open it up for discussion and if anyone has any points they would make about our week's work please do so. Wolf.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Thank you Stéphane. With regards - just a point with regards the new kind of session discussing motions (in advance) I welcome this opportunity as well. And I find it very useful to discussing it once and then to find out (unintelligible).

But I would like to say that due to the time (unintelligible) time schedule with regard to the constituency day there's still uncertainty after that discussion because it may happen so from day to day that, you know, each constituency just caution there may be some - definitely had

some (unintelligible) influence on that with regard to the motions which we could not have in Council (unintelligible).

So on one hand I welcome the discussion on the other hand it's, you know, they might pick even also (unintelligible) chance that (unintelligible) to the motions could be implemented on (unintelligible) as well. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you Wolf. Anyone else? Marika. (Unintelligible) forgot your name.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just a comment I think on the sessions that we had on the different proposed final report which I think while really productive and I think the working group members really appreciated as well the feedback received from the Council and I think it really helps as well to already socialize some of the recommendations that are moving their toward this Council.

I'm wondering as well going forward if it may be possible to distinguish between, you know, just working group updates which are normally shorter and, you know, probably 30 minutes are sufficient to go through the update and just tell the Council where the stand and allocating more time where there's actually a report with recommendations because I think working groups really benefit from the feedback and input from the Council on some of the items that were there (unintelligible).

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, very good. Thank you very much. John.

John Berard: On a lighter note it was clear that we're not sitting where you could see everybody.

Stéphane van Gelder: That is true but the rules actually state that the Council Leadership Team should see everyone so...

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: ...no one's expecting anyone to have a 360 rotating head it's just that between the three of us we should see everybody. And Mary and Jeff were doing a great job of telling me who was raising their hands. (Unintelligible) I apologize for that but that's obviously all part of this (unintelligible).

John Berard: (Unintelligible) talking about the motions; I think it's a good idea to understand (unintelligible). No, no, anyway it gives (unintelligible) to be more focused on our discussion. It has a secondary sense that of the meeting. I do think that the presentations are (unintelligible) because (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...so appreciate it.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks John. That's absolutely right. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes (unintelligible), you know, (unintelligible) but certainly if you think (unintelligible) and something that's casual (unintelligible) full (unintelligible) that we can choose from (unintelligible) even the ones that do. So (unintelligible).

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, good points. (Unintelligible).

(Jay): (Unintelligible) the motion (unintelligible) also the working group (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) some kind of general view or summary of all the work that has taken place (unintelligible). Okay, there are some presentations (unintelligible) but what is in place?

What is the - the amount of work that the staff is (tackling) with. And I think just to (unintelligible) this would help prioritization of our work and (unintelligible) councilors.

And I wonder if we could have some discussion (unintelligible) once there is - we are presented with all the work as an informal exchange of ideas that (unintelligible) the priorities are (unintelligible). And this would help both chair and staff to (unintelligible) were the Council thinks of being prioritized if this is not obvious.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks (Jay). This, I mean, to answer (unintelligible) earlier question about the useful (unintelligible) once again it's proving extremely useful. It was - it's been this way for the last couple of meetings. And the informal discussion actually brings out a lot of great ideas. Definitely something we can carry on doing. Mary.

Mary Wong: (Unintelligible) talk about (unintelligible). So the other (unintelligible) work on the Singapore schedule overall - to sum up on Jeff's point about the councilors social agenda I guess one thing unless people say otherwise we are going to try and continue that even if we do have a Board social event say following (unintelligible) night.

And one thing I was thinking about for Singapore particularly is that if we did something more informal and casual that's - Jeff, I think that was your question; I don't know if that's the question of most of the people at least something worth trying.

I do want to say and talking with staff and others that there are some limitations depending on things like the size of the group down to things like whether a restaurant will split bills especially if some people drink and some people don't as well as things like (unintelligible) for example there's a couple of other conventions going on at the same time as ours CommunicAsia being the big one.

So occasionally getting in, especially if we don't know their numbers, is going to be a problem. I think that's a constant problem; I just want to bring it up because I think that's something everybody should be aware of even though other requests I think will be taken into account and (unintelligible).

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) because, I mean, I think - I just wanted to make a couple of reflections. And I haven't pre-prepared these, there's a lot of thoughts so these are a little off the cuff (unintelligible) themes that we've been discussing.

Now certainly the dinner with the GNSO just put aside the cost issue for a moment I thought was an immensely valuable evening. I thought it was pleasant. I thought it was really good to get to know a couple of you. I thought it was very useful.



I think - I was just thinking about this for a moment as Mary was talking (unintelligible) or something in another - other environment the way this one might handle this is to - and I know I could be opening up a huge can of worms here - is to just agree on a budget in advance and then work with that.

And, you know, when it's gone, it's gone. I mean, you put - everyone agrees what we're spend on a one-by-one basis (unintelligible) parameters of the outset rather than having (unintelligible) at the end. So that's just one thought on how that might be a way to deal with it.

I certainly feel that the dinner with the Board was very, very useful as well. And I like the fact that (unintelligible) and it wasn't in either case overly cliquy and it was an opportunity to do things. The discussion of the motions was very, very useful to work those through. I think I'd personally like to - I'm sure you'll join me in recognizing that Stéphane seems to do a very good job.

And I didn't have the pleasure of experiencing the previous chair obviously but, you know, Stéphane has done a very good job of steering us through some rather tricky issue both in terms of content and timing. So I'd like to offer a personal - and I hope you'll back in a (vote) of thanks to him and of course to the staff who support the whole thing as well.

So those are my reflections on a largely positive level. I think the one other point I'd make is no one should underestimate the challenges of this environment. I mean, I hope you'll take this in the right spirit but I consider myself to be, you know, relatively competent, experienced

and articulate and nevertheless there's a lot to cope with here in terms of volume, wording, history, politics.

And so it's a very, very challenging environment to work in. And to the extent that we can all assist one another in managing that and perhaps Jaime's idea of an executive summary is one way of helping to pull that all together.

But I think the one - probably the most negative impression I've got is that we tend to sometimes focus - and I know this is not lost on anyone and it's not an earth-shattering revelation - but on some of the ping-ponging in and around more technically-related issues rather than the desired outcomes.

So those are just a couple of thoughts, largely positive, about my first experience on the Council in person but perhaps also a couple of reflections on where we might try and improve. Thank you for indulging me.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you very much for those kind words, Jonathan. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. For a long time I found the weekend meetings among the most productive of the week. And I thought that had been lost in the last couple of meetings. It was back in spades this time and I found the weekend discussions incredibly useful and beneficial.

In terms of the GNSO Council meeting itself I'm not particularly worried if we're in the main room as long as we're in a room that's well done and more than enough seating for the people we expect.

That being said I would really like to see it not scheduled against other GNSO activities. You know, in my case I'm used to running out halfway through the meeting because of an ALAC thing. This time it was an ALAC registrars and to schedule a registrar's activity against the Council I think is counter productive. Overall it's been a great week though.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes just to - (unintelligible) you're next. But just - I just wanted to pick up on that because I think there's a perception, I mean, obviously if we're in a room the second down and there's running water and electricity that's fine.

But I think there's also a perception that the work we do is, I mean, the GNSO is probably the busiest of the SOs. It's crucial to the work that ICANN does in general. And I don't think it hurts to recognize that. That's what I was saying earlier on.

We've traditionally had the main room for our open Council meeting. We I think find it extremely useful to have that face to face interaction. I also think it's useful to have it with the community. And I think it's useful to have it in that kind of environment. Obviously if we can't do it, I mean, these were extreme circumstances here so we recognize that.

The other point you make about clashes is actually a lot more important to me because Olga can speak to this; we struggled like crazy here and this was the case for Cartagena as well which is a meeting that I helped organize when I was Vice Chair and working on the agenda.

For the last two meetings we struggled like crazy not to have clashes. And the reason for that is that the meeting - the general meeting agenda is just getting fuller and fuller and fuller. So we're now, you know, we get into fights with other groups because they want an RAA thing or they want a new gTLD thing that's going on.

And we'll drain, you know, it risks draining interests away from the open Council meeting. So it's something that we really - I know it goes on behind the scenes so a lot of this goes on unseen but it's something that we're very careful of.

Alan Greenberg: A quick follow up. There was nothing in what I was saying that was aimed at the people here. Wearing my other hats I've had enough of the scheduling problems that I know we are simply told that's what it is take it or leave it. I was just - this was the first time I saw a GNSO Council conflict.

Stéphane van Gelder: No I think what you said is very useful. It wasn't taken personally or anything. I'm just outlining the work that goes on. Bill, sorry. Please hog the mic.

William Drake: I forgot what I was going to say. Yes to the presentations, yes to the pre-meeting motion discussions; that was very helpful. And be good for the stakeholder groups. Yes to praise the Chairman, all hail to the Chairman although not quite as panoptic (unintelligible).

With regard to the dinner personally I thought the restaurant was very well chosen. I was very pleased to be there. And I'm - even though I'm noncommercial and paid less than most people here I'm perfectly

willing to spend \$30 more once every three or four months on a meal to be somewhere with people.

So I wouldn't make this too complicated for the organizers. I think it was difficult enough to find something that works for everybody. And if we're going to start getting into setting all kinds of criteria and trying to disaggregate the bill and all that it's going to be really difficult.

I would raise different points. On the - on the scheduling thing certainly I do recognize the (unintelligible). One thing I would really emphasize I am so much happier with the afternoon meetings. I do - I really hope we do not go back - please god do not take us back to 8:00-12:00 that was a horrific way to spend four hours trying to get the crust out of your eyes and deal with jet lag while you're sitting in front of people is just pathetic.

The other thing I would say is kind of - and this is not something - I don't know how much the Council can be involved in this but it's probably more of a staff issue but maybe we can work with the staff. We've talked repeatedly - and I'm sure the conversation went on for years before I got here - about the transparency of our activities in terms of newbies.

And we had at our meeting, the noncommercial, a number of new people show up who I spoke with. And someone actually was saying, you know, I can't figure out what the hell you guys are doing. And it's just so hard to just look at the agenda and get the background and have enough of a sense of what's happening.

And I know that there's been work going on with the Web site. I don't know what the final revision is going to look like and all that. But I sure hope that we can find some way prior to these meetings particularly since we're, you know, when we - especially when we go to developing countries where we're supposed to be doing outreach - I'm sure, Marika, you have the answer.

So I just wanted - I'll pinch the point - you know, I know that when we were in Nairobi for example I had multiple conversations with local African people who were showing up and saying they could not figure out what the hell this meeting was about and what we were doing and so on. They couldn't even figure out the agenda and where to go.

I had similar conversations - well one in Cartagena. I think this happens over and over and over. So some way of like before we do a physical face to face meeting having some kind of like easily digestible framing thing that people can look at as background that says, you know, here are the main issues and here's what's going on and here's what will be voted on etcetera and why that matters in a more digestible way would really be helpful because this is really - it's tough.

When people come to you, you know, new people and they're - we're trying to get people involved and they're just so discouraged, you know, it's just crazy that we make it so difficult for people to understand what's happening. They feel like they're walking in on arguments that have been happening for three years which often they are, that's right, you know, but that's the point right?

So they, you know, they're like slicing into this long running process at a particular point in time and they just can't figure out what it's about and why are these people talking to each other this way.

It's - we've got to find some way to make this more accessible, we really do for new people because otherwise I think we just don't get the value of, yes, I mean, flying around the world and going to nice places is fun but if we're trying to do outreach I don't think it works effectively.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks for making that very important point. Marika, did you want to just answer that and then I'll go to John.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. I completely agree that I think it's very important to make this more accessible. I think, you know, one tool that we already use and I think is considered useful is the Policy Update Webinar that we run just prior to the ICANN meeting which is really intended to give people an insight of the issues that are going to be discussed and, you know, provide information on where those issues stand and, you know, what opportunities are at the meeting.

Something we used to do that we actually didn't do for this meeting and maybe it's something to bring back we would prepare like a little - I think it would be a two page document for any issue that was up for a vote for the open Council meeting which would very briefly say, you know, what is it about, what is the Council going to decide, what impact could this have and, you know, how can you participate.

Maybe that's something to consider bringing back for the open Council meeting where, you know, we can provide that to people.

Stéphane van Gelder: Why did we stop doing that?

Marika Konings: Recently - I was doing that for the previous meetings. And I actually never got any feedback from anyone say hey great or hey don't like it all. So I don't even know if people were looking at it but we're providing it in the room and...

Stéphane van Gelder: Because those things were there. When I first joined the Council like the first two meetings I did...

Marika Konings: Right.

Stéphane van Gelder: ...those things were there and they were extremely useful. Maybe, you know, no one made that point but I would definitely say that that is useful.

Marika Konings: Okay that's very helpful feedback that I think for this meeting has really been a resource issue, you know, with all the stuff going on doing that on top of that, you know, preparing that as well does take additional time.

I think we can definitely try to as well make the agenda more clear and maybe have a kind of newcomer agenda where I think on the Council agenda we have already tried to do that trying to explain what is that we're going to discuss, you know, what is the agenda, why is it important.

And maybe we should try to do that for all the GNSO sessions that take place throughout the week and put them on, you know, one kind of agenda for people specifically interested in the GNSO.



I think we definitely can do a better job and I hope we have some building blocks that we can use. And, you know, any further input I think we'd definitely appreciate on how to make it work better.

William Drake: If you'll allow me a quick two-finger response. I appreciate it. I know you guys are doing a hell of a lot of work on this kind of stuff and I'm not in any way giving you a hard time about it. I'm just saying, you know, when you live inside this world you understand what's being provided and how it works etcetera.

A newbie might not even, you know, know to go dig through the Web site and find a Webinar and realize what a Webinar is and why it's useful. I mean, isn't there - is it inconceivable - I know we hate paper but is it inconceivable that like there be a three-page flyers that would be in a registration packet that would say this is what the Council is doing or something?

I just - we're always assuming that, you know, that these things are clear to us so it should be clear to other people too. It's not that easy to navigate through all this stuff. I mean, and the Webinars, frankly, often they're more drill-down into particular things that like a newbie - they wouldn't even feel like oh I'm going to go to that necessarily.

Sometimes they might feel - I've talked to people that were intimidated, I mean, particularly in Africa when we were in Nairobi. I talked to a number of people who were just really intimidated by trying to get in here, you know. And they just figured - these people who were so crazily into this technical stuff and my god what are they doing and I don't know how to begin.

And that sense of I don't know how to begin is so dis-empowering, you know, and so, I mean, just the easier, I mean, this doesn't have to be for everybody for if some really simple accessible ways of handing something to people that they can actually look at concretely that would make them feel queued into something I think it would really help.

Marika Konings: Just one more comment and I definitely agree; I think it's very helpful. One thing I wanted to mention as well I actually did do a session on Sunday that was specifically intended for the newcomers because they had several sessions going on and, you know, what is ICANN, what is the meeting about.

And it was the first time as well that I actually was invited to do a little presentation on, you know, what does the GNSO do this week and what are, you know, the main sessions taking place and what they discuss. And so at the meeting itself - and I know other colleagues have done that in previous meetings as well - we do try to cover that.

And, I mean, it might still be a lot of information and people sitting there, you know, to hear about GNSO, ccNSO and then all the meetings that are going on and maybe indeed, you know, the paper copy helps as well. I think the different elements, you know, hope we help and I think the newcomer session is as well a way where we're trying to get that information out.

And just to mention as well - and I think that's something maybe we should communicate better or spread out. We ran a while ago a Policy Development at ICANN Webinar which was like a 19-minute session

which went into quite great detail, you know, what do the different supporting organizations do? How do they do policy development? How can you get involved? How do you participate?

And that session was recorded. And, you know, I don't think we need, you know, we can run it again but basically (people) interested. But I think we need to be better as well in getting that kind of educational material out maybe through constituencies as well so they can have it on their Web site posted with a link and say if you want to learn, you know, more about, you know, what we do and how to get involved have a look first here.

And then, you know, I think we as policy staff are more than happy to have as well, you know, a set of Webinars or talk to people that want to learn more or, you know, (unintelligible) conversations or presentations on - because I think it's in our interest as well in getting more people involved because having more volunteers will take up, you know, part of the burden that we have on doing some of the work as well so we're in the same camp.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you. I've got a queue so John, Wendy, Marika - you've just - yes, Mary, Edmon, Ching and Liz.

John Berard: The...

Stéphane van Gelder: And Chuck.

John Berard: The problem of communication is not an epidemic it's a pandemic. And I think there was no sharper anecdote than the interview that was posted in the Chronicle this week with Rod which the caveat was that it

was edited for length and clarity. Just as a - if anecdotes can drive decision making perhaps that might be helpful.

The one dangling participle that I would like to come back to is the territories' and countries' staffing. We can bring it up now or - there were two people who had no designation. We were going to try and find out what designation and then make some determination. And my interest in this is in trying to ensure - assure to getting Chris Chaplow on that team. So any update on that?

Stéphane van Gelder: No not yet obviously because Glen sent out a message to the volunteers and the group - well the whole group - is there a mailing list for that, Glen, or did you send that separately?

Glen DeSaintgery: No there's no mailing list that I know of yet. It is the ccNSO project. And it is the - main part of the administration is being done by the ccNSO. And those men are Garth Miller and Jothan Frakes...

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...came to me via the ccNSO so I've gone back to the two of them personally asking them to let me know immediately and urgently what their affiliation is because we have to make a choice.

Stéphane van Gelder: So John...

John Berard: That means that the ccNSO asked the GNSO to provide eight volunteers...

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes.

John Berard: ...and two of them are going to be nominated by the ccNSO...

Stéphane van Gelder: No, no, no...

Glen DeSaintgery: No.

Stéphane van Gelder: They forwarded some - those two names were forwarded.  
But we set our own volunteers, I mean, we - had the volunteers come from the GNSO community and the only thing the ccNSO has asked is that we limit it to eight.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Where it had been - originally it was six; I asked for eight because it's a better fit because we have four stakeholder groups. So I wanted it equal for all the stakeholder groups just like we did for the DSSA group.

Can you ask the person that you mentioned to volunteer?

John Berard: The odd thing about this is that on Monday I checked out a wiki and his name was on the list. And then - so I just put it to bed, figured we'd deal with it when it came up. But then when it came up his name wasn't on the list.

Glen DeSaintgery: His name came in late Stéphane and he - it was put on the list late. And I think there were one of two names that were taken off. And I think in that probably Chris's name got deleted so I think it was just

unfortunately an administration error. But we can put Chris's name back on again and then...

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes let's...

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery: ...about these other two people.

Stéphane van Gelder: Can you do that Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: Is that all right?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you very much. Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: I think we used our time efficiently and I liked that we didn't have lots of the repeat presentations that have plagued some of our past meetings. That seems to tie in perhaps to the concern that that made the meeting of Council that much more opaque for newcomers.

But I wonder if there's a good way to divide those because the councilors don't need to, in general I hope, sit through the introduction of issues and the background that is most helpful to the newcomer because if we've been paying attention we've seen them through the multiyear process that has taken them to where we are.

So my suggestion is let's keep the streamlined presentations to Council letting us make efficient use of our time among the other groups and think about whether that means finding another vehicle for communication to some of the newcomers about what it is that Council does and how they can participate in some of the - because we do need them as well to - when we have working groups need to invite participation from our volunteer pools.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you. Mary. (Unintelligible) thank and then Mary.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, thank you. Thank you for...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: ...at the Non Contracted Parties House you realize. You know, I wanted to follow up on Marika's point because I think all the suggestions were suggestions I was going to make and with a couple of additional comments.

I think a few of the newcomers that came to our SG and constituency meetings on Tuesday said that they found that the newcomer sessions - because there's more than one - are very helpful at this meeting. And I've not been at some so I can't compare. But we definitely heard that from more than one person.

So I think that presentation that you did and however you refine it and change it or whoever else is doing it next time is very, very helpful. I think that coupled with the other suggestion that the briefing papers or

the short summary we made available to people coming to our sessions - if I think we knew that as the Council that that's going to be the case for every meeting then maybe we could have a short little bullet point message before each ICANN meeting saying to our members here's the schedule, handouts will be available at these sessions. So that's one possible regular practice we can do.

I think the other one would be going to Wendy's suggestion or comment about not repeating the presentations. I really think - I agree because that contributed to the efficiency that we had here. But with respect to those that could not be here for our weekend sessions, for example having been following up all that much I wonder if copies of those presentations could be made available on a regular basis right before the open Council meeting.

Because then they don't have to sit through the presentations as they're talking through - discussing the motions if there is one if they could at least get through the slide deck.

And I know sometimes that's available on the schedule after meetings. Some of them are, some of them are not. And I think a lot of that is because the staff are so stretched and so many things are changed at the last minute. I don't know which would be easier to actually upload it electronically to the Web site or to make it available in paper copies. But I do think that would be one thing to do.

And if there's anything that I think we can do - final point here - actually no two final points. So second last point with respect to the schedule I think again it's very, very difficult. We know it is because especially for



this meeting because things kept changing and we didn't have agendas or we couldn't have agendas until the end.

But I do think a lot of people make a practice of looking at the schedule everyday maybe online. And sometimes in our sessions it's not always very clear what it is that we're talking about - you could - in the agenda there are so many acronyms. So maybe there's a way we can work on making a nice short snappy description of the day's Council proceedings if that's at all possible.

Last suggestion would be I think the Web site updates might help and we probably all need to coordinate on not just what that looks like but how do we get the message out and how do we get out all these presentations and papers in advance of each meeting? So those were just my random thoughts.

Stéphane van Gelder: The Web site thing - we have a new Web site that's supposed to come out - what was it four months ago? That might be useful if it ever does because the format of the current Web site I find - I don't know about you guys - very difficult to navigate.

I just wanted to digress for five seconds if you'll indulge me. Chuck sent me an email from Izumi Aizu from the At Large in Tokyo. And I just wanted to give a sentiment.

Izumi just - while we're working on the ICANN stuff and our day to day interaction and problems or issues that we work through ICANN just wanted to tell us that in Japan they are dealing with an extremely difficult set of circumstances and they are trying to get things like

connectivity back up along with obviously shelter, trying to find people, trying to recover from the earthquake and everything.

So I just wanted to express the GNSO Council's support to the Japanese people that are dealing with this horrible crisis. I think it's well worth just remembering that there are people dealing with real problems on the other side of the world.

Next I have Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Just I guess building on Marika and what Mary and Wendy said and not to belittle the issue about getting newcomers up to speed but I think the newcomer session is definitely very useful. And there are fellowship sessions - what they call fellowship sessions - they're somewhat cryptic but they're actually newcomer sessions.

They are traditionally just for the fellowship that ICANN brings to each meeting. But I guess since Seoul (ParAsia) we have been supporting a number of university students to come to these meetings. And they, you know, the from the feedback I've gotten from them they have - the fellowship sessions have been very useful.

And I tend to feel that, you know, as much as, you know, a lot of what we say in acronyms and all that is relatively cryptic but with those sessions and, you know, if you are really interested in the subject and you prepare yourself a little bit we have gone quite, you know, quite some way from - on this subject.

But I think the efficiency of what - how we talk about and, you know, different subjects is also important. I don't think - as I think Wendy

mentioned - too much of an introduction in terms of open meetings would be that useful. But links to it, to those background information at the, you know, on the page those would be useful.

And I think the fellowship program - right now somewhat exclusive. I can't figure out whether they are exclusive. Every time I talk to (Janice) and to include (mission) ambassador people into it and usually she's more than fine for it. And I have followed the sessions a few times and found them to be, you know, quite useful for newcomers as well.

So we should probably advertise those because they happen at 7:00 AM in the morning. It's tough. But if you're interested in what we're talking about then, you know, early in the morning, 7 o'clock, about 7:00-9:00 usually before any session happens the fellowship session happens. And it gives you a pretty good overview, you know, background knowledge of how things work here at ICANN so.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you. Ching.

Ching Chaio: Thank you Stéphane. And I think what I'm going to say is pretty much covered by the people here. So I would just like to echo what's been said that - and trying to offer a second opinion that someone, I mean, obviously come here for the good intention of learning, you know, sharing knowledge but some comes here, I mean, just to - for the photo opportunities, you know, to - maybe to take a photo with Peter or maybe with other people in this room.

So I would actually take this from different angles that it's good to engage and to, I mean, to work on it in more - at a more inclusive basis but I just don't think at this stage the Council - this Council is sending a

message asking the staff to do extra outreach or actually a promotional, I mean, activities.

I will pretty much say that the existing Webinar and actually the Web site is pretty much transparent. For me also as a newcomer to this Council I feel, I mean, pretty much engaged by participating in the Webinar and also the past meeting archives. So I have personally found that useful.

So - and this is just my personal thought, I at least I'm not trying to - I'm not seeing additional work needs to be done from the staff to the, I mean, those type of the marketing activity. So promotional - that's necessary but perhaps some other constituency, like for example like the ALAC or actually their subsidiaries or the AOS, they can help us to sort of educate and to - just to promote the awareness of the GNSO activities so that's one.

Second is I would like to bring up one issue which we've also briefly talked about is the schedule change in the past weeks and for the dinner we had with the Board. And we've heard - actually Rod and Peter saying that, I mean, Bill Clinton came here which is a great, great arrangement.

And the whole process is pretty much coming from a sort of the out of box idea is a creative thing to do. And I would just like to make sure that this type of thinking out of box thing setting up the schedule of the meeting to the meeting like the GNSO works would be sort of not - I shouldn't say not being a constant thing to being out of thinking out of box but sort of, you know, once in a while this something that's useful

and something that's - it's pretty much a fresh and new way of doing things.

But I'm just worried and probably because I'm a newcomer here so I'm worried that there will be lots of thinking out of box type of activities being brought into this meeting schedule so that too.

Third is that we talk about sort of - before we met with the ccNSO and we've asked ourselves and we also - they also asked us is meeting useful. And I realize by learning from - actually from Stéphane and from others saying that the decision is when doing the ccNSO meeting we usually hear from (Chris Moore) and other councilors from the ccNSO Council.

So I think this also one of the issue that we would like to, you know, not an issue but one of the, I mean, the idea or actually a reflection to be made is that whether we, you know, to think actually the value of this meeting how we can, you know, get this better. So I would just like cut it off before I put myself in the wrong position so thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks Ching. Liz.

Liz Gasster: I think Ching actually, you helped kind of tee-up what I wanted to raise about this last discussion which is, you know, Bill and Mary and Wendy and Marika listed several things that we're doing now relative to newcomers and trying to help newcomers learn about, you know, this complex set of activities.

Bill also made some suggestions and I think Marika too about ways we could improve what we're doing, the flyer, the one-pagers, you know, it

occurred to me that we could even put a notice in the registration when you register for the meeting that there is the policy Webinar and, you know, so, you know, I can imagine some other things we can do; some are more time consuming than others.

I've also heard in the course of conversations about the workload some of you mentioned that you think the outreach that we're doing is wrong. And that the Webinar - that the time that we're putting into developing the Webinars and producing the updates and working on outreach, helping newcomers get adjusted isn't the right use of our time; that we should be focusing exclusively on the pending policy work.

What would be helpful - I see many opportunities for improvement of course in our outreach. I think some of the suggestions that were made are great. But I also recognize again - and keep reiterating - that we have limited resources.

It's extremely important for us to get clear direction here from all of you about what you think the most important things are for us to do. We have such limited time on Saturday and Sunday. Each one of these briefings that we give on these issues we're trying to condense an enormous amount of work into very short time periods. I think it is hard for newcomers to understand all of that.

But I think we're trying to please everyone. And in doing so I'm not sure we're pleasing anyone. So I would really like some help in, you know, specific guidance on, you know, these are great ideas; should we do them or shouldn't we?

Stéphane van Gelder: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stéphane. I think we can tell by the amount of discussion, which has been great, that Bill brought up a really important point and I reinforce that. And I'll be really brief.

There's been a lot of ideas and I think they're all good. And a lot of them are already tools that are in place; people just need to be able to easily find them. Bill mentioned the one about putting things in the registration packets and I think that's fine but I think we should also realize that a lot of people aren't going to be able to - maybe I should say it this way - are not going to do advanced preparations for this meeting; they're going to come in.

So I would highly suggest that there's a brief handout that's available and it can point to them to other directions. Because - I think all of us know how much stuff we get in our little packet when we register. And the chances of people really going through that and preparing it's more likely they'll look at it after they leave.

So I guess what I'm saying is let's use all of these ideas as we think they can be effective but let's make sure there's something in the rooms when something is happening that they can pick up to help them on the spot.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks Chuck. Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: I guess I would just say my first reaction is that I have some real concerns about the Council as a council taking positions that we have no obligation to try and do anything to help facilitate participation and knowledge by new attendees.

Perhaps I was misunderstanding how Liz is charactering some of the input she received but if I'm not misunderstanding it that I am troubled by that. ICANN, at least in my world, has a very - it's a big perception issue that it's only for insiders; that the learning curve is too steep; that nobody is going to help you, etcetera. I don't think we do ourselves any favor by taking any action that can be characterized to continue that.

Having said that and recognizing that we have limited resources I think we've already talked about some of the things that we can do. And I think we can just try and repurpose some of the existing things. For example, you know, the ICANN welcome and meeting overview, I wasn't really fully aware that there was one and it's intended for newcomers.

But having it at 11 o'clock on a Sunday morning before the meeting starts might not be the best time particularly for people who haven't come to a meeting before and don't realize that some of the best stuff actually happens on the weekend.

So I think perhaps having that later in the day on Sunday, making it more available, taking some of the information that's been made available during the lead-up policy Webinars and repurposing that to little bullets as opposed to having staff write up new materials would be really helpful.

And I don't know does ICANN still do the daily kind of report thing that they used to do? Because - okay then never mind because I was going to say that a lot of new people found that very useful because it was



kind of a one-pager of here's what's going on today, here are the issues and the like.

I don't know, you know, what the reasoning was behind discontinuing it but if there would be ever any interest in starting it again I think it would be helpful. You know, just - I think a lot of Mary's suggestions are ones that I would have made; to take the presentations, make sure they're available on the site - on our site during the meeting.

And I just think we have to find the right balance between not spending so much time on it that we can't devote the work - get the work done that we need but I think we just have to be very careful about doing anything that creates the perception that we're trying to keep it an insider (unintelligible).

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you. I have Olga next.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Stéphane. I think I have said this before but just in case we are touching the issue about outreach again related with GNSO. In the restructuring process the constituency and stakeholder group which I chaired produced a document which was one of our two main tasks about outreach for the GNSO.

The document is now for public comment until April the 10. So if you think that we may add things - we had representative from different constituencies in the working team but in the case you think that you can add new ideas or review them or change them or just like the document I recommend that you go to public comments and review it. It's online now. If you want I can send a link to the Council list. Thank you.

Stéphane van Gelder: That might be useful. Thank you very much. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: I guess in following the theme of my negativity all week I've been told - by you and others. This time I'm not going to drive a bus in reverse. Yes, so a couple things.

I'm a little confused as to - we started talking about the Council meeting then we're talking about the weekend, then we're talking about additional sessions. I want to be clear in my mind that the - I don't think that we should do anything different with the Council meetings.

You know, we have business we have to do so we have to get to it. And if it's more detailed than people watching it well, you know, I'm sorry but we can't really lengthen the meetings in order to just go down to, you know, 101 on each issue so that's number one.

Number two is I also don't want ICANN policy staff to take away from this meeting that I view any of this stuff as more important than the work that's already going on. And we're already seeing a lot of clashes on work that we can't even get started because of policy staff issues with timing and resources.

So, you know, if you gave me a choice as to whether I'd want policy staff to write, you know, this one-pager or three-pager rather than starting the review on the UDRP or the best practice for the registries and registrars, you know, I'm not going to choose that one.

So I will also note that this really shouldn't be for policy staff. There is a communications and outreach department of ICANN. And, you know

what, I couldn't even tell you who they are anymore. I thought I used to know but the positions keep changing around. I just looked on the ICANN Web site to try to find who the staff person is.

I see a woman named (Felise) that I've seen a couple emails from but I don't think I've actually had the pleasure of meeting her. And there's probably a bunch of others. You know, I would take this feedback and provide it to that group and not burden the policy staff here because they have a lot of work on their plates.

And again so it's weighing priority I would not put this in a higher priority for the Council as the work that we've asked to be done. I want to make sure that there's nothing taken away from this meeting that that is higher priority.

And if that's the case, if you find that, you know, you're getting pushed at work then come to the Council and the Council leadership and we'll try to figure out and help prioritize. But I don't think it should be something that just the staff takes away and says okay this is now what's deemed important.

So again I'm not trying to naysay; I don't - it's not that I don't think outreach is important but we should really push that to the - respond to Olga's - the paper that Olga was talking about and then hopefully the outreach people and communications people at ICANN will take it and run.

Stéphane van Gelder: Take it and run. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Well this is great news because I can say something - Jeff, I think that was a very positive and constructive suggestion so you don't have to worry. I think my theme is along the lines of Jeff. And I would hate what I said earlier to be misinterpreted. I think the work of the GNSO Council is, in many ways, intricate and at pretty high level and a long way down the road. And one needs not to undermine the level at which that is at.

And I think Chuck made a very good point about a digest being in affect a roadmap to the kind of information that might be available. And ironically I've seen the Board summary that Jeff is due to present tomorrow and frankly that's an extremely useful document at a higher - it's a good high level summary. Ironically it's upwardly directed but I think that could serve a useful roadmap.

And the bit that seems to me to be missing perhaps more than again is again along the lines of what Jeff has said; this is more of a sales and marketing issue, in other words an outreach issue as far as I can see, as opposed to the substance which is the policy - the content, the policy work.

And so perhaps I'm saying it's something - well anyway I won't - the key point here for me is that it strikes me that there must be hundreds of thousands if not millions of people out in the world who are kind of along the lines of the key not speech yesterday - who are desperate for some work experience, who are educated, available.

And if we could somehow bring them into - but that's not the work of the GNSO Council, it's not policy work - but somehow it is engagement work into ICANN as a whole. And it's astonishing that we're sitting in

this kind of empty room when there are, as I say, people out there who would be desperate for their first bit of experience so that they could then get proper meaningful employment.

So somehow or another there's a gap missing there that's not a policy issue; it's perhaps more of a - like I say a sales and marketing issue.

Stéphane van Gelder: Well I can tell you why the room is empty and it's just got emptier because Wendy was next in the queue but she's gone off to see what probably everyone else is doing which is the .xxx protest. So I suggest we cut this short and - because I've got things to do. I've got Margie next.

Margie Milam: Yes I just wanted to comment on Jeff's observation of the communications department role and the policy department role. It doesn't work that way, Jeff, because - it can't because the issues are so complex the only people that can write these documents are the people that staff them.

I mean, even the - in the entire Council you guys aren't even - probably can't write these documents unless you're in the working groups, you know, in the day to day, you know, issues. And so there's just - it's just entirely you can't change the processes within ICANN.

And in the communications department, you know, we can push content to them but they won't write it. And it just will not happen if it has to go that way because when you're talking about - you think about the policy Webinar, you think about the monthly report it is very detailed analysis of what, you know, what's going on and the work to

even just get the information out. It takes a lot of time, I mean, it doesn't seem like it should but it actually does.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks. Debbie.

Debra Hughes: So I was really involved in a lot of the work on the outreach plans and ideas. And thank you, Olga, for that pitch for everybody to read those public - the work that we did and to participate on those public comments.

All I really wanted to say to this point is I think that there's a really interesting role that the GNSO Council can do in encouraging each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups before ICANN meetings come. If you know you're going to an area - especially in a developing country or a developing economy - to get the information out about the policy work that's going on in advance of the meeting.

And there are wonderful resources that are already available that we put out. And I agree, we can't find them; we don't know where they are; they're all over the place which is part of what we were trying to accomplish when we were taking a look at the outreach recommendations for the organization and we started kind of really lofty and we kind of paired it down.

But I really think that there's opportunities for volunteers to get involved and to learn and to help. I mean, there's - I'm sure all of you have been to conferences where on the main day there's people who are manning an info desk kind of helping people get where they are.

And, you know, something to think about is I'm in another organization and what we do on the very first day is people from each of the different groups volunteer at the info desk and kind of steer people if they have questions about issues.

I mean, there's all kinds of neat things that the community can do if we've got volunteers engaged to help them find their way on the first day. And I really like the idea too of at each session having a one-pager about this is what's going on and this is why this is important.

And again ways to engage volunteers, you know, there's people on work groups, there's people in your constituencies and stakeholder groups who would love ways to feel important or engaged or involved. And maybe those are some of the things that we could talk to communications staff or whomever helps plan and organize the event - ways to engage the stakeholder groups in getting the policy information out.

I agree, I share what Jeff's concern is that I really don't - I understand, Margie, that, you know, you guys have to push the content but I guess what we were trying to say is that we don't want that to be your job, you know, to communicate to the wider ICANN community.

You know, it seems to me that somehow each of us who are members of the ICANN community need to be involved in communicating. And that if, you know, policy staff is creating the content then certainly communications or whomever is doing that role need to be assisting in pushing that content out.

Stéphane van Gelder: Jeff, you're next. Don't panic. Then I've got Jaime and Glen, did you want - that was at the end, okay - and then I really want to get to the .xxx protest. So I don't know about you but - and that's what's going on. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes so, Margie, you know, I don't - and I'll tell you why and my thinking has changed. You know, a couple of years ago I would have thought I would have agreed to you - with you as far as the policy staff I've intimately involved.

And then my corporate communications and marketing department basically said to me if I can't explain to them in 30 minutes or less what's going on then I'm not doing my job correctly.

And what they did is in order to brief the rest of my team - and I think this is probably something good you guys could do - is have someone from your corp/comm - your communications group sit down with you for a half hour, record it and then write something up based on it. If they can't do that then they're not an effective team.

Now - and if it takes more than that so the detail you're going into is much more detailed than for a one-pager, right? So I think it is something you guys can do. I think it's something you should try. It's something that's worked within my company; it's worked within other companies. It's the briefs that go up to my executive management; it also goes to other people on my team. It works. I would try it.

But if it takes any more time than that let me stress that I don't want it done. Okay? I know the outreach is important but I don't want it done if



it's going to take any more time because we're already having these issues about finding time to do the work that needs to get done.

Mary Wong: Well I should just caution everybody that you should not send pictures of (porn) protest to Stéphane unless you want to lose him from the room.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mary Wong: Well then he'll be back shortly. Liz and Margie, did you want to respond to this because Jaime was next in the queue. All right Jaime then Liz then Margie.

Jaime Wagner: I'm from a developing country. And we have this problem of outreach. And one of the problems I face is the language problem. I think the Webinar and the written material previews - a one page saying what's going on, what is important, made by the policy staff that knows what is going on is something that is very important.

And - but it should be spread not on - ahead of the - what? It should be given ahead of the meeting. And I (forward) the Webinar announcement to my ISP associations that are in Brazil. And I wonder if one of the 2000 ISPs attended. And I think it (unintelligible). And why is that? Well I - many, many answers. Is that important? They understand why it's important, they - I will leave this in the - as an open question.

But definitely this work subject to the brevity that Jeff is recommending I think it should be maintained. I would like to add to staff's burden my

idea of a brief - very brief overall view before the working group reports.

Mary Wong: Jaime, so let's - as part of your response I guess can I just clarify that that these policy Webinar - because I've seen the notices and it seems to me that there's one before every ICANN meeting in addition to things throughout the year.

And I think I recall from the last announcement that the one right before the meeting is specifically geared towards things that we are going to be discussing at the meeting, right? So maybe those of us that forward these messages to our constituents need to make that link clearer in the sense that, A, it's going to be regular and, B, if you're going to attend any one and you're coming to the face to face you should attend this one.

Margie Milam: We also do an announcement on the homepage; we do an announcement in the GNSO; we send it to the, you know, liaison list which is the full list.

Jaime Wagner: Just a clarifying question. We have one Webinar for each meeting or two?

Margie Milam: Two actually but it's the same content. We try to accommodate time zones.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, okay. But it's - how much time ahead?

Mary Wong: It's two weeks isn't it?

Margie Milam: We have it about it two weeks ahead. We announce it about two weeks before that or a month before that so...

Jaime Wagner: Two weeks ahead, yes.

Mary Wong: And I think Liz, I'll hand it over to you because I know you had a response. I think my point here was just that so that all of us in the room remember that so that when we see that announcement we can say to members if you're planning to come you probably should make time for this Webinar before you actually show up. Okay?

Liz Gasster: Actually with your indulgence wanted to broaden the conversation a bit because I think we started with the staff resourcing discussion in the context of determining the prioritization of some of this outreach work vis-à-vis other work.

And for us right now I feel we have a very pressing problem on the table in that it's not just the additional outreach work that some may put a premium on but it's also other work that we have in the queue that we just simply do not have the resources to do now.

I feel we're at somewhat of a crossroads together in that we are beyond capacity and we have work in the queue that you all are telling us is really important. So I haven't been able to give you all deadlines on the work, right, on the issue's report, on the UDRP, on the best practice's report. I would like to, you know, I've assigned resources to it and I know staff is working really hard to try to kind of start on them now.

But I just implore you to give us some direction that is a Council view where we can do the work that you most want us to do. Right now I am just kind of maintaining the status quo and working on the things that are already in the queue that have us over capacity because I have no indication from a collective view of yours to change anything or do anything differently.

But I'm more than willing to do so if you think that should change. But I'm sort of operating on the status quo because I don't want to make any changes to anything unless, you know, I'm sure that you all are in support of how the resources are allocated today. And thanks, I'll turn it over.

Stéphane van Gelder: This is - thanks, yes, yes. Carlos was on. We're on a very difficult topic. Tim, I've got you as well. And I don't know, Chuck, if you're going to address that but the point that was made during this weekend also, I mean, we also have to factor this in that 94% of the funds come from the GNSO community so it's difficult for the GNSO community to hear that there aren't resources to carry out the work that it needs to do.

And that's no indictment of you; I fully understand the problems that you face and that you've just described. I would remind or draw attention to the fact that we have been and we are continuing to tackle the prioritization issue and we are trying to do that.

But it's not just a question of, as I think it was Andrei suggested jokingly, on the list just striking projects and just, you know, it's not as simple as that. So I think we're all working under some - a lot of strain and pressure to deal with this issue.

I have Margie next then Wendy, Chuck, Jeff, Carlos, Tim and Bill.

Margie Milam: So am I...

Stéphane van Gelder: So Margie...

Margie Milam: Yes, back to the issue of the content on these monthly updates, a couple points, the audience is not you; the audience is the broader community that doesn't understand what's going on within the GNSO Council and it's not a marketing piece. And so it's not intended to be something to be read in 30 minutes.

We get a tremendous amount of hits on those monthly reports and we could certainly share that with the Council. And we get a lot of thanks because we have so much content in there and people can take it and look at it and come up to speed on the issue before, you know, if they want to know what's going on at any given time, you know, during the year or before an ICANN meeting. So it's a different, you know, it's a different purpose.

And the other thing I wanted to remind you all for those of you that were in some of the GAC meetings, you know, it was - the topic of the talk (unintelligible) this paper came up and that is that even the GAC feels that this is an important use of information and suggested - although I don't believe that this would be a policy issue, we may make room for GAC input.

But they clearly saw this monthly newsletter as something that's important to the community to convey information on what the given

projects are, you know, with respect to, you know, not just the GNSO but other, you know, SOs and ACs as well.

So I don't see that being a viable option that we cut back on that. And really unfortunately that's the way our department works. You know, the communications department pushes it out; there's no question that the communications department is involved in that. But developing the content it's - excuse me - and, you know, and sending the information to them does take time and it's something that I just don't see how it could be shifted away from the policy department.

Stéphane van Gelder: Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Just a quick report fact that there are various new potential constituents out front. The .xxx protest looks to be about 20 people walking around with no .xxx signs or fewer. But it's amusing.

And does the official literature still claim that the meeting starts on Monday? Because one very helpful way to inculcate newcomers might be just to officially acknowledge that the meeting begins on Saturday and encourage people to come starting for those introductory meetings.

Stéphane van Gelder: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: You read me correctly, Stéphane. I really think that we're at a stage where the GNSO Council needs to provide input on the budget framework. And, you know, I forget when the deadline is for that, I'm not sure it's after your seventh meeting or not. But it's really important.

I brought this up on the weekend. And there's an opportune time to do it. Now I personally talked with David - David Olive on this. One of the issues that could help - won't solve all the problems you're talking about because I think Margie is right, some of this has to be done by the ladies sitting at this table, okay.

But they have to do - and, Liz, I'm going to use a term that you used in our conversation - they have to do an awful lot of grunt work because they have no administrative support to help them.

And there could be I think some huge gains made if there was some administrative support for the policy team. And I'm not talking about Glen and I'm not talking about Gisella; they're overloaded already in other types of administrative work.

But editing, a lot of the other things that these ladies here have to do could be done by somebody who's well qualified but not with the qualifications like they have which are very good and should be very good.

So I really think we need to speak out on that and we - and like I think a couple of you already implied we need to ask for more resources so that is one way of dealing with this issue. It doesn't mean we shouldn't still prioritize but I think it's to the point where it's going to be, I mean, I've been saying this individually - it needs to come from the Council in my opinion.

And I'm not saying you do it now but in the next couple weeks that you work on this request new resources, request administrative support for

the policy team. Now my understanding from - in my conversation with David it actually was in the early budget last year.

And you've heard me say - I mentioned this to Denise when she was in charge - it got dropped with all the other cuts. But again understanding that over 94% of funds are coming from us; I'm not saying it all has to go to us but we need to request more funds.

We need to request administrative support for the policy team so that their time - pointing right at them - can be doing work that matches the good qualifications that they have and they can delegate some of these other things to a person at a lower level but an important level.  
Thanks.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks Chuck. And this ties into what Alan just told me as he left - and he had to leave so just wanted me to convey the message that the budget process is nearly - I think the deadline is nearly upon us and we could put in a budget request for new policy staff. That was Alan's idea which ties in with what you're doing.

If we're willing to do that someone may need to take the lead on doing that and just putting that request in. If you remember when we got the budget requests forms through I actually responded because it's such a new process with request for guidance on how to service those and we did not get an answer to that.

So we are also in a situation where we're having to cope with a new process that's upon us and all this in a set of quite tight deadlines so that's not easy. Jeff you're next.



Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Sorry, and since Liz brought it up then I guess I'll try to continue on with this. Part of our problem, Liz, and I don't think you answered my question on the list so I want to throw it out there so everyone is pretty clear.

You gave us the utilization survey which is good. The problem is there's - what I hear over and over again is that you're asking us to help manage your resources and manage - not manage your resources as in we the managers but manage the stuff that we give you because you're overworked and over-resources.

The answer I never got - and what everyone here needs to understand is we're not the only ones that give work to the policy staff. Policy staff gets work from the Board, it gets work from their executives, gets work from, for example - and I appreciate this work and Debbie doe too - for the new constituency policy staff - when they request a constituency it's policy staff that actually helps them to get it set up and deal with their issues.

All of that is outside of our complete control of the Council. We have no control what the Board gives you. We have no control if your executives have you working on. And Julie spends time on SSAC stuff and maybe a little bit of time here; I'm not sure how that breaks down.

So we have - there's all these areas that we have absolutely no control yet you're asking us to - you're telling us you're overworked, you're telling us that we can't add anything new. What I'm not hearing - what I haven't heard is that that message has been delivered to all of those other groups. And that all those other groups maybe are working on that as well.

And if not, perhaps we can get one of two people from the Council to work with your executives, to work with the Board, to make sure that we have an understanding. Because - and I had a conversation with David Olive on this, too, back in Brussels and Stéphane happened to be there, as well, and I said to David, you know, how much time, you know, when the board asks you do something is that one person's time, is that two people's time, is half person, and he said well it all depends. It can be any of the above.

So, you know, it's very frustrating because I want to help you out. But it's hard to actually listen to the mantra of I'm over-worked, I'm over-worked, I'm over-worked and I'm afraid, Chuck, to answer your question, I'm afraid if we ask for more policy staff there's going to be people that are designated to the GNSO but that are just accessible by others.

And so I don't know how we can try - I think part of the issue is that if someone is dedicated to the GNSO, that we understand what that means, and right now it doesn't mean dedicated to the GNSO Council, what it means is dedicated to broad areas that ICANN staff or is designated as being GSNO in subject.

So whether that's asking for a new constituency that wants to come forward or whether it's a toolkit issue or whether it's a request from the BC or whoever - whatever constituency wants something, policy staff is automatically assigned to that to the extent they can and, again, that's area that's outside of our control as policy managers.

So I want that understood by everyone that when we do this, we all understand the difficulties that we're having.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you. (Carlos)?

(Carlos): Thank you Stéphane. I have three or four points that I want to talk. Maybe some questions.

The first is I don't understand, maybe it's incapacity, my ignorance or that I'm naïve or I don't know. Why in some cases when you discuss motions talk about friendly amendments when the friendly amendments in most cases are declarations of war, in my point of view?

I don't understand because I try to find in the bylaws but I not can - I can't saw in any place if it regulate the friendly amendment.

The second point is I agree - I totally agree, I fully support the work in order to make more outreach and improve the webinars and especially in relation with developing countries and support, also, the work with fellowships.

I can - I want to add another point that is acronyms, in some cases, including me, I confuse or I don't know what means at times. I work some years here in ICANN in another country, acronyms I think is one of the obstacles to understand many things for newcomers or new - or beginners, no?

Okay. The first point is I don't know if you are all fans of Bill Clinton. But I don't know if we need to make a statement or no, it's a decision

of the organization but I personally think that Bill Clinton conference changed the focus of our work.

It was interesting, especially for me. I coming from a developing country to see a world reference for me was amazing. But I think modify the agenda, change the focus of our meeting ICANN meeting and I don't know what was the final results of the presence of Bill Clinton in the specific area for us. Sorry.

And the last point, in the - I don't know how to say because it is for me difficult to say, and I don't know what nobody talk about this; I know that is the rule that we have that we need to respect that is the law for us but the question is are you sure that the GNSO improvement was good, is good? The two houses works with many sectors yesterday in the social networks criticized the resolution of our organization related to (RIA).

In the room, the results of the election, the votes, was 14 votes to 6. And the motion not passed. So one group with 6 votes make the motion not pass against 14 votes. Is the rule we need to respect this, but what is your think - or what do you think about it? It's good that one house very strong. Another house with different interests inside. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks (Carlos).

First of all, I don't think the way you portrayed it is quite true. But I think your questions highlight a couple of things. First - the first is that the Council has a lot of history and the newcomers to the Council it's

difficult to understand that history and I think you asked some very valid questions from your point of view.

Some of us have obviously more experienced on the Council and the history is something that we understand better. The - and so sometimes we lose sight of the obvious and I think you do a very good job of bringing us back towards what the obvious thing or the obvious dysfunctional aspects of our organization might be. So I think that's very useful.

I don't think it's true that one has a strong and the other one is weak. But there are certainly things wrong with the restructure. I am not afraid of saying that perhaps some more work should be done on restructuring the restructure, that once I say that, the three policy staff have just fainted and all the people that have worked on the restructure for three years and remember all the last minute meetings to try to come to some agreement meetings and work that most of the people on the Council today actually weren't privy to because they weren't on the Council at the time -- there's very few people left on the Council that have worked through the restructure -- so it's a question of knowing if we can start that work again or not.

I don't think there should be any barriers to anything and I don't think there should be barriers to the questions you're asking. Unfortunately, I think it's tough to address that topic now. But it is maybe a good discussion point to start a discussion on the list and to take this forward.

So thank you for those points and I'll turn to (Bill) and then I would propose if you're all in agreement that we close - Liz, you had a comment too, that we close it off.

If you want the - and Jaime, there's no - we have until 2:00. I unfortunately will have to leave before that because otherwise I'll miss my flight, but if you want to carry on until 2:00, that's fine. This is scheduled until 2:00.

So I will turn to (Bill). I will probably have to leave you now. I just want to thank you all for this week for the enjoyable work that we've done together. And wish you all safe travel home and see you all in Singapore.

(Bill)?

(Bill): Well I will be very brief because much what I have to say has been picked up.

But I'll start again by saying thank you Stéphane for your wonderful chairing.

I just want to make clear, having raised the point that didn't imagine this was going to become an hour long conversation about outreach and I recognize this type of conversation, you know, being one to have.

I just want to emphasize that I did not imply that the Council should change the way it works. That we should do 101 sessions, start at the beginning and go from there. And I didn't mean to imply that the policy

staff is not already overworked and should be spending lots more time doing additional things.

I do think I agree with Chuck, come as a resources, you know, I can certainly see the argument for writing a letter saying, you know, let's find a higher spiritual advisors and gurus and whatever else, but a priority would actually be from our standpoint another policy staffer who had a designated role of working closely with the people who are doing the serious work and making - having sort of an outreach - strong outreach dimension.

I don't know, you know, if you can name the people Jeff in the communications department. I can't but I would suspect that they would have a hard time explaining IRTP anyway in a way that maybe they wouldn't put - you know, I think you need somebody who has some specialized knowledge of what we do, who's working alongside the folks who are doing the reports and everything else for us, but yet who has some savvy about how one does talking to external people who are not in our bizarre intellectual universe and who do not, you know, prior to coming to a meeting spend a week or two digging through a Web site trying to find things that might be relevant to them in order to make sense of what they're doing.

It is the case. People wonder in. You know, they kind of - oh, ICANN's going to be here. I'll sign up and come. I haven't done that much background reading. I kind of know what they do or it could be interesting and I want to get involved.

And then they walk in and it's like they hit a wall, you know. So, I think there, you know - it is something that requires particular set of skillsets

that we want and at the same time it also requires a solid understanding of what the Council is working on.

And so combining those does not mean to me giving to somebody who's got a generic sort of communications job running press releases, whatever else. I think it is probably a skillset that belongs within the policy environment working alongside it but I'm not asking Marika and the rest of the folks over there to spend an enormous amount of time or to put aside things we've asked them to do in order to do this. That wasn't my intention.

So I just have to say that.

Mary Wong: Anyone else? I'm sorry, Liz, you had a follow up and then Jonathan.

Liz Gasster: So first I want to acknowledge what Stéphane said about the progress that we are attempting to make with reviewing all the current projects with, you know, really talking, like one per Council meeting on, you know, how we can push these things along, bringing up some projects like talking about service requirements that we haven't had a chance to get to today but that's been languishing and I think there is a bit of great effort on the part of all the chairs to, you know, try to push those along and it's helpful. I appreciate all of it.

And I appreciate, also, all the ideas that others have offered about how we could just, you know, operate more efficiently, that kind of thing.

I want to make it clear about the report that I gave you. There's no ambiguity or softness in the number of staff people we have. You know, Julie is 50% assigned to the GNSO. She is 50% assigned to the



SSAC, you know, she keeps track of that generally. She does, you know, more than 50% for both groups.

Steve Sheng who is sitting in the back there also same thing; 50% for the GNSO, 50% for the ALAC - sorry, for the SSAC. They both have special skills that the SSAC needs, as well as the GNSO. It's an efficient way to utilize those kills across.

But when I gave you my report, it is just based on the 50% of work that they're doing for the GNSO, so I just want to clarify that.

GNSO are - let me get to that. GNSO is GNSO-related topics, okay? Not ccNSO, not ALAC except for joint working groups which many of them work on that are listed on our project list, but it's all GNSO related.

Now, Jeff is also making the point that we get assignments from the Board. We get assignments from the Executive Team. Absolutely true. In the last report that I did, it came to 25% of our time. That's a decent amount of time. We should look at that time and we should be talking to, you know, having a broader conversation about what that work involves.

I can give you an idea of what specific assignments during that report took up the bulk of that time, but what I really want to say more importantly is that that leaves you 75% of the work that you do have control over and that is within your responsibility to take a look at.

Now not 100% because many of those assignments in a sense were related to the GNSO improvements that was also originally a board

directive. But it's not true that you don't have control over anything that we're doing. It's the 75% that is all designated by the GNSO.

And I just want to make one last point which is I believe all of you must do some staff work, some administrative work, some training work that is - that you can't bill your clients for. Let's put it that way.

One of the key things I spent on that week that we did the survey was I probably spent two to three days developing the staff responses that for the ATRT recommendations that the community asked us to look at and implement so related to the GNSO.

Those are your requests to improve the public comment processes, to - I mean, you all had participants in those groups. And so - and we're only working on the ones that are GNSO related.

So, you know, yes, I think there's more dialog that we could do about that 25% and I'm totally open to doing that in the best way possible and as openly as possible. But the 75% is here and now and we can take a look at that any time.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, on that, I mean, I just - I want to be clear that the 75% is not listed in our control as being ours, being GNSO policy managers.

And again, the work that you did - because how can I tell Debbie who's asking for a constituency which is very legitimate not to ask for it because there's no time for staff to do it.

That took up hours, yes, hours on the ATRT, that's not the GNSO Council asking for. That's your responsibility under the Affirmation of

Commitments which in theory is the responsibility that someone else should be assigned to.

You taking up control of 75%, again, I'm not saying that work is worth doing but that people don't have to do, but we can't really say that we have control of 75%. We don't and we don't know - like we didn't know that you were going to respond to the ATRT request. How do we know that? Do we have the ability - I totally understand. That's not my point.

But you can't say that we have - we doing the Council as policy managers have control of that because we don't.

Liz Gasster: I actually made the point - was trying to make the point that you - that that's in the 25%. I was trying to give you an idea or just some color around what's in the 25%.

Jeff Neuman: Well right to the 25% with the Board and the executive staff and then you said (unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: I was giving you an example of what I was doing in some of the time that I allocated...

Mary Wong: No, no, no.

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: ...25% that was GNSO related.

Mary Wong: Yes, I think this is probably part for a longer conversation...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, it is.

Mary Wong: ...that's probably difficult to have with (unintelligible) going on outside. But before - well, sure, but before I turn it over to Jonathan, Liz, I guess the one follow-up I would ask, and we might need to come back to this as the Council, would it help if the Council or some representatives of us talk to the Board and the others in that 25% about either just generally as to expectations from both sides?

Liz Gasster: Talking never hurts. Talking never hurts. And I also support your thought about the budget. You know I encouraged you all strongly to make a GNSO Council submission on the budget. I mean, I pretty much begged everyone to do a GNSO Council submission the budget, but we didn't get that. So highly support that, as well.

But I also really encourage you to talk a little more about the 75% and if it doesn't work, it doesn't work, but what I'm honestly more worried about is the stuff in the queue. And Jeff your point about, you know, the broader community saying, well, what about the issues report on the eTRP, what about, you know, the standing committee, what about the best practices.

And it's very important to me that it not be some arbitrary decision on the part of staff; okay, well we'll start with the issues report and we'll drop these ten things. We'll just spend conference call on these ten things. What if there's Debbie's thing or what if it's John's thing or what if it's Mary's thing or what if it's Jaime's project?

You know, all of you have projects that, you know, your pet projects; your favorite - your - the things you think are most important and I don't

want staff to be put in the position of arbitrarily deciding well, you know, gee the issues report just happened and we need to stop - you know, what do we stop to do that.

If we continue working on the trajectory we're on, will we try to work through the backlog and have the dialog and that works for everyone, then I'm okay with that. But what worries me intensely is that one of you is going to stand up and say why the heck haven't you finished my issues report on the eTRP.

Mary Wong: Well, may I suggest maybe that Jeff, Stéphane and I do a caucus after this meeting maybe come back with some kind of suggestion to the Council to give the kind of feedback that you're asking for and that we can follow up with staff, as well, on the chair to this on this point because I know there's a lot more that goes into this conversation we can have.

Jonathan, then Jaime and then I think we probably need to close the meeting unless...

Jaime Wagner: Mary - if I can jump in. It's only about just that.

Mary Wong: Okay, just a moment, Jonathan has to do on this point or another point?

Jaime Wagner: It is very - very small...

Woman: Okay, go ahead Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: Because I think there's an action item for our chairs and vice chairs that is - and it's urgent and it's the one to act on the budget. And the point that was brought by both Liz and Chuck and I think this is something that should be strength is something for you.

Mary Wong: Thanks Jaime. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Six points Mary, I'll be very brief. I mean, I think clearly our meeting is running out of steam, so we got to recognize that it's literally falling apart, so I think we have to bring it to a close.

Two, I see - I mean this - it looks to me like a classic management problem, this issue of staffing, right? I mean, we - and it's a very unusual structure for a Council to be in effect managing the staff, but I support the suggestion that you, Jeff and Stéphane come together.

Some the communication thing with (unintelligible) hope is not - I think there's two levels of communication. If we're trying to communicate sophisticated and at high level work, clearly it's got to have sophisticated and relatively high level input. If we're trying to communicate broad level engagement, that's what I meant by a sales and marketing issue. Just so that we're not at odds with one another on that.

But in general, I suppose, in the broader sense, communications departments should be able to distill down the more complex stuff into the elevated pitch, but it depends where it's going to. If it's not - if it - there are the two levels thing and I acknowledge and understand.

Mary Wong: Thanks Jonathan. And while we still have represented the most constituencies and stakeholder groups in the room, Glen would like to make a brief announcement about arrangements for Singapore. And I think on that note we can then follow by concluding the meeting.

Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, thank you very much, Mary. I'd just like to tell you that the (unintelligible) date for the Singapore travel arrangements will be the 22nd of April. If all your arrangements, your itinerary, your schedules and all that are not in by then, you will not be able to have a room at the conference hotel.

Now I'm going to send out a note to the - pardon?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: It has - the conference hotel hasn't been announced yet but we have to make arrangements to get you into a hotel. If we have not got - if we have not got the names then we can't make bookings.

Mary Wong: Let me just add that the conference venue I believe has been set and what I said I think on Saturday that a couple of hotels attached to that complex, as far as I know, they have assigned which hotels but I would remind people that because there are other major conventions going on in Singapore at the same time and I know ICANN and local organizers went through some hoops to even get the block of rooms at the hotel, so I do think this is particularly important for us to note for this meeting.

Glen DeSaintgery: And we'll be sending notes to the chair of all the constituencies, but perhaps you could also take it back as a matter of urgency because your itineraries have to be in with the - when the rooms are booked you have to have an itinerary. That is the main point. So you have to eventually have a ticket booked.

Chuck Gomes: What was that date?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: And that's all requiring you to have gotten - yes, have decided who you want to send to Singapore each constituency because that's up to you, constituency stakeholder groups.

Chuck Gomes: What was the date?

Glen DeSaintgery: Twenty-second of April Chuck. That's important. Yes, it is early. Sorry, (Bill), but if you want a room...

Mary Wong: I think it's Good Friday, isn't it? (Unintelligible). So if there's nothing else, I guess on behalf of Stéphane and everybody including the staff, I think you agree with me that we have actually had an extremely productive meeting and we will continue to work on some of these outstanding items.

Like I said, Jeff and Stéphane and I will work on the last issue and possibly make a suggestion with regard to the budget framework because we noticed the public comment period closes on the 4th of April. Not that much time left, but I noticed also I think there was a



request that there be more support for policy staff in there. Maybe we can think about adding on support to that request.

So thank you everybody. See you in Singapore.

END