ICANN Costa Rica Meeting
GNSO Outreach- TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 10th March 2012 at 13:30 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Coordinator: Excuse me; today's conference is now being recorded.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: We're in between (unintelligible) presentation comes up. I would like to remind you that the (unintelligible) team or outreach has been the office for a long period of time and is part of the improvement process of the GNSO.

And we had or we talked about, we had motions on the council which we talked about. And the outcome of this discussion and the voting on the motion seemed to be not satisfactory to let me say the majority of us.

And so that was the reason why we put that on the agenda again. And in this respect I would like just to come back at first briefly, also to the audience here in this room because they are also invited to contribute on the discussion on that.

And at first I would just to refer to what we missed the last in our conference session presented just a brief overview - history and then come up to the point which we have to talk about and what should be our next steps of that.

The next - ICANN yes, so just coming back briefly to the background is what was done in the past so we had starting from July 2008 the Board Governance Committee came out with a report on improvement and there was with regard to outreach about a directive written that means the GNSO had developed global outreach programs aimed at increasing participation and constituencies in the GNSO policy process.

And the following, so the implementation policies of the improvements, the so-called Operation Steering Committee, the office, that item and the constituency and stakeholder group, operations team, that was team working with the OSC to develop outreach program and other tasks.

And there was participation from all groups, stakeholder groups within the GNSO in that. So over the last year we dealt with the report itself and the recommendations of that report and the report - the main item of that report was to establish a so-called Outreach Task Force dealing with the strategy for outreach and it was put on as a part of this - put on opening.

A comment then there was a drafting team which chartered off and it was convened and they came up with a draft charter. And that charter was provided through the council to move and the council defeated that motion about that. And as a follow-up at the end of last year there was an alternative motion submitted by the BC and that motion was not seconded.

Now, next slide shows what was the difference and why this - between those two approaches and these two motions and that is one point we should take into consideration between our discussion.

Just in general the first motion which came from the drafting team was about implementation of the OTF, Outreach Task Force and this task force should be responsible for developing the GNSO outreach strategy that meant okay a separate task force had to be established with participation of the stakeholder groups here. And that would be responsible for doing that.

So the second approach for us and that was the second motion was that compared with that staff should compile and collect information about ICANN's already ongoing outreach and participation activities. And so that process, council should postpone the internal discussion about that until receipt of this report.

So these two approaches mirror the different thinking behind them and the different ICANN's which are contentious. So the ICANN is the question what is your role and the involvement of the GNSO Council here in this respect versus your involvement of the stakeholders which was back to outreach. And this was and still an ongoing discussion and open question.

And I would like, that is the major ICANN, I would like to invite all of the participating and people here in this room and from the only stakeholder group from the GNSO by community to contribute to that question.

So again where are we staying? So we have - on the one hand we have defeated the motion which dealt with more over one year with the OTF question and we did not gather motion was even not supported. It was not discussed let me say because there was no second of this motion in the council.

So what I would like to suggest right now is from that point of view, we have as an open point to address the amendment which was given to the GNSO by the Board with respect to the outreach and participation. So that came a long time ago, it was even more than two or three years which implement this improvement of implementation process that the GNSO should come up with something - recommendations with regards to outreach.

So we have to address that and we have to think about how to address it. And for this we should discuss - and also for our internal understanding we

should discuss the roles in this respect between council and the stakeholders all with regards to the outreach.

So this is my brief intro to that and I would like to take a queue for those who participate in the discussion. First so - I'm sorry, (unintelligible) and secondly Jeff. And then Carlos and then Marilyn.

Bill Drake: Bill Drake, I guess I have to start by questioning the framing rule so I'll recommend we have a small disagreement I guess what the underlying problem has been. It has been suggested including in your slides, but this is an issue of the stakeholder group send the community versus the council being responsible.

I've never been able to understand that in any kind of concrete way that's related to the actual proposal that we decided not to support because in fact the Outreach Task Force concept was to have a community-based framework. I mean, the - it says if you read the report, there should be one representative from each GNSO stakeholder group constituency and then to represent us from each geographical region, etc.

It's never been the understanding - most people I know are interested in supporting some sort of outreach activity that what we are trying to do was construct the GNSO Council as some sort of imperial (unintelligible) bureau that was floating above the stakeholder groups and would command them all and manage them and deny them the ability to do any independent work of their own or anything like that.

Rather the idea was that we were going to try to have a collective mechanism so that people would have incentives to cooperate and what ought to be a reasonably non-divisive activity.

I mean, all of the things we're involved in which we tend to have sharp differences, the question of reaching out to people who ought to be engaged

in the work of GNSO in developing countries and so on in trying to get more involvement, I would think ought to be something everybody's kind of on the same page.

And so therefore a collaborative activity that mobilizes on the spirit of commutable effort by trying to coordinate some initiatives, share best practices, share ideas about how to do - how to reach more effectively and so on as a layer that exists alongside what goes on within stakeholder groups I would've thought would have been pretty non-controversial.

But instead what happened when all this came up after a very long delay when we finally got to the motion was, you know, we had -- I don't want to recapitulate all of it back and forth -- it happened, but there was a lot of 11 follower kind of changes where suddenly people were presenting what the OTF group had done as some sort of horrific, you know, almost Stalinist kind of plan.

And it just left some of us baffled and I just think it really created an environment where, you know, a lot of people had thought we're on the same page and doing something that ought to be pretty much a no-brainer and suddenly it was a contentious point that was very kind of new rings that were just pulling.

So that ended up leaving us with nothing and to me the idea of we go back and we just say well we'll let the staff do a survey and then the stakeholder groups all just kind of go off on their own. That doesn't strike me as really a community activity; that seems more like a mandate for individual silos to build their own special relations with various constituencies out there. And I don't think that's what we want.

I would think that ICANN community and the GNSO community ought to be doing these things with a measure of coordination amongst everybody across stakeholder lines.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Bill. Next is Jeff.

Jeff: One of the questions I had, a fairly simplistic one. We said the Board's mandate was for the GNSO to address outreach of participation. Did the Board say the GNSO Council or just say the GNSO as a community or just left it vague? I mean, that's what the whole discussion has been about. There's obviously some groups, constituencies feel stronger about this issue than others.

The registries were going, you know, have no problem supporting the motion. We actually requested a deferral, the initial deferral because in our view when I think it was John Berard that had presented the business constituencies issues. I thought it was going to be a simple matter of just tweaked to that original motion and then it just kind of skyrocketed from there.

I think there's nothing wrong with us sending a message to the Chairs of the stakeholder groups, strongly encouraging them that they do this organization by a certain time even to try to, you know, push them a little bit that something does get done. But, you know, I am sympathetic to the view that this is not really policy development. It's important, but it's not really policy development.

If there's anything the council could do to offer support and any encouragement to get the leaders of these groups, I mean, you know, the non-commercial Chair, the Chair of the BC I know is obviously willing to do this. I know the Chair of the Registry as well and, you know, I'm sure the other groups.

If we can offer encouragement for them to get on it and then, you know, criticize them if they don't, this is what they're volunteering for, I think that's the role of a council and that's opposed to setting up a council working group

supervised by council. If we could do that and it works, hey I think let's give it a shot. Let's actually give them what they're asking for.

Tell the SG Chairs you guys have this mandate -- and the Constituency Chairs -- you guys have this mandate, do it. If you don't do it and we're not satisfied within a couple months or by Prague that you're making progress, then we will step in because, you know, you need some coordination.

All right, Marilyn, I don't know if she heard that or not, but that's my view.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Jeff. Just briefly to your question where it was addressed to the GNSO or the GNSO Council, extrovertly it goes to GNSO. But and the GNSO was incorporated in all of these development of the implement improvement - implementation as well. So there's no question about that.

The question is - one of those questions is since the group has worked over let me say about two years, we should avoid - or we should think about that we shouldn't mislead working groups in such a way that they are working for two years near the end the outcome is not that much - it's seen as not that much appreciated as it was intended to be.

But okay that's just an opinion. Carlos please.

Carlos: Thank you Wolf. Just some thoughts, first of all I strongly support the original proposal made by Olga in her working group. I know that was defeat, but -- the motion -- but, motivation for the first undefeat before (unintelligible) was that the outreach work is in stakeholder and constituencies scope.

But I want to say that it's not true, at least in my region. In Latin America and Caribbean there are no Registry (unintelligible). There are only a few registrars and the other constituencies and stakeholders are invisible. So the outreach doesn't exist. And if we weren't a better GNSO - if we want a better

or improved (unintelligible) and if we want one world and one Internet, we need an informant participation.

And participation is after outreach. We need outreach. GNSO is in my region at least where anybody knows about GNSO in my region. GNSO is nothing, nothing exists. For that I support - I strongly support the consideration, again the first motion. Outreach never is so much, so why deny it? A new possibility to do or get more outreach?

Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: All right, thank you Carlos. Just for clarification and I hope it is a very common view in this room, there is to my understanding, there is no question about that outreach is needed. The only major question is how we shall limit it and how we shall - how that should be done. And this is contentious hearing that, so just for having the team volunteer.

So Marilyn, next.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Marilyn Cade speaking for the transcript. I think - I appreciate the comment that you made because and I'm going to defer to John to make most of the BC's points.

But I think it is important that as the Chair of the BC that I make it very clear from the beginning the BC has been committed to awareness, outreach, participation and involvement across all of ICANN stakeholder groups, not just the GNSO's constituencies and stakeholders, but much more broader than that.

We're committed to the survival of the organization and the improvement of the organization, but our concern is that there's a great deal going on. Things have changed even in the structure of the organization since the initial group was chartered.

Looking back in retrospect, I would say all of us perhaps all of us including the council may have learned a lesson about needing to take stock along the way about whether certain initiatives we charter may be affected by external changes such as the creation of the stakeholder groups.

But the other thing that has happened is there's been an evolution and an involvement of proposals from larger funding from the ICANN budget on awareness and communication. There are budget proposals from the other supporting organizations, from the constituencies, from the SGs to initiate activities and there's no coherence right now that ties all of those together to achieve the common goal as well as the individual and specific goals.

My support for the motion John made on behalf of the BC, it is that coherence we're seeking. We're very supportive with moving forward with coherent and effective approaches that address awareness, outreach, participation and involvement. But we are not supportive of the initial approach that was taken. The goals however I think are common to all.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Marilyn, I have a queue, John, Zahid, Chuck. John first.

John: Thank you Wolf. First let me say that I'm happy to own the impasse. I'm not backing away from having offered an alternative motion even though that motion gained no second. Primarily because the motion that I offered reflects as Liz has just reminded me the specific Board resolution from June of 2008 which was directed at the staff and not the GNSO Council.

              And so combined with the fact that there are two things that members of the Business Constituency are most opposed to. One is unnecessary overhead and so the bill I think that our conversation at the time of my motion in which you were suggesting that I was suggesting that there were some Stalinist plot here to control the minds and behavior of people, you know, I'm not sure that that stuff really ever works, but that wasn't my intention.

My intention was to make sure that we were not creating an organization that would cost money, divert attention from the task at hand. The other thing that Business Constituency members are opposed to is non-strategic investment. You know, we have all seen the inability to solve problems just by throwing money at them and our concern was that we did not even know what outreach was being conducted before we were willing to create a superstructure to help guide it.

So creating an interim step to find out what's going on before we could then decide how to best promote it seemed prudent to us. The last thing that I would want to do is to dampen the enthusiasm of people like Carlos because we share that enthusiasm for expanding ICANN. But one of the questions that I think at some future GNSO Council and Board meeting might be, what the heck are you guys doing to promote ICANN?

Why should someone in Latin America or Europe have a sense of the GNSO if they have no sense of what ICANN is? And so the integration of the outreach efforts on the part of the constituencies and stakeholder groups needs to be aligned with what ICANN is doing on its own.

So I think there are - I think - I believe the Business Constituency as a whole agrees that there are far too many things we don't know to create a new superstructure that could distract or cost money that we might not need to spend.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you John. Zahid is next.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you. I want to just chime in; I have said this before as well. The work that Olga and her team did was extremely valuable to the community. I don't want to in any way say that should just be put to the side so maybe there's a way that we can feed that into whatever process we choose to take forward.

So it's not a question about whether we should have outreach or not have outreach. I think everybody is unanimous that work in outreach has to be done. It's just a question of how it needs to be done. I will note something, we won't ask - the GNSO wasn't asked to do - come up with this outreach program.

If I'm not mistaken and maybe staff can correct me, I think the Board had said that staff has to come up with an outreach program and that's why this was being done. The proposal is to do something leaner, get the constituencies and stakeholder groups to basically provide their input and I completely agree with Jeff.

Let's give it to them for a few months. Let the Chairs and the leaderships so that constituencies come up with it and if they aren't able to, then the GNSO can take, you know, control and say, "Well, you had the opportunity, but maybe we need to coordinate our own."

But I think that opportunity needs to be given to the SGs and the constituencies because I think that they are ultimately responsible for a lot of the outreach efforts that need to happen for who's going to join their constituency (unintelligible). So I just wanted to make that point.

Also, is there a staff compilation document about outreach? If there is one, it would be nice to get a copy circulated.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, thank you. Well, I have to make clear I think so for John and Zahid was mentioning regarding the staff or the GNSO in this respect. I cannot imagine that we have been misled - let's say through the former council has been misled that way. (Unintelligible), this is not supposed to be an ICANN (unintelligible). So then everybody must have slipped that time, you know, that would be unbelievable.

So maybe (unintelligible) could say something to that. But I have in the queue then Rafik and before we go to the next one then we will go then to Chuck. Rafik at first.

Rafik Dammak: So it's Rafik for the transcription. Just say I want more clarification, but I wanted to respond to Marilyn when she said there was some external context that would change say maybe if I'm saying it correctly the output of the report because the existence of stakeholder groups. But in that time we already integrated working to highlight that there is stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So we already in the working group integrated that and we understand about the new external changes. So if we really talk about (unintelligible) is just that I can meet more internationalization and the bringing more participants to the community.

And this wide outreach is really original task that we are just delaying the working group of more than two years and the report that was sent to the GNSO Council (unintelligible) and there was already drafting team. So discovering after that that the reason maybe some problems went already the BC has presented since the working group already make comments and some feedback.

It's literally strange and I don't understand the problem. This Outreach Task Force is not aimed to be kind of outreach superstructure controlling the outreach activities, but just try to bring all the community participant to work in the same goal to bring new people, new blood to the GNSO.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Rafik. Before I go to Chuck maybe - I thought you (unintelligible) from that time, okay then Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I want to start off first of all with some old history. The very beginning of the GNSO, I don't know if it was '99 or 2000, there were a bunch of working

groups that were formed. I happened to be on one. I think it was if my memory's correct -- it may not be -- but I think it was working group E. Guess what topic it was on? Outreach.

Nothing ever happened to that. There was some recommendations made, but nothing ever happened to that to my knowledge. I think all of us has always appreciated the need for that and that's come across here in this meeting.

Now I was also involved indirectly and directly in this working group, but I started off as Chair of the Operation Steering Committee and then when I became Council Chair I backed away from that and just participated otherwise so as not to have a conflict there.

I can tell you that a lot of input was given to this group by those who participated and they made a lot of changes because some of the same concerns I think that the BC is concerned about were brought up in that group. One of the things and please take this for what it's meant. I know how busy all of us are that you can't participate in everything; that it's difficult for every stakeholder group and constituency to participate actively in all groups.

We're the same way on the registries; we have to make conscious decisions. But I think one of the important things that we're dealing with right here is and it illustrates how important it is for us to have people actively involved earlier in the process is that things like this happen after the fact. It would've been much better if the concerns that are being expressed right now came up in the working group itself.

So I'm not going to belabor that, but I think it illustrates to us as leaders in our various groups to make sure that we do our best to get people involved with these things when they're being worked. Otherwise it undermines the process, it makes the people who spend all the time -- and this group did work for a long time -- feel like that their efforts were wasted.

So after that general counseling thing that probably you didn't even want to here, let's talk about the issue at stake. I think we have to be very careful about how we handle this. The group did come up with some recommendations. It's perfectly in the council's purview to reject the recommendations. Okay, or to modify them or even to go back to the group. I don't know if that's realistic at this time.

And ask for changes. Sorry about that for those of you who are on the group of even suggesting such a thing. But it should be done with caution. Now, are there some improvements that can be made? Yes, it'd be good if there could be - maybe we can do like the U.S. Congress does where they - the two Houses have a reconciliation process between bills that are different. The BC has come up with some suggestions.

I don't know if there's some people within the group remaining that could sit down and talk about maybe some ways to reconcile that. That might be one idea. But one thing I caution against is just, you know, totally changing the recommendations of the working group without some consultation with some of the members there to see if there can be some compromise that can be reached.

What I'm perceiving here is that you have some people on one side that are saying, "Let's just go with the recommendations; there's some suggestions made." Would it be possible to have a little reconciliation group? Not a PDP, not a working group, just to see if maybe there's some ways that we could bring our concerns together and accomplish the outreach goal that like I said really started way back at the beginning of ICANN.

And not too much has really happened in the regard, so I think we do need to make something happen.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much Chuck for that explanation and I still have Bill and then John next. Bill?

Bill Drake: Thank you, Bill Drake. Everybody says they agree that outreach is important, we should do it. So that's great, so we're half way there. Now the next step is how? John, just not to go back through all the history. The only point I was making in using those words is that you sent several messages and on calls used words like centralization, bureaucratization and alternated the word to superstructure and all of these words have sort of this sense of them.

And that we're creating some sort of monstrosity that I don't see in the (unintelligible) report at all. So the bottom line is the issue is not the GNSO Council doing everything versus stakeholder groups doing everything. The issue of stakeholder groups doing things by themself or stakeholder groups doing things in coordination with each other.

And people who supported the OTF approach which is (unintelligible) for creating a group of stakeholder representatives, not of, you know, the council to run everything, but as stakeholder representatives we're imagining a process by which we would all get together and share information and coordinate on things we say we care we want to do.

And so why that would turn into a problematic or divisive issue is just beyond me unless we're starting from a presumption that there shouldn't be coordination, that we don't want to have to work together and that we just want to go off on our own.

And if that's what we want, if we want to just say, you know, I can't (unintelligible), give each stakeholder group a pot of money and we'll go off - we'll cultivate our own little outreach efforts and make our brochures and do our things, then that's a completely different kind of model from saying we as a community try to work together towards a shared objective which is a non-controversial and non-political objective.

I tend to think the latter's better. And this also goes to the other point that Marilyn raised about the lack of overall coherence, yes. I mean, there is this stuff going on at several different levels within the organization. So do we respond to that by getting rid of the only mechanism for creating coherence at the GNSO level and doing everything only at stakeholder group level individually?

Or do we try to coordinate within the GNSO community, A, and then with other parts of ICANN in the context of these larger initiatives? Again, I would think the latter's a more sensible approach. We're going to be tampering our ability to contribute to any overall coordination within the organization if we limit our own ability internally.

So, you know, let's not have a debate about something that's not on the table. That not on the table is the GNSO Council will be running everything, the GNSO Council is doing things that are not policy. All the GNSO Council was supposed to do was to approve the charter of the Outreach Task Force and the point of share. And then, you know, people get together and start working.

So it really wasn't more than that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Bill. So we have still 15 minutes to go for this session and I would like then to give the floor to John. And then we should talk about the next steps which already Chuck started to make some suggestions or some - to have some opinion about - let me say about that. So John and then maybe Marika.

Yes, okay John.

John: So there is no objection coordinating outreach. The objection was to creating a mechanism to create it before that we knew what was going on. It was our view that we should first understand what people are up to, how they were up

to it and have the staff do that survey that then could perhaps help guide the design of the coordination.

Okay, so specifically the motion that I offered was merely to vote on recommendation. I think it was three of the prior motion before we decided to take on the rest of it. So there was never any this is the worst thing since whatever the worst thing has ever been. It was as, you know, as I have tried to do since I took the seat here was to find out what the heck the data was. What do we know before we make decision on what to do next?

And, you know, Chuck I apologize if you thought otherwise. I certainly wasn't - I wasn't seeking to throw anything out. The ostensible conclusion was that it would be a bit delayed, but I thought it would be better to know rather than to just jump head long into the pool.

And, you know, look there are some - we could in a sidebar get into a conversation about how ICANN has allocated the funds that it has allocated for outreach which if you're a member of the GNSO in general you should find, you know, objections. So yes, so there may be some ardor link to - for that annoyance.

But no I think that it's best to know and once we do we can then make an informed decision.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Marika please.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, I have a question from (unintelligible) of participants and from George Kirikos he asks, "Has it ever been proposed that as part of the REA registrants we emailed once a year in their native language in how they can participate in ICANN -- for example give just like annual who is reminders -- and or maintaining a permanent link on a registrar's home page to encourage outreach although there is no real registrant's constituency at present?"

John: Well, I don't have an answer, I have a response. I think of my responses is that would be spam, that would be telling a registrar to basically requiring a registrar to email all of its customers with something that has nothing to do with their business. So I think that's not been considered, but I think probably for good reason.

Marilyn Cade: In response to the question if I might -- it's Marilyn -- don't we need to when we get questions like that point out that ICANN has a very robust ALAC initiative and I know the Chair's in the room. And that many people who might not presently have a constituency may be able to actively participate through the ALAC.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. So yes, is it right to that point or?

John: I'll say - I mean, if registrants don't always have their information with the registrar this is one of the issues, right? So if somebody's using a proxy, how do you get the information to them?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. So we have ten minutes left. So I would like to talk about the options you may have; so with regard to the outreach ICANN - handling the outreach ICANN. I wanted to say that I think that if we all followed the processes we have implemented so far, if it means the working team follows their policy and they provide support and so on to the council and the council moved about that and there's all this what we have right now.

So there is the report was or the motion on the question of the - just averaging the OTF was rejected. Another motion was not seconded, so it was not discussed also because it wasn't seconded. So what are the options we have? So at the end there shall be (unintelligible), an address to the Board, yes to say something, what we have dealt with, what is our outcome of that whole discussion?

What are the options about that? Do we really have the opportunity to step into the existing motions, the past motions again? Or is that leading to the same result say if we go that way? So that one question. The other is, so if we do not, then I would understand the thing is so far over. But and anybody of the council or any group can come up with a new motion about that issue and try to get it through the council.

So what is your real options? I would like to have some ideas about that. So if you do nothing, then if you don't do anything, then the status quo is at risk so it seems to be finished. If somebody comes up with something with a new directive or we see some proposals where we can pick it up and do that.

So Thomas please.

Thomas: This is possibly slightly off topic, but (unintelligible) the registration for the Internet industry has recently carried out an update and study also asking the registrars whether they pass on promotion material by the registries to their resellers and less than 10% would do so.

So I think it's in general very difficult to simulate a process whereby information is passed on to the next hub and the reseller chain if you wish. And therefore I think different mechanisms are needed in order to reach those who would be the legible parties who participate in the ICANN process and I think each and every registrant would certainly not be interested in participating.

At the same time discussing this at the council level and seeing this discussion lingering on for such a long time, I have to honestly admit that I'm not an expert in identifying channels to bring across this message. And therefore I ask myself whether this would be the appropriate forum to make decisions for which at least my expertise is not relevant.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, we have a contribution here from the floor. Please say your name.

Carlos Afonso: Okay, yes I would like you to if you can take a look at...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Your name please?

Carlos Afonso: Carlos Afonso, I'm a former Board member of GNSO and with the NQC. If
                  you can take a look at www.icann.org.br and is a Portuguese version that the
                  Brazilian Internet Steering Committee maintains of the ICANN site which the
                  relevant resolutions - main topic is being discussed reasonably I think until
                  February 17. And just to show you that like that there may be several efforts
                  that promoting ICANN.

                  We should be taking into account, you know, policy to promote the
                  organization, GNSO and all its supporting organizations, etc. Incidentally the
                  Portuguese site which I'm showing you now is not explicitly linked from the
                  ICANN main site, okay?

                  That's it, thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you; I have further contribution from here.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, the Chair of the At-
                  Large Advisory Committee. Thanks for allowing me to speak in your meeting.
                  Just a couple of points, I think the first one is every since I've been in ICANN
                  I've been fighting against the issue of having silos. I see outreach being
                  discussed here. We have outreach being discussed tomorrow in our room.

                  There's outreach being discussed in other parts of ICANN and we all say the
                  same thing. We all say outreach is needed; we need to have more people
                  involved. But everyone appears to be fighting against the other constituencies
                  and other communities because there's just one part of money that everyone
                  has to share from and I think that's very unproductive.

I think that ultimately outreach is something that should benefit all of us. These are my personal views on the matter, but outreach should benefit all of us. And, you know, we've had a policy in At-Large to have one ALS, one At-Large structure in every country. We're far from reaching that yet, but we are signing up more At-Large structures because we need new volunteers to come into the structure.

The ICANN multi-stakeholder structure is only there because of the volunteers that are here and the big danger is volunteer burnout because the same people have to go from working group to working group and you just get taken up into it until you end up not doing your real work because you've got another life as well.

And you end up spending all of your time on ICANN related matters. So more volunteers are required all the time. You will get some that will leave, that will come back, et cetera and that's valid not only for Internet users in ALAC, but also for business - well, for all of the different constituents of the GNSO. So really, you know, to summarize my point. I think that it's important that we coordinate somehow the outreach.

I know that when we've tried to sign up new At-Large structures sometimes from At-Large structures meeting with new potential At-Large structures, they don't fit the At-Large criteria. They might fit the BC criteria or they might fit another part of the organization and we should be able to share this information between the different SOs and ACs. I think it's really important.

I also appeal on the GAC to be able to perhaps give some leads as to what organizations would be able to join ICANN in different SOs and ACs. And of course appeal everyone here in the GNSO to be able to see if you have anyone that would like to join and to take part in the GNSO's work, but might not quite fit into some of the categories that the GNSO has.

If they fit into the individual Internet user part or the At-Large structure part, then to send them over to ALAC.

Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Olivier for your thought and appreciate as well to get input from other sources. Since you have only two minutes left for this ICANN, so I wonder if we could come to a conclusion right now.

So I would say -- so this is a suggestion to make -- since we have still the both contentions I would say on the table. So isn't that a -- and we have to address something to our - to the body which gave us amendment to the overhead. So are we in a position to answer that request?

It could be an answer in any kind, you know, these are okay just explaining the situation as we are and so that we are in a kind of deadlock or maybe we've come to a different conclusion.

But that would mean if you would like to come to that conclusion that we have to fit together - some of our people have to fit together again and think about do we find a way out of this rather than to have three polarized positions let me say, different ones, and communicate that to the Board?

And so my suggestion would be that let me say three or five or four of us get together to do that to try that. So that's - and the proponents were John on one hand, Bill on the other side. I would be a volunteer to that so we don't have the leader of that group. So Olga has left the council, but maybe you have somebody of that group available.

That would be my suggestion to find - it must not be the result of a new motion, but it could be a message to the council, okay, that the situation at the time being and we have only that message which is a kind of consensus message we could convey to the Board.

So that would be my suggestion, but any comment to that very last one, of comments to that? And then we close the session. Bill was first and then Chuck.

Bill or Chuck. Okay, good.

Man: Thanks Bill. And well, if I can be of any help in that suggestion, I'd be happy to. I just one real brief comment. In hearing a lot of the discussion and the concerns and so forth, I can't help but come to a personal conclusion that these are things that the Task Force can be dealing with. But that said, maybe it's a group like this or even a preliminary task force that kind of does the work on this.

I think there's a way forward on this and again if I can be of any help on that, I'll be happy to volunteer as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. Chuck, Bill?

Bill Drake: Actually I was going to say we need contracted party people in the group number 1, so Chuck solved that problem. And then the other question is whether we want to try and talk about, you know, one step at a time and I think we should put that back on the table.

And I guess my point would be the original (unintelligible) part of the Outreach Task Force group to actually do the survey. John's suggesting staff do survey and then we'll think about it. So this is maybe one of the first things we can focus on and whether there should be two steps to this.

If it's just the survey and then we stop and we think that's one thing, if it's we do a survey and then something else happens, then we're talking about a different situation. So I just put those on the table for our consideration when we do this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay John, any comments to that?

John: No, I think we've pretty much covered this from A to Z. I'm more than happy to serve on any transitional task force that we might - as long as we can vote on having our meetings in some nice place.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

John: But no, I think that there is - I think that the small group that you have picked can I think can find a solution to this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay and the (unintelligible) parties would be represented by Chuck I suppose? Last comment please Marilyn because we are overtime.

Marilyn Cade: Can I have clarity on this that this interim whatever is going to try to seek a compromise? Not bring forward as a substitute for a task force that I do not feel there's support for.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So can we have clarity on that because I will say from taking notes on some of the comments, I'm not sure there's clarity on the purpose of the small group is to seek a compromise which would come back and present the compromise. Is that right?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, that's correct.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, John can go to a meeting in a good place then.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay, thank you very much. So I would like to just sort of contact after this session you both and just to put together some points here and so that we can organize ourselves.

And then I would say thank you very much for your contributions and this session is over. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you Wolf; thanks everybody. Let's have a really short recess and then we will continue with an item on the (unintelligible).

Start in two minutes please, thank you.

Coordinator: This concludes today's conference. Thank you for your attendance, you may disconnect at this time.

END