

**ICANN Dakar Meeting
NCSG Meeting - TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 25 October 2011 at 14:15 local**

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

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded, if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Man: We're recording right here but as far as getting connected we don't connect it there. The translation will only start now as far as the translating.

Woman: And can people in the Adobe Connect participate the audio and they can speak in the Adobe Connect?

Man: The Adobe Connect and the streams have always been up, the Verizon bridge was not.

Woman: Okay so we should be able to hear the people talking in the Adobe Connect room.

Man: Correct.

Woman: Okay so...

Man: No, I'm sorry, not in the Adobe Connect, that room is always text only.

Woman: So how do we hear people talking that are participating remotely.

Man: They would need to call into the Verizon bridge, which I can give you the phone number.

Woman: Okay so yes, I need to give you guys a new phone number to dial in to if you want to talk and again I apologize for some of these connection issues, it's been like that so far for much of the week.

So working on it and we'll have a call in number so people can dial in, apparently the number they gave us before isn't working for folks.

And you can always type into the Adobe Connect chat in the meantime as well. So okay, well let's get started while they dig up the number that people can call in to and let's first talk about the amendment to the RAA.

So the registrar accreditation agreement is an agreement that has - people have meaning to get some amendment into that agreement and we had a motion that is currently before the council for a vote this week that would include a number of issues that are considered high and medium level priority for amendment to make into the registrar accreditation agreement.

So excuse me, let me just go back and give everybody the number for people to dial in to if you'd like to speak and I hope you will. It is 1-866-692-5726 and the code is NCSG and I'll say this again and Konstantinos will type it into the Adobe Connect room so that you can actually see it.

Again it was 1-866-692-5726 and the code is NCSG. And Konstantinos if you could also send that to the email list so people can get that number via email and again sorry that you've been given lots of incorrect contact details and start time details and such that turned out to be changed.

And so it's a bit confusing but let's go forward nonetheless. Okay, so on the RAA amendment actually I was hoping that Wendy as the drafter of these proposed amendments to the amendments could - and is our only GNSO councilor - GNSO councilor in the room and she could explain what the amendments are that we are putting forward and how that works. Wendy?

Wendy Selzer: Thank you. So this is the - another piece in a sort of long running discussion of the registrar accreditation agreement and the process for amending that agreement.

At the moment there's a motion on the table which is of the third iteration of motions that have come up and been voted down by a block vote of the contracted party's house.

That's a motion to adopt a process for amending the RAA that would have the proposed agreement that all registrars sign, come before the GNSO council for a vote before becoming a finalized contract.

This is coming up again before council, the process would be that the negotiations gets done by registrars and ICANN council, not without public observers but that the final contract would come before the GNSO council for review.

At the moment the motion on the table is to recommend the adoption of various items identified as high priority items in a working group that was review - proposed changes to the registrar accreditation agreement and those would be - we are planning to propose an amendment to this motion to divide the procedural from the substantive aspect here.

To say we are fully on board with the procedure that would be more open and transparent. We do not endorse all of the changes that are proposed as high priority items for adoption because some of those are things like the restriction of privacy and proxy services.

And other changes that would go against substantive issues that NCUC has supported in the past, if we'd like to discuss those issues more fully I would be happy to defer to the specifics.

Man: Yeah, so I just want to (unintelligible) good afternoon, good morning.

Woman: I'm sorry, who's speaking?

Man: Pardon

Woman: Hello, could you please say your name?

Man: (Unintelligible) good morning, calling from Sierra Leone.

Woman: Wonderful, please go ahead, Sierra Leone.

Man: All what I'm seeing because for the (unintelligible) has not been (unintelligible) but I mean we have been fully discussions and related this issues you are talking about.

Though we've - I mean I did not replay them for quite some time but all I'm saying you guys are (unintelligible) date walk and I mean and the motion is yet towards pushing ICANN forward.

I mean I think that's where you (unintelligible) and for me I think I'm (unintelligible) this is my fourth meeting this year and sometimes I'll be (unintelligible) on the issues around ICANN development.

Woman: Okay, let me just make sure I understand what you're saying. You're wanting to see ICANN focus more on development issues? I'm sorry, I'm having a hard time hearing you, it's a very low volume call and so if you could speak

up. Is that what you're saying, you'd like to see ICANN more focused on development issues? Did I hear that?

Man: Yeah, of course, of course. Yeah. You know I mean like for (unintelligible) not many people know the work of ICANN and it's very important for people to know the work of ICANN so that more people will participate (unintelligible) the issue because most of the issues around privacy or property (unintelligible) to ICANN.

These are issues that are new to some people, if you want to talk about ICANN development or issues, I have to...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you. Thank you. What we're having our discussion on right now is the registrar accreditation agreement and the particular motion that's before the council this week up for a vote, for amendment to the registrar accreditation agreement.

So it sounds like you're talking about something different and we're right now looking for comments and input on the registrar accreditation agreement and the amendments that have been proposed.

So if anyone either on the call or in this room, in the group would like to speak to this issue, the RAA motion please raise your hands and let us know if there's anyone who can speak to this issue.

Man: Hello? Hello?

Woman: Hello yes? I'm sorry, did you have a comment on the registrar accreditation agreement?

Man: Pardon?

Woman: Do you have a comment on the registrar accreditation agreement motion before the council this week?

Man: Well of course I do support the motion.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Yeah, you're welcome.

Woman: Okay so does anyone else have any comments on the amendment that we're proposing this week? On the RAA, nobody? Okay. We're talking about the RAA motion this week, want to see if anyone has any comments on the motion or...

Wendy Selzer: So I'll just - procedurally what's likely to happen in council is just completing my draft of some proposed amendments to send to Kristina and Debbie as the proponent and seconder of the motion, to ask whether these are friendly amendments.

If not and I discussed them with Kristina a bit earlier, she said she was unlikely to consider them as friendly. But I am interested in raising them as an amendment before the council even if as an amendment to be voted on in the event that they're not friendly.

And we will then traditionally vote on the amendment and then one way or the other vote on the underlying motion.

Woman: Thanks, I just note that Bill in the - Bill Drake the NCUC GNSO councilor who's participating remotely has expressed his support for the amendment that Wendy has drafted.

Okay so we're going to start a queue here for people who want to speak to this issue and so far I've got Debbie Hughes from the American Red Cross, Debbie go ahead and then Mary.

Debbie Hughes: Thanks. I hadn't seen the amendment, I'm sorry, I've been having intermittent email access and challenges with my work email so if you could send them I'll send you an email from my Yahoo email if you could send it there I'll take a look, thank you.

Woman: Thanks Debbie. Mary did you have a comment?

Mary Wong: It goes back to the procedural stuff because as Wendy's saying if the amendment is not accepted as friendly then I believe the practice is in the council vote - actually no, if it is not accepted as friendly then do you still vote?

Wendy Selzer: We would vote on the amendment and the amendment would be accepted or rejected then we would continue to vote on the motion.

Mary Wong: And so my follow up was thank you for clarifying that I had a moment where my brain just melted, it's not relevant at all. So if that happened then we would go back to our vote on the original motion that Debbie seconded and it may be worth talking a little bit here so you could feel that the council has talked briefly about this.

And you know Bill had sent some comments because in the past when we've had similar motions come up before the council, we voted in favor of the motion and our primary reason has been because we thought it was important that there was community input into the process of amending the RAA.

And we knew that the contracted parties would always vote no, that they would want to negotiate the amended agreements with ICANN without having

community participation during the process. So that was - there is a big concern for us and I guess what I'm asking then is if you go back to the original notion given that the proposal amendment does it mean that some of us will be voting against the motion in contrast to the past?

Woman: Anyone have anything to say on that? I mean I've got some views that I'd be happy to share but prefer to hear from others first. Okay so I think there's two separate issues, there's the issue of whether or not the GNSO is the forum for making these kinds of amendments.

And the participation from the community that Mary spoke of, so that's one issue and there's a second issue which is the actual substance of the recommendations and the kinds of changes that they would make with the agreement.

And I think that it's the second part, it's the substance of the RAA amendment that have been proposed, it's in the final report, the RAA final report dated October 18 2010 if anyone would like to go look at it.

It's 180 page document, written in typical ICANN fashion so what you really would do is pay attention to Pages 20 and 21 of that document because that lists the items that have been considered high, medium priority, things that this group will then go and try to make the amendment in accordance with the issues that are listed on those pages.

And that's the part that some of us realize just what was contained in those - the substance of these recommendations sort of got a hair on end, things like (unintelligible) privacy rights and taking down domain names if there's any inaccurate information and requiring registrars to investigate their customers.

And you know all sorts of things that non-commercial users have fought very much advanced over the years here at ICANN, so now that we've realized

that this is what has been put forth into the council, some of us are like wow, we can't possibly do this.

What are we - this is in complete contrast to everything we've ever done in the past and all the statements we've ever made about the importance of privacy and due process rights and things like that.

So a number of us are concerned about this and would like to vote no on the overall motion if our amendments don't succeed. And I doubt those will because I'm sure the IPC and commercial stakeholder group would be against them and the contracted parties are against this whole notion for (unintelligible) which again is an entirely separate issue.

So if there's a good chance that these amendments will not pass then we'll go back to the original motion which contains all those scary things.

So I think that a number of us would be voting no, if that particular motion was the one that goes forward to the council. So does anyone - Mary?

Mary Wong: And I realize that this is a risk but I wonder if - and obviously I think that we need to make some kind of statement during that in case the contracted parties misinterpret a no vote from some councilors who have voted yes to similar motions in the past.

I think that a statement that on the record as to the reason for a changed vote or at least perhaps a surprising vote would be useful on the record so that we're not then interpreted as saying well now we don't mind that they can go up and negotiate in secret.

I think that's helpful. The other part of this is to the extent that we know it's going to be shot down by the contracted party's house, would that statement be sufficient?

I realize that since - that there be some further thoughts within the group since the last motion and I'm not trying to push people to change their minds, I'm just urging all of us to the extent that some (unintelligible) be surprised to make sure that there is a very correct statement and explanation of what it is that we're concerned about so that doesn't get misinterpreted, particularly by the contracted party.

Woman: Thank you, no I appreciate that and I agree, we should make a statement about why we would vote no and what are the particular issues that we have and highlighting them in particular.

But a lot of people in the audience would be surprised to find out what substance if you dig down into the details to find out just what it is we're voting on here.

So I think it would be very helpful for us to explain our rationale for why we would want to do that. Did anyone else have anything to say on this issue? Anyone on the call? Participating remotely?

Okay. Doesn't look like it so let's go on to next issue on the agenda which is the other issue that is up for a vote on the council this week, the PDP working group and their task force that they've come up with.

They've been working on trying to reform the PDP process and so they've come up with a whole new PDP policy development process for those of you who are relatively new to ICANN.

So it's trying to rework the policy development process, in particular as a result of the GNSO restructuring. So we've got this motion that's up as well, do we have any people who can particularly councilors who can speak to this particular - Debbie is this something you can speak on, the PDP work team vote for this week?

Debbie Hughes: No.

Woman: Okay, you're not on that one. Okay, Mary.

Mary Wong: Actually the best people would probably be those of our members aside from the council to involve, I don't have anybody who's on the call but essentially as (Robin) said this has been a work in progress for a long time, we've had very active participation from I think our whole stakeholder group.

And talking about it has been (avass) and this is something for the members to direct us on. It seemed that within (unintelligible) very encouraging occasion and going forward it would be really good if what happened in this working group was followed in that there were several opportunities for public comments.

And at each stage when there were public comments, the team went back and looked at those comments and addressed them and incorporated them on some way took account of them and therefore the final report is a process that is somewhat collaborative taking into account public comment.

Aside from that I think that one of the recommendations really does improve the existing PDP process so I don't see any reason not to support the motion.

Woman: Any other councilors in particular want to talk about this motion if they're going to vote for it or against it and why that might be?

Wendy Selzer: This is Wendy, and I'm inclined to vote for the motion, I think that it does good things to improve the policy development process and...

Woman: Great, thank you Wendy I really appreciate that and I want you to note in the chat that Bill says that he agrees about explaining the need to the specific problems that we have on the RAA motion.

Okay Bill, did I sufficiently - is there something else you wanted said that hasn't been said? Please type it in. Okay, so sorry about that little detour there, back to RAA.

Any other comments on the PDP work team? Debbie please.

Debbie Hughes: Yes, I'm inclined to vote as well, I mean the overview they gave of the weekend seems reasonable, though I haven't been intricately involved in the development work, sounds very reasonable.

Woman: Konstantinos?

Konstantinos Komaitis: Yes, I just want - I have to take you back to the PDP sorry, but Bill is asking that's the RPC (unintelligible) the motion down in flames.

Woman: I suspect you'd have to ask the IPC what they realize. I don't read their minds. Has anyone had any conversations with the IPC on this issue and can discuss what they've had to say about it? We're back to RAA again apparently.

Woman: Are we talking about the CSG or the IPC?

Woman: Bill says IPC.

Woman: What was his question?

Woman: Does the IPC realize that refusing to accept the amendments they'll lose votes and send the motion down in higher flames or the CSG more generally?

Woman: I would imagine that that's pretty obvious although I haven't had any conversations, I think that you know that or not a moment's reflection would mean that they know that.

But I believe from the conversations I've had since Saturday not on this specific issue on the changes we're proposing since the language hasn't gone over, the idea during the Saturday sessions was that a door was opened to the contracted parties to come back with a friendly amendment that would address our transparency concerns for example.

So I would hazard a guess that the thinking is there is to be a friendly amendment issue come at least at first from the contracted parties so that the thunder isn't stolen from the basic point of the whole motion which was going to die anyway.

Woman: Okay, thank you. Does anyone else have anything to say on these issues, if not I'd like to go on to the next issue and move along, we've got - we're very short for time.

And one of the more hotly contested issues coming up here at ICANN is UDRP review and possibly reform and this is an issue that's been very close to non-commercial user's hearts over the years.

And we have been pretty active in the last six months or so talking with other stakeholder groups about the different ways that the UDRP could be improved and how we could look at that.

Actually I'd like to turn this part of the conversation over to Konstantinos because he is someone that is extremely knowledgeable on UDRP and has been working on a lot of the comments that we've put forward.

So Konstantinos why don't you talk about the - can you explain to us what is it that we're trying to - that we've been asking for with respect to UDRP review here at ICANN?

Konstantinos Komaitis: Yes, I will also - this is Konstantinos, we also had this conversation this morning at the NC Symington so as many of you may or may not know the (unintelligible) was brought before the council.

And since a year almost now since that has been brought up, (unintelligible) occasions whereby discussion every year they have taken place, at first it was a webinar, the second was a workshop.

Generally the ICANN meetings (unintelligible) and the - then the ICANN staff produced the report that was given to the GNSO and now the issue is whether the UDRP is going to be amended or (unintelligible) amended and when this is actually going to take place.

My (unintelligible) there was discussions it appears that the majority is not against a review, there is an issue of timing though when this review should happen. AT the GNSO council on - during the Saturday and the Sunday sessions there were discussions that maybe we should wait for 18 months and figure of 18 months was heard.

Especially because the new gTLD's about to roll out and some (unintelligible) production mechanisms have - and we don't know how the right production mechanisms basically the URS and much less of an extend the UDRP are going to play out because they have been both on the UDRP.

So that's where we are, when it comes to the issues with the UDRP they are both substantive and procedural.

I think that like the GNSO and ICANN seem to be more afraid and I want to put afraid in quotes because it's not a lack of a better word right now.

Touch the substantive issues and they seem more amenable to the procedural issues. I'm going to set (unintelligible) what each one of these

issues are in that I would like to say that the UDRP is the (unintelligible) that I can have.

The UDRP has never been reviewed in the past 12 years and it is very important that at least we pretend whatever everybody things when the UDRP should be reviewed.

Those who actually developed the UDRP should be reviewed really to put a time frame that what the GNSO needs to be on a time frame because the same discussions were taking place back in 2000, between 2002 and 2003 and the issue was postponed until we have now 2011 and the issue is still being discussed. Thanks.

Woman: Thank you very much Konstantinos. Is there somebody on the line who wanted to speak to UDRP review? Okay, is there anyone in the Adobe chat who's made some comments on the issue?

It doesn't look like it. Okay, so let's go on to the next issue then, which is - oh Mary's got a comment.

Mary Wong: It's not so much a comment but when reviewing the final agenda for the council meeting tomorrow and I think we've put in an item to discuss this.

So it's just a note, obviously there's nothing up for a vote at this meeting, it would be probably be the next meeting so the second point would be between now and the next policy call, the next council meeting I think our group should discuss what it is that we would want to push forward.

Because that same of the other groups who are amenable to a review but that's not at this time but do not want to postpone a vote, they want something that happens at a time certain.

So maybe worth us thinking about our position or possible alternatives that we can be happy with and talking to some of those other groups about it before the next council meeting.

But there is a discussion item tomorrow if anybody wants to speak to that.

Woman: No, I think that would be great actually, I think that would be a really good opportunity for members to make statements to take the floor and to open meeting and one can take the floor and then one can give their two cents on how they feel about the UDRP and where they see improvements could be made.

And I definitely would encourage you to do that because this is as Konstantinos has noted one of ICANN's oldest policies, 12 years and certainly one that everyone who registers a domain name it touches upon.

So it affects you know millions and millions of people and so it's actually a really important policy and I think as you - important for non-commercial users and prospective of civil society to be vocalized in these public forums on this issue.

Does anyone else have anything on the UDRP review issue? Okay doesn't look like it, speak now or forever hold your peace because we need to move on to the next subject.

Okay, so the next subject is another motion, or excuse me not motion but another issue that is working its way through the GNSO right now and that's a request from the Red Cross and the Olympics committee for special rights in the top level domain name space.

And this was something that the GAC had been - got involved in and so does anyone here have any comments? I know we had a lot of discussion on the mailing list on this issue.

We had frankly really great to see all of the participation and the new members vocalizing their perspectives and it's really exciting to see so many new perspectives and participants engaging with the NCSG and the GNSO policy development process in general.

So does anyone have anything they wanted to say on this issue, on the Red Cross and the Olympics request? Anyone? Mary does.

Mary Wong: Okay, just real quick, just to note that the proposal is to form a working group task force, whatever it is and that proposal's been discussed within the council and seems to have some support.

So as this goes forward, and those of you who were at the GAC meeting on Sunday will note that the GAC was not too impressed by the idea of the joint group at the moment.

They're going to send off the GNSO's proposals and recommendations in a document, obviously I think the council continued to talk about that.

But we - to the extent it was members interested in both issues, the - that will come out of the council on that so keep a watch out for it or opportunities to contribute.

Man: Mary, sorry for jumping in, a very quick question. Is - I wasn't clear that (unintelligible) probably, is the working group if it's going to be formed will be comprised of council members so anyone can join?

Mary Wong: I don't think it will be comprised just of council members either because that's not the working group model.

I will note two things, one is that it will not be a typical working group with a charter and everything I don't think because this - the term itself and the process will be problematic for the GAC.

But I would be very surprised if it was limited only to council members.

Man: I just wanted to - I'm generally supportive of the idea that we have a working group or similar. I think there's some definite you know - there's definitely some strong arguments in the proposal but there's also a lot of stuff that is clearly not the GAC lead misrepresents particularly the treaty of Nairobi.

So I think we need to do a lot more. We need to have a working group or something that drills down a lot further than the GAC letter does into the details. I mean the treaty of Nairobi protects the - which they have used as they made a justification on the Olympics, protects not the word Olympic or Olympiad it protects the five ring symbol which is quite separate.

And it's a completely separate set of legislation that they're talking - you know it's just very confused, the detail is not adequate, we need a working group to look into this in much more detail.

Woman: Great, I've got Debbie in the queue and which is good because we've got a question from Bill who's participating remotely and he's wondering why the mechanisms that are applicable to others do not adequately or do not provide adequate protection for the Red Cross and the Olympics. Go ahead.

Debbie Hughes: Thanks Bill, you queued up that perfectly for me and I have a statement that the American Red Cross would love to share.

And so thank you for the opportunity to speak to the GNSO council and to the NCSG. As you're aware the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement is protected by unique lair of protective privileges for the emblems and the board designations.

However here we're talking about our word designations. The Red Cross and Red Crescent is it's emblems and its designations provides assurances to communities and victims of disaster that help is on the way.

The Red Cross has looked at and carefully considered the nature of these protections and thinks that there's no other organizations with this unique level of protective privileges.

As you know the Red Cross, Red Crescent movement is protected by both the Geneva conventions and a unique tapestry of national legislations in more than 100 jurisdictions.

The Red Cross Red Crescent movement provides help and assistance based on the generosity of the public and thank you, and we're asking for this because it's consistent with our mandate to provide these assistance in times of disaster and consulate which is not funded by governments or municipalities.

And so we thank the GNSO for considering this special request and look forward to the - to protecting our important organization. Thank you.

Woman: Konstantinos, I believe you're next.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Thank you. It is just a question which I (unintelligible) take and it's a question to Debbie, is there any reason why the international Red Cross has not made that request instead that request came from the US plant? Thank you.

Debbie Hughes: Actually we're working in conjunction with the international federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. I was asked to take the lead because I'm a GNSO councilor.

But we have consulted with them, thank you.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Thank you.

Woman: And we've got another question follow up to your statement in the Adobe chat room, Bill Drake asks, Debbie let me be more specific then, everyone supports the Red Cross and know there's a treaty.

But why are the mechanisms defined in the AG not sufficient to your purposes? So if you can answer that question.

Debbie Hughes: Certainly. In times of disaster the level of fraudulent activity increases as third parties attempt to confuse the public in order to devote funds and payment for the Red Cross Red Crescent movement.

It's a shame to ask our organization to devote billions of dollars to stop the fraud that unfortunately occurs during these important times and to be able to serve our community we're asking for these special permissions. Thank you.

Woman: Okay, so I think everyone is against fraud and everyone wants to help people but why are the mechanism defined in the AG not sufficient for your purposes?

Debbie Hughes: Okay, so I'll be specific. Whatever the total amount that's going to be required to participate in the US should be retaking or the (unintelligible) taking money from donated dollars to protect against fraud.

Woman: So it's the money, okay, does anyone else have any questions? Want to speak on this issue? Okay. Yes?

Wendy Selzer: I want us to be - this is Wendy and I just want to be very clear that in discussing this issue I think all of us unanimously have been supportive of the important mission of the Red Cross and we're trying I hope to all in good faith

to figure out how this request fits into ICANN's policy making and how we can support these mission related issues.

And the processes that ICANN needs to develop, so I hope we'll be able to do both of those things. David please.

David: I just want to make one really brief comment, I think I agree with Debbie's assertion that this isn't an issue where we really need to worry about precedence.

There are as far as I can tell you know a very small number, possibly only two organizations that we are having to consider in this manner that are protected by essentially global treaty.

Woman: Anyone else have anything on this particular issue? Because if not I'm afraid we're going to have to cut the meeting - one more question here, could you please state your name?

(Michael Carsten):Hi, this is (Michael Carsten) from the YMCA of the USA, I don't have a question regarding the issue, I have a question regarding the issue that's not on the agenda.

So I understand that there's time constraints but this issue is important. I believe not only to the reputation of the members of the MPOC but also the reputation of ICANN.

It's - I'm here because I've been a part of a list serve as a member organization and quite frankly it's a little alarming to me some of the conversation around MPOC members.

So there's two issues that have not been addressed and I don't understand why they're not on the agenda because they're pertinent issues for the

MPOC to move forward in the things that we have already laid out and plan to do.

And that is the denial of members by some of the NCSG members, as well as articles and other documents that have been produced to the public to basically do legitimize MPOC.

So I understand that there's time constraints, I understand we need to move to another meeting. However I think those issues are important and they should be raised so that we can - so that I again as a representative of YMCA also as a member of MPOC and with other organizations that are sitting by and frankly waiting to find out what's going to come out of this ICANN meeting.

And they really don't understand why their organizations are being questioned by one or two individuals as to their legitimacy and also they don't understand what's going on here.

And really from a reputational standpoint they're quite frankly appalled also. So I think that needs to be addressed, if it's not addressed here I think we should at least address it to the board.

There is a letter to the board, we feel that the MPOC at the MPOC that we should get some type of response from the board, not - you know not emails or anything circulated about what the board might do.

But some type of response from the board to those issues. So however you would like to address that I would appreciate some comments on that.

Woman: Okay, so we've only got a couple minutes and I basically have a couple comments. I agree with you that we absolutely have to have a long and serious engaging direct conversation on these issues that requires one time.

And as you noted today only has an hour so that this probably isn't the time since we've got things we need to vote on this week and two, you have to request that it makes its way into the agenda if you would like to see it in the agenda.

A draft agenda was sent out several days ago and so you know if you want to add something to that if you think of a particular topic that you think is really important and needs to be in there, you need to make the request to please add it to the agenda.

So - but I take your comment very seriously and I think it would benefit all of us in the NCSG if we could please put these differences and past blood - bad blood aside and try to sit down and talk through these issues and work through these issues.

because I suspect there's a lot of - we could benefit a lot from just hearing each other's perspective. And hearing the experience that we've had in the past and learning about what it is that we're trying to get at and what our concerns are.

I think that's (unintelligible).

Michael: I understand your point. However there are really only two issues that are under one main issue and the one main issue that I'm concerned about because I have to meet with again with the leadership team of the YMCA and others you know you're going to Africa for a week, you're going to - you know they're already suspicious of ICANN.

Do you want us to be a part of this non-profit organization, why should we be part of this organization, what's going on. So there are also other organizations that are represented by you know a number of prominent attorneys I've hired - I mean have been hired by these organizations to - because they want to be represented, they want their voice to be heard.

But quite frankly they're concerned and to - for me to go back to say well we didn't get it on the agenda, there are a number of issues that were on the agenda.

This issue has circulated - has been circulating on the list serve and there have been comments throughout this entire weekend, is again quite alarming to me because this was an issue that isn't new, this isn't an issue that was just brought up today.

This is an issue that's been brewing. So I'm really not concerned about in the past relationship issues, what I'm concerned about is what do I tell the YMCA and other non - other MPOC members who are waiting, who are sitting by wondering why their applications are being denied.

That we came here, we've been here almost - going on four or five days and I'm to say well we can't accept the application.

Woman:

I think we get the point, let me respond and then we have to end this. So according to Section 2.4 of the non-commercial stakeholder group charter, which MPOC agreed to these - one of the specific roles of the NCSG executive committee is to resolve disputes with in the - between various consistencies.

So that's the first - so please let me continue, so what I would like to propose is that we have a meeting to discuss this issue and to really work through the - all of these issues and try to build a bridge so we can begin to have much better communications.

And frankly I think that it would start with you know really direct engagement if we can just sit down and talk to each other and on the mailing list for those of us who aren't here in person.

I think we just have to engage and I'd like to propose that we have a meeting specifically for this topic so we can address this issue in a serious amount of time and a serious way which unfortunately given today's one hour deadline and all the various issues we have to talk about it's just not possible in today's meeting.

And I know you sent a letter to the board and the board can respond to you as they will. It's up to them.

(Michael Carsten): Okay, so we have three, four more days before the conference is over, can we - because quite frankly before today this is the first time you and I have said anything to each other.

And this again this issue has been brewing so can we sit down before this...

Woman: Let's sit down this week, let's definitely sit down this week.

(Michael Carsten): What day should we do it?

Woman: Tomorrow works for me, how about you?

(Michael Carsten): Okay tomorrow, what time?

Woman: Well I need to look in my schedule but let's figure it out. We're really short for time now, we're supposed to be somewhere in six minutes with the board, we don't want to keep the board waiting.

But first let me get (Maria) to comment.

(Maria): Hi, my name is (Maria), I just want to respond to some of the comments you've been making. I think it's fantastic to see you here from the YMCA and I do - I accept that you may be not interested in anything further than the two month past or the three month past.

But there are many people in this room and in this organization who have been working here for seven, eight, ten years who are very, very invested in this.

And who you know frankly - you've been frank with us so I want to be frank with you, you know when you come and join a new organization there are ways of acting, there are ways of respecting.

My apologies. Sure, when you join - sorry, I think I was (unintelligible). When you join a new organization and want to be able to enter into that organization there are ways of acting, there are ways of participating, of listening, of respecting the people and the processes and the culture that is there already.

And you know in an inside the beltway kind of world it's okay to hire a lawyer and have them come and talk to you but this is a global organization and the behavior norms, they are different.

So people want to see - you kind of can't just - to be blunt like you can't just turn up and start demanding things and Debbie is working you know in the system and is a really valued person here and I think we all need to be aware of that.

You know we all have to make the investment and if you want to work with people and get a result I think you need to work with the people who are here in the way that they work.

And - sure, please.

(Michael Carsten): I'll respond to that, okay, I take your comments to heart, forgive me, I didn't want to appear to be blunt or appear to - but sitting back as an organization over the last few months, the emails that I'm receiving as a part of this group have - they have been alarming.

The comments, the things that have been said about MPOC, they're alarming. And for this issue to not be on the agenda when a letter has been sent to the board, and I understand that the letter was sent to the board, but for this issue to not be addressed for a new organization, that as I was told today was ICANN's first constituency and a number of years were not to be addressed.

Again it's quite alarming and we have members who are sitting in limbo who can't understand why their organization is being questioned.

Woman: Okay I think the board is going to be alarmed with all of us if we don't make our way over there really fast. So I'm going to have put this meeting to an end here and we can certainly pick this up, in fact if you have an issue with the board you should speak with the board.

So - which is where we're going to now and this is one of the issues that I'm going to request before the board so here's your big chance. All right, see you all over at the board meeting, thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for calling the digital replay service.

END