

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO – ISPCP Meeting
Tuesday 23 October 2018 at 1700 CEST**

Note: 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.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: So, can we continue. So, we have on our - before speaking we have on our agenda three blocks, (unintelligible) counsel and ISPCP Internal activities and any other (unintelligible). Before we go into that I have a short follow up from yesterday which came to my mind after this morning when I mentioned that we have (CSG) meeting with the Board, the Board was asking us about our priorities for the next year and I think (unintelligible) coming from yesterday presentations (held, we) could make sure of that really.

So, that means for example we take after a new technology on (identifiers). We could especially make a use of what you have presented, Phillippe, because that leads a way, you know, towards how to sort out and how to sort out the different impacts of the new technologies. You know, we are looking at this. So, I wonder whether we could get together maybe a small team or just have an exchange, you know, in order how to find out which part or what can we use of this or to make it a kind of open for the next time for us to dive into these things and to have a closer view on that.

So, that's my idea and I would like to have a short conversation between us and let me put it to the list to kind of - a bullet list of forms and then can talk about that. That will be something which we could do in the future. Well besides our (usual) business on top of that. But that was just an idea. We should not go into details today but...

Philippe Fouquart: We forgot – Philippe Fouquart - I think we have to do something looking forwards, with the decisions that we have to make the (conflict) of one ICANN meeting and so that is (unintelligible). Whether that's focused on what I introduced or not, I think we should probably take a broader approach. That would be part of it but limited to it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes.

Philippe Fouquart: So, we'd certainly be happy to do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Good. And let's continue with (unintelligible) activities and (that again) and Philippe to guide us all a little bit - especially towards the motions which have to be voted on. Yes.

Philippe Fouquart: Is Tony around? Anyway, so Philippe Fouquart, - so we have four motions that we've already debated during the closed meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, but we shouldn't repeat all of them. If you came to a conclusion just tell us the conclusion and then...

Philippe Fouquart: I'll just mention a couple of things. On the (unintelligible) committee on budget and operations, given that -- Tony, we're talking about the counsel (unintelligible) the closed meeting -- on the SCBO given that we saw more expressed out support for the continuation but in light of the reservations that we identified during the (global) session, I would suggest that we express those reservations - those in favor of the motion but recapture our reservations to the effect that the SCBO should not prevent the

constituencies to express their views relative to project and there shouldn't be a perception that all those views should be channels through the SCBO.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. Sure.

Philippe Fouquart: If that's agreeable. I think it's a bit uncomfortable to vote against that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Philippe Fouquart: At this stage.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Philippe Fouquart: That would be awkward but...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. Is there any sort of (unintelligible) against that? Any (unintelligible) of that? That was not the case.

Philippe Fouquart: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So please...

Philippe Fouquart: So (unintelligible). The other one is (unintelligible) development (unintelligible) problem with that one. (IDS) will see what's (unintelligible) that item on (IGO), (IGNO) access security of (right) protection. I have to say that I'm not aware of the recent developments or if there's any for that matter. I circulated the correspondence to the list of maybe - I've seen that Mark has some reading of it. I can give you mine but I'd be happy to hear what you make of it.

Mark McFadden: I've already said so I don't feel like I need to say anything more.

Tony Harris: I will support Mark's view of it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you Tony.

Wolf-Ulich Knoblen: Please, tell your name and then continue.

Mark McFadden: Oh, my name is Mark McFadden. I posted the ISPCP mailing list that I believe that for counsels should vote. In the absence of anything else -- which I think is what we talked about on Sunday -- I mean, if there were an effort -- a good faith effort -- to either extend or somehow incorporate the GAC comments I would step aside but in the absence of anything of that I think if the PDP process has been followed and the Council really has no choice but to vote in favor.

Philippe Fouquart: The point being that and the observations that I think correct that in a number of those -- (unintelligible) forgot, sorry -- in a number of the letters, those were letters correspondence to the board providing elements of substance, certainty but to the board and not to the PDP to change the working programs. So, and in that respect the PDP was not followed. Or but (unintelligible) that's what I mean. The PDP itself would follow but those who expressed their (conflict) did not follow - did not fit their common (scheme) through that process.

The only comment that I would make is that reading those letters should it be read at the board level for good or bad it doesn't look good for ICANN. The dispute is being about IGO/INGO's reading a letter from the UN saying to the board that there should have been decisions they can (unintelligible) for ICANN as an organization I think the (unintelligible) PDP but ICANN as an organization and for an (outsider) and in the context of conditions, et cetera. It doesn't look good.

So, if we can - if there's that idea of postponing the approval and possibly - I'm not sure we can resolve the issues. It's been around for two years. We're not going to sort of it out in two days. That could be better.

Mark McFadden: So, Malcolm and Tony -- this is Mark McFadden for the record -- Malcolm and Tony spoke eloquently about that and I think there is a possibility to engage the GAC and make modifications that are acceptable to all parties. I think we should support that. I'm convinced about what you said on Sunday. But on the other end if what is presented to the counsel is the motion that you currently have and nothing more, my feeling is that you have no - I mean, I don't think you have much choice, right.

You know, if a substitute motion or amendment comes along for postponing it, I think that it would be my opinion that you should take that chance.

Malcolm Hutty: Wait a second. If I may, you know, finish please.

Mark McFadden: Let me be finished then.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Malcolm, please.

Malcolm Hutty: If it is possible for the substitute motion to defer and reopen it could come along. Is it not possible that we could propose such a motion?

Mark McFadden: I think it's difficult - I'm sorry.

Malcolm Hutty: I mean, if there is no procedurally correct way to reopen this, then of course we have to accept it. But if there is a procedurally correct way that we open this then suddenly the argument that Tony and I were making on Sunday was that we should look to do so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, just a moment, Only because there are procedures how to use motions and that just (unintelligible).

Oswaldo Novoa: Yes, so I've been participating in the Working Group for the last four years I think and in the previous one. The big problem is that - well first from the (INGO) the (IGO) -- it doesn't necessarily by go (unintelligible) organization --

(unintelligible) never participated. Only the Red Cross participated. The rest they were asked to participate and never did it. There was a small group from the members of the board, the GAC, and the IGO's that purposed a solution.

The problem is that even though some people in the group tried hard to accommodate the GAC wishes, there were a lot of people in the group that didn't go along with that. And there was a big trouble of getting the Working Group to work because one of the guys went to the (unintelligible) twice and we had that (unintelligible) counsel represent the (tape) and they didn't like what she proposed. It doesn't work. There was no (functionality) of the group.

And then the big problem we have is that what the GAC is asking is much more than what the government give to the international organization in their own countries. So, they are asking ICANN to protect them for something they don't do in their own national law. So, it's very difficult to accommodate those and a lot of people are against it. So, I don't see a clear way out of this because from the (procedural) point of view, we should follow the PDP (unintelligible) -- which I'm not clear because they are a lot of minority reports that (unintelligible) with what they ask is much harder measured than what we got out of the group.

So, I just don't see a clear way out of this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So, in the past I think we should be consistent with what we did in the past as well and be really support of the PDP and this is part of (unintelligible) all these things around. And we will also again (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) in favor with what the GAC has been doing. Regarding (internal) procedures of Malcolm of (unintelligible) (TSNO) because it has procedures how to do these motions. I'm not sure that this motion has been introduced several times already so I'm deferring - there's a procedure for deferring a motion and all these things. I'm not sure.

So, if that is not the case, we could do so for example just twist our fingers and saying, okay let's defer that. But I wonder if it helps because - and you have to come back within a short timeframe, you know, after three weeks or so with a new motion or be the same motion and then to vote on that. So, that's one followed procedure that you can (unintelligible).

Philippe Fouquart: Well a (unintelligible) referral would imply a further discussion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, sure.

Philippe Fouquart: Which would probably be an order...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So, the other thing of following represented procedure is after this meeting there shall be an informal counsel together with the (unintelligible) leaders and (unintelligible) leaders.

Mark McFadden: (Unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well I'm not sure if it's going on...

Philippe Fouquart: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And that is just in case if there is something to be discussed prior to the counsel meeting, still - and there are problems, you know, from the (SG) constituents' side, we should be sorting that meeting right now from 6:00 to 6:30...

Philippe Fouquart: It'll be discussed there for sure because that is preparation for tomorrow.

Philippe Fouquart: To this point, the idea of deferring and proposing deferring the motion, I think this thoroughly (unintelligible) is that you would propose deferring the motion if you are in the position to either change the current proposal or have a leverage on the process. And we have...

Mark McFadden: Just from a (formal) point of view...

Philippe Fouquart: So, I think all would support deferring this if that (unintelligible) helped. As Mark said, it would appear that people will think that, well we did what we could on our minority report and this is the motion people think that's the best we can achieve and if the motion is up for a vote tomorrow we would vote in favor.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Mark?

Mark McFadden: Responding to something (Phil) had said earlier, I think this is going to end up bad either way, right. That if the GAC got its way the part of the community that worked so hard on the PDP is going to go to the board and say, "why are you doing this," right. So, this regrettably is something where I think the result is not going to be (unintelligible) either way. And I think the counsel is well served by saying, "well at least we stuck to our procedures," right, "when we did this," because as Osvaldo-- four years -- I didn't know that but --as Osvaldo points to is a long history here of the GAC intervening from outside on this issue but never participating directly in the policy development process despite being repeatedly asked to be a part of it. Part of my reaction to what you said is that no matter what happens here this is not going to be good for (communities).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, so in this case, is my suggestion would be that to be consistent with (unintelligible) past and anyways so (unintelligible).

Philippe Fouquart: And also following the discussion with which is going on with the GAC or reaction on the GAC's, so...

Mark McFadden: Can I just ask one more thing? Might I ask the counsel if something comes up during the counsel coordination meeting later tonight, something that - just let us know?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. Okay, good.

Philippe Fouquart: And the last item for tomorrow is discussing...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. Nothing as - so there is nothing (unintelligible)?

Philippe Fouquart: There will be a vote.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, thanks very much. So, yes with regards to - you also talked on Sunday at election specifically for the (Chair) election. Is there a clear (unintelligible) or do we have...

Philippe Fouquart: I mean, to me what we decided was on the first round we'll vote for Rafik and the second for Keith. That was mine.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Was there any coordination of the other constituencies?

Philippe Fouquart: I have to say I'm not aware of the inclinations of the (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: How many (unintelligible)?

Man 4: Sorry?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I'm not aware either. Fine by me. Tony?

Tony Holmes: I'm in the same situation, I'm not aware of any.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So, it's a little bit confusing to me personally because we had some telephone conversations - we've had a monthly (unintelligible) call which was never coming to a final coordination which was said here, let's coordinate here doing lunch and that and this time lunch was you representative and (unintelligible) said that meeting. So, no body coordinated. So, that may seem

that's the constituencies are going different ways and that was - what I know from the others is from the (IPC) they are in favor or (unintelligible) in the end also but whether they are going to split during two (hours), you know, and going different ways, I don't know.

So, the question for me is here shall I refer back to the others and tell them what we are going to do or we decided to do so? And then, they know. They're not surprised. Maybe not surprised them.

Mark McFadden: I think also - yes. I'm going to say exactly what you were going to say. I think transparency in this matter is really important. And being forthright and upfront with the other constituencies I think is a really excellent policy.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay. Good.

Tony Holmes: So, the first thing (unintelligible) remember was half the votes for Rafik. In other words, not all six votes. She said three. If my recollection is correct.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Three of what?

Tony Holmes: Three of the six votes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, and which one?

Tony Holmes: For Rafik, the first round.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Two of us and one from the (IPC).

Tony Holmes: I think it was one and one in each constituency.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Tony Holmes: But then the (BC) had another opinion. They didn't like that. There was some...

Mark McFadden: Tony...

Tony Holmes: ...variation there. That hung out there, I don't think it was resolved.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That depends - sorry (Wolf-Ulrich) speaking. So, in depend of that, so this should be really firm, you know, with that, you know. Not to get confused, right, as we did in the past sometimes, yes. So, then if that has been decided upon discussion, you know, on Sunday then let's do it. Let's call this (unintelligible). You know, both are going to vote for Rafik in the first round and then you come back to a second round because no one gets (unintelligible). So, then it goes (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Let's do it that way so that it's the easiest way to do it.

Tony Holmes: So, we both vote for Rafik in the first round and the second round for Keith? Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Also, I have to say personally but I'm not convinced to do that but okay. I would have - it happened. Well two of ours for Keith but I'd vote for Keith right off the bat.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well you have to discuss that and let's do it that way, yes. Okay, good. Do we have to talk about Vice Chair in action as well because there is the Vice Chair to be appointed by each house. So, that means - I'm not sure if (unintelligible) schedule but it would be good. The best would be if Keith - if the new Chair could start immediately there's two Vice Chairs. So, I'm not sure that the contacted parties are appointed. No, it depends on maybe the outcome of the Chair election. We appointed already somebody but it should

start immediately to coordinate internally about the advised chair position as well. We (unintelligible) procedure between the (unintelligible) Chair and us about that. I will take care about that and then rely on that and discuss with the others how we can view the (unintelligible).

Usually I think it's (unintelligible) going to alternate from one stakeholder group to the other depending on whether it's going (unintelligible). So, it may happen that if Rafik is not appointed Chair and he would like to stay in his Vice Chair - well there maybe (unintelligible) discussion. So, I will take that and come back to the list with it so that we have - but it should be done immediately after this election because to be clear about that.

Well by the way, I would say (unintelligible) so if for example our constituency would have a (committee) that means, somebody as a counseling member is willing to stand for - who's willing to stand for Vice Chair and who is able to stand for Vice Chair, who may get support from the other constituencies, you know, in our house, that we should go that way. So, please think about - constantly think about go into yourself, you know, and think about whether this could be an opportunity as well from our side.

Philippe Fouquart: I think there's one element that we should take into account is that there will be quite (unintelligible) over within counsel on the fact that Rafik has already been the Vice Chair and he's probably the only element continuity with it. And that's a good thing. That's probably something to consider. It's (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, so it's both parts. One is the person the other one is the process we have agreed on. I have to look at this. Good.

Next point, ATRT 3 is also to nominate somebody (unintelligible) each constituency has (unintelligible) - hold on, (unintelligible).

Ozan Sahin: And so, as I'm Ozan Sahin for the record. May I please kindly remind all speakers to state their names for the transcript before speaking, thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. It's continuing -- Wolf-Ulrich here, speaking -- and take up the item of ATRT's 3 so it's about (unintelligible) asks to nominate somebody which has been - I think the nomination stands by the (unintelligible) itself on behalf of the GNSO but internally each constituency has provided to (unintelligible) one person. I think it's also on short term. It should be done within a week? Yes, I have to look at this schedule.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible), 31 of October so just a week from now. So, do we have a candidate?

Tony Holmes: I'd like to nominate Osvaldo, if he's willing.

Osvaldo Novoa: I'm willing.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, that's good to know but...

Osvaldo Novoa: The thing is I'm in the (Spanish) committee and it's a (unintelligible) so I think Tony is the (alternate) if I'm going to be the candidate, Tony will have to take over.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so we have to sort that out. Are there any others interested? I'm asking here.

Mark McFadden: I would support Osvaldo.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh, support is, good yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Competition is also good. So, yes, we are not going to nominate right now. So, I just call for that on the list.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, well, we are not going to nominate right now but will do so on the List. But it's good to know that we are going to stand for that (and with) the other engagements and all with Tony.

Oswaldo Novoa: Okay,

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay. Good. Then the next - we are going to move to the next (IS-PDP (internal) ICANN's. And this is one favored (unintelligible), yes.

Christian Dawson: Yes, sir.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So, continuation on the charter. So, Christian together with (Chantelle) that blocks for (Burk) and the question is how to precede and how to fill these blocks with people working on that?

Christian Dawson: Yes, so we have developed a work plan which I think that the constituency has agreed to. And that involves ultimately, we have gone through the existing charter, we've identified areas that we'd like to spend some time on, we have nominated me to be basically Project Coordinator and to work with volunteer (drafters) to work with the constituencies and likely put together a series of meetings. We suggested in the document a meeting every other week but this could come - once we have our volunteers we could decide something else. So, instead of that meeting period, has not been decided.

Ultimately what we are trying to do is we are trying to get a small group together who was willing to put pen to paper, listen to the needs of the constituents and start to draft proposed language. And the first thing that we are going to do is we're going to take me and those initial volunteers and we're going to get a little bit of a class from the ICANN representative who has been tasked to help constituencies like ours guide ourselves through the process of what the new ICANN bylaws require.

So, when we talk about the different sections that we're looking for volunteers on, we had four - Wolf-Ulrich, you suggested we take it down to three. And I think that that is likely smart. The four that we had outlined are - mission and principles, organization and membership, leadership and then transparency and openness - which is a new section that's required by the new bylaws. Wolf-Ulrich suggested that we could likely loop in membership and leadership into one section and just have a call for three volunteers -- one that was focused on mission and principles, one that was focused on membership and leadership criteria and one that was focused on transparency and openness and other requirements of the new bylaws.

Should we decide - yes?

Mark McFadden: Sorry, just have a question. Sorry to interrupt you on your flow there.

Christian Dawson: Please say your name.

Mark McFadden: Oh, my name is Mark McFadden. I know that. Now, what was I going to ask you? Oh, it was the openness and transparency part. Is that mostly boilerplate. I mean, that sounds like it should be mostly boilerplate.

Christian Dawson: Well I don't actually have the answer to that.

Mark McFadden: Oh, okay. So, my reaction would be that my recollection of the bylaws and Malcolm will correct me here but my recollection of those requirements are that the statements are fairly generic, right. And that the constituency signs up to a set of transparency and openness principles which are already outlined in other documents.

Christian Dawson: That could be the case. So, what you're saying is that if we do break it down like that we might have someone with an easy job?

Mark McFadden: That was going to get to be my point is that you - I was going to say it a different way but what you're saying is completely true. Oh, and this is Mark McFadden for the record. I think the mission part is a difficult - and the membership part is difficult.

Christian Dawson: Right.

Mark McFadden: Right. But I don't think the transparency and openness is difficult. And so, what you might choose is just to have a small drafting team of one person to investigate the transparency and openness thing and focus your energy - this is just a suggestion - focus your energy on what you know to be more contentious, more difficult issues.

Christian Dawson: So, we also may want to talk for a moment about whether we do want to combine membership and leaderships since they're different subjects. One, is criteria and one is things like elections and - so perhaps we want to focus our attention on three and perhaps my responsibility as Coordinator should be ensuring that we're complying with the bylaws and putting in any boilerplate activities.

Mark McFadden: So, that was Christian Dawson for the record. And I'm Mark McFadden again. My reaction to that is that's a pretty good suggestion except we have this backstock that's ICANN staff, right. I assume that once we get done, we're going to hand this to someone who's an expert in this and they're going to say just pass us the bylaws.

Christian Dawson: We're going to start and end with them.

Mark McFadden: Yes, that's cool. So, my reaction is is that my suggestion to you would be to divide the work of membership and leadership into separate tasks and to simply find one volunteer to do the transparency and openness.

Christian Dawson: Okay. Right, yes.

Mark McFadden: So, what I would propose to do is have someone go talk to the ICANN staff about what's required in the transparency and openness and see - find out whether or not I'm right that it's effectively boilerplate text.

Christian Dawson: Got it. I'm turning to the other people in the room because I'm perfectly comfortable with that idea.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So, we followed already some - it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking...

Christian Dawson: With transparency, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: With transparency and openness taking over that because you are pointing to you when you were talking...

Mark McFadden: Yes, so this is Mark McFadden again. I would be willing to do that. I think we have volunteers right, for the other parts.

Christian Dawson: Yes, I do not yet have volunteers. I'm calling for volunteers.

Mark McFadden: Oh, okay. Sorry.

Christian Dawson: I can say now that most -- this is Christian Dawson for the record - with Malcolm Hutty in the room, I would love to tap you to handle the mission and principles section as you have been very - you have shown your ability to work on mission and principles very clearly in the ICANN bylaws process.

Mark McFadden: But you were working with Tony on that, right? Weren't you - after the San Juan meeting.

Malcolm Hutty: I don't think we did it anything.

Mark McFadden: Didn't do anything, okay. It's alright. I think the two of them would be unnatural to do that. So, that would be - and to answer Wolf-Ulrich's question, yes, I would be willing to go away and do the discovery work of finding out whether or not the transparency or openness part of the charter is effectively just standard text. If it's not standard text then we'll need to, you know, have a drafting team.

Malcolm Hutty: Well Tony agreed to this so are you just assigning him work because he sat in the room and he can't object to it?

Mark McFadden: Both of those are true Malcolm.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So, you are mixing it a little bit to know - well I'll be clear with blocks, three blocks.

Christian Dawson: Well it is sort of four block snow.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh, four blocks.

Christian Dawson: We've gone back to four blocks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh, four blocks. So, I'll be clear with that. So, we have parts clear with volunteers, yes or volunteer people Malcolm and Tony Holmes so I have to note as well on mission and principles. And you're starting with the (unintelligible)...

Christian Dawson: Yes, leading membership criteria and leadership criteria is areas where drafters need to step up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: This is Wolf-Ulrich, to add a comment as well, is it worthwhile also to look to already existing charters from other groups?

Christian Dawson: We have done so. In fact, I put that in the last message that I sent to the group. I sent links to recently approved charters for people that could review as sort of process - now here is one idea. Let me know what you think. This is Christian Dawson for the record again. We need four volunteers. We have just tapped two sections as potential sections that could start. What our mission and principals are may help dictate where we take membership and leadership. And the requirements of transparency and openness may end up driving some of the things that are required of membership and leadership. Is it smart to start with these two sections with an idea of kicking in those next two sections in a little bit?

Mark McFadden: So, this is Mark McFadden for the record. The - I think that's a good idea. Wouldn't we be modeling -- and this is just a question -- wouldn't be modeling the leadership section on what we already have in the bylaws?

Christian Dawson: People have a lot of notes in this thing but sure.

Mark McFadden: I mean, we wouldn't - I presume we wouldn't be changing the structure of the constituency through this process, right. So, like leadership, you know, we have Chair, Vice Chairs and all that stuff, right, two counsel members. I mean...

Christian Dawson: Right.

Mark McFadden: And the way that we do elections I would think we'd keep just stick with what we have.

Christian Dawson: Well okay, so yes but here's the thing. If you even take a look at the EPDP you can probably find 90% agreement on what needs to go into this thing and the left 10% blows everything up and keeps people from being able to communicate with one another. And I think the same thing might be true here. Little language changes that will result in conversations that are going to drive us crazy.

Mark McFadden: So, maybe I make this suggestion along the lines of what you suggest that is that, you have this ICANN staff support person that's going to help us sort of under - who's the expert witness in the charter in this re-chartering activity. And that we kick off two that we know we have people for, right? But that after that call with that expert, I would say that you should make a call to the constituency for the other two.

Christian Dawson: Agreed.

Mark McFadden: I wouldn't wait.

Christian Dawson: Agreed. I think that's smart. Let's the four of us -- the three of us and Tony -- get on the call with the expert and figure out what we're in for.

Mark McFadden: Yes.

Christian Dawson: We'll start to lay out what the roles are in these two sections and maybe it's not sections one and four but maybe with sections one and two.

Mark McFadden: Yes.

Christian Dawson: Because your section doesn't exist yet and hopefully is mostly boilerplate okay. At which point we say, we've got a little bit further down the road, let's bring in the other two groups.

Mark McFadden: Good. I think that's a good way forward.

Christian Dawson: Yes.

Mark McFadden: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Philippe?

Philippe Fouquart: This is Philippe Fouquart, and one point, an observation I made on the list is that we should probably in addition to the bylaws have a look at the GNSO Operating procedures. There's a template there of is expected from the (group) in terms of appointing them to (unintelligible). I'm not saying that we should necessarily follow that template but please make sure that, A, it is referenced in our document, and acknowledge, that also we account for these items.

Mark McFadden: I think that's really good advice. Once again, I'm hoping that the expert from ICANN staff almost gives us a checklist of things we should refer to.

Malcolm Hutty: Yes, exactly.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, good. Good idea. So, I have to - Wolf-Ulrich speaking -- to ask about what do you think when this call could happen, you know, obviously the expert (unintelligible). I'm asking is, you know, we should not have much delay in staffing the other (sections) and kicking off that problem.

Christian Dawson: I can ask Chantelle to coordinate -- this is Christian for the record -- a call between me, Malcolm, Tony, Mark, her, and the ICANN-appointed representative. I can ask her to do so right away. Chances are it'll take a couple of weeks to negotiate something.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Malcolm Hutty: Good, if you're talking about the next couple of weeks, yes (if you want) significant input from me. I'm going to be in Dubai with ITU..

((Crosstalk))

Mark McFadden: It takes two to four of us away.

Malcom Huty: This is not going to be my priority in those weeks.

Christian Dawson: Understood. When would you like us to have a kick off call just to learn what the scope of what is we have to deal with?

Malcom Huty: Honestly, I'd prefer not to think about this until (plentapod).

Christian Dawson: Okay, I will instruct Chantelle to reach out after (plentapod).

Malcom Huty: Okay. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks for your willingness as well. So, (unintelligible) and next...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ICANN officer elections but now we have just to look at this because it has to do with either charter as well. So, we have - usually on the basis of existing charter, we should have had already elections or a new election out for the Chair of this constituency and for the Vice Chair and for some of the offices. We have an (unintelligible) for the credentials committee so called committee. Then we have - what is it? I think for the CSG Excom also (unintelligible) to be sent there.

So, this is all in our charter with regards to elections. What I would propose here just from this (unintelligible) is that I personally go into contact list - getting into contact list with Chantelle with regards to that. Sorting out how we can do that. In order to make that happen but also to avoid issues, or it being too complicated and too much overlapping, you know, there are some (elections for) Chair and Vice Chair.

So, that would be my proposal but I'm open onto hear about that and if you see immediately - no. So, your time is over so let's do it right now. So, I'm also open to follow and to discuss these kinds of procedures here.

So, are there any opinions on that? How we should deal with office elections here in our constituencies? Any better proposals? Nothing. Not yet?

Mark McFadden: This is Mark McFadden for the record. I would support what you described before, you get together with Chantelle, propose a schedule, work out the details and make that proposal to the list.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. (CROP) program, Christian, are you familiar with that (item)...

Christian Dawson: I am.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I know there is also something, a deadline for staffing for nominating somebody for the (CROP program). Isn't there?

Christian Dawson: There is. So, we do have an existing (CROP) funding if anybody wants to bring something forward that meets their criteria and measurable criteria and for being able to go to an event within region. And to bring tangible results back regarding that event for the purposes of outreach. If you have something that you know of in your region and you want to create an event around it, we have funding available.

But we also have a funding slot that is possible to use to bring somebody to a region and meeting. So, for instance if there was somebody in the (APEC) region that we wanted to bring to the Kobe meeting, we could use a CROP slot as long as they were in region for that purpose instead. That's a new thing this year.

Mark McFadden: That's very attractive.

Christian Dawson: Yes, it is very attractive.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, really. So, it's for some days so I think...

Christian Dawson: It's very short, right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: ...four days or so. Maybe three or four days.

Christian Dawson: And we need to let them know soon. I need to make sure it hasn't passed.
But we need to let them know very soon if we want to do something for the
Kobe meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I think that would be an opportunity talking to a (client) (unintelligible) here
so if you in your -- as Christian pointed out -- your business environment in
the Asia Pacific region, you know, somebody who would be keen on the -
would like to come to a meeting, an ICANN meeting, and is related to our
business and he is looking for some funding (unintelligible) funding of that,
there's a chance (unintelligible) to fill one slot here to cover those costs. So,
but let us know very soon if that opportunity is and we will show you the
posted process how to (unintelligible) to it.

Christian Dawson: This is Christian, I have the date if we wish to use CROP slot for that
purpose, we need to file the application by November 8.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Sorry?

Christian Dawson: November 8.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: November 8.

Mark McFadden: That's two weeks.

Christian Dawson: Two weeks.

Philippe Foucart: Does it have to be a new comer or can it be someone who's...

Christian Dawson: It could be one of us.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Christian Dawson: It would just, sort of a loop hole - yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: If you need APEC in the region, you know, in the Asia Pacific region for the other meetings that's...

Philippe Fouquart: But Suman LalPradhan is in...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, for example yes.

Philippe Fouquart: ...in the region.

Christian Dawson: True.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: But if there are others as well...

Christian Dawson: Of course, we still need to file a report showing the measurable results of our spend.

Mark McFadden: Yes.

Christian Dawson: So, if we bring - it is up to us if we decide that we want to submit, just bring one of ours but we need to show the tangible results that we got from having them present.

Mark McFadden: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: People have to at least to provide a report of they're travel and their mobile (data service) and so they experience with that and so that's something else to do. Okay, so coming in connection with that to ICANN 64 Travel Support. We have (to decide) immediately. I think one week - within

one week to nominate is going to get funds for Kobe meeting, you know, the constituency has five slots for this opportunity and we usually cover your -- the people who bear the workflow -- however we have more people (unintelligible) and bearing (unintelligible) people. So, we have to find ways, you know, for the next meeting. So, I personally would ask for support. I know Tony Holmes is asking for that as Vice Chair as well. I'm asking (Mike) to counsel us...

Christian Dawson: I think I'll need a...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Tony Harris (unintelligible). So, that would end to the usual question so that we have one slot and we have to find a way to find out, you know, who can get support. So, here from the colleagues, you are not from the Asia Pacific region? No, you are not.

Mark McFadden: Not that I'm aware of. I would love to be but no I'm not. I have a question, if we nominate Osvaldo for ATRT 3 is his travel covered as a result of being on a specific review?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Depending on whether ATRT 3 will have an in-person meeting.

Mark McFadden: It's in Japan.

Osvaldo Novoa: Yes, I don't know if it's covered.

Mark McFadden: Oh, okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: If that is the case then, okay.

Mark McFadden: Okay. So, he will find out.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Maybe also others, you know, who are in teams. I don't know. Whatever, so, it could be covered this way. On the other hand, we will have also to fill his leadership program and this is clearly not funded. Travel is not funded.

Christian Dawson: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So, it could be just one of us who gets funds or it's funded by its own company or so. So, this one will also be given a chance to join the leadership program.

Mark McFadden: You're being very polite here. This is Christian Dawson for the record...

Christian Dawson: Wait a second, no.

Mark McFadden: Without beating around the bush, I'm not going to request travel support. So, that's one less person that you have.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Christian Dawson: I am going to travel request referral. I will be on the list of requested.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I would like to ask you who needs travel support, put your request on the list. You know, and then we have to decide on the - we will discuss it on the Excomm and be transparent as possible with that.

Christian Dawson: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, okay.

Mark McFadden: So, for the record though, I'm not going to request.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you.

Malcom Hutty: Not for the record, I don't know whether I will go and if I do-- what I see is that some people that can really only make it if they get travel support. I can make it without it but I won't turn it down if no one else is going to take it.

Mark McFadden: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible) that we shared some aspect (unintelligible) for me to get funds for the travel (unintelligible).

Malcom Hutty: But I wouldn't want to deprive anyone that needed it more.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. So, good. Well we are in time. Somebody put it on the agenda ISPCP how to join. I think it was (Chantelle). Is she in the room?

Malcom Hutty: No.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So, maybe she has some questions with regards to that process and then - because so we have usually we send out a - what is that? Four questions for people who are interested and are filing for (leadership). Usually these discussions are very general, you know, to say yes or no if they (unintelligible) from (unintelligible). I'm not sure. Maybe she's asking for that. I will contact her so that she comes back with that. And in order if we can help her - because sometimes it happens that there are - the requirements are not every clear. Maybe we can also deal with that during our charter discussion here. I will go back with her.

ISPCP Elections we covered already. So, that is the question related to officer elections. Yes, any question of our next call? So, we should do our next call, usually not the week after, is there - Chantelle is usually repaired well to make suggestions. So, usually have the call on Monday. I think that fitted (unintelligible) will send them later in the afternoon. So, why not to have a call two weeks from now? Will that be okay or is that too early? Two weeks from now?

Mark McFadden: Two weeks from yesterday?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: From yesterday. That I would say is the 6th of November, two weeks from now.

Philippe Fouquart: Monday is the 5th.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Pardon me?

Philippe Fouquart: Monday is the 5th.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: It's the 5th of November.

Mark McFadden: I'll be in Thailand so I won't be joining.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: We can also move to the 5th- the question is is there anything with regards to next (unintelligible) after this meeting.

Mark McFadden: Okay. This is Mark McFadden for the record. I was going to say that I think the 5th is a good idea. Especially if we can, you know, have the participation of our Japanese partners to talk about the beginning of the planning for the Kobe meeting because the sooner we can get that started the better. So, just because I can't be there doesn't mean you shouldn't have it on the 5th. I think you should go ahead and have it on the 5.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. You mean, that would be possible - also, we have to ask to Jia-Rong from ICANN if he is ready to join us. So, let's fix the 5th in case we have to shift that because of this outreach event so maybe. But let's do it on the 5th and at 15 UTC.

Mark McFadden: Yes. I just did the math.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, can you tell? No, wait. We have the last attendance finished.

Malcom Hatty: You can mark my attendance.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: You were just saying we will have the next call the 5th of November. I will...

Malcom Hatty: The 5th.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, anything else? Any question? Any open remarks? Thank you very much for your cooperation. Thank you. We are going to the council meeting. Thanks for the time. It's my pleasure. Thank you.

END