MILTON MUELLER: Don't look so sad, Vittorio. Wake up. Perk up. I will try to say something that ticks you off.

RITA RODIN: Thanks, Tony.

Having a real program that's mapped out with the key priorities, the right approach, getting the balance in those working groups offers a way forward. But we need to work with staff and determine how we handle that and recognize that we have to have priorities. We won't be able to do everything at once.

In other cases, the way the group was orchestrated or the way the process went and the way it was chaired, there were failings there that caused things to go wrong. That said, I don't think a working group is a panacea. Even if you look at the IETF, there are plenty of examples of working group efforts that have failed. In one case, I was on a panel and we were discussing the IETF and the IPR issues. And I said that there were a couple of examples of working groups that have not been successful.

Anyway, as I say, I will be happy to give more explicit maybe written comments or something like that to the group about what the working group model is, and it is not a panacea. It is something that must exist within the bylaws and I think possibly I was talking to Milton yesterday about how wonderful I think the GNOG is. But we need to do that stuff and consider that.

I think that's a real danger in this model.

Because in the engineering community, what happens is, the protocol or the engineering work either works or it doesn't. It's very binary. And in the political world, that's not the case. Things go to the edge of the cliff and then we have to decide whether we want to go over. So that's one of the useful things that working groups can be useful is providing a slate on which people can choose from. I think that the -- the contrast between the WHOIS task force and the WHOIS working group was that the task force force tended to stalemate around the law and the working group was much more useful in terms of the people coming together and thinking of other solutions.

So in terms of operating principles, I think one of the useful things working groups can be useful is providing a slate on which people can choose from.

I support the idea of working groups, but I think there are some really serious things that have to be thought through before you can make it a workable model.
In light of that, the council, if they have to take a vote to determine whether they have something that they believe is reasonable, that's a different situation. If they need to take a vote to determine whether they have something that they believe is reasonable, it's an entirely different process.

Now, one of your recommendations -- and this might go into another one of your categories, but you talk about the council being a management body for the organization, and the first step is this. The council already decides whether consensus policies happen. It's nothing new and it's not going to change. If they need to take a vote to determine whether they have something that they believe is reasonable, it's an entirely different process. And the reserved name working group, we didn't take a vote. So we've had some good successes in that and so we need to move away from voting. You're all recommending that we need to have the council work with you, with volunteers, that's tough. You may not have to talk about the idea of maybe paid facilitators to do these things. I don't know. I haven't really thought that through very much, and I don't want to give the impression that we have that kind of consensus in that sense.

The goal of a working group should be to motivate members to work towards a common position. That is really critical for working groups.

If you just have working groups where the people involved want to make sure their position is the one that wins, you need commitment from individual membe...
Also, that should come in conjunction with the reviews of the other SOs and the ALAC. So that everything is consistent and at the end we have one sort of...
Also, it seems as if it is designed, perhaps unintentionally or will have the effect of turning those constituencies against each other, just with, you know. Despite the fact that to 99% of the public, they're one and the same. They clearly have the same primary business model of trying to maximize registrars. 

I supported in the LSE report the proposal for a 15 council member. I think some of the terminology we used here has led to some -- some confusion. ICANN would be the one to elect two, and then the registrars and registrars together need to come to an agreement to elect the fifth. The five business constituency representatives, instead of, if you will, forcefully merging the ISPs, the BC, and the ISPs together, you would allow them to elect two, and then the registrars and registrars together need to come to an agreement to elect the fifth. The five noncommercial could be elected through the NCUC and the ALAC together coming forward. So what we would have here is instead of coming up with a new layer of management, it would just be representatives that would be elected to the council. What I would do is I would fix those constituencies in place for three years. They would be the ones that would get to elect those 15 on the council, ICANN would be able to -- would be able to, if you will, provide them support to see if they could self-form. At the end of three years, there would be what I said, I -- as Mike Rodenhaue has said, when you begin to merge and do things, it really is a sign -- it's really a sign of last resort, so I think And this goes to just my final point. ICANN, with its ever-growing budget, has allocated a lot of money to global outreach, and the question that I am going to close it here. I'm sorry for having gone very much over the time allocated, but we also started late, so you are now free to attend to the

[Applause]

>>ROBERTO GAETANO: Time. Thank you. Thank you, Mike.

Can you go to the last page?

Okay. We have also other questions and other things, but there's no time to relate to those, and so the -- the slide will show the e-mail address for persons I will just go over quickly what is happening. First of all, we have -- the other part that we needed to go over was the relationship of the GNSO to other ICANN structures. So also on this, your comments will be welcome.

I think that I'll close it here. I'm sorry for having gone very much over the time allocated, but we also started late, so you are now free to attend to other things.

[Applause]

>>ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Go and multiply.

[Laughter]