

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
January 29, 2013
12:45 am CT**

Steve Metalitz: ...I can identify in advance three issues to discuss for our CSG meeting on this slot which I'll just to review. One was improving communication coordination among the three constituencies.

Second was SG role per an ICANN governance versus council role per an gTLD policy.

And the third was preparing SLAC special requests for FY '14 budget.

So I wonder if we want to take a few minutes to respond or react to we heard from Fadi before we start or do we want to put that at the end? So...

Marilyn Cade: Yes I'd like to do it...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: ...as a kickoff. And maybe we can also ask who's on the phone to...

Steve Metalitz: Thank you yes. And this is Steve Metalitz speaking from the IPC. Is anybody joining us on the phone?

I don't hear anybody.

Marilyn Cade: We did have Jeff Brueggeman and (unintelligible) on the phone. I'll just check with (Benny) to see who's on from the BC. I know Ellen was on here.

Steve Metalitz: Ellen had been an earlier. I don't know, it's getting pretty late.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: But anyway okay well why don't we get started and so let's open the floor for a few minutes to reactions to what we heard from Fadi this morning are things we should be following up with on that.

Marilyn Cade: Well I'd like to kick off on that. It's Marilyn.

I am very enthused about hearing a report on progress in many areas that we've been concerned about for a very long time in terms of being the commercial stakeholder group and constituencies.

But I also think that they need to slow down and be sure that we are being inclusive.

Holding events balance in both in the Mena region and also in Africa that we're not able to be sure we're putting business participants into.

And I don't mean business constituency. I mean business participants into, we have a major initiative going on in outreach with business. So do the other constituencies.

So I think I was hearing a lot of moving parts, lots of optimism about initiative. But I also think what was coming across to me -- and you have and I this big change -- while well I really believe there has to be the focus on enforcement of the obligations of the contracted parties I think you have to be very careful that we are not put in position of ICANN primarily becoming the trade association for contracted parties. That will kill ICANN in terms of its legitimacy.

So lots of focus is appropriate as we said for a long time in ICANN enforcing the contracted party obligations and improving and enhancing those. But it's also got to be done in a way that includes the voice of users of the broad and several society and of the registrants.

And you know, I think coming up out of this there's going to be some further work and further discussion from us to say what is our broad (reach) into these programs that they are now launching staffing up on?

We're going to do (unintelligible) on this. But I think it's certain to digest.

Man: Steve do you think we can make a queue if anybody else wants to speak in reaction to Fadi. Tony Holmes, anybody else? Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Steve.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Steve, Hector okay.

Steve Delbianco: Thanks, Steve Delbianco. I had conflicting reactions. On the one hand I do think I'm surprised that with all the currently banking processes, with all the new gTLDs and RAA negotiations and GNSO working with everything going on that we thought we were going to talk about he had launched a new initiative towards - to manage reputation.

It's a new initiative that involves the CEOs, the registries and registrars. And if they all gather here the last week of March I don't think they're really going to want to talk about registrar Bill of Rights or user Bill of Rights. They're going to want to talk about where they are in the new gTLD program, government objections and contention sets.

So on one hand I feel like it was bit of a misdirection, maybe a bit ambitious to take that reputation thing on right now.

But on the other hand that's what a CEOs supposed to do right? They're supposed to have a whole lot of people running the operations as they think about the next set of battles and the next war.

So I'm conflicted on that. I understand his perspective and I'll give him the benefit of the doubt that he truly is trying to pay attention to execution but always looking ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Okay Tony Holmes?

Tony Holmes: Yes I've got some sympathy for that for Marylyn too but I would know way suggest that there's not an awful lot going for that approach. And with Steve's point you're right that probably is primarily on their minds when they meet in such a short time frame.

But the bottom line is they can discuss those issues that impact them today all day long. Maybe Fadi doesn't get this piece right they don't (unintelligible) into nothing. He's going to count for nothing.

So I really believe that once we need to continue to do the things we're doing that Marilyn referred to we've got to get this (all this) (before) we can for this.

And basically I applaud it. I think we should engage it. If it doesn't deliver let's have that dialogue after. But let's join him in doing it now. I really think that's essential.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Tony Holmes: Okay?

Ellen Shankman: Excuse me. This is Ellen Shankman on the phone.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Do you want to get in the queue?

Ellen Shankman: I just want to ask if everybody could speak louder on the phone. It's almost impossible to hear you. And over the Adobe it's very noisy. There's something very (lessing).

So everybody's saying important things. If you could speak more into the mic, everybody on the Adobe is having some issues with you.

Man: We will do our best.

Steve Metalitz: Steve are we - do we have this set up right to...

Ellen Shankman: Steve Metalitz, whatever you just spoke into it was much stronger. So wherever that was it was great.

Steve Metalitz: Nearest the center here but.

Okay. I have Hector, (Elisa). I'm going to put myself in the queue. And did anybody on the phone want to be in the queue? None?

Jimson Olufuye: (Unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: (Jimson) I'm sorry. (Jimson), Hector, Elisa. (Jimson) go ahead.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay thank you very much. It struck me that we have a (unintelligible) that one of our stakeholder is multi-stakings and dynamic and (unintelligible) What is key for us also to be on the (unintelligible) in supporting the groups (unintelligible)?

For example it's a good thing for us also to review our mechanism of (unintelligible) level. For example talking about (unintelligible) is very important.

So how do we, you know, follow-up, you know, on all these issues and (unintelligible) we'll follow-up engagement so that it will be a two way (unintelligible)?

So I think we need that kind of momentum at the top from our perspective to meet all (unintelligible) the goal and the processes to manage (unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you (Jimson). Hector?

Hector Manoff: Well I'm Hector Manoff and (Helene) is listening. And really I share a think - a thought of (Helene) saying that she was happy that in the CEO was like confessing that he maybe he didn't understand or didn't really balance how complex (unintelligible) program allowed the (unintelligible) clearinghouse and allowed the IP rights.

And really I like that. He can say well I want to learn more and I want to have more information before deciding.

But on the other hand I remember that we began talking about the third clearinghouse maybe two or three years ago. And always it was a very - everybody realized that we were creating almost like a new - a work trademark system.

Because this is really an issue very, very complex that it took more than 100 years to live (along) this system of world trademark was (unintelligible) from the late 1900s with the price combination and later was created in WIPO.

And we are in the middle of the creation of the system to try to protect not only (unintelligible) but also consumers.

That mean that we should try to stress that not only the consumer that will use the domain system we should care, But we should care about the consumers and the trademark owners that they also have a right.

But I think we should work to make a more awareness about this issue even that we are working for a long time.

Elisa Cooper: Yes I guess I'd like to echo what Steve said. I find it actually a little troubling. I was aware of the CEO roundtable that my colleague participated in.

And I understand this concern about how the domain name industry is perceived. But the fact is, you know, the issues that we're facing cannot be solved simply by in my opinion engaging with the analysts.

We kind of need to get our act together. We've got to focus on getting this trademark clearinghouse household out.

We've got to get the URS provider selected. We've got to make sure that we build out this thing that he's going to build out so that we can be aware of the registries as they roll out. It just seems like there's so much.

And I realize that, you know, he may be delegating but I mean already he said that people are working too much.

So if they're working too much and, you know, they're , and he's getting four hours of sleep you know maybe it's not the time right now to be engaging in this.

And I don't know, I was a little bit concerned about that. I would have preferred that we just really focused on (unintelligible).

You know, the - wrapping of the RAA negotiations and the other things related to the new gTLD program that seems like a tremendous amount of

work right there aside from trying to, you know, get the domain name industry more exposure in (unintelligible) are, you know, perception.

We - we're not going to improve our perception if it doesn't improve. I mean if you would like us to just stop - or if you would like me to just stop writing negative articles about what's going on well I will as soon as things are fixed okay.

I'm not going to just stop writing them because it's bad for the industry. I want the industry to improve.

And I think, you know, trying to improve the perception before we fix the problems is probably not the right way to go forward.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you.

Man: Especially not before the China meeting, you know?

Steve Metalitz: Yes I've got myself next to the in the queue. (John) wanted to be in and anybody else want to speak? (Dave)?

Ellen Shankman: Steve can Ellen Shankman get in the queue please?

Steve Metalitz: Okay I will do that. Anybody else?

(Mark Traclenberg): I'm sorry, (Mark).

Steve Metalitz: Okay. And then I think we should try to move on to our - the rest of our agenda.

I agree with a lot of what Elisa just said. I think it's - I would not sure how I would explain to my folks that the top priority of the CEO as he explained it to us was to improve the image of the registries and registrars. This is not our problem.

Man: I don't think he said that.

Steve Metalitz: I think he said...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: (Unintelligible) the (mutation) of a DNS sector. And he didn't seem to have the definition.

Man: But he didn't say registries and registrars.

Man: Yes I don't think he said that.

Man: That's unfair.

Steve Metalitz: Well okay.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Well then I stand corrected. But I don't think he had a definition of the - I think he was open to having a more (unintelligible) definition of the DNS sector.

But he's already done a lot of work. He hired Hill & Knowlton. He hired all these other people and the analysts and he told them don't tell me about the DNS sectors. What do you think they thought it was?

I just think it's - I am concerned. I mean I have all the goodwill in the world to Fadi. And I think he said a lot of very positive things that are really important for us to work with him on and we need to work with him on this.

But I think it is - it did strike me as kind of odd that this seemed to be his top priority and this as Elisa Cooper said look who was - (unintelligible) hasn't even been appointed. The deadline that was set by the board for it to complete his work is three weeks from now.

Man: (Oh my).

Steve Metalitz: The RAA, every single deadline has been missed on the revision of that. And the last time they put out they said they'll announce in January when it will be ready. That's Thursday.

So you didn't hear anything about it. Maybe we'll hear something about it this afternoon.

Man: He started saying everything's going as planned.

Woman: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Well...

Woman: I understood that (unintelligible) in the context of it was like a subheading before that section which was internally here at ICANN. He said so internally

here at ICANN. And I understood that to mean sort of institutional things. But I agree. There was the opportunity for misconception there is huge.

Steve Metalitz: Okay well so I'll stop there and I think (John) was next?

Woman: And then would you put me back in the queue too?

Steve Metalitz: (Unintelligible) queue.

John Berard: Well this is John Berard. I think Elisa Cooper has hit on the key tactical elements of what from a communications perspective strategically you would say that reputation lags reality.

And so if you seek to have your reputation changed you at first remake your reality. And redoing that and doing that requires delivering on some of these very important tactical steps that will despite Fadi saying we need to showcase a solid and mature industry before we roll out new gTLDs whether we can showcase a solid mature industry is not really relevant because the new gTLDs are rolling out.

And so the better part of valor here might be to protect the organization from chaos that might accompany that roll out.

I - my - I have not yet decided specifically how I feel about so much of what he said. But again looking at it strategically the notion of drawing a circle around something is initially inclusive.

But in the context of what ICANN is and his apparent approach I worry about the religious wars that may break out over the next year because that circle is exclusive as well.

Who is - who perceives themselves be on the outside of that circle the current system allows (unintelligible) people who have standing and access and opportunity.

And so I'm thinking personally I've got to sit on the GNSO council for the next year and watch people have at it with broad swords and maces. I mean thinking of it at its worst understanding of course that we have law and so therefore we have suits instead of the maces and broad swords.

But I worry about - I think about those strategic issues. Drawing a circle around something is as exclusionary as it is inclusive. Reputation lagging reality what are we doing to deal with the reality.

And Tony Holmes I appreciate your quick response on the notion that the DNS industry is registrars and registries.

But I do have a - some modest concern about the table of organization on engagement where we have government input, oversight and input. We have SO and AC oversight and input. And we have DNS - the DNS who - the contracted parties input.

So as the organization solidifies around Fadi's view of how efficiencies can be driven do those - does that organization empower or displace for depose certain participants that we have right now?

Tony Holmes: If you'll just allow me to respond on that. John I share that view. I really do share that view. This why I think the very worst thing we can do is not engage in that because it's going to happen. That's going to move forward whether we're part of it or not.

And if we don't engage I think there's a real chance of what we fear is becoming reality. So the only way to combat that is to try and engage in this so make sure that doesn't happen.

And that was my point to say you've done these things for the others. There's a whole big other groups sitting here who are not part of that. We need to play in that as well.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly.

Tony Holmes: So...

Marilyn Cade: And I think that was what I was trying to say to Tony Holmes not to say Marilyn ICANN has a set of functions to perform.

We told them at the BC that if they did not fix the operational excellence of how they performed overall not just on the new gTLD programs but we couldn't save them from their inner meetings and that we are right (into us). They are us.

I think though so I was very interested and enthused about a range of the new things that (Claudio) is supposing to do.

But I think we have got to also make sure that the focus on operational excellence and dealing with some of these poor vulnerabilities is the top priority otherwise we're not going to be - they're not going to be here a year from now. You guys are all going to go - (because) (Neil) and others at the ITU or someplace worse.

I think we can do both. But I think we need to come back to a little bit of maybe we could ratchet back the speed of some of these reputational works so we can prioritize (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: It does worry me that he wants to do so much by Beijing.

Steve Metalitz: Right. Could we get back to our queue? I think (Peter was first and then Ellen on the phone and then (Mark).

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: One more. What was (unintelligible)? Was it (Peter)?

Caroline Greer: Please can I (make a) comment? It's Caroline Greer. I had trouble calling in.

Steve Metalitz: Well but you're here now?

Caroline Greer: I'm here now. Yes I didn't get in the queue but I just had a minute comments.

Steve Metalitz: I will put you in the queue.

Caroline Greer: Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: (Peter).

Man: Okay thank you. This is (unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: Sorry.

(Peter): Oh that's fine. (Unintelligible) this program hugely in the structure of their -
of ICANN (unintelligible).

And GNSO (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

(Peter): But I haven't seen (unintelligible) I think (unintelligible) by granting of the
GNSO proposal grant (unintelligible) possibilities in the (unintelligible)
program (unintelligible).

I think we (unintelligible) the opportunity of the (unintelligible) program to
participate (unintelligible) and use it to prepare (unintelligible).

I think Fadi (unintelligible) believe (unintelligible) believe that (unintelligible)
supplement what (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) going to be huge and include structural a division
(unintelligible) which (unintelligible) observed the show. And consider the
(unintelligible) programs (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. I've got Ellen in the queue, Ellen Shankman.

Ellen Shankman: Okay Steve thank you. I think that Fadi's stories are extremely telling. And I
think that it's important to use the language of his stories in conveying things
back to him and to using them forward.

First of all the pinhole under the house, I think the concern about not having our self-responsibility and our concerns there become one of the pinholes in the pipe under the house. And I think that has to go back to him that way.

I think the fact that he labels himself an industry man is very important terminology. I think Tony Holmes's offer that Fadi jumped on to attend some of the various meetings I mean he - from what I understood and obviously you in the room could follow it better than we could on the phone, he's laid out about four or five different meetings -- some in February, some in March, some in April in which he's defined these various smaller subgroups.

And I think to the extent that it's going to be critical for the IPC and the business constituency to define themselves as also being relevant for these various meetings to possibly be able to go to those meetings and attend can I think be very important.

And I would go back again to the place that says he keeps talking about the importance for us to show that we can self-govern so that the ITO whatever would then come on and to say that what we're doing is in fact part of that responsible self-governance.

Because whoever raised the question -- and it is going to be critical -- is when the massive outreach efforts, you know, take off and there is going to be huge numbers of people joining in this, if our voice is already diluted now once that mass of communication people comes in it can just be, you know, written off the face of the planet if we're not included in however it is that they're drawing the circle.

So I think it's really important to use Fadi's own terminology and how telling he is about what he's saying his messages are.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you Ellen. I think you made excellent points in my personal view.
(Mark)?

(Mark Traclenberg): (Mark Traclenberg). And I definitely take all the points that were raised and I mean don't dispute them in principle and all and especially last point, you know, saying that we need to make sure that, you know, we're one of the important constituencies not just in the sense of structural organization but really in the groups that he feels have to be at the table.

But, you know, that being said, you know, I don't think that that I heard him say that his focus was purely reputational.

You know, he said that his agenda was dual agenda of your reputational issues of improving profile of this sector but also improving the framework of the sector and that you he repeatedly said that, you know, we have to be able to go forward to (the table) and tell them we have a machine that works if it actually does work.

And so, you know, I think when you hear things that's partly based on the context of where we are. I mean he assured that we're not frothing at the mouth over things that may not be so important.

I personally saw opportunities to be engaged. He clearly recognized the structural issues have to be addressed and if they don't that ICANN is going to be irrelevant and none of this is going to matter because it's going to be taken over by the ITO or something else.

And so, you know, I almost feel like I was in a different meeting than some of the people based on the comments.

I think maybe when people read the transcript maybe it'll be a lot clearer. But, you know, I saw really his very deep understanding that there was deep structural issues that had to be directed as quickly as possible.

And I think that we should, you know, focus less on - well (randomizing) some of his comments about reputation which are important issues especially as you're trying to prevent, you know, government and other actors of the importance of the DNS sector and, you know, it's relation to the economy.

I think we should focus, you know, less on maybe criticizing or focusing on those areas which are also important and recognizing he's a CEO. He can't just focus on one thing. He's got to focus on everything.

And we should try and take the opportunities to really dig in on what you recognize as the critical issues (fixing) structure and really focus on, you know, making him understand and making him (accept) that we are players and we have to be at the table. He has to have meetings with us like those CEOs. He has to have, you know, our input. He needs to work (directly) with us to work on those things that he said were critical. And I think that should be our focus.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Caroline Greer are you...

Caroline Greer: Yes, I had a quick comment or concern about his - and where he addressed the IUCs regarding his - the statement that he claims, you know, was taken out of context.

But he prefaced it and said I thought hearing that the - well like it's too late to do it publicly but I can assure you blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

And I thought that was a little odd that he couldn't kind of correct the record publicly...

Man: (Yes).

Caroline Greer: ...in case anyone interpreted it that somehow that that was a mistake. Because he said then some very glowing things that I would think I would love to see out in the public.

And I just was concerned - I don't know why he prefaced it with like it's too late to fix it.

Man: I think he said he didn't have time. I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Yes it's a good point. We can't (unintelligible) on every story that, you know...

Caroline Greer: They are in the...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) has to make one call.

Steve Metalitz: Right.

Caroline Greer: Yes but they are...

Ellen Shankman: Steve this is Ellen Shankman. Can I just make a comment to (Mark)'s point that he just finished before?

Steve Metalitz: Before you do I think Tony Harris was in the queue and then we'll go back to you. And then we need to decide whether we need to wrap up this part of our reading. Tony?

Tony Harris: Yes this is Tony Harris. I just wanted to say a couple of things but actually (Mark) said them all for me.

I entirely agree with what (Mark) said and I think he was right on with his comments. Some of us at the table have been around ICANN since 1998 or perhaps even sooner on - Marilyn for example.

But I have never felt in all these years -- and I've never missed an ICANN meeting -- I've never felt so comfortable with a CEO as I do with Fadi.

He talks to us. He listens to us. I'd give him at least that. But whatever criticism you may have for what he said I think he's a great improvement and we should give him an opportunity to do what he's doing.

Steve Metalitz: Okay personally I agree with everything you said Tony. I think it is a really refreshing change from what we've seen in the past.

Ellen and then maybe we can - oh I'm sorry, then Hector and then we can wrap up on this point.

Ellen Shankman: Thank you and I agree with Caroline Greer's comment about concern.

(Mark) what I was just suggesting to say is not that our message should only be he needs to meet with us the same way that he needs to meet with the CEOs and whatever the various groups are that he's doing.

I'm suggesting that when he identifies a group like the CEOs if some of our people are those CEOs they should be at that meeting too, not just that the IPO whoever we are treated like those other meetings but in fact that we find ways to define ourselves to also be able to attend those other meetings in addition to his treating us like those other meetings. I think that's where the expansion has to be.

(Mark Traclenberg): That's what I meant basically.

Steve Metalitz: All right, Hector?

Hector Manoff: I agree with Tony also about the concept about Fadi. But on the other hand I am a little confused about a - the view of the - the particular view about the DNS sector.

I don't know if he mentioned that ICANN itself have a very low level of knowledge. And really ICANN is who represent all the sectors and all the communities.

I'm sure that the DNS sector whatever is exactly the limits should be with better self-regulation and have a better image.

But on the other hand we as ICANN it should take care of all the other part of the communities because sometimes they - even the IPC sector also have a problem about image.

I think we need a - more help from ICANN to improve the - our image.

Steve Metalitz: Okay let's - should we move on to the rest of our agenda here. We had the three items that we had talked about before that get back on track. There were - there's only 45 minutes left and so I'd like do a shift to that.

The first issue that we had here was shorthand as improving communication/coordination among the three constituencies.

And I think some of this grows out of the last few months and the discussion, development of consensus views on right protection mechanisms between the IPC and BC and then everything that's happened since then.

I don't know whether this is just an isolated incidence or something we need to talk about further. But I think that's kind of how this got on the agenda.

So let me open the floor to people that...

Marilyn Cade: Before we do that I have a point of order if I might. It's Marilyn. I just need to be - I just need to clarify that everyone understands that the call is being both transcribed and non-CSG participants are able to participate via the chat room as observers I...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: ...(unintelligible). But I thought that was an important point for everyone to know.

And the assumption is that the transcript of course will be made public. But I wasn't sure everyone both on the call and in the room was aware of that.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you for pointing that out. That's a good piece of information.

So, you know, we - I think we over the years we've worked quite well since this current structure in which we have (unintelligible) constituencies in the commercial group I think we've worked well together and it's been reasonably effective, want to make sure that that remains the case.

There obviously are going to be issues which our constituencies have different views. That's inevitable. But making sure we - that everyone keeps each other apprised of the views and of the directions things are going I think is an important aspect to it.

And whether it's on a specific issue if you will, like enhanced rights protection mechanisms or more general issues such as some of those we talked about with Fadi about policy versus implementation and so forth I just welcome any thoughts about how we can improve our coordination and be more effective in the months ahead.

So I think Tony Holmes wanted to be recognized, Marilyn. Anybody else want to speak on this?

Okay let's start with that queue Tony Holmes?

Tony Holmes: Okay if I fully understand where this is on the agenda I think there are clearly issues around this that have evolved.

And a lot of that has come about (I think) this of us doing so many things in such a short timeframe.

Marilyn Cade: Tony Holmes.

Steve Metalitz: Can't hear your Tony Holmes. Sorry.

Tony Holmes: Okay sorry. My comment is, the underlying comment to make is I do think we need to talk about this. And I think we've got some work to do on it. And I think we need to do it openly.

I would prefer to do this on a specific call when I think we just set aside a full hour to have this conversation.

And I don't think we're going to be able to do that during these two days. So my proposal is that we recognize that, recognize the need to do it and set up a time when we can (pull) it through and do it properly.

Man: Just a nut that needs to be cracked...

Steve Metalitz: Just I had a question about what - are you suggesting that that would be a call of the full memberships of the three or leadership of which do you...

Tony Holmes: Well I'm open to what is the prevailing view on that. I'm happy to have it as full membership.

Steve Metalitz: All right Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. It's Marilyn for the transcript. I want to pose the question just a little bit different. And not to disagree with your proposal Tony Holmes but to take us back to why we're even in the CSG and what our charter is because we have a very lightweight charter which we chose. We chose the very

lightweight charter. You know, it may be time to examine and we agreed that constituencies (identify)

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...was separate constituency identity was very important to us. Not everybody was here at the time but this was a very active engagement as some people will remember.

And really the NCSG took a different approach. And I'm not making a comment for pro or con I'm just saying let's remember how we got there.

The constituency as a group and I mean the membership as well agreed that we would coordinate loosely and share information.

And where appropriate and where we agreed we might collaborate on policy positions. But on the gTLD environment and also more broadly like on budget or operating plans.

I think we are at a stage of growth where figuring out what our communications plan is in terms of exchange of information and informing each other and on what areas is a very important thing to do.

But I think we also need to add to this discussion where we are in thinking out but whether the present structural arrangement at ICANN how they're going to work in the interim period and at what point we would say that the present structural arrangements within ICANN are not performing.

The chairs of all of the constituencies and DFOs were asked by (Steve Crosby), the Chairman of the board to make a statement about this issue and we all did.

Now maybe we all sort of said let the new participants get on board. Let's broaden and deepen the participation. And then let's do, let's assess what best meets the broad community.

But I think I would like to think we have an interim discussion about improving our exchange around whatever topic.

But we also factor in this bigger topic because I think that's the only thing that is going to make it really useful for all of our members and for us. And we need to live through an interim period of some time on the performance.

I don't want (John) to be wearing a coat of mayo when he goes to the council meetings or to be sitting behind a screen with a voice disguiser so that people can't lob things at him.

Man: I do worry about it.

Steve Metalitz: Okay (Wolf) and then Tony Holmes want to do (unintelligible) and (unintelligible)?

(Wolf): Yes. Thank you. (Wolf). So we're talking about internal complication. And I would like to talk about the improvements before I talk about the perception let me say.

And I have great impression over the last few months sometimes that captive views, and we should have different views but they be not open enough well

to accept different views let me say that in that way because everybody has this view and tries as well to convince others and so on. So this is one point.

On the other hand I got the impression that sometimes when we exchange views we seem to have a certain position.

We don't really look at what happened, what is for example for what is the processor or what is in the process.

And if we don't really know about what we have - what has been fixed in some processes for example and so that we have an opinion and try to convince others with that before we go back to the roots and looking into that what has been talked about in earlier things.

Well it's - it happens to me as well so because I don't remember all these what has been decided in the past now. But we should be open now to understand and to accept those (positions) and what has been already developed.

For me it's really internally as well as externally it's a basic question of credibility so in the form as we are communicating so that we are consistent with that what we have done in the earlier days and what we have - and not since a situation has been changed that we are thinking about okay well we can change our - also our position with regards to some procedures, process we have.

So that is what I would like that we think about that (unintelligible) discuss it more and more before we stick to positions, before it comes to that (unintelligible).

For example this is a trademark clearinghouse. We feel that we got very, very much under fire and very much under pressure because we had a different position that others had and that we really try now to exchange views and to accept that others have different views. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you (Wolf). Tony Holmes and then I'll put myself in the queue. So does anybody else want to speak or does anybody on the phone wish to say anything on this topic?

Tony Holmes: Okay. Well firstly I'd just like to echo the point that I think you made them very well.

There's clearly work to do here. And I think Marilyn it's also undeniable - (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: ...for that work to be done because she said that we all agreed that we don't need to do anything now. We can go through a period of letting things...

Marilyn Cade: I didn't say that.

Tony Holmes: ...settle down. Well you suggested that there was agreement that we didn't see the need for any urgent action to change things now. That is not our view and we've made it clear it's not our view.

So there's a clear example of the need to have this dialogue in a much better manner.

And I don't think we need to go down that path now talking about the need to react or to look at changes now. But clearly I think we do have some different perspectives there.

And going back to Wolf's point we need to find a way of handling those. I think this is really an issue as I said at the start that needs some focus time and I again very much support the need to drill down and do that when it's appropriate. But I don't think we're going to get through it here.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Okay this is Steve Metalitz. I just want to respond to Wolf and Tony Holmes. I hear what you're saying about the importance of respecting the views of our fellow constituencies.

And I think it - part of the problem I think has been things have been done under extreme time pressure because there wasn't a set method for doing it.

I mean this really comes back to the whole the policy implementation issue a few will. And, you know, discussions in Toronto were extremely ad hoc. And I think Fadi said he was trying to do it in a comment sense manner but it was his common sense and not maybe not everybody else's common sense.

Regardless we ended up with some extremely truncated time frames that we didn't, you know, none of us dreamed up that process but that's kind of how it happened.

And I think if in the process of that because of those extreme time pressures on an issue that frankly is extremely important to my constituency if there were instances where we were not sufficiently respectful for the views of our fellow constituency then I apologize for that.

And I think that is an example of something we need to do better on. And I'm just kind of putting it in the context that if we had a somewhat more regular process it's - that is if ICANN had a somewhat more regular process and wasn't always trying to come up with kind of ad hoc ways of doing things between policy development extremely slow ponderous, et cetera, and pure (reputation) where the staff just does its thing, the problem is we don't have a good definition of that middle ground so we ended up with this very ad hoc process and very short time frames and therefore pressured to say look well are you with us or not?

So again if there were circumstances there where members of my constituency did not, you know, didn't communicate that they were listening to and respecting your viewpoint then I apologize for that.

Man: No need.

Steve Metalitz: Is there anybody else that wants to speak on this topic or...

Man: Or implementation?

(Christina Rosette): Steve it's (Christina). Can I get in the queue very quickly?

Steve Metalitz: Yes you can. Anybody else?

Christina go ahead.

(Christina Rosette): I completely agree with - this is (Christina Rosette) for the recording. I completely agree with everything that Steve said. And, you know, I think having a call is an excellent idea.

I'm not set in any view as to whether or not it should be leadership only. I do think it would be helpful to have it be a small group.

And frankly I think the most useful outcome from my perspective would be to have some sort of for lack of better word communication protocols so that we have a sense of, you know, there are going to be regular calls on a monthly basis on this day and this time, you know, among leadership when there is an issue that any member of leadership in one of the constituencies believes requires some kind of or merits some kind of communication or coordination. You know, this is the process we're going to use for doing that.

I don't want us to necessarily get to boxed in and to be too rigid but I think there's - we're so overwhelmed at this point that if we can try to develop something that has the flexibility that we need, the utility that we also need will be very well served in the long run.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, anybody else?

Marilyn Cade: Yes can I? This is Marilyn. I really agree with what I think we're coming to. But I think agreeing to a regular timeframe we have proposed that in the past but it's been difficult to stick to.

I think we would welcome it as the BC once we figure out what the topics are that it's worth all of our time to devote that time to. Because we also have constituency working issues that are not - and again I'll just go back. I don't want to beat a dead horse here.

Our charters says, you know, I'm not saying we have to strictly stick to the charter but we sort of agreed to a procedure.

If we can establish before we leave maybe tomorrow two or three things that are important enough to have these coordinating calls about because I think we're going to have some follow-up items we very much all want to talk about.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. I think that's a very good point Marilyn. And I think it's worth reminding ourselves that the original approach was that we would - the coordination on policy issues would be perhaps the exception and not the rule and do we - are our expectation's different about that or do we need to reset? So that's a big question that we need to discuss on the call (unintelligible).

Okay (unintelligible) why don't we move on to our next topic which is listed as SG role ICANN governance versus council role gTLD policy development.

And I won't go any further into what that topic is because I think there are probably people that are eager to jump in on this.

Is there anybody that wishes to speak on this topic? (Wolf), Marilyn, Steve?

(Wolf): Oh thank you, (Wolf) speaking. Well this is an everlasting point. I can (unintelligible) the question stakeholder groups will council the question will the GNSO (unintelligible) all of the GNSO council in these things?

Well it reminds me every time though as we had in Europe, you know, it was by of the European Union. So and Henry Kissinger was asking what is the telephone number of the European Union? Who can I call, you know?

So that's the same point we have here, you know, Fadi or if we are approached, you know, the GNSO is approached to some extent by others by the board by somebody else, you know, (unintelligible) to approach.

So for example if we have the situation with regards to the comments of strawman proposal for example so all stakeholders are asked for the comment on that. The GNSO is asked. The GNSO council has been asked to comment how shall we deal with that?

And the GNSO that also the outsiders of the GNSO don't know exactly how to approach the GNSO in this respect.

So that means that we have not only to raise our hands and say okay this is counsel and this is policy and this is - there is a borderline of the council and there's nothing else and anything else is up to the constituencies and stakeholder groups themselves.

I think we have also to educate if we are, if we stick to that position, if that is our current position that's it. That's - I say we have to think about whether this is our common position.

Then we have to educate outsiders as well really then that they have been aware that how to deal with that.

And we have to provide them tools or provide the means well and contacts, contact numbers and these to whom they should refer in case.

Otherwise we - every time it comes back to us and we struggle internally because we are approached from outsiders who don't know how to approach us and we struggle internally who is doing that and who shall do that.

So we should think about - I have not found a solution to that. But we should think about and not only just pick case by case and say okay now this is out of your call this is just internally and now...

((Crosstalk))

(Wolf): ...(unintelligible) we should really come up with a suggestion about the role and this...

((Crosstalk))

(Wolf): ...(culture) also and GNSO. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. So for those of you who don't read the ICANN bylaws on a regular basis the bylaws for the ccNSO and the GNSO are different in terms of functional assignment.

I say that to you just because, you know, sometimes we forget that the supporting organization is actually a creature that was agreed to and established by bylaws.

There is a history to why that is. We started out with the GNSO and the ccs were incorporated in that. Then that was changed.

And the ccNSO elects their chair differently than we do. There's - the chair's elected by the managers of the ccTLDs.

The council according to the bylaws of ICANN of the GNSO is responsible for gTLD policy development.

Now when I've look at the functional work that is done by that councilors and by the policy council the workload is aggressively more than the amount of policy work that goes on in the ccNSO because of how different the ccTLDs are (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I don't really consider it a practical for us to actually have only two people who can be responsible for being the single go to place on everything that is going on about ICANN and gTLD policy.

And when we established an executive committee in the BC our charter separates the work. I'm not saying everybody's stuff. I'm just saying our stuff that really follows more the bylaws.

I understand Wolf's point though that is people don't know who to call then it's easy for them to think that they can turn to the council and turn to the councilors and shove all of the expected work onto the councilors.

I just think practically for this time that's, you know, first of all we do have the bylaws issues. But I just think that that's not really practical to expect the councilors to take on coordinating comments on the budget other than on policy issues, taking on comments on the reviews, et cetera.

And I do think the chairs and the SCOMs of the CSG do provide an additional layer of management within each of the constituencies.

Steve Metalitz: Steve passes. Anybody else think about this? Okay I'm not sure what our next step is here. I (Unintelligible) very well laid out the problem which is that if we - is there a need for a clearer statement of where we think the dividing line is and for a clearer sense of who are the contact people, the things that fall on the stakeholder group side (unintelligible). I don't know if that's something (unintelligible) but Tony I think you had...

Tony Holmes: Yes Tony Holmes. I think generally this is where we...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: ...(unintelligible) have a discussion and I think we'd be pretty close in agreement where those dividing lines are.

The problem we've got as Marilyn said is that there are bylaws that were put in place that even if we got that agreement making it work is beyond us because it involves all the other participants in the GNSO as well.

And it's a mess. It's a horrible mess. The only way out of this mess is when we actually get to the stage of having some review maybe to the point we can put it back into some of the discussions that we're having right now about the impact of gTLDs and how that impacts so constituencies and (humanization).

We need to point out that there is clearly that overlap. Because our ability as a stakeholder group to actually resolve this it isn't there. It's got to be part of a much broader discussion.

And currently we fail at this because I think we do try to make it work in our own constituencies, in our own stakeholder groups in a way that we feel is the right way and the appropriate way.

But it falls down because GNSO council, they just all do their own thing which in their defense they're chartered to do or one could argue that they're chartered to do.

So it's a much more difficult issue than us sitting around here trying to resolve it because it's got to be resolved with a much broader discussion.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible) can we make this one of our topics for our follow-on more in-depth discussions? And I just want to reinforce my comments about earlier which I may have been misunderstood about. I think we need to have some interim improvements but I don't expect that to replace the need for more substantive things.

Steve Metalitz: John I'm sorry.

John Berard: So this is John Berard. My concern about the - this being the question that I feel that the cart has gotten now ahead of the horse prior to the discussion about what's policy and what's implementation.

We could get everybody to agree wholeheartedly but yes we are only going to deal with policy. Then we find ourselves back in the same (unintelligible).

And so I think it probably would be a good idea if at the front end of every GNSO council meeting there was a statement of our purpose mission and approach drawn from the bylaws.

It might sound pedantic but I think it would be helpful psychologically but clearly the discussion now is totally focused on the difference between policy and implementation.

The councilors each of us in our own way has made it so, some more aggressively than others. And until we sort that out I think we will continue to be the court of not just last resort but the court of first resort for people who are seeking information decision access and to whom it is not clear who they call in the organization.

I mean it's possible that in six months Fadi will have sorted out the organization of ICANN to such a degree that all of these will evaporate.

I doubt that but I hold out hope that these things could happen. But so I think that's where we are right now that the discussion is now what's policy, what's implementation.

We can assert the role, the proper role of the council but until that first question is answered the - it's not really valuable.

Steve Metalitz: Okay I think that's a good point. Brian, anybody else want to get in the queue? Okay Brian go ahead.

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt. This is a little bit of a separate topic but I just feel like it's worth bringing up and discussing. And I would like to hear other councilors opinions on this.

I feel like it has become apparent that I feel like one of the things that we need to be looking at - and again I don't know if it's an interim solution or if it's really a long-term fix when we're looking at restructuring but really tying and

making sure that there are safeguards in place to make sure that seats on the council are tied to constituencies and that constituencies actually have representation so that we don't get into a situation we have now where in NCSG there's a constituency that neither has a council seat nor a place on the executive committee.

I know it's our stakeholder group that I'm talking about. But I think it is an issue and I think it's something that has created a lot of problems but basically means there's ascension in almost every council vote block voting by all those councilors.

And if anything is going to pass we need everyone in RSG and our good friend (Lonnie) who is on our side can get things on the other side in order or we can't get anything past the council.

So that's just something I want to kind of throw out there and it's become an apparent issue I think and it impedes the policy process in my experience.

Steve Metalitz: Okay it's not a new issue and we have ideas about how we might best approach it.

John Berard: Steve this is John. I had asked the same question of our (NEC SG) colleagues and was told that the process is very much in keeping with their charter and that the NPOC which is the constituency that I think you're talking about.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

John Berard: I thought that they had gone to the ombudsman. And I don't - I thought but I don't know. But if they have then maybe there is something progressing along that...

Man: Okay. Yes getting to this issue I was involved in the formation of the NPOC because most of them - many of those people are friends of mine and we share activities and social inclusion.

Steve Metalitz: Still friends of yours?

Man: Right. That's it. And basically this is a very good point you raised because they have had a nightmare being able to get ahead with our constituency.

They will present applications from NGOs who want to become members. And these are in many cases blocked by the NCUC. And they say well, you know, you are commercial. They'll tell NGO they are a commercial entity because I don't know, they have some source of income to be sustainable or something...

Man: They sell too...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...and all this kind of strange things happen.

They can have probably twice as many members as they do right now but so many of them have been sort of blocked and sidelined by - because they have to go to the NCUC for approval.

And I asked in Toronto in a meeting the board was - I forgot which meeting it was but I brought this up at the microphone. I said I'm on the nominating committee. I was in the last addition and I'm on the addition for this year and there is no representative from the NPOC which seems strange.

And there again that is due to the bylaw situation in the - in the NCSG which enables the NCUC effectively to occupy all the council seats and exclusive (role) of participation in the nominating committee. It doesn't seem quite fair.

Steve Metalitz: Marilyn and then Tony Holmes.

Marilyn Cade: The reality is -- Marilyn -- the charter was published for public comment. It's a very long history to this. We did not feel they we could impose our structural view on another SG.

Well let me address this a little bit differently. I think there's been advances in thinking. And maybe we could just park the further discussion until till we hear more from the NPOC about some recent changes that I think are evolving there.

But I think the underlying point that was made that I want to be sure we understand is the composition of the NPOC often includes NGOs and academics who are practicing who - they're different than the membership of the NCUC.

And I think probably our concern is probably more we expected the diversity of participation to change. That's what we thought we were getting out of the restructuring.

And I think the real question is is that different perspective coming forward both in policy development and in policy influence of ICANN overall?

And that to me I think is a larger issue that we have a right to sort of be concerned about because that diversity is required in order for ICANN to

freely be the multi-stakeholder representative body that it is more than just a question of whether they will voting (increase) on the council.

Steve Metalitz: I think Tony Holmes.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Just a quick point. I had some discussion with the NPOC on this and I was under the impression that they were not pursuing the issue of council seats at the moment for what reason. But I didn't clearly understand.

But if they're not going down that path we clearly have an issue with it because I think it's an issue of appropriate representation.

But I'm not sure who owns that or whether we can even raise that before we have some form of GNSO review.

I don't know whose problem that really is if the NPOCs aren't really saying we fill we're disenfranchised through this situation. And I don't think that's the case now.

Steve Metalitz: We need to do a little more fact...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...finding I think...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...with the NPOC about where they currently stand.

Tony Holmes do you have a comment then we need to wrap-up this topic.

Tony Holmes: Very quick yes. This is true that they have been let's say doing a little nonviolent exercise probably trying to make friends with these other people. That's part of the story.

And getting to something I think if I understood Marilyn correctly about our views, I know that as far as Whois for example they share far more on what - on our thinking with regards to Whois than the traditional adversaries we've had - we have had in the NCUC.

So it's a shame that they're not represented on council. It would as you pointed out it might change the results of a lot of votes on council if they had a couple of seats there.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Unless there's anybody on the phone that wants to say anything on this second topic? If not let's move on to the third one which is preparing SOAC's special request for FY '14 budget.

I think this is an area where we want to try to coordinate if we can among the three constituencies.

So let me turn the floor over to Chris who has been kind of leading the effort on this. Chris Chaplow.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you. Chris Chaplow speaking. I'll just hand some of these documents around.

One is the just - and experts, probably not enough for everybody so perhaps...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Chaplow: ...one between two. I just print this off before I left.

Just to let everybody know that the FY '14 support period is now open. The deadline for the request is the 19th of April but there's a fast track for deadline on 22 March.

One of the documents I'm handing now they're on the wiki. And those in the constituencies (unintelligible) but that's the template (unintelligible) example.

And the other document I'm handing around was the FY '13 (unintelligible) appendix which showed what everybody claimed and what was paid.

I think I'll be able to explain the mechanics probably after the meeting tomorrow better. So I won't go into all that. But I just wanted to raise this because although these support claims there are three independent constituency support claims. There's not a CSG claim, the three constituency claims.

I think if we confer on what our requests are we'll have a better chance of success.

So I'm just going to very quickly recap on what the requests were last year to remind everybody in the room.

And then I was thinking perhaps ask the three chairs to explain what they - or say what they think - what they're thinking of claiming for FY '14. I know it's a bit premature but let's get this out on the table and then probably open to questions.

There were five areas that were claimed by the three constituencies. The monetary total was about \$50,000 on each.

The five areas were Office of Travel which it was paid across the - it wasn't paid sorry. It was agreed across the board I think at three offices per constituency no matter what different constituencies requested different things. But ICANN went across the board on that.

Across the councilors yes, three offices plus the councilors which were existing. Outreach events still claim - we all request outreach events. And that was yes but it was rolled into this meeting. So in effect it was a yes but it didn't happen.

Outreach material, we all requested outreach material and that was accepted. The BC and the ISP had requests for leadership development or sponsored attendance by ICANN meetings by ISPs and that was accepted.

We also all requested either secretariat support or secretariat travel and that was denied. And the reason given is Note 2 on the sheet I've just handed around.

So that's just a quick recap on where we are now. I think I'll stop by asking the chairs who wants to start.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes questions.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Yes.

Man: To understand really this table is from June 2012 this one here. But now over here now said, you know, there was something in-between, you know, decided about how can we find it here with that table?

Chris Chaplow: That table is because that is the final published ICANN FY '13 budget...

Man: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: ...which was published in June 2012.

Man: So is...

Chris Chaplow: Approved by the board and became the FY '13 budget.

Man: Okay it's - so but it's still valid.

Chris Chaplow: It's the year we're currently in. It's the year we're currently working to. So the discussion now is the FY '14 claims...

Man: Okay yes.

Chris Chaplow: ...which was which is FY '14 starting the 1st of July...

Man: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: ...next year.

Man: Good all right sorry.

Chris Chaplow: Sorry this year.

Man: That's this year.

Chris Chaplow: Forgot what year it is?

Man: That's FY '13.

Steve Metalitz: Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Sue I'm happy to kick off. It's Marilyn speaking. So in addition to this everyone generally should be aware that there is a another process called the toolkit...

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: ...which provides expenses, services from the ICANN budget that you use such as conference bridges, transcripts, meeting support coordination -- various things of that nature -- that are provided. And they are in the ICANN budget.

Part of the toolkit also addresses the GNSO council's similar use of activities so transcripts, the wiki -- all that kind of stuff.

So the toolkit is separate from this. And I think that's important to know because we do provide input to...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...(unintelligible) on what our use of toolkit services are going to be.

So just as an example for all of you the BC insisted that we have transcripts not just the (B3).

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Not every constituency felt that way. But so that budget process there's also a process where somehow Tony Holmes or - and Steve, (Christina), you guys will estimate the number of conference calls you're going to have.

We put the estimate for the number of CSG calls and support for the CSG calls into that toolkit support. So that's point number one.

Point number two that I want to make is the BC has asked ICANN - we're not suggesting everybody shares this theme.

But we have asked ICANN to provide a solution to banking and their processing of member fees in particular where companies must have a W-9 or some other kind of legal document in order to pay their fee.

We will be continuing to advance that as a part of the toolkit. And we have talked to some of the other constituencies who we think also share that need. It may or may not be on your radar screen but just as an FYI to you.

We will be reinforcing the idea in our request that officer travel needs to be funded. I think our - and that is up to the constituency to determine whether they allocate that officer travel to elected officers or they allocate it to an attending member who for some reason but that that discretion but that ICANN would continue to fund that travel.

We will also be asking for an improvement in their funding materials including they're putting more support into contact development, maybe using their own existing services. Because right now the only thing we will pay for is printing and we need language translation -- other things.

We will be asking them to support participation at outreach events in order to ensure that members of our constituency or members from the business community are able to actively participate in those regional events.

And we will repeat a project that we asked them to support leadership development for business leaders from developing countries.

And we will also go back to them on the idea that ICANN needs to provide support to fund secretariat services to support the growing needs of the constituency.

The ability to support a very diverse group of participants if we're successful in bringing in 50 new brand companies to participate in new - in these constituencies and others or, you know, lots of business participants from developing countries really increases the need for there to be a secretariat function.

So we will go back in on telling them to solve the problem that they're reluctant to provide either funding or to pick up the contractor as a ICANN contractor for BC secretariat.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you Marilyn. ISPs...

Man: Okay yes, okay as much information as I can now because we haven't had the discussions around our input for FY '14 yet.

But in outline we are not far away probably from (sharing) most of the approach that Marilyn spoke about.

Certainly the outreach activities are going to form quite a large part of our request along with travel to ICANN meetings.

The way the sponsored attendance at ICANN meetings was handled last year has been a little bit confusing to say the least.

And also that we found the time was ticking by quickly on that when we needed answers. So we will be looking at doing something around that area again.

We have (unintelligible) able to put any flesh on that. And issue that Marilyn made about certainly secretariat services we'll be coming back on that yet again.

I know when we had the call on this I was on the call with Chris...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (unintelligible) and Chris quite rightly playing to the game on that call but it didn't seem to be something that was being focused on and (unintelligible) was going to lead to any satisfaction that.

We don't - I don't think we should just accept that and not do it. We need to follow-up...

Chris Chaplow: Follow it up with an email and have (Xavier) reply to you come back to us in two weeks which is about a week away.

Man: Okay thanks. That's as far as I can go.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. I think we (unintelligible) the IPC. (Unintelligible) a bit farther along (unintelligible) in deciding what to ask for (unintelligible) on improving that we will - again we'll have support for officer travel to ICANN meetings.

I assume also that we will again ask for secretariat support. And I think this is clearly an area where we should be coordinating because we're going to need to push ICANN to get us a better answer on that.

I'm - I think the issue that - one of the issues Marilyn raised about banking or tax solution is a very good one.

And I guess I'd want to know who in your constituency is the person that our treasurer who kind of handles this stuff? It should be Chris okay. Asked Mark Partridge to contact you.

Marilyn Cade: It's the two of us. And we're meeting...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: ...with (Xavier) so if you could just ping Mark and let them know it's an urgent issue for us.

Steve Metalitz: Okay all right.

Chris Chaplow: And on that point Steve for us it's myself and (Alaine), myself and (Alaine).

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: It's sorry it's you and...

Chris Chaplow: (Alaine).

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Okay so that's probably all that I can share at this point. But I did have one question for Chris because I was a little unclear that - I mean there's a fast track. In terms of what the deadline really you said there is a fast track deadline and a some other deadline. What are the...

Caroline Greer: Yes. It's not the data on the sheet that they're sending around...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: I didn't get...

((Crosstalk))

Caroline Greer: ...a later version of just (unintelligible). But the final deadline's 19th of April. And that will find its way to the board vote at the end of June just before the next cycle.

But there's a fast track which if you can get your material together and apply by the 22nd of March it will hit an earlier board meeting and you'll get a reply sooner.

So I would think it's recommendable if we can. But it - what did you say?
Sorry 22nd of March or 19th of April.

Steve Metalitz: And is this for just for these requirements in the constituencies or is this also for comments on the budget general?

Chris Chaplow: This is just constituency requests.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: The budget generally I expect (Xavier) to talk about that. The framework has not - is not happening this year and because of this management system.

And I think coming up or going to get our first opportunity. This is something we want to ask (Xavier) That's just requests.

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Yes I know we have a session on this tomorrow so...

(Christina Rosette): This is (Christina). Can I get in the queue very quickly?

Steve Metalitz: Yes please. Go ahead.

(Christina Rosette): I'm I just wanted to highlight an issue that I think we all need to be cognizant of in connection with our budget requests.

And this overlaps a little bit with budget requests and overlaps a little bit with toolkit.

And this has to do with the, at least the current thoughts on the GNSO review that will happen at the constituency and stakeholder group level. But for our purposes it's much more important at the constituency level.

Rob Hoggarth at the last council meeting distributed this PowerPoint which I guess had also been presented at the session in Toronto that identified the current potential plan which is not yet solidified as I understand it, of how each of the constituencies is going to be reviewed. And it breaks down into I think it's about ten or 15 different areas.

And under each of those there are additional, you know, at least five and as many as ten additional criteria, some of which are amazingly arcane.

But the vast majority of which presuppose that a constituency has existing solid adequate secretarial support, secretariat support.

And the concern that I just wanted to flag with you because (Claudio Diangie) and I had a call with Rob to just follow-up to get more information is that I think we need to be very careful go - about how we put our requests in and how we position ourselves for those reviews.

Because the Catch-22 I'm concerned about is that if we all are scrambling with the current resources that we have such that we get a passing score on the review I'm concerned and Rob thought that it was a valid concern that the outcome might be that the ICANN budget review would be well, they're fine. They don't need any additional secretariat or admin support.

So, you know, there's going to be a very fine line between not doing so much that were deemed not to need it but not doing so little that we fail because the re-amplifications of "failing" are not entirely clear.

So I just wanted to flag that for everyone and just note - let you all know that admin and secretariat support are going to be a pretty high priority for us.

And also it's my understanding that there is going to be a session that will address these issues with Rob. And I don't know if it's today or tomorrow.

But I would certainly encourage you all to take a really close look at that PowerPoint that he will make available because it's got some pretty specific onerous MIB requirements.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. I'm not sure when that comes up in this meeting but...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: No that's toolkit so okay.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: And we might be able to address it in the toolkit. We'll - we met with Rob yesterday. We (unintelligible) an interaction and had Rob come.

He is providing the PowerPoint Steve and we can send around to everyone. I think this is the legitimate issue. I want to raise a related area of concern.

Again I'm not saying all constituencies will share it but there's been a bit of a conversation between myself and (Robin) and (Elaine) at NPOC about the

need for in addition to secretariat services what I would call more of a public policy skilled approach to do the work of the constituencies and the SG.

And again I'm not suggesting everybody may be there but I think we would like to also put into a perfect discussion whether there's also interest in the idea that ICANN should be providing kind of support to the SPs that they provide to the ALAC for instance which has three professional people and administrative support as well.

So, you know, just for a conversation among all of us if we're going to build up these constituencies I think we are going to have to try to support the volunteer work of the officers and the counselors by some additional professional dedicated resources to the these functions.

Steve Metalitz: I guess maybe that turns on where we fit in the DNS sector but I'll stop there.

Tony Holmes: Just a question to Marilyn on that. Do you see that request possibly forming part of the budget input from the constituencies or do you see that as almost another line on the budget which is a submission from the CSG?

Marilyn Cade: I was thinking it was a submission from the CSG Tony. I think getting (Mike Yen) to do more than allocate one person to the - to a CSG to be shared, to a SG to be shared initially would be a big step.

But I, you know, I think we would have to write a job description of what our expectations were and have an equal sharing of time with that person in terms of their function.

But I just think you're going to hear more, we're all going to hear more and more from (Sally), from (Tarik) about all these things that are going on.

And the workload that is coming they way of all of us in order to be effective at ICANN I think is substantially growing.

Steve Metalitz: And on that cheery note we do need to wrap-up here and go to lunch.

I also noticed I mean on the final revised - this is the first time I've seen a firm agenda that had three versions.

And on Version 3 of the firm agenda which is the final one I think there is a slot tomorrow afternoon where it's possible for either the stakeholder group or individual constituencies to meet.

And I don't know if are - have the other constituencies discussed how we want to use that slot, Slot I at 1:30 tomorrow afternoon?

I don't - I'm not suggesting we need to meet further as a CSG. That's one option but I didn't know if others maybe had made plans for that?

Marilyn Cade: Well it's Marilyn. The one thing I think that we might benefit from thinking about is we're going to have a conversation with the board chair...

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: ...and some members of the board.

And Rob sent around a list of the topics that Steve had shared with him. I sent those out to the BC. I can pull them up again.

But among the topics are some of the things that we've been talking about, will of the present structures be - how satisfactory are the present structures? What point do they do they need changed, implementation versus big P policy versus little P policy, you know, internet governance and its implications.

There's a lot of topics there. And we are going to have interaction with the board because we could use part of this time to think about a little bit of preparation for, I'm not saying we all have to be like (unintelligible), the kind of thinking through some of those topics that were thrown out so we take good advantage of the opportunities to meet with the board.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. That is one possible use for part of that time. Let me - I don't know that we have - most people have other thoughts about how we should use that slot.

Maybe we should just all talk about it over our various lunches and try to figure out if we need to reconvene or do we want to do things on a constituency basis for that Slot I.

Because again I think this is kind of a new jigger to this agenda. And that one seems to be open to having meetings with these small conference rooms if we want to do that. So we just need to figure out how best to make use of that time.

Chris Chaplow: Can I just clarify Steve now what is the plan for the IPC and for the BC across the lunch?

Marilyn Cade: We're going to need the BC participants to talk about the upcoming meeting with (Sally) and (David) because they go to (unintelligible) participation and really set a priority.

So I was going to assume we would take our lunches into that small room.

Man: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm open to other ideas but...

Chris Chaplow: That's fine.

Steve Metalitz: The IPC is planning to all gone into this beautiful zeroscape garden out there and enjoy the California - no I - I'm not sure what the IPC is going to do during lunch period. I think we're going to leave it freeform.

Man: Steve if (unintelligible) when we get a chance...

Steve Metalitz: Pardon me?

Man: When we get a chance I'll make an announcement about where folks can go...

Steve Metalitz: Okay I think unless there's any other points...

Man: Well...

Steve Metalitz: I'm sorry John.

Man: (Unintelligible) for the ISPs I think to certainly the early part of lunch (unintelligible) and Rob's guidance where lunch is then we would meet as a constituency in the room designated.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. And we'll take a room too if you've got one but...

Man: Sure I just wanted to alert you we at this point as you all adjourn I'm going to have to ask you to cough up your things and (unintelligible) in the cafe at which time you're welcome gather among the couches or whatever there or use - that room's available to each of the constituencies where you can have a brief meeting or whatever.

The NCUC is going to be in the (reserved) room so please don't go behind the reception area.

The IPC we've got you in the (Baca Peaches) room. And (unintelligible) room. The ISPs are in the (unintelligible) room.

((Crosstalk))

Man: And the BC's in the (Crawford) room.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) on that side of the office (unintelligible) check with us.

We're giving you an hour and a half because that's how much time the IT needs for us to reset this room. So I'd ask you to enjoy the park, or your room or (unintelligible) work or whatever you want (to do).

Tony Holmes did you have a question...?

END