ICANN

Moderator: GLEN DESAINTGERY-GNSO

December 19, 2011

8:00 am CT

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, (Tanya).

So for today's CSG conference call, we've got -- on the 19th of December 2011 -- we have Marilyn Cade, Chris Chaplow, Ron Andruff and J. Scott Evans on the line and we have apologies from Tony Holmes and Jaime Wagner.

I - over to you, (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: And one - with one final addition.

We also have Benedetta Rossi, the secretariat to the BC. And Benny, you will be with us for the call or are you going to be dropping off?

Benedetta Rossi: Is - As you prefer.

I mean I was planning on staying on, but it's up to you.

Marilyn Cade: It would be great if you could stay on so that any - our minutes and the transcript - we could come back to you on, if that's okay with you.

Benedetta Rossi: Of course.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Chris, I'm - just wanted to...

Chris Chaplow: Great.

Marilyn Cade: ...get that out of - verified and then I turn it over to you.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, thank you. Yes.

Just before I mention the agenda or run through that, just to draw everyone's attention to the Wiki page that Benedetta has created for us. And I think there was a link on the email announced in the call of the Wiki page, but if not, Benny could send a - just a link 'round.

And the idea of the Wiki page -- like all the Wiki pages -- is to try and keep the up-to-date information about when our next call is, when the last call was, links to the transcripts and links to any other useful information that this work group is going to need as it moves forward.

So Benny will send another link 'round to that. Take a look at that and if there's any other - any information missing from that, please forward that to Benny if there's documents or pages or anything that we've missed there.

But before I...

Marilyn Cade: Chris, it's Marilyn.

I'd just like to make a quick comment about that, if I might.

Chris Chaplow: Yes. Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Well first of all, I want to commend you and Benny for beating me into submission on the use of (unintelligible) pages, because -- for those of you on the call -- it did take them a while to do that.

But I'm now a big fan. Benny, this is a fantastic - it's got all the information that I need, all the links I need, all the history. And I want to commend you and Chris for doing this because as we go forward, I think this Wiki page is going to be very, very helpful.

And can I - I raise it because I wanted to ask a question. The Wiki page can be accessed by any of our members, is that right?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, that's correct.

Can be read by any of the members...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Chris Chaplow: ...not written by...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Chris Chaplow: ...the members.

(unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Fantastic.

Well, I've gotten over my aversion to Wiki pages as a result of the work you did, Benny.

Chris Chaplow: Great, thank you. Yes. So you said all the information's there, Marilyn. I won't claim all the information -- I'll claim most of the information there.

It's - so like I said, anybody who's got any useful information that, you know, could be in other parts of ICANN or maybe -- I don't know -- a particular GNSO council meeting has some talk about the budgets and the plans and you focus on that, then send the link over that and Benny can add that information and hopefully we can have at our hand all the resources that we need for doing this job.

Okay, I'll move on to the agenda items. Now, the original plan for this call was that - to actually try and decide how we're going to cut up the work for the FY13 budget, so we'll come to that next.

I've took the opportunity to add in the SLAC request templates, because that's something that is new. It's come up in the - in the last couple of weeks. And so I thought we would just have a - have a look at those and see if anybody's got any comments, if anybody's had a chance to look at them deeply.

Marilyn Cade: Do you want to talk about the templates now?

Chris Chaplow: The templates, yes.

And just briefly on the templates. Just - this is anything that anybody wants to throw into it. We had a previous meeting where we shared the document -- the BC support request document -- and that's in our - was in our -- I think -- last meeting.

And the IPC and the IPC - IPC/ISP outlined the sort of things that they would be planning on submitting as part of - as part of their requests. And those are in the transcript.

And then, at that time we thought we would all be submitting documents for -- it's a Word document -- for - I think the deadline was the 7th of December. And then this template has come in and the deadline's the 20th of January.

Now, I don't think this - I'm not going to put it to - put it to the group. I think as three constituencies, we'll probably just complete these documents ourselves and submit them on the C3 and submit three separate documents and there won't be a team document from this group -- that's my understanding.

But we're encouraging each other to share any insights or any information or any problems that we see in the templates with each other so we don't have a problem at the last minute, actually, like we did last time with the templates.

So I'm just kind of ask anybody if they've got anything they want to share with us that they can see on these templates.

Marilyn Cade: I wanted to ask a question if I could from - of J. Scott. And (Steve)'s not on the call yet, is that right?

(Steve): I am on the call.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, good. Thanks.

If I could talk about topics for the - we had written a proposal and we modified the amount to include outreach and participation support conducted by the constituencies to include - we modified the amount to include travel for officers -- the ability for a constituency to do publications or events -- blah, blah, blah.

Since we submitted that -- and I haven't had a chance to talk to the - the next call for Chris and I is a call with the officers of the ex-COM of the BC. I've been approached by some governments about the idea of doing a event similar to the event that we organized in Brussels -- the reception with the GAC, the board -- and I'm going to propose to the BC - we're going to propose a separate funding amount for a business summit.

We haven't talked about that at all. I have no - I haven't had a chance to talk to any of my officers, but it looks like the high-level event for governments is going to be in Prague. And that would be a opportunity for these three constituencies to have a significant social event and substantive interaction with the governments.

So I just wanted to mention it, because I'm going to write up a separate proposal for that that is separate from the $25,000 dollar amount. I think we'll stick with $25,000. We may increase it, but it's along the lines of previous discussions about support to each of the constituencies.

The Business summit would be a separate item and a separate amount of funding, but it wouldn't be asking ICANN to fund the full amount. It would be a collaborative funding so that we don't lose control of it -- or in the lines of having ICANN's help to provide the venue and some limited coordination with the sponsorship of the event coming from business so that we continue to own the - we own the message and the interaction.

But I wanted to mention it at this time, since it did come up in a recent meeting I was at with governments.

Chris Chaplow: (unintelligible).

(Steve): So Marilyn, this is (Steve).

You're going to be circulating something on that -- a proposal? Or...

Marilyn Cade: I am. I am.

I - yes I will, (Steve). And there's no urgency on it, but I just - given the interest of the governments that I encountered, remembering - they really liked the Brussels event that the BC organized and thought it was very beneficial.

And I think if the - we're going to have a bunch of senior government officials in Prague, we would want to own a reception with them -- not going through someone else, but having a business event with senior - we with the GAC and then we invite the board and the senior staff as guest, as we did in Brussels.

And I'll circulate something on that. Working right now on trying to find a couple of associations -- one from WITSA, one from ICC -- who would help us do the logistics.

Chris Chaplow: Good thinking, Marilyn.

I noticed in the instructions that (Javier) sent us we will in one template form for each individual new resource, so we've - it's not twenty - lots of different things into one - into the one template -- so it creates a new template.

So if you're going to draft something, I suppose the best way forward is to actually try and go straight into the template and try and fit it into there. Does that - is that all right with you?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

I don't want to divert us from the original proposal. I think it's really important to understand whether we're all going to be supporting the $25,000 per-constituency initiative or something like that.

The feedback we got from (Flavia) was he would prefer to have some consistency from the constituencies. Sorry. And I haven't gotten any feedback from the registries or registrars.

I did circulate our original proposal, but I haven't gotten any feedback. I can follow up with them, but I guess the important thing is to understand whether these three constituencies to advance a similar amount of request funding.

(Steve): This is (Steve).

We're still drafting our request. I think it's going to be for more than $25,000, but it's also going to cover topics other than outreach. So it may well be consistent with what you're suggesting.

I'm a little puzzled, though, by the idea that the registry constituency would get any money for outreach. Why does the registry constituency need to do any outreach?

Marilyn Cade: You know, (Steve), I, you know, you had a chance to look at the outreach proposal that the council, you know, that - the BC opposed the proposal put forward by the council, but that proposal included the idea that ICANN would fund outreach to generate registries and registrars.

(Steve): Right.

Marilyn Cade: We were - we opposed that and suggested - that was the (Olga) thing -- the (Olga) initiative.

(Steve): Right.

Marilyn Cade: But that initiative included significant focus on recruitment of registries and registrars.

We, you know, within the BC leadership and members, we had some cautions about it. Each of the constituencies had representatives on that group who didn't recognize the implications -- I guess I could say that -- and - or who personally might have supported it.

So that idea of funding for registries and registrars is embedded in that outreach initiative.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott.

That's absolutely insane. I mean, they need to be getting the registrars that they have in place aligned with meeting their contractual obligations, rather than going out and recruiting naïve companies to take part as a registrar when they don't have the wherewithal to run a business.

I mean, it just makes...

Marilyn Cade: J. Scott, I...

J. Scott Evans: ...it absolutely makes no sense.

Marilyn Cade: I couldn't agree with you more, but the - that initiative -- and it's on pause right now -- the BC put forward a - I'm almost thinking I should pause this recording.

The BC leadership raised a significant concern about this that isn't necessarily shared by all members of the council. But (Olga) and working group were interested in using the ICANN resources to generate new registrars and registries in developing countries.

And (unintelligible) to be said about the fact that we missed...

Benedetta Rossi: (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: ...(unintelligible) broadly we, the ISP's, the IPC, the BC.

The ISP's may have a different attitude about this particular issue, but I think the BC and the ISP's - the IPC would have similar concerns and think that first of all, you get the guys that you're accrediting in line and make sure they're competent before you start recruiting a bunch of people who don't - you don't have the mechanism to train them and you don't have the mechanism to hold them accountable.

Leaving that comment to another time because of the purpose of this call, I think the BC shares a general concern that outreach and participation needs to be about generating informed and responsible participation in ICANN.

J. Scott Evans: I agree.

Marilyn Cade: And so if we can advance how we use ICANN resources to help us bring in responsible participants from developing countries from our communities, we're going to strengthen ICANN.

Right now, I don't see that happening. I see the outreach and communication focused on civil society and government participants. I don't see it helping us bring in participants from developing countries from our communities who would be responsible players.

And I - that's what I'd like us to try to (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Well Marilyn, is that because this effort has been spearheaded by someone whose focus is exactly that rather than where it needs to be?

Marilyn Cade: You know, it's - I think it's two things.

I think it's that, J. Scott, but I think it's also somewhat a bit of ignorance in the - and innocence. When I suggested that the executive director of the ICT society in Nigeria should be approved in the fellowship program, the answer I got - he's - was, "He's business. That's not our responsibility."

That guy is one of the most accountable responsible voices I have heard. And yet we don't have the mechanism to bring him to ICANN, which is why the BC is thinking about our own fellowship program.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, I think that's a smart idea.

Maybe - (Steve), is that something we want to think about? It's a - maybe joining...

(Steve): Well, we've talked about it.

Yes, as more officers...

J. Scott Evans: ...joining forces and giving scholarships to people.

(Steve): (unintelligible) some of our money to bring regional people to regional meetings, you know, to meetings happening in their region.

Marilyn Cade: And the second thing I'd like us to do informally is Ben, find a way to get those guys keeping in touch with each other after they come to the meeting.

If we bring...

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely.

Marilyn Cade: If we bring three people per region each, you know, it's pretty phenomenal if we could just do - I'm not even looking for 20 people per meeting -- I'm looking for three to five per meeting...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Marilyn Cade: ...and then find a way to keep in touch.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Well, I think that that would take - Marilyn, maybe at the CSG level we need to have a recruitment coordinator that would then be responsible for making sure that they'd in fact (unintelligible) the list, add people that have come to these meetings to the list, maybe have quarterly if not monthly calls -- so they do an update.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

So you know, J. Scott, the BC will be leveraging participation in ICANN and in the IGF and - in that region. But I think if we could just park the idea that we want to have financial resources that are driven by the constituency...

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: ...for participation in ICANN...

J. Scott Evans: And that just - driven by doesn't mean that we're not held accountable and we don't have to be transparent.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

And so what we proposed, by the way, was that our participants would come to the orientation session of the fellowship program, but we owned them for two full days.

So they would be ours on Tuesday and ours for, you know, certain workshops and events that we're engaging in. And then we would own the follow up responsibility with them.

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely.

Marilyn Cade: And I think, you know, it's going to take funding.

I mean, if you - if we expect people to come to this meeting, we may have been low-balling the amount of financial cost that we were proposing.

J. Scott Evans: I'm...

Marilyn Cade: But if you were to bring - I mean - and maybe that’s the thing we really -- (Steve), you and J. Scott -- we really need to focus on is we want an (AGUP) fellowship program if we - you give us three people per meeting and that funding is X amount, our proposal is we will identify those people, we'll coach them and mentor them and they will be, you know, they'll be a part - they'll be agent to the fellowship program so they get to go to the orientation, blah, blah, blah.

But we own them. We own selecting them. And then we've got to figure out, can we actually find nine people per year or do we need to say five to seven per year?

J. Scott Evans: Well, all I can say is that I think that would a little bit more effective than the - what they're doing now because they're trying to willy nilly.

They've tried to put me as a mentor with someone who's - (unintelligible) they have some sort of IP interest, but it's been very hit and miss -- someone from the Middle East.

Marilyn Cade: Our...

J. Scott Evans: And I think we would do a much...

Marilyn Cade: Our...

J. Scott Evans: ...better job.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Our experience with - they did that with us as well. And our experience is they give us development people who think that our job is to fund investment. But (Xavier) and - I think we're - I think we're at the opportune moment.

What is our pilot program that we want to use in this phase? So we're not - and what is the right number? Is it two per meeting, which would be six people per year that we own and mentor?

And maybe we start with that number so we're not, you know, we're not being overwhelming here?

J. Scott Evans: Yes, I think two sounds like a fairly decent number.

I would - I wouldn't want to go more than three, because I think two sounds more...

Marilyn Cade: I think...

J. Scott Cade: ...you know, in a pilot program.

(unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: A pilot - a pilot CSG program allocated across the constituencies, (Steve) and Chris.

So we say, you know, we on them for - we take responsibility for Tuesday and certain other follow up and mentoring. They get full funding to participate in the fellowship program and we evaluate it at the end of the year.

That's not the only thing the BC wants to do, but that would be a big (unintelligible). If we had six people per year that actually joined our communities -- and particularly from developing countries -- and they stayed involved after year one, it's a place to start.

Chris Chaplow: Yes. That's right, Marilyn.

It's the - stays involved is the - is the key, isn't it. That - the objective.

Marilyn Cade: What we would probably do is use our WITSA - the WITSA association - we would probably use our WITSA members, because they're already involved and they have association leadership in a number of the developing countries.

So we would probably focus on WITSA. It'd be the quickest way for us to hold people accountable and get them involved but give them a network of support afterward.

Let me move to Chris. I - I'm - I (unintelligible) want to raise one other point.

Chris Chaplow: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: I don't think that is the only thing we would need to have funding for.

If we - that's - I think that's separate from - we want support for materials development and outreach events that are, you know, for instance, we want to try to do aggressive participation and recruitment and membership development.

And so I think our request is going to include some focus on financial support for that.

Man: Well, what was that again Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Outreach and participation. That’s more general.

Man: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Maybe officer travel which is a problem right now for us. We don’t have any officer travel funding. We’ll - that’s not (right truly). We’ve had some - one trip per year with our limit but if we could include officer travel it would be very helpful for us to ensure we can have all of our officers at all the meetings.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, I think Marilyn and I think the decision point comes with we actually try and complete the templates and we have to make decisions on what we put together globally and what we actually break down into individual requests knowing that the smaller you break it down of course it’s easier for them to strike different ones out.

So I suppose the deadline for these is the 20th of January so I suppose the sooner that we can get some draft templates completed and that we can share them with the - with each other that will take - I figure that would be so much the better, you know, because we’ve got strategic alignment with a strategic plan, what are the demographics, what are the deliverables.

The metrics under the second page actually asking us to break the cost down into the different quarters next year in terms of job support, language support, technology support and so on.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Chaplow: Chris, (that I guess) would be January 12th.

Marilyn Cade: Chris, I sent two emails as you know to (Rob) asking why does this include a request for language support since the tool kit should support language support? Do we - I think we also need a call between (Javier), (Rob) and us after we have our draft to figure out, you know, the tool kit’s supposed to be absorbing a lot of cost. And...

Chris Chaplow: Yes, I think that’s just (by countries) section so if we had something that clearly had no language support then that section will be left blank. I think it was - it’s simply that. It’s difficult for us to fill in. Maybe that’s sort of official use only.

And they would be filling - the staff will be filling that in because we can’t estimate cost in some of those areas. But I’m just drawing attention at this moment to some of the hurdles that are ahead of us, nothing insurmountable I’m sure.

But they are there so, yes, it might not be a bad idea to think of having a call with (Rob) and perhaps (Harry) as well and, you know, around the 10th of January or around that time.

Marilyn Cade: I’d love to do it before that Chris, because I’m going to be in Geneva for - but I’d like to do it in early as January as we can because if they don’t agree with us or think that things are being addressed otherwise, that’ll - you know, we need some...

Chris Chaplow: Yes okay. We’ll let (Benny) have your Geneva dates and (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Yes, my Geneva dates, I leave on the 9th and I’m in Geneva from the 11th through the 13th or actually 15th. I will but if we could propose to (Javier) now and (Rob), if others agree, we have a draft. We want to walk through it so they tell us early. One of the things I haven’t been happy about is how we keep getting blindsided.

Chris Chaplow: Yes. Chris here. In our original and (fun) layout we were going to have a meeting with (Javier) after the submission but I think it does make sense for us to do one before and with (Rob) as well.

Marilyn Cade: And the other reason I’d like to do this is because of that outreach issue with the council.

Chris Chaplow: Right. So we’ll look - try and have a call. (Benny) can do a doodle poll and - to sit - to try and find it - at time but we’re looking at week ending the 8th of January, at some date during that week, the first week in January.

Marilyn Cade: And we would all have draft templates your proposing we would share with each other so is that okay with everyone that we share the - our templates with each other?

(Steve): Yes, this is (Steve). I think that’s okay and we could - I think we would have it by the end of the week of the 8th but I’m not sure - sometime that we we’ll have a draft.

Marilyn Cade: Well, can you guys tell us other categories that you plan to include beyond what we’ve talked about? If - do you know now about what other categories you might include?

(Steve): We’ve talked about a number of things including (funding) for an intercessional meeting of our constituency, officer travel, as you already mentioned, secretariat services and then these outreach issues including what you talked about but also possibly, you know, some other means of doing outreach in the - outside of the - especially outside of North America and Europe. So...

Marilyn Cade: Right so...

(Steve): But those are the (ideas) that are on the table but I’m not sure we can credibly ask for all these things so we need to set some priorities and we haven’t done that yet.

Marilyn Cade: So if we were to, (Steve), and (Jake Scott), you know, (Christine knows) about my idea about a special meeting in Prague because that came up while I was in the Philippians. It came up because I’ve had conversation with a number of governments, (Heather) included about the idea of a high level meeting of the governments in Prague and whether we would repeat our special event which was that reception we did.

(Steve): We would look at that but that wouldn’t - certainly wouldn’t go on the template because that would occur before the start of the new fiscal year.

Marilyn Cade: Right, right, right but I just want to mention it as a - we are - I am - Chris is going to hear this for the first time. I am proposing a business summit sand that sounds like similar to your idea of an intercessional meeting.

(Steve): No - well, I don’t know. We’re talking about something not in connection with an ICANN meeting.

Marilyn Cade: No, well that’s what I’m talking about as well. And I’m - and not to influence anything that you guys suggest but I’m - we’re going to be proposing a couple of events that allow us to do significant outreach and parallel with that would be a business constituency meeting.

So I don’t think we need to align ourselves or duplicate what we’re each proposing. I’m just mentioning it as something that is consistent that would go forward in our proposals because I’m particularly interested in the idea that the ALAC gets a summit every year or two.

And I decided that the business constituency needed a summit as well. It might even be that we would decide to meet in the same space but that’s very premature.

But right now, the only point is I’m going to be proposing a business - I’m probably going to call it a summit just because it - a business high level event or something like that just because that would help us draw attendance from a number of companies.

We can come back and talk about how we work together on anything that makes sense. The only thing that we’re going to do right now is ask for ICANN funding to support it.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, thanks Marilyn. But as (Steve) points out this is FY’13, this process. We just start on the 1st of July. So we’re going to have a call with (Rob) and (Javier) we hope somewhere close to the 6th of January and the more each of us have been able to do with those templates, the more meaningful that call will be because we’ll have hit the issues and the problems and we can ask them for guidance on specific details.

And it’ll force us all to think on how we cut up the requests into individual templates sheets. Okay, if there’s nothing more on that subject, I’ll propose to move on to the other agenda items. Anybody want to come in with anything more on the request?

Okay, moving on to the other subject which is the general planning on how we divide up our work for the FY’13 budget. We’re assuming that the budget sections and categories will look more like the same as previous additions.

So I was just - well, I can ask the question first, has anybody got any suggestions on how we - the best way of breaking this work down? Let me chip in by noting that the present operating plan was divided into - and the expenses were divided into 15 functional views - new GTLDs, IDNs, (Ion), the security stability compliance call meeting and so on, right down to 15 operational reviews.

So there’re 15 there. Then we’ve got the projects where it was also at the end of the 15. We mentioned the different projects. So those all seemed like natural areas for us to investigate. Obviously we can’t be digging deep in all those areas and - but maybe if I circulate a list of those areas and people volunteer, if that’s an area they feel that they’ve got some expertise in and then (they meant) to volunteer for leading some work there and getting themselves up so they...

Man: Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible). I would suggest you circulate that (list) and then we prioritize things that we believe are important to the (CFG) and then on that smaller list, we ask for volunteers.

Chris Chaplow: Okay.

Man: Like if someone happens to have a particular interest in something that’s a majority (that seems like) is pertinent to the CSG, that’s not really time well spent.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, sounds a good approach. So if I make a list of all the areas that I can see using the existing plan as the guideline and using the existing project names that have been mentioned, you know, the ones that we don’t know very much about in details, that’s on the spending side.

Now on the income side, well the income section, investment in capital which certainly isn’t one that I know - don’t know very much about but I’m sure somebody else will and so add that to the list as well.

So I’ll probably end up with a list of about 30 items and (put out) a doodle pole perhaps on that where we take all - we try and assess priorities there and then the ones that come to the top of that list we’ll then try and divvy up between us. Does that sound like a reasonable approach?

Steve Metallitz: Yes, this is Steve Metallitz. I think that makes sense and we should be aiming at, you know, five or six of the top priority items. And let - I don’t know how valid your assumption is that the budget will be organized the same way this time as it was last time.

But I don’t really know what, you know, what to expect so it’s probably, you know, useful to be prepared as (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: (Steve), it’s Marilyn. You know, Chris, (Javier) is - got to remember this call is being transcribed - (Javier) is committed and interested to interacting with us so could we take advantage of that and - interact with him in a - be in an open and, you know, sort of saying start with maybe more then one exchange of views with (Javier) as we progress and Chris could ask him if he’s open to that?

Chris Chaplow: Could you just elaborate a little bit Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Well I’m just thinking that, you know, we’re going to work - we’re going to spend a lot of resources of our own and (Javier)’s new and he’s indicated he met with the rest - as the CSG he’s indicated that he’s interested in working with us proactively so why don’t we take advantage of that and see if we could have a couple of dialogue calls with him, not only our submission but consider whether we should have a couple of other dialogues with him. We have to be far enough along in our submission to have valid questions. But we (unintelligible) build that into the timeline.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, I think in principle the, you know, any dialogue that we can have with (Javier) the better. We can ask him what the progress is on the document whether it is going to be the same, are there any more areas anymore of these subjects that we’ve missed that he is expecting will be an area of the plan and so on. Yes.

Marilyn Cade: And maybe, (Steve), if you and (Jay Scott) agree, we could propose an interaction just during the CSG in Costa Rica.

Steve Metallitz: Well, I can’t remember the timeline when the comments are supposed to be due on the budget framework. I guess it’s after Costa Rica, right?

Chris Chaplow: Yes I think so. I think so.

Marilyn Cade: Chris, could you just check on that and if it makes sense, then we would know we need to build that into the CSG interaction?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, that’s a new heading...

Steve Metallitz: I don’t it - that - what I’m suggesting is that that’s two months after the budget framework comes out. I wonder whether it would make sense to try to schedule a call with him earlier then that.

Marilyn Cade: Oh good. Yes, right. Okay.

Steve Metallitz: So before some things get more set in stone. I don’t want to hear, “Oh, it’s too late to fix that,” so.

Marilyn Cade: Oh yes, yes. We’re - I think we’re totally together with you.

Steve Metallitz: So maybe to try to talk with him in, you know, early February or something after we’ve had a chance to look at and chew over the framework a little bit but have some questions, early mid February.

Chris Chaplow: That sounds very sensible, yes.

Marilyn Cade: (Benny), if you would support Chris on that on checking those details that will be great.

(Benny): Sure.

Chris Chaplow: In fact, it’s a section we should have on the Wiki. Well, according to the presentation, what was it now, that was shown to us in (Deca), the budget framework posting will be the 17th of January, the continued consultation. Let’s see. I haven’t gotten a deadline for the publication. Yes, I haven’t got a deadline for the framework comment returns.

But the posting was the 17th of Jan and San Jose is obviously - it’s the 11th to the 16th of March so they - it’s about the same time, isn’t it? They - if the budget framework is going to be 45 days. In fact, that would be before San Jose.

And the actual draft (ops) planned on posting is the 1st of May. So a sensible time would be after the 17th of Jan wouldn’t it? It would be - yes, that would be (submitted) early February.

Marilyn Cade: So Chris, (Benny) could go to (Janice) and work out the timeline and document that and come back to you and then you - and you could post it on the Wiki?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, we could have a no- we could have a timeline on the Wiki, I think so. So we can quickly refer to these dates.

Marilyn Cade: Would that work for - Steve, that way (Benny) could go to (Janice) who’s - and work with Chris, report to Chris and then we get it posted.

(Steve): Yes, that makes sense.

Marilyn Cade: And (Benny), you’re going to - besides posting on the Wiki, if you don’t mind, post it to this list as well so, you know, we don’t miss it because sometimes we just don’t go check the Wiki. Is that all right?

(Benny): Yes, it’s fine. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Chris and I are going to have to go in a couple of minutes. Chris, if you want to finish this up, whatever works here, then I can go start our call.

Chris Chaplow: Right. Good. Okay so that’s...

Woman: (Ours is) starting in 40 minutes.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, we have plenty of time. Never mind. I was...

Chris Chaplow: (We do have time). Yes. Well, that’s - we’re heading up towards the top of the hour anyway. So that’s what we’ll do for that and we’ll get that timeline posted and the cause in all of this sorted out and get it posted up on the Wiki. And any other business?

Marilyn Cade: I - yes, Chris, I have one and I’m sorry to spring it as a surprise on everyone but I was thinking that besides our constituency summits that perhaps we really ought to be thinking about having a CSG summit funded by ICANN around, you know, I don’t know if it’s a summit or it’s three meetings or it’s whatever, but the ALAC is getting a huge amount of funding, over $500,000.

I support their having that funding. I really do. But I’d like to support the idea that the CSG has a similar gathering once a year to help us develop our strategy and our involvement in ICANN or our involvement in I don’t know the right amount of participants. I don’t know the right amount of money but I am thinking we should make it an annual event or an every two year event.

And put that funding forward to provide travel funding, ICANN staff participation and support. We want to convince business that they need to work inside ICANN help us and I’m just going to use this as an example. We’re struggling right now in the - we still need improvements in the new GTLD program and (maybe) businesses who weren’t actively engaged in ICANN are now coming forward and they wish they were.

We need to bring them into the fold. And how are they going to do that? What are we going to do that makes it worth their while to participate on an annual basis? I’m not suggesting they’re going to spend their time at three meetings.

But I kind of think we need to come up as the CSG with a - on an annual basis, come to at least one meeting.

(Ron): Marilyn, this is (Ron).

Marilyn Cade: Thank you (Ron).

(Ron): I think the idea of a CSG summit is probably a pretty good one because it seems to me that when we have our little cross constituency hour or two at the various meetings we cover a lot of ground but I think there could be a tremendous amount of cross pollination happening where we could really all benefit, each one of our constituency groups, from the thinking of others in terms of the various things that we might be chewing on in our own constituency.

The question comes to mind for me in terms of what - when that would happen and I would think that the ideal thing would be to select something, a meeting that is a couple of meetings out so people can plan and make plans accordingly but we should probably do it at an ICANN meeting where everyone is physically already there rather then having get on a plane and try to gather in one particular city or another at an odd time.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: So (Ron), what if we didn’t even fly - when the governments have announced high level participation. What if we did it - I’m - that’s - (a meeting two out). It’s in Europe which is (travelable) - is that a word - a word. It’s not - you know, I went to the Philippians 27 hours in flight.

I don’t think I could propose you guys join me there. But can (Steve), (Jake), (Scott), would you be interested about working on a CSG summit together?

(Steve) Yes, it’s certainly true - I would agree with - this is (Steve) - I would agree with (Ron) that the hour we - or two we have at the meetings and the catch as catch can other things that we do are not really sufficient. And so maybe the way to do it - I don’t know whether it’s for Prague or for Toronto, (if there’s a) planning...

Marilyn Cade: Yes, yes.

(Steve): Is - just, you know, have a day that - maybe the day prior to the meeting.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

(Steve): One day. I don’t think it - definitely - I definitely don’t think it should be more then one day.

Marilyn Cade: All right, so let’s say it’s one day and it’s - and we look at Prague and Toronto both as options. (Jake), thought - does it sound like the kind of thing that you would find - you’d be willing to say let’s explore?

((Crosstalk))

Man: I think (Jay Scott) had to drop off the call.

Marilyn Cade: Well then I’m going to say you speak for the ITC and we will come back to you. I think we would be - so I’m going to - (Benny), can you stop the recording?

END