

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
NCSG meeting
Tuesday 19 November 2013**

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.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Robin Gross: Okay, shall we get started folks?

And I apologize for the lateness here. We had some technical issues trying to get into the Adobe Connect and whatnot.

Should we start the recording and such? Is it (unintelligible)? Okay, great.

This is the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group Open Policy Meeting.

And my name is Robin Gross.

And let me go through a very brief agenda quickly. We've got first the update from the constituencies on their morning meetings.

And then we've got an update from the Policy Committee on Sunday's Policy Meeting.

And then we will prepare for our discussion with the Board of Directors.

And then we've got Thomas from - who's the Chair of the IGO-NGO Working Group. And he's coming in to talk with us because we had some questions and some members had some questions about that report and the motion before the council this week.

Is there anything else anyone would like to add to the agenda or...?

Okay, then not hearing anything let's get started.

And again the first thing is the update from the constituencies on the morning meeting. And right here immediately to my left is Marie-Laure Lemineur. And she's the Chair of the NPOC which is the Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns constituency

And so why don't we get started there if you want to give us an update on this morning's meeting with your constituency, that'd be great.

Marie-Laure Lemineur: Thank you very much Robin; Marie-Laure speaking for the record. Well basically this morning we started early with the ICANN Fellows and then we had our 15 minutes presentation of what we do with the group.

And then we went running to the other meeting we had with the ATRT 2 Team, well the ATRT 2 which is the (Installment Team). The Accountability and Transparency Team, the T is for team so ATRT 2 Team doesn't make sense. Does it?

I'm looking at Ari.

Anyhow you understood me. And we had one hour, 45 minute session with the ATRT 2.

And then we stayed where we were and had our Internal Session Stakeholders Group until 12 o'clock discussing - I mean the agenda is on the

wiki so it's probably, it's a document discussing a membership issue, strategy planning. What else? We had charter review. What else, outreach, many aspects.

But the NonCom, that's an important issue we discussed too. So it was a lot of - it were a lot of items that we had to cover in a three hour session but I think we did a good job.

And that will be it. I don't know whether you have questions or comments. I think or you want to add anything, my colleagues from the Executive Committee?

Is this okay? Okay. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Any questions for Marie-Laure, anyone in the Adobe Connect Room or online?

I'm not in the Adobe Connect Room.

Woman: Hold on.

Robin Gross: Wait, now I am. Okay, yes.

Question?

Marie-Laure Lemineur: No. Sorry. Just I want to congratulate Robin because she's pronouncing my name very nicely.

Robin Gross: (Unintelligible).

Marie-Laure Lemineur: Thank you very much (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Thank you. All right, yes, Rudy.

Rudy Dekker: Yes, Rudy speaking. Just one additional information; we also have been talking about the CROPP and there is some extra clarification we probably will need to have a clear view on how it is going to be rolled out, for instance and just giving a sample. It says it's covering two nights and one day, logistical trouble and then and hotel.

But if you have to go to meetings outside of the ICANN world most often you have to pay a fee to be allowed to be in the meeting. And that fee can be quite high depending on how valuable it is. And as far as I understood CROPP does not cover the cost of.

Janis Karklins: Right. So this is Janis for the record. I just jumped up from the RP Desk to be here. Right, so Rob Hoggarth and I have been building a program which launched October 11th.

So the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program, CROPP, and that's right. But it could have been worse and I won't say it on record. And I'm sure it's been called that in some places.

So Rudy you're absolutely right. It does not at this time cover any additional cost that way. This is a pilot program.

And just for clarification for anyone in the room who doesn't know about the program, it is focused only on the non-contracted parties of the GNSO and the five (RALOs).

So for the pilot program that's where we're focusing. Each of these community groups provides ICANN with two administrators from their teams. And it is those two administrators who will work on the community wiki on an online application to do all the facilitation really of the application and setting up all the arrangements.

Rob and I are actually monitoring that not as the guardians or employees but only to make sure that a couple boxes are checked which are you coordinating with your regional Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement that there's an understanding in that region of that activity. And again they're not there to police it. We just want to be building those bridges of engagement.

So we want to check that box and we want to check the box that the Chair of that community group has also seen this, is in agreement. As there are only five trips for each we want to make sure that there's as much consensus built around the selection of those trips as possible.

So once there is consensus, it's interesting and once there is consensus then the administrator from the community goes onto the online application and fills it out. And we ask for six weeks advance notice on each would be great but six weeks advance notice because we do have to process the trip arrangements through the ICANN constituency travel.

We are going to stick to the travel guidelines except for booking your own travel. Where right now going to an ICANN Meeting you have the privilege of booking your own travel based on the cost that the ICANN Travel Team says they're willing to expense back. For this pilot program we do need to measure, monitor, evaluate. So we do need to, you know, closely hold onto all the facts and figures.

So just - I just want to give that to anybody in the room who wasn't aware of it. And we're really trying to give the community the choices of where they need engagement and outreach in the (capacity) building in their region. What makes sense for you to go to for your specific region?

It can be to an ICANN Meeting. So if you're looking forward to Singapore and there are individuals in that region that you want to get to that meeting and

yes, then it would still be that three and two because we have to build some kind of structure.

And yes, you know, kind of like this. We kind of did. But we had to do it. So what the idea would be I would assume from a community, from an ICANN Meeting perspective, was that you would choose the maybe Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday to be on the constituency day, to get the start of it, to get the - you know, that would be my suggestion but it would be your choice.

But you can choose an ICANN Meeting as your - one of your five, you know, meetings or conferences or whatever you'd like.

So bear with us in this pilot program. Comment, you can comment on the wiki. You can comment by writing Rob and I directly. We share with each other.

But we - this is a test for us. And we need to know for next year to start to build the FY '15, how this worked, what was right, what could be better, and so forth.

I know you're going to ask Rob that (but you got it).

Okay, David did you have your hand up?

David: Yes. Just I assume that we will be - you'll be able to supplement it with other personal funds or constituency funds if you wish to stay for a longer - you know if you need to go to a longer event.

For example if we wanted to take someone to the IGF, original IGF and that was - is normally, you know, could be up to a week.

But if we can - but ICANN would support to (a process) so we're not...

Janis Karklins: As long as it worked into the funding that we have. And again we don't want - I want to stress this. We do not want the community thinking about funding. It is up to us in this pilot program Rob and I to worry about the dollars. You worry about the content. You worry about who you want to get there and what the purpose is. We will figure it out within the constraints that we've been given, okay.

So we do not want and Rob and I want to stress that, to worry about that at all.

And you're right David. If you want to do that and it can work like the airfare didn't jump up exponentially, right. So we're paying for the airfare on either end.

And it would have fallen within the guidelines if we stuck to the three, two and if it went up exponentially, if we try to go for the seven during this pilot program we may need to come back to you and say for the pilot program that's not working for us.

Okay. So there would be some give and take there. But you could reasonably do that.

And I should say too though there'll be a per diem. Just as there is for ICANN travel, there will be a per diem for those days as well.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you. Cintra Sooknanan. I'm just wondering Janis and this came up in our meeting. Was there any particular reason that this program ends in April?

And we were kind of speculating as well the Internet governance - well meeting is taking place in April as well in Brazil.

Is it that we cannot use this - these funds to apply to that as well?

Janis Karklins: It doesn't end in April. It ends at the end of the fiscal year. So it goes by fiscal year. So it doesn't end until June.

But there is no carryover so it's a good point to make. So if anything is not again applied for in a timely manner before the end of - for anything ending in June so if you have a meeting in June we need you to apply for that in May, right, to get the funding for the June, right.

Cintra Sooknanan: That's what it was. I was being - sorry. Sorry Robin. But it ends in June but you have to process all the maximum data. The deadline is May. I don't know if - I don't remember if it's first May or end of May but anyhow this is the information is on the wiki. It's just a matter of.

But what I was getting to was - I'm sorry. This is Cintra Sooknanan for the record. Was that meeting in Brazil, is there any funding or any support that ICANN is giving to its constituencies aside from this program for that meeting or is it still in planning or...?

Janis Karklins: It hasn't even been discussed because it's that new. So though now that it's in front of us it'll be up to Fadi to work with Sally and make some decisions.

But we are just with you and finding out that this is where we're going to go and this is what's happening. So bear with us on that one.

But again the pilot program put that in, talk to your Chair. Talk to the regional. Talk to Rodrigo and take a look at it. And use it for the pilot program.

And again to David's point if it extends longer than three, two, if it fits in the airline plan or if it's regional train plan or, you know, whatever that is, and you want to extend but we - our costs still remain the same for the program, it's a beautiful thing.

Robin Gross: Okay great. Thank you very much. All right, so our next update is from this morning's meeting with the Noncommercial Users Constituency, NCUC.

And I will turn it over to the NCUC Chair Bill Drake to give us a quick update.

Bill Drake: Thank you Robin, morning or good afternoon. So okay so we had a grueling and grueling three and a half hour meeting (without) a coffee break unfortunately as it turned out because of meetings we had people coming to visit.

But anyway we talked about a number of issues. The internal nature for a bit and our current selections and various other kinds of things I won't bore with you here but administrative issues.

And then we had a visit from (Bruno Lanvin), incoming appointed Board member. We discussed - we had a visit from Theresa Swinehart, Senior Advisor, President on Strategy as well as George Sadowsky from the Board to discuss civil society participation in the post (unintelligible) process and how we interface with that.

We discussed Singapore Policy Conference that we'll organize and some other activities. And we met with the ATRT for almost an hour and had a very good discussion with them.

And finally we talked to them about our bylaws and other kinds of administrative matter.

So it was a mix of both substantive policy discussions with business and various in-house things that needed to be done at this particular point in chunk - point in time and hopefully going forward those will be not requiring much more attention.

So that was pretty much it. Yes, masseur.

Klaus Stoll: Klaus for the record. Bill would it be possible to - for you to summarize a little bit on your post (unintelligible) discussion which are (unintelligible)?

Bill Drake: Certainly. So well I think we had quite a bit of discussion around the - George Sadowsky was particularly interested in discussing the question of which civil society coalitions are engaging and being fruitfully tied into the One Net Process, which are not and how we might do that or arguing that we should do that which we assured him we already were doing so that was fine.

And then we talked with - also with Theresa about a high level panel and our conversation with Fadi about adding a civil society person to that panel.

And what else did we talk about? We talked a little bit about some of the challenges of assembling the One Net Process in a way that's fully inclusive and how do you bootstrap the stakeholder - the Coordination Group, Steering Committee and so on and participation in the meeting next week. And what Fadi had told us about the possibility of support for that.

So basically that was it. It's nothing cosmic. Nothing you wouldn't know from with everything's that's being debated on all the listservs from best bids to the IGC to (MCCs) that I'm sure it'll impact to the One Net list itself. There's people trying to grope towards some understanding of, you know, exactly which networks will participate, how do they input people, how do they nominate people, what is the agenda going to be in Sao Paulo, etcetera.

(That's all).

Robin Gross: Great. Thank you very much Bill. Are there any questions for Bill on NCUC's morning meeting, any others?

Okay. I don't see any so let us move onto the next thing on the agenda which is an update from the NCSG Policy Committee which met on Sunday afternoon.

And I will turn it over to Wendy and Avri. I'm not sure how you guys - you weren't there so maybe it should be Avri. Avri, the Alternate Chair of the Policy Committee and if you want to give us an update on that, that would be great.

Avri Doria: Sure. Thank you, Robin. So we had the meeting. We talked a lot about the IGO-INGO issue that was coming up before the council probably tomorrow. Those are discussions that continued beyond that meeting to various other venues, various conversations yesterday, various conversations in the bar last night.

I think we've come to a very clear definition that we really don't know how we want to vote. But so that discussion goes on. The issue goes on.

We talked a little bit about transliteration and translation and basically I guess there was no disagreement on that going forward.

Stephanie Perrin gave us a very good discussion on the Expert Working Group, notified us and showed us that there was a interim report out. Unfortunate it seems that while that interim report is announced, it is not under review at the moment. And they didn't actually open a review on it.

And in an outside conversation I got that, you know, if we want to say something, if it fits in with any of our discussions with the Board or anyone else we may want to say something about, you know, that this report should have further review while it's just sitting there waiting for the work being done.

I think other than that the only thing we discussed was the need for the NCSG Policy Committee to be more active and certainly took blame myself

for having only been intermittently active through the year. That every once in a while there'd be a free zone and I do a bunch of work and then I do nothing.

And basically sort of saying whoever we get next time on the committee we know who the council members will be. We don't yet know who the NPOC and the NCUC representatives to next year's Policy Committee will be. Maybe they're the same as they are now, maybe not. It's up to, you know, it's a yearly - I think it's a yearly appointment.

It really depends on your charter how often it happens. But yes, so you just did it. So you're probably fine. NCUC definitely has to replace at least me because since I'll be a counselor I can no longer be the NCUC rep on it.

So at the very least they need to do that whether they want to change both or not, because that was an appointment made last year. So that's that.

And in a discussion that came up sort of right after - was either at the end of the meeting or after the meeting. I'm losing track because this was really in the last minutes of the meeting was that perhaps in addition to nominating and this is sort of to the - and perhaps it's already happened.

But that the Policy Committee meet policy people and policy writers but it may also be able to use someone who's got a little bit of administrative skill and knows how to sort of keep things going as opposed to being like I believe both the Chair and the Alternate Chair were about being relatively intermittent and doing a bunch of work themselves periodically but not really getting the committee to work as a committee. So that was pretty much what we got.

Robin Gross: Thank you Avri. I just want to add to that that I think you came and after I said this, but Thomas the Chair of the IGO-NGO Committee - Working Group, excuse me, he's coming in here at 2:45 to talk with our members because I understand some of our members have some questions about the recommendations and the motion so he'll be in at 2:45 here.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you Avri. And just a question, when you mention I mean the strategy reports, were you talking about having ICANN Staff or someone from the actual community taking care of?

Avri Doria: Yes. And possibly Rudy can explain it better than me since it was his suggestion.

But he was basically saying that the policy - and maybe it's just in addition to having a bunch of policy geeks, it could possibly use somebody that was also into doing a little bit of chairing.

Rudy Dekker: Yes to - Rudy speaking for the transcript to add to Avri's comment on this specific function that we talked about. Is it's a bit like I would say kind of secretary that would be able to help us in addressing things that we are not able to do because we have too much focus in the policy staff and are forgetting the administration that the community itself has to keep track on.

Essentially how far are we on a specific topic? How far is the policy work done? So that we have some kind of project manager knocking on our head if we are not in time with what is expected.

So and we are a small group so it is important that we can use an extra hand in this. And especially I know in NPOC we have been through a difficult period. I've been doing a lot of work on my own.

And it's not easy to follow everything. So if you have a second hand it's always easy.

And I rather say that Avri did a marvelous job. Although she thinks she didn't but she did a marvelous job.

Robin Gross: Great, thank you, any other questions, comments for the Policy Committee?

Okie-doke, the next think on our agenda is preparation for our discussion with the Board of Directors later this afternoon.

And as usual they ask us for - let me just tell - the discussion with the Board of Directors is from 15:30 to 16:30 on local time here today right after this meeting.

And as is our practice we send a list of discussion topics to the Board of Directors in advance based upon what the members have expressed they would like to discuss with the Board.

And so we've got about - we've got six issues that were proposed to the Board.

And so I just wanted us to have a chance to go over that and talk about what we were going to talk about.

In our Policy Committee Meeting on the weekend we did start assigning specific people to be an initial discussant to sort of kick off the discussion on whichever topic it is.

But anyone is welcome to speak. In fact we - hopefully many people will speak on an issue.

So let me just go over what these issues are and then we could maybe just talk briefly about each issue and sort of how we want to frame it to the Board.

So the first issue is the need for ICANN community engagement in the Brazil Meeting Plans. And Bill has agreed to be our initial discussant on that issue.

And the second topic is the policy versus implementation. And the Board's view on the rule of the GNSO and overseeing staff implementation of GNSO approved policy. This is basically the discussion about our reconsideration request and the IRT, or excuse me; IRP that we're in the process of preparing on the Board's adoption of the Trademark plus 50 Policy.

And I agreed to be the discussant on that since I've been doing a lot of the work on that.

And the third issue is explanation from the Board on the need to keep public policymaking inputs top secret and specifically we're talking about our (DIVP) Request and a Reconsideration Request asking ICANN to release the policy input contributions that were made. And they said well we can't. Everything's top secret.

I agreed to be a discussant on that. But frankly I'd prefer that somebody else would because, you know, I don't want to be - I already agreed to be the discussant on the earlier issue. And since I'm going to be Co-Chairing I don't really want to do that much talking.

The next issue is ICANN's accountability mechanisms. And we must be able to create positive change. For the - and the - let's see Rudy has agreed to be our initial discussant on that.

The fifth issue is the CEO's new Strategy Panel and how they relate to the bottom-up multi-stakeholder policy development process.

And Maria's agreed to be our initial discussant on that.

The sixth issue is the new gTLD auction revenues. How do they utilize and who decides?

And Avri agreed to be our initial discussant on that.

Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes. I'm sorry. It's great you mentioned this because there's something we actually did in the Policy Committee but I forgot about it.

But we did resort them I thought so that four and five were actually - because we were afraid that we wouldn't be able to do them all. And so it went one, two, three, six, four, five is actually the order at the moment I believe. Because we didn't think we would necessarily get to them all.

Robin Gross: Okay, one, two, three.

Avri Doria: One, two, three.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: No, six, five - yes, one, two, three, six, four, five.

Robin Gross: Okay, thank you for correcting that.

Okay, so let's go back to the first issue that we want to discuss with the Board which is the Brazil Meeting Plans, the mock video statement, the future of Internet governance.

And Bill since you're our initial discussant on that why don't you kick off our discussion and give us an overview of what - at least what you're going to say to the Board on that issue.

Bill Drake: Can we actually come back to that later?

Robin Gross: Yes.

Bill Drake: Thank you.

Robin Gross: Okay. So then the next issue is the policy versus implementation and again this is our Trademark plus 50 Policy.

And our unhappiness with the way the Board has changed the policy which was actually the staff that changed the policy. The - with respect to new gTLDs the GNSO came up with a set of - they had PDP and came up with a set of recommendations on policies for new gTLDs.

And one of them was we got to protect trademarks. And in the course of that there needed to be implementation work done on that policy proposal because there was some or there's some disagreement amongst the GNSO on how to do that and what that meant.

And so there was a number of subsequent working groups that were set up to more finely discuss what the specifics of that policy should be. And in particular there was the IRT, the Implementation Review Team. There was the STI which is the Special Trademarks Interest Team.

And both of these groups said that the types of marks that should go into the trademark clearinghouse are exact marks only, identical marks only and the - so that was with the policy that the GNSO approved.

But then the staff issued a memo earlier this year where they said what we're going to do is we're going to allow trademark holders to adopt, you know, to have an additional 50 marks per trademark that they're able to put into the trademark clearinghouse.

So it was basically a change of the GNSO Board approved policy of exact match, identical match to Trademarks plus 50.

So this is a big problem because ICANN is supposed to be bottom-up. And here we've got a bottom-up process that said we want exact match, identical match only. And subsequent to that staff came along and said no, we're going to do Trademark Plus 50 and so we have been trying to correct that error and get ICANN to conform with its own bylaws which say the GNSO policy is made from the bottom-up.

And so we would like to hear some kind of explanation or discussion with the Board on how they view the implementation work that staff or the role that staff has in implementation of GNSO approved policy.

So that's just sort of an initial overview of what our concern is. I'd like to see if there are others who would like to comment on this or say something to the Board about this, anyone? No. Okay.

I suspect we'll get a similar reaction. Is that a hand up?

Woman: No.

Robin Gross: Oh sorry. I was hopeful.

Woman: Not on this one.

Robin Gross: Okay. So it'll be interesting to actually have a discussion with the Board on that.

All right, anyone want to say anything on that? No. Okay.

So then the next issue is sort of a follow-on to that issue is in the process of our dissatisfaction with that decision we filed a (DIVP) Request which is a process where you can ask ICANN to release information, internal information.

And we asked them to tell us the basic policy inputs that they received that help to formulate their decision to adopt this particular policy just because we're supposed to have openness, transparency, accountability at ICANN.

And yet we're then told that all of the policy inputs are top secret.

So this is a problem for us. And we'd like to hear an explanation from the Board about how do they reconcile these two positions.

Yes, Marie-Laure.

Marie-Laure Lemineur: Regarding this one I have one question. I'm guessing you have this. And I found out in the ATRT 2 Report there is a section about that.

I don't know whether you have a chance. If I'm not wrong, I remember seeing something about that.

So have you had the chance to review it? Maybe it would be good input if you have the time to use it and rationally. I mean for the upcoming meeting if you're planning to ask a question or something.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Marie-Laure Lemineur: I keep executive summary so that (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Right, right. Avri maybe you can tell us a little bit about this.

Avri Doria: No. I mean basically there's a presumption and we need to make it a little more explicit. But it runs through the report a notion that everywhere through ICANN there has to be a default of transparency.

And we - that there's a total understanding that some things - sometimes things have to move up a scale of opaqueness from transparency such that

you may decide that a particular discussion requires (Chat a Mouse) rule or you may decide that a certain discussion needs a certain amount of redaction.

And sometimes you might even decide that a discussion needs to be not discussed at all for a certain thing. And that could for example happen in SSAC if they were talking about security problem that they didn't want to inflame further and such.

But that everything needs to be intentionally moved away from that ground floor of default. I mean of a default transparency.

And what we tend to see in groups like the Board, in groups like the staff, in groups like SSAC, is everything is opaque except for the few things that they decide to make transparent.

And so that's the real issue is why on each of these things for what reason. The other thing that's in there is we're asking for a - two other things. We're asking for a degree of explanation of what are the redaction rules. No one in ICANN knows the basis on which anything is redacted. We just see pages full of black lines.

And so knowing more about the redaction rules is something. So again this is going back to the ATRT in that this Board discussion but please reinforce the importance of these things.

But so those are things that we're trying to impose on the whole ICANN community what's up with the Board and the staff.

Marie-Laure Lemineur: Thank you. Just the fact that it's in the reports, I mean the idea - I brought the topic, the fact that it's in the report shows that there is an issue there so that's an argument in our favor and when you share this with the Board. That was why I mentioned it, you know.

Avri Doria: And so while I don't want to take the whole topic on, I could certainly help, be called on, you know, to repeat the ATRT line on it.

Robin Gross: Okay, was there anyone else who wanted to say anything on this? And again I would really like to request that somebody else other than me be the initial discussant on this issue.

So do we have any volunteers?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Well and I don't think anyone needs to be involved with the process from the beginning because really the only story to tell here is ICANN made a policy based on policy input that they then said you don't have to release to you. And that's it.

Please explain what you mean by this.

Avri Doria: It would be good if one of the counselors took it.

Robin Gross: It would be fabulous.

David: Yes. I'll be happy to that one.

Robin Gross: Oh thank you very much David. I appreciate (you) picking up the slack again. Thank you.

Okay. Anyone else have anything they want to say on this?

Oh okay and then the next question and Bill.

Bill Drake: (Unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Okay. Okay, okay, thank you Bill. Yes, so Bill's going to tell us about what he's going to say to the Board about the (mocked) video statement and the Brazil Meeting and the future of Internet governance. Or what - you tell me what you're going to tell the Board.

Bill Drake: I'm not going to do that. I'm going to ask you what you think I should talk with them about.

I'll tell you that the - I mean I've talked this issue to death over the recent days and all through Mali and so on. I certainly have my own views.

The question of course is what's really germane to the discussion with the Board per se.

You know but Fadi and the staff leadership, senior staff that are involved in this have certainly heard a lot from us in the past few days over exactly how all these things will be formulated and how we can participate and everything else, etcetera.

The question is what is it that we would want the Board to know about or do in this context.

I was just looking at the - when you called on me and that's why I wanted to finish reading it, the Board's resolution from Sunday. Has anybody read it?

The Board passed a - rushed to pass a resolution on multi-stakeholder Internet governance to (unintelligible) say that everything Fad's done he's done by support.

And so - and they say that they gave him a mandate of September 28th to work with other organizations to establish a coalition which became the One Net thing and so on and so forth.

But when we were in Mali and people were pressing him on who all's really - well he didn't tell us. It wasn't at all obvious. I talked with Board members in Mali and they gave me kind of broad vague assurances that there had been some sort of support but it wasn't really clear.

And now that all this has become politically (unintelligible) Board comes back and said of course we intended to do all this. Well that's fine.

But I guess the question is do we want the Board to - do we want to say to the Board that they should play some ongoing role in some way vis-à-vis this initiative and how ICANN's (unintelligible) is managed. If not it's not - there's not really that much to talk with them about.

It seems to me that, you know, the Board has said in this motion that they passed that he should - that ICANN should continue to be - remain engaged in and supporting the three initiatives, the so-called high level panel, the One Net initiative and the Brazil Meeting. They treat those as three different things and they repeat the same language like four times in the motion which makes me think they - it was written on the back of a napkin or something or in a rush.

But in any event to the extent that the Board is directing Fadi to do these things I suppose it's not entirely unreasonable that we could say to the Board that therefore we would expect you to work with Fadi to ensure (in reality) that civil society from ICANN is given a full and proper possibility to participate fully in this process.

One of the big concerns a lot of people have raised if you read the other civil society lists among the different coalitions is the perception that, you know, well the One Net thing is being launched by the technical community there.

And what we don't want is that they come in like (unintelligible) at some point and say well we've discovered who the civil society people on all the - you know on the Steering Committee for the conference should be and all the others. There's, you know, there's four committees and there's an overarching committee for the One Net initiative, etcetera.

And of course, you know, we wouldn't want technical community bodies with which we have no direct interaction to decide that those select the people or that, you know, I mean we have to ensure. We have to ensure that we are given our own economists full ability to participate.

And my question is simply for you guys do you think it's appropriate to raise that with the Board?

If it is not a matter for the board to be providing Fadi guidance at this point, in fact then it's not clear to me how much more the Board would have to do with this.

There's one other question I could mention and relates to this motion. They say this is an organizational (master) function for which a public comment is not required.

Given that a lot of people in the business communities have been jumping up and down about all this, I wonder, you know, would we want to say that he might consider a public comment or something like that or some mechanism for people to provide feedback or is that just likely to become a roadblock to any - since most of us actually support the initiative broadly speaking, maybe that wouldn't be wise.

So I stop there and ask what do you think the Board - yes I've seen possibly waiting. So what do you think that the Board will - this if any should be?
Please cough Mr...

Klaus Stoll: Thank you, Klaus for the record. When I came here last Friday or Saturday the decision was that I can start at something and now it's up to the rest to run with it. Now we are in a position that I can start at something and it's not going through the direction it should go and we are doing something. I completely support - or I would- my position would be very similar to that what Bill just described I would say look, if it's ICANN participating in the Civil Society of ICANN should have its own processes motion and clear structure to participate itself.

Don't create a parallel to society in ICANN, and I would - and I think I expressed that in another email last night to the iNet there needs to be some clear structure not people indicating that there are tight Civil Society organization meters who will meet somewhere and do something, which is very, very damaging and hurtful for us.

Robin Gross: Great I've got Avri and I've got (Maury Lower), anyone else want to get into the queue on this?

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks and I apologize shortly after I'm going to have to leave because I have to go do my omatic thing again, but I think I actually if I understood you correctly I think I might have a slightly different view point. I think there is a strong Civil Society in ICANN and that that strong Civil Society in ICANN must do its part within the iNet and such. I think there's more Civil Society in the various eye sock bodies, etcetera but there they're always a little confused because you're not function so much as Civil Society as next. So I think we have to take advantage of that.

I think there's a multitude of other good Civil Society or organizations, you know APC, best bets for the moment seems okay. I think IGC should be avoided like the plague because it's gangrenous and should be avoided. And you know I can go on and on about that. The idea that there could ever be a unified Civil Society organization under one party's leadership I think is - it's a dream. It's actually for me it's a nightmare but I don't see that happening.

I do think in this case there is advantage in playing both an inside and an outside game on this that the ICANN Civil Society is inside and APC best bits and some other organizations are on the outside. Let them all contribute, but this one is in our home and we should be forceful about it.

Bill Drake: Can I just ask for clarification? Are you saying therefore - I mean what is the specific Board dimension of this, is the - I mean we could all talk about what we think about the Board.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes I don't think the Board has much of a role at all.

Bill Drake: Okay, so that's what I'm wondering.

Avri Doria: I think the Board is oversight over their employee. He should have informed them - he did inform them, it's not policy it's not ICANN operations, is ICANN within the environment and I don't think the Board has - that Board has as much role as any of us, but it doesn't have a particularly special role.

Bill Drake: In which case then this mean that'd be a long discussion, it just to register a concern and say that we believe that the Board should help to ensure that all members of the ICANN community are fully given an opportunity that the - to work (unintelligible) to that effect. I mean I think we don't have to get into one that, but still again just to make sure that we - they understand that if we end up getting sort of frozen out somehow to the weird back end machines of the RAR's and whatever else, that that wouldn't be cool, but they have some responsibility too again for us.

Robin Gross: Okay and I've got (Marlio Lowry) and then Milton and then Klaus.

(Marlio Lowry): Okay, thank you just to echo (Marlio) speaking I think we shouldn't forget that we are having a meeting with the Board so don't lose track of - it has to be question that he's presenting to the Board and the role he can play in the

process. When the two - I wouldn't want us to lose time asking questions to which we have been provided already answers by (Fadi), because it would be like repeating and asking the same stuff and we're getting the same answers so I don't think it - I mean I think you are making a bit use of time. And number three we have to separate the internal ICANN process when they be with these and the external process.

I mean I don't really know how this is - I don't know - anyone knows how it - this is going to work but the one that thing to me I think as external I mean I understand that from Friday that he sort of promoted together with the are other leaders the initiative but now it sort of got - it's out of ICANN and it's up to us to see how we are going to engage, so this - one thing is how we get organized as an ICANN delegation Civil Society slash litigation I don't know, the other is on Board with the two with the process outside.

Robin Gross: Thank you. Milton.

Milton Mueller: So I'm just trying to narrow down where and what Bill should actually say to the Board. And so my question is, I sort of like the approach that we're here, we need to you know make sure that ICANN base Civil Society has some role in this process. But can we get more specific about what we ask them. For example are we saying we want two particular seats on this one Net Steering Committee? Are we talking about anything like that? Is that too specific, what do you want to do there?

Bill Drake: I wouldn't think that that's appropriate, I mean really - I mean personally, I mean it's - why do you...

Robin Gross: You don't think the reason he's asking for that?

Bill Drake: I don't - this is a - we shouldn't think of this as an ICANN initiative where ICANN can ensure a certain distribution.

- Milton Mueller: Absolutely, I agree with that, we - but I would say sort of what our expectations are and we hope that you know that there's a lot of other Civil Society groups outside the ICANN remit, but ICANN is really central to this process and we think the expertise and so on regarding reform of internet governance institutions there's a lot of that here in the NCSG and the Board should you know - where you could just casually throw out you know we would think that we would at least have one maybe two seats on the - this one NET Steering Committee that kind of thing.
- Robin Gross: I think it's worth pointing out that you know we are the groups who have been building the Multi-stakeholder process for the last 15 years so we don't really need to go elsewhere exclusively in order to try to figure out how to build this because we have been doing this. So you know we represent 300 some organizations who participate in the ICANN process so we're in a pretty good position to tell them I think that we could.
- Milton Mueller: That's a good sound bite, we are the ones who have been building the Multi-stakeholder process.
- Robin Gross: That's right, that's the point. Okay, sorry (Klaus).
- Klaus Stoll: Maybe it's a compromise -- (Klaus) for the record -- very simply to ask for clear structures and lines of engagement in the process, especially with Small Net, and how that would stand. Back off that you can say that my problem at the moment with Small Net is I have no idea what sort of likes and prove that engagement of and who's doing what?
- Bill Drake: I'm having problem with the idea that the Board would have anything to do with that. I mean I'm having a problem with the idea (Klaus), I mean seems to me you're voicing concerns that we all have perhaps, but I just don't see the Board of Directors operating at this level. I mean I think that it's appropriate for us to say you have oversight over your employee which is the CEO and please work to ensure that ICANN works to ensure that we are given a proper

seat at the table but beyond that another thing we should be thinking the Board of Directors using there and watch how this is being done and then we don't like this process and it's not their business.

Klaus Stoll: You're right, point taken only want to repeat, it would be helpful to have case structures.

Rudy Dekker: But no I'm precise what Bill is saying and the Board them being in the Board and it's not the task of the Board to define the structures, it's a question we have to bring maybe up in the public forum and ask (Fabi) how he sees these structures rather than asking the Board. Because it's his duty, it's on his task list to produce that rather than the Board. That an approach?

Avri Doria: I'm about to run away but since the next one was my topic can I ask to do a quick interrupt to that topic then you can get back to this one. If there is a back to this one, but anyhow on the funding basically since 2007 when the new detailed recommendations came out, was that when they came out? Yes, since then there has been a discussion about and what about the money you get from auctions? And in fact there was even a mention that money needs to be kept separate so a question is is that money being kept separate? And now that those auctions are immanent and so on what sort of community process is putting for the place.

Lots of us have good uses to which we believe that money should be put. Everything from some people, the business types believing it should go into the reserve, to people like me that think it should go into a remedial round just for developing economies. There's a whole gambit of things that need to be done, how are they going to handle that? And that's my issue there, it's about time, it's been pending since 2007.

Robin Gross: Great anyone want to comment on this? Have anything else to say on this issue? Yes, Rudy.

Rudy Dekker: Well maybe during the discussion we had I also raised the question and that's brought me a lot of concern with what about for instance I heard that in the auction process there will be also the extension of health which is a global common concern because it's affect everybody. If it's got reaction that is not really in favor of the community itself it was rather pure commercial then it's fade away and if that money is then used by Icert, by - sorry by ICANN I - it doesn't make me happy.

Avri Doria: As I said yesterday I don't quite - it's a good topic, but it seems to be a different topic and then it's not what happens with the auction money, it's who should win the auction. And you know you don't me - get me into my opinion on some of those things. But so that's a different - I think that's a different issue, but you know I don't see the reason why someone can't bring up a different issue but I really do think it's a different issue as once you get those auction monies, what's you're going to do with it and the who should get that health, and the objections and the incredible politicking and who and all of that behind that - boy is that messy and if I were them and you ask that I would (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Sure.

Avri Doria: I don't know.

Rudy Dekker: Except it's just the thing you want to hear from them.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Robin Gross: No, no thank you. Thank you very much. Okay, let me go back quickly to see on (Bill's) issue and the Brazil meeting in the iNet. Did anyone else have anything that they wanted to add to that? Did we - do we feel like we nailed that down sufficiently? Yes, okay, yes.

(Marlio Lowry): Are we allowed to make a positive comment?

Robin Gross: Yes, they're encouraged...

(Marlio Lowry): The Board.

Robin Gross: They're encouraged.

(Marlio Lowry): Is this allowed? Sorry - now the thing is that I - you might remember that on the list at some point I posted the commenting that I was worried and actually during a conference call I was worried because I could listen to (Fabi) and I couldn't hear him speaking of the mention the risk that he was taking or ICANN was taking in the process. And somehow something happened and since we came here I heard him actually he incorporated within his speech that we - the idea that the - this is a complex process and that he's rolling in the whole process and that there are risks as specific to it and I think it's a good thing he did it. And then he became aware of that, so I thought that maybe it would be worth mentioning to the Board that - I don't know whether it's that big a deal or not, but. Because it's just we discussed that it's not - you don't think it's worth it.

Rudy Dekker: (Rudy) for the transcript, I'm afraid that we are giving them then the chance to escape to give us a real answer.

Avri Doria: Okay, I mean it's (unintelligible) traffic.

Bill Drake: Again I just think it...

Man: (Unintelligible) the Board (unintelligible).

Bill Drake: I just think that with one hour or whatever is with the Board we got six questions. This - and this is one that really is not a real detailed back to forth, we're just expressing a view we want to put on the record at least think that's

what's happening. I think we can do - deal with this fairly cleanly and not make it too complicated, that's what I would say.

(Marlio Lowry): Sure.

Robin Gross: Alright, and I guess there's nothing further on that. Then the next issue is ICANN's accountability mechanisms and (Maria) agreed to speak on that, but I don't see her. Oh you there go ahead in the backwoods. Okay, I'm sorry go ahead (Rudy).

Rudy Dekker: She was here early for the transcript. Well I'm - based on the report of the ATRT and we are seeing that the under recommendation for there is clear a requirement for good mechanisms for initiative and objectives processes and what we do in ICANN. And based on the fact that ICANN wants to be the Multi-stakeholder organization I would like to ask the court to explain how they see mechanisms bringing positive changes essentially based on the relationships between the silo's because what I see is in the last couple of years what (Fabi) was saying that he was trying to take down all the walls between different entities that I in the last couple of months see more Silo's growing then there were before.

So in relation to how the different constitutes can work better together we need mechanisms that helps us producing fruitful work at an earlier stage. And just pointing to the sample of the word between the (unintelligible) and for example the policy and specifically the GNSO the time between is too long and we need mechanisms that allow us to trigger faster potential policy work when advice is already being boiling up and I would like to see mechanisms that allow us to show to the world that both are concerned and working on to allow it to move faster in the process, because actually it is still a very slow process and I don't see the mechanisms to prove that we are accountable to the world to produce the right procedures.

Robin Gross: Yes thank you I think that you know when we look - I'm sorry Milton, did you have your hand up -no, okay. When we look at ICANN's accountability mechanisms they say well there's the reconsideration request, then there's the DIDP and GB get and IRT in - sorry IRP Independent Review Panel. And so these are the accountability mechanisms that ICANN says has - it has in place and the problem that we've discovered over the course of our policy development is that they're insufficient to - they're not really meaningful accountability.

They - all roads lead back to ICANN and sort of this circular - it's a very circular mechanism when we've got the same person or the same department that drafts the policy and implement the policy and enforces the policy is now going to be asked to decide whether or not that was process was followed properly I mean it's just circular and it's not meaningful accountability at all. So that was the concern that I wanted to raise with the Board that these specific accountability mechanisms that ICANN always points to, in our experience they're meaningless, they're nothing but lip service and rhetoric and window dressing.

But we're not really getting independent outside accountability. And take for example the Independent Review Panel, we wanted - we're - we want to file on the Trademark Plus 50. The rules basically say that we need to come up with a million dollars if we want to contest this, now obviously we don't have \$1 million, we're not going to have \$1 million and neither is 99.9% of the world.

So if that's really what you have to have in order to get an independent decision on this then that's, again a meaningless process. That's all I wanted to add, does anyone else want to get into this in accountability mechanisms at ICANN. No - I see someone - yes Stephane please, into the microphone.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane: Interested - there we are, I'm interested in the accountability mechanisms and I'm sorry I haven't got the history on this but I did hear yesterday (Fabi) say that he was unable to get his metrics project off the ground and they're looking for some independent person to help break the lock jam on the metrics. Do we even know what he's looking for metrics on?

I mean it's not just spending because you could have metrics on this whole circuit of problem of one guy drafting the policy and then the other guy been going over and approving it over here. In other words you could have this separation of powers thing measured all the way through the system, so it seems like a very interesting project because a lot of things could get cleaned up by a proper set of metrics.

(Marlio Lowry): I don't have an answer to your question, I don't think we do have - I mean, but this morning we sort of talked about we need ATRT2 about the report and there is a big part of the recommendations that have to do with the metrics. So if he wants to I mean and has the time to do it and should take the time to do it and - he wouldn't review - he still would review the report and that would be a good opportunity - right here please, for him and his staff to decide how they could use some metrics like this because some of the recommendations are about from here they are formal review and others have specifically made right now beyond new recommendations - I don't know.

Robin Gross: Basically I guess my homework is I should read that report and have a look and see if I have any comments on the report and I know that's what I was afraid of at stake, right?

(Stephanie): (Unintelligible) executive summary.

Robin Gross: Yes the good stuff never in the executive summary. Alright was there anything else on this accountability issue? No, alright. Absolutely, okay (Marlio Lowry) you have as a question then we go back to the topic of the Internet Governance and she wanted to ask something on that.

(Marlio Lowry) Thank you a question, don't we want to ask the Board something about IANA? Do we or don't we.

Man: Well...

(Marlio Lowry) We sort of mentioned it on the waiting list too.

Man: Who mentioned it?

(Marlio Lowry) (Billy's) outside too 3 2.

Man: Do you want to continue this discussion?

Robin Gross: I'm sorry...

(Marlio Lowry): She want me to...

Robin Gross: I thought you had something you wanted to say.

Man: Well she was asking about the IANA.

Woman: Oh and (Bill's) not in here, okay. Let's see if we can get (Greg).

Man: Well we certainly want to develop ideas about how to make the transition. I'm not sure we need to ask the Board about that or tell the Board about that. I'm not sure what that accomplishes at this stage. Maybe we might prepare the ground by saying then we're doing this, or we're going to do this, will you be interested in reading the result...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...the way you read everything else that we give you?

(Marlio Lowry): Well I just asked Bill and he says he doesn't think we should ask. Don't really know why, but he's busy talking today, so.

Robin Gross: So are you really satisfied with it - should we - okay.

(Marlio Lowry): I don't have an opinion on it, I'm, just whether we should or not, so.

Man: Well the fact that Bill doesn't think we should doesn't necessarily mean we shouldn't and the question is is there anything about can the Board help us you know if we wanted to ask for advice of ICANN legal regarding you know that might be an interesting request to make - let us get (John Jeffries) in the room and ask him about the implications of change in certain contracts in certain ways. I'll be happy to handle that question.

Robin Gross: Well you know we'd be want more than one discussion in kind of issue so maybe this would be a great follow-up question on this issue. Great, okay and the final issue that we want to discuss with the Board is on the CEO's strategy panels and how they relate to the bottom up process. And (Marie) has agreed to be our initial discussion on that but I don't see her now, so I'm not sure what she intend to say to the Board on that. Shall we have a discussion here and tell her what we've discussed before she goes in to (unintelligible), so what do people in the room think? Somebody suggested this, someone suggested this issue, so what were you thinking we ought to discuss when you raised the issue? Yes and please and state your name for the record.

(Sam Onprango): (Sam Onprango) for the record. This concern comes from watching this from a distance and from a wider perspective and that's that ICANN has within itself a set of procedures and a multi- stakeholder model that has some strong points and has some areas that need to be reviewed. As these panels are created as one that - and these other initiatives grow.

As the internet ecology becomes more interactive ICANN should be saying to itself we have some best practice experience and we have some problems within our best practices and so as these things are developed after the panels and so forth there should be some I hate to use the term missionary position on the part of the - of ICANN.

But ICANN should be saying no not - sorry, ICANN should be saying there is a you know there's a culture of how we've been doing this and we'd like you to think about that culture in your panel because many of the participants are going to come from very, very different backgrounds sometimes very bureaucratic or very top down backgrounds and my worry is that if ICANN just shows up as one player on the panel, on an effort where these other - the other players have very different models of the dynamic of the ICANN experience around process will get lost. That I'm saying as a concern.

Rudy Dekker: Was there anything else folks wanted to add on this? And I don't see anyone. Alright well that was the issues that we wanted to talk to the Board about and we've got a (Thomas Rickert) here now who is the Chair of the IGO-INGO Working Group and I understand there's a set of recommendations and emotion before the Council this week and from the GNSO sessions over the weekend I know there was some questions or controversy about separating out motions and what do they mean and so, maybe you could tell us a little bit about what's happening on that this week and then I think there were some people who had questions although I don't think they're in the room, so, please.

Thomas Rickert: Sure, thanks very much Robin and thanks so much for the opportunity to be with you. Before I dive into the substance I just want to let you know that I met my dear friend (Bob Kandricks) and - in the hallway downstairs and he very much regret that he can't be with you this very moment and he sends you his greetings. And I think they're talking about the wider internet governance seen I think what can give best placed to enrich the Board's discussions on that side. Wholeheartedly congratulate him to that promotion.

With respect to the IGO-INGO PDP Working Groups work product which is not only the fund we worked but now we've also passed on the graph motion to the Council. I'm not sure what extent you are familiar with this, but in order for - in order to keep this short I would like to respond or speak to only the items that have undergone some changes since I spoke to the Council during the weekend sessions. So I'm not sure Robin whether that's in mind with your - with what you're thinking was.

Robin Gross: Actually I wasn't the one with questions, so...

Thomas Rickert: Okay, good.

Robin Gross: Now there isn't anyone in here with questions on this report? (Klaus) did you?

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Oh you've already talked, you talked in the hall, okay, great, anyone - Omar?

Omar: Yes I was just going to say do any of our councilors have questions because they're going to be voting on this, right?

Robin Gross: Any of our councilors have questions?

David: Yes, but I think - I think I asked you this before but I (unintelligible) so it's the - I gather it's going to be somewhat presented to the council in a slightly differently slashed up form but it was discussed on the weekend and if the Section Five that - and is the question what happens if we vote it down, will it - does it get sent back to the working group or does it just disappear?

Thomas Rickert: Okay, now with respect to the forming of the motion we basically had three areas in there. There's a set of recommendations that receive consensus level in the Working Group and we have what you refer to as Section Five,

which is not going to be Section Five in the latest version but you know it's commonly known as the Section Five recommendation. And then we have another recommendation that dealt with passing on the question to the standing committee on improvement where it's respect to the - to procedure request relating to the vocabulary that Working Groups have at their fingertips to describe consensus levels.

Now we've - now after consultation with Johnathan Robinson the GNSO Council Chair deeply streamlined the motion to now take the recommendation to pass on the question to the standing committee on improvement out of the motion and put that into the consent agenda of the GNSO Council meeting. I'm not sure whether you're familiar with the consent agenda, but that's basically a section on the agenda of the GNSO Council meeting where the non controversial issues go. So they would vote in favor of them in the block and only if the council requests that an item is further discussed, then it's taken to the ordinary agenda.

So the recommendation on the SCI is taken out of the motion. And then we've agreed with Johnathan that a way to proceed with this is to have one vote on all recommendations that receive consensus level. And then we take a separate vote on what has been previously Number Five. And you will remember David that we had two alternative pieces of language in Subsection Five and removed the first option.

You know a little bit of coughing is not a big thing I've - I was hoping to survive this Working Group in the first place. And what's now happening - what's now going to happen is the following: there will be an additional vote on the recommendations that receive strong support but significant of position. And should the Council vote that down these recommendations will be off the table, there will be no further Working Group deliberations.

If it voted up, then these recommendations will be passed on to the Board as well. These air conditioning systems really kill me over for we set as this.

There have been questions whether it would be appropriate to pass on the question should it not receive consensus level back to the Working Group, but in essence we don't expect the outcome of that to be any different. So if the Council votes it up then it - the Council has made a decision that the recommendations is prior to not reaching consensus level should be seen by the Board and if we pass it back on - if the chances are slim that they would receive any more than strong support but significant of position which means that the situation would not change.

Only in case the registrants which did not participate in the final consensus call voted the inclusion of IGO acronyms into the TMCH, into the Trademark Clearinghouse up, that would make a difference but that we would also find out when the Council votes, right, so basically we can save us the exercise of putting - pushing this back to the Working Group because the outcome would not be any different. I guess that's the underlying question though, isn't that not something for the Working Group to discuss but maybe for the GNSO Council.

There are no clear rules as to whether a Working Group is limited to passing on consensus positions only to the GNSO Council for deliberation. And this is since the strong support with significant of position, position receive strong support. The Working Group think that we should bring those to the attention of the Council particularly in the lives of the registrars not having chimed in the consensus call. But now if you chose to vote that down it will disappear forever.

Rudy Dekker: Rudy speaking, maybe a stupid question but is there any idea how GAC will react on when this motion is voted? Do you have any impression already?

Thomas Rickert: I should be very careful as to what hat I'm wearing. In my capacity as Working Group Chair strategic considerations should not be put into the equation. I am responsible in the integrity of the policy making process, and for those that have been joining this Working Group and some of you have,

you will remember that when we started this exercise there was no consensus in site at all. So I think that the community has shown a very mature a collaborative effort that took a little bit over a year to come with recommendations that are the best that the community can deliver.

Will it satisfy the GAC, probably not, will that satisfy all of your requests, for sure not, will that - you know nobody will be happy with the outcome and I think that's part of the what makes successful bottom up Multi-stakeholder policy development is that everybody has to compromise and I cannot foresee whether the Board will be accepting the recommendations that may or may not be adopted by the Council. We will know by this time tomorrow or roughly about this time tomorrow.

But I think this is the best that we can offer and it is my sincere hope that the Board will not cause any or too much friction between the GNSO policy recommendations in their own decision making. And depending on the voting threshold that we'll receive it will be harder and harder for the Board to turn down what the GNSO came up with and so I hope that there be little friction between what the Board and what the GNSO is doing.

And further I'm also hoping that the Board will discuss with the GAC and that there will be little friction between them. Because I think the position of the GAC has also - I wouldn't say diluted that would be too harsh of a word, but I think the position has changed a little bit so the GAC has been a little bit more - has indicated to be a little more flexible on their asks as in the point - at the point and time when we started this.

Robin Gross: Great thank you very much, any other questions for Thomas on this? Yes Milton.

Milton Mueller: So the strong support things you - I'm not sure if I heard this right were you suggesting that if we don't like the recommendations without consensus support that we would just have to vote the whole thing down?

Thomas Rickert: We will most likely offer two votes on this motion. One vote on the consensus positions as a block and then a separate vote on the recommendations that only receive strong support.

Milton Mueller: Oh so they're going to split the thing.

Man: Yes, yes.

Thomas Rickert: Because (unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: I think you kind of have to do that because my understanding in the Working Group process was that only things that emerge with consensus should be coming out of that. And if you start saying you know there are things that some groups really don't like are they being recommended to the Council then there's all kinds of games you can play by bundling things together in different ways and that we should probably keep those as part of a separate report of something.

Thomas Rickert: Which is correct if I might respond directly, the GNSO Council will have another meeting later today, and I think it's not up for me as Working Chair to make decisions as to how the Council wishes to vote on this, I'll leave that to our Council leadership. Nonetheless the plan as discussed with our Council Chair at the moment is to actually have two votes and that's exactly what you're - what I guess you're recommendation would be to Milton. I guess the over option question with respect to this topic is that we need some guidance procedurally as to where the Working Group should actually pass on the recommendations that only receive strong support to the Council.

So far there's no limitation on that, we had even more proposals that have been discussed by the Working Group but be clearly checked them as proposals and therefore we didn't even bring them to the attention of the

Council in the motion. So we only pass on those recommendations that receive an E strong support, but significant of position and the Working

Group chose to do that particularly because at least on one of the recommendations the voice of the registrars would have been decisive, so if the registrars had confirmed their support for this very recommendation it would have been in a consensus position, and we did not want to sweep that under the carpet. I hope that explains things a little more.

Glen: Just for the record, what other GNSO Council meeting is there today?

Thomas Rickert: There is a meeting that is - that still needs to be confirmed in terms of location, but there is the plan to have a meeting between 6:30 and 7:30 to sort of have final - have a final discussion in preparation of tomorrow's public meeting. So please watch out on the GNSO list. Glen you're not yet on that?

Glen: I'm on it.

Thomas Rickert: Okay, okay.

Robin Gross: Okay, well thank you very much Thomas I think we've got a little more clarity on this now. Alright let's see where are we?

Thomas Rickert: Thanks again for the opportunity and just for the record I am offering information to all groups, right so I just want to say that I'm treating everybody equally eager with this and offer my availability, thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you I really appreciate your time on this.

((Crosstalk))

Robin Gross: Okay, so this brings us to the end of our scheduled agenda and we're three minutes under schedule and remember we're meeting with the Board in half

an hour and I'll tell you what room number that is if I can find it. Okay I don't have it in front of me so we're all going to have to look it up.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Alright, so with that we will...

(Marlio Lowry) AB...

Robin Gross: Liber Tow - Liber...

(Marlio Lowry) Liber Tower AB, that's the big one.

Robin Gross: Yes, the big one, Liber Tower AB.

(Marlio Lowry) AB like (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Yes, yes, okay so we'll be meeting up there with the Board again in 30 minutes and thank you very much.

END