NCPH Intersessional meeting, January 30th 2013
Lunch with CEO & Community Needs discussion 12:00 Local time

(David): Thank you. We are ready to reconvene and people online and participating remotely, I just wanted to let you know we are now back in session. We thank you for your patience. We should acknowledge and praise those participants on remote participation. Thank you for that time and attention to your sessions here today.

Briefly I wanted just recap some of our activities for Fadi allowing others then to comment on the issues or topics they would like to raise in discussion and then we'll of course hear from the CEO again.

With 43 participants from 22 countries and others online, we thank you for the sessions. We started out of course with a roundtable with the CEO, first with the Commercial Stakeholder Group and then the non-Commercial Stakeholder Group allowing the CEO to present updates and to hear their views.

We then of course had to negate - a discussion with Sally Costerton and myself on the stakeholder engagements and your views on that. The day one we had further discussions on the new gTLD program, the RAA negotiations and the Whois initiatives followed by a larger reception to engage some of the other guests of our stakeholder and efficiency groups who joined us last night. I was very brief in my remarks. And the reception went on late and that was good to see the interaction and the dialog.

Today of course we had started our discussion of what community needs might be required going forward. We talked about the GNSO toolkit Phase 2 and some other elements of that. We will continue that discussion afterwards and allowing also preparation for a discussion with the CFO and his budget team on the FY14 budget and SO/AC budget presentations.

And we end the day luckily with members of the Board who are here to interact with us, the Chairman of the Board and some members of the Board of Directors will be here in dialog with some of the topics you had suggested. And that will then complete a full day's schedule for today and a rather busy workgroup of two days here in Los Angeles.

So with that, I would just like to again thank you for the efforts. Our CEO is here. Maybe others would like to start out with some attempts since we are now here together with the CEO to raise any other comments or questions that you'd like to have. Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Tell you, I lose my voice for one day and I make up for it the next day. Fadi, one of the themes that I've been sounding all day today and silently I was emoting yesterday but couldn't. When you think about the strategic initiatives that you're working on, all the outreach, all those and, you know, this has been an amazing time to listen to all that's going on. It's wonderful.

The theme that I would sound is don't forget about the working group layer. Don't forget about the bottom. Because there is where the opportunity lies. It's, you know, as we had conversations about the opportunity to expand into third world markets, in a way the working groups is a similar sort of opportunity. It's a very undeveloped part of ICANN.

At the same time to use your analogy, there are some pinholes. And because the bottom of the bottom up layer is where the at least first and usually final draft of the actual GNSO policy is written, those pinholes can be very important.

And you've seen some of the impacts of that in some of the more unfortunate conversations around trying to fix those problems further up the chain. So my theme is the opportunities of the working group layer. And you don't have to respond now. I'm assuming you're going to have lunch and hear from all of us but that would be mine.

Man: Hello Fadi. (Unintelligible) speaking. I just wanted to say regarding ICANN meetings especially since there's going to be a session just to discuss on the updates of the last IGF and a lot of discussions have gone on about IGF. I feel since the MAG is going to come before the Beijing meeting it will be good. I don't know what (that) to be a possibility this suggestion.

If ICANN can have a particular session where we stakeholders and the communities can just discuss what we would like to see happen in Bali, Indonesia in November. So we'll use that just for (unintelligible) just to talk of what happened in (Bacu) but. And the next process I had so the various communities are prepared and what staff and communities are on the same page on how they want to view things for (Bacu). Thank you.

Fadi Chehade: This is an excellent suggestion. Actually I don't know if it's already on the calendar for Beijing. But if it isn't I'm now inclined to put it. Thank you for that. That's a good point.

I also want to let you know that both the (unintelligible) multi stakeholder Internet governance works events that we're doing in Dubai and in Addis Ababa in March are under the auspices of the regional IGS.

Having said that, I am a great believer that the IGF is an underutilized vehicle for promoting multi stakeholder Internet governance and that we ICANN being the fulcrum and the heart of that we should take a more proactive look at how we can make Bali a great success for our cause for what we believe

in. So thank you for that. And I will convey that to Sally who's finishing the agenda of Beijing actually as we speak.

(David):   Okay. I'll take the list here, excuse me. Steve DelBianco, Steve Metalitz, Brian, sorry yes, Brian Winterfeldt; Lisa, yes, thank you. Steve DelBianco.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Fadi. It was clear yesterday during the remarks that your mind is focused on Dubai and (Davos) in an appropriate. That's a CEO's job to really look ahead to the next battles we have. And you explained a perception that we all share of external threat, ITU.

You talked about concern over the relative obscurity of ICANN as an entity in our industry because our industry isn't really defined as an industry. And then bemoaned the reputational deficit we have with respect to other in the IT industry.

So all well and good that those are on your mind. And your plans to remedy that it will take a long time, as you know, trying to get analysts to pay attention to a sector that doesn't have publicly traded securities or a sector that their clients aren't interested in buying research on is a big stretch.

But we're sympathetic with that. And yet the last two days, I mean after we talked with you, we've been focused on so many other execution elements. And most have to do with the new gTLDs.

Man: Yeah.

Steve DelBianco: Even things that aren't to do with new gTLDs like Whois and RAA, they end up circling the orbit of how they'll be implemented in the new gTLDs. And I just had meetings with the legal department to understand that there's genuine questions about some of the closed TLDs and the policies that will be there.

So we will have a lot of heavy lifting in the months ahead but it'll make it really difficult to advance the initiatives you described to increase our reputation and awareness. And so applaud the idea of pursuing it but let's be realistic and focus hard.

I have a feeling those CEO roundtables that you're going to have that you'll want them to focus on the awareness and reputation but then they have other things on their mind as we may as well.

Man: (No question).

Fadi Chehade: Steve is right. I mean we have what I shared with you as he correctly said things that are on my mind at what I would call the kind of the purpose - the core purpose level and how it's being handled and the longer-term view.

Man: Right, right.

Fadi Chehade: And the brand management of our sector. Well said. We have some almost existential issues today that could actually clobber any long-term planning if we don't pay attention to them in the delivery of some immediate things that have huge impact on many of the people in this room as well as the market in general - as the user base in general.

We are very, very much focused on these things as well. I want you to know that there is no loss of focus on these things. After all frankly, that's where my heart is. I'm the CEO and I know how to execute. It's easier for me actually to live in that world than to live in the broader world.

And we we're - we have a team of people who are very focused now to get this program straight. But you may have overhead me and I got the call from (Vint) this morning because he was worried or you may have overheard me say in Amsterdam if it were up to me I'd delay this program by a year. Of

course now there have been articles written about this. There have been articles now written about the articles written about this.

And so in France in Boy Scouts we used to call this telephone (casse), which is, you know, just as people pass it one to the other. So let me just get back to the source here.

Of course, yes, if I could relieve the massive pressure on us, I'd like to take my time to do this in a different way as I shared with some of you yesterday. I do not intend to delay this program. But as Steve correctly said yesterday, it doesn't mean we do, you know, we cut unnecessary corners so we do things that end up causing us more hurt than good. At the end of the day the outcome has to be good.

There is an enormous amount of things that need to be done and I think our team is starting to get hold of them. Just starting. It's I'm having some of the first meetings internally where people are not under water. They're starting to say okay. No, I got hold of that process.

You may have met during these two days new people like Chris Gift. I don't know if you met Chris Gift. Chris is the new Vice President who just got on board, an extremely capable fellow. I hired him in one of my companies many moons ago and he helped me build great, great solutions.

But he's going to own our online presence and how do we really - when I promise some of the new gTLDs for example, the IP lawyers were telling me you're going to get all these new gTLDs out and we have no mechanism to figure out what's coming out and when and therefore we have no time to strategize what to do with these things. An issue for us and we just, you know, we can't catch up nor do we have visibility.

So one of Chris' main projects is Chris, I want to give everyone clear visibility as to what new gTLD is coming when, where is it in the process so that

people can have a chance. As (Fab) said when I spoke to him, (Fabricio), he said, "So now I have the chance to step back and look at the whole picture and make good decisions." So we're not making massive defensive registrations. We're actually thinking through this stuff.

So we're bringing teams of people that have built systems before and that have built processes before. But we are catching up. We are definitely catching up.

Steve DelBianco: And your analogy of the pinhole leak in the pipe, did you share that with the non-commercial group as well?

Fadi Chehade: Well, I think I did.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah.

Fadi Chehade: I've had...

Steve DelBianco: Because I was in pain as Fadi went through that. I had a house where we developed pinhole leaks in our copper pipes due to a (tannin) content in the well water. And, you know, I wish it had only been one pinhole Fadi. The entire house developed leaks over time. And after patching the walls, I eventually paid plumber to pull all the pipes out and replace them with plastic pipes.

And, you know, $15,000 later was hopefully tried to sell the house. But the point is things don't necessarily happen just one leak at a time especially if the (tannin) running through our pipes is the new gTLD program trying to run through our pipes here. We may have a lot of leaks, not just one that's hard to discover.

Fadi Chehade: We do have a lot of pinholes. They're not one. And that's why I'm hiring able hands - more able hands that come and help me fill these holes. But I think

the point is well taken. Let's not just focus on the big picture. Let's realize that we have an executional set of issues that need to be paid attention to.

And again, that's where I'm comfortable, that's where (Akim)'s comfortable. That's why I took away some of (Akim)'s responsibilities recently and I gave him more staff because that's what we did. I mean (Akim) ran a million dollar business and he's run operations and execution but he's been like many of us at ICANN just overwhelmed with the amount of responsibility. So I'm trying to focus the able hands on getting the execution now. Thank you Steve.

(David):   Steve Metalitz and Brian is next. Steve please.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you. Fadi, I just want to mention one execution issue. And I know you've been meeting with a lot of the CEOs of the contracted parties and so forth. And I would like you thoughts about how you've been discussing with them the revision of the registrar accreditation agreement, which I understand that there's negotiations ongoing and there's technical issues.

But it seems to me there are a couple of high level points that it would be important to get buy in from the registrars and in effect the registries too. One being that ICANN and community expects that in the registrars agreements with registrants - right now the accreditation agreement says you have to have these points in your agreements with the registrants. The registrar has to have these points.

But it doesn't say that you have to enforce that agreement. And that is extremely important and I think it fits into your registrant's bill of rights. It's also a question of responsibilities. What do people expect on both sides of that relationship.

So I hope that they - you can get buy in from them and have reflected in the policy that registrars are obligated to enforce their agreements with registrants.

And the second high level point is that because we want to have a better registrar accreditation agreement, that should be - signing up to that agreement should definitely be the gateway to being able to sponsor registrations in the new gTLDs. Registrars should not expect to be able to (remand) to the old agreement and participate in this important new market.

So I wanted to get your reaction to those. It seems as though those might be two critical points that if we can get - if there is buy in from the contracted parties, that will help to ensure that we're actually having a quality agreement that we can use for the future.

Fadi Chehade: Steve, you are far more experienced than me at this. So you know that I can't discuss what we're telling them. But to put you at - in a comfort zone, these two points at in my view.

(David): Brian and then (Elisa). Brian.

Brian Winterfeldt: Bran Winterfeldt, IPC. Thank you again Fadi for meeting with us today. We really appreciate all your time that you're spending with us over yesterday and today. We met yesterday with...

Fadi Chehade: At least I get lunch. I don't - (so leave me here to my talent). Thank you.

Brian Winterfeldt: The least we could do is feed you. So we met yesterday with Christine Willett and she gave us a new gTLD program update. We were hoping for a little more information from you about next steps with implementation with regard to the potential improvement to the Trademark Clearinghouse, to the strawman proposal and LPR and where that stands as well as sort of next steps with URS and if there's going to be an opportunity for the BC, IPC suggestions around that to be heard and considered for implementation purposes for the URS.

Fadi Chehade: So both of these items you bring up are kind of still in an open comment period. So I typically try to stay quiet during that period just to allow people to express themselves. I don't want to influence what people think. But I said this yesterday and frankly I've had so many meetings I can't recall who I said it to but I'll say it again.

Some of the things that came out in the strawman proposal as a result of our discussions makes sense in their implementation decisions. And I believe unless the community vehemently disagrees with us I want to do what makes sense. I want to do what feels right for the industry, for the community.

And we spent however imperfectly - as I agreed with several of you and (Maria) yesterday; however imperfectly we spent a number of days working extremely hard to try and figure out in good faith what would be right way out of this. That work will not be thrown away. We will look at it in good faith and move forward.

And I remind everybody this is not just about us anymore. There is a whole world watching how we behave, what we do. There are governance people who can govern us. There are all kinds of people with good intentions and unfortunately some with bad intentions. And we need to discern the communities but we need to do at the end of the day what's right.

And on the URS I think some of the input that came also will be looked at. The URS is now moving I think in a very good direction. We were - the biggest request was make sure that URS comes in at the right price. And I think we delivered on that. So that's the good news.

And thanks again to great work on our team we were able to find multiple providers, qualified providers that would bring that cost a factor of, you know, a third from where we thought it would be. So I hope I answered you Brian. But I reserve my full answers till after the comment periods are closed and

then I will talk to the whole community openly, transparently and discuss where we go from here.

Brian Winterfeldt: Perfect. Thank you so much.

(David): Thank you. (Elisa).

(Elisa): So I think we're all very encouraged by the fact that there have been so many additions to ICANN staff in so many different parts of the organization. That said, you can imagine that the Business Constituency is overwhelmed at this point I think in terms of the amount of information, the amount of work that's going on, keeping track of it all.

So I guess my ask is that there be resources for us too. Clearly you've seen that there's the need within ICANN to increase staff. And so there's the same kind of a need within the Business Constituency. And I'm sure that the other constituencies may feel similarly that, you know, they need resources whether that is Secretariat resources, resources from the policy department to help guide use resources.

You know we talked a little bit today about what's available with the toolkit potentially getting some more support there. But I think we're in desperate need of some additional resources because this is not a full time job. This is not even a half time job for me.

This is something that we do because we feel that this is important and we want to participate. But most of us have regular jobs that, you know, we're spending the bulk of our time and we need those resources to help us make - to help make this as - all just much more understandable.

Fadi Chehade: How much did (David) pay you for this? So I sorely know how much you all do and give to this purpose we all have. And I thank you for that. I thank every person here who gives up, you know, billable hours, who gives up

family time, who gives up many things to be here. So I thank you for that and yes, I will talk to (David). Anything we can do to just alleviate a little bit of the burden on all of you.

And frankly our self-interest here is to make sure that the multi stakeholder model does work and that most of you participate and feel that your contributions are heard and you have he permission you need to make the right decisions. So thank you for that. And I'll talk to (David). See how we can help you.

(David):   Thank you. Any online comments? No. Okay. I'll come back. Then it's Wendy Seltzer and Kathy Kleinman next. Wendy please.

Wendy Seltzer: Thank you. Wendy Seltzer. So when you spoke with us the non-commercial group, you were talking about the difficulty you saw others having in managing the shift from sort of an org chart to a more distributed management and distributed governance that is the bottom up multi stakeholder process.

And so I recognize what a challenge it is to be mediating between such different understandings of the role, the process and so I - in that spirit I want to reflect some of what we've heard has sounded a bit as thought different messages are being sent to different constituent parts and different groups. And it's difficult to move from the traditional communications to community engagement communications.

But I think the transparency of communications and the sharing of widely of the same messages is critically important. Part of that is the adhering to the processes that we've set up as the core of what keeps the distributed organization running, the processes that we spend lots of time fighting over but ultimately working within at the GNSO Council and the GNSO.

And so I think that - sorry.

Fadi Chehade: Wendy, let me be clear. And I took permission from (Maria) to speak. Many of you know that as part of our open transparent process and I have such regard for this. Any of you - anyone for that matter can contact our ombudsman ombudsperson. Is he here? Is (Chris) in the room? Do you all know our ombudsman? Or should we bring him in so you say hi? You all know him.

Okay. So any of you can contact him and, you know, share with him any concern you have. And some of you may know that (Maria) acted in very good faith and actually asked the ombudsman to - she complained to the ombudsman about how I ran the Trademark Clearinghouse meetings.

And I was very - this was my first time since I was at AT&T in 1985 that I dealt with an ombudsman with someone complaining about me. So it was good for me. It was a great experience for me.

And (Maria) and I had an excellent meeting yesterday. And during that meeting (Maria) made clear that her concern with me was that in a way without knowing I broke a code of conduct about how meetings should be held, how transparent we should be, how people are convened.

And I took very copious notes of her report and some of which you're talking about when you get transparency of how we manage our affairs, how we work in this environment is very important. And (Maria) you should know that since we met, I already met with my team.

I asked them to contact you to start putting together a meetings best practice strength for ICANN so when people do meet or when I convene people for a number of reasons that we're very clear why we're meeting, we're very clear what is the code of conduct, the protocol for the meeting, how do we make meeting transparent, how do we share with people what's going on, that

that's the - that's something even if it's engrained in how ICANN work today, I'm aware of it and I stumbled onto that because of your good work.

We will make sure that is the way we move forward. So transparency - back to Wendy's question. The way we do things, the way we manage things, the way we communicate things at ICANN across all constituencies has to always carry at its heart what makes us unique, which is that we are bottom up, we're transparent and we have nothing to hide. It's very important.

Now even (Maria) and I when we were discussing this with the ombudsman, we discussed that look, some meetings for example when I'm negotiating certain people, some meetings are kind of tough to tell people listen, we're negotiating a very hot thing now and we're all on record. It just makes people climb up or it makes it harder for me to be able to get them certain places.

So there are some differences or types of meetings where I hope we will all understand just like I'm sure within your own family's sacredness. You know, there's certain meetings you have with your wife that not everyone in the family needs to know about.

But you can explain the outcome and you can tell people what is happening, why you're having this meeting. Or maybe six months after the meeting you can say this is what we discussed or something. But we need to find the right form of it. But we cannot lose the spirit of transparency.

So on that, I don't know if I was with you or with the other group when I said that I will investigate bringing transparency international in to help us create these best practices and these frameworks as well and ensure that we become a model for the world as a bottom up organization that embraces the fact that top down is dead. Top down is dead.

Businesses and governments are realizing that the top down model is dead. The President of an IT at (Davos) said quote, "The org chart is dead."

Unquote. So the model of top down management is changing. So what we practice here and we've been very proud of called the multi stakeholder bottom up model is actually becoming the model of the world.

And we will be looked at and tracked and measured and referenced and hopefully not ridiculed if people find out that we are not following our own recipes.

So I don't know if I addressed the core of what you're looking at Wendy but I'm committed to, you know, this transparency concept and I'm committed to the bottom up model. And I will embrace the mistakes I do and I will immediately fix them in good faith because if we don't do this to each other, we all lose.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks very much. I'll just respond very briefly. In the spirit of transparency, I think many of us are sometimes internal critics but more importantly we are internal. We're part of ICANN and we're here because we support the organization and the work that it's doing. And so I'm here to help. I think we all are.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you. Thank you. I know that. Thank you.

(David):   Thank you. Kathy, excuse me. Then Bill and then (Sentra).

Kathy Kleinman: Honored to be called Wendy.

(David):   Sorry, sorry, Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: And Fadi, I wanted to thank you for all the time that you're giving us with family and friends and living on planes and team all over the world telling people about ICANN.

A comment on an engagement and then a question about the URS. The comment on engagement is that we've heard presentations about all the new engagements that's about to go on. And just - sometimes it sounds like there's a lot of changes. Certainly a lot needs to be done.

But in some ways a lot has already happened. I mean we're all here, lots of engagement efforts that have taken place today. There are people all over the world. Robin Gross is an expert on engagement.

And so as the engagement efforts begin to bring in more people, I hope that they'll be funneled in through the constituencies and the At Large and others so that we can put them to work that so that we can teach them and help them learn more about - take that interest and build it into active engagement.

And I haven't quite heard how the pipes are all connected and how the dots are all connected on that and I'm sure it's being developed. But I just wanted to add that that's a very important part of it is - and not just the interest (unintelligible) to the funnel so that we can give to (unintelligible) working groups. A mingle.

And a question about the URS. It was raised yesterday and I thought I'd ask you. It might be too detailed. But it has to do with contractor accreditation. And the recommendation of the STI was that the New York providers be under contract. And that was so that like the Trademark Clearinghouse they'd be under the oversight of ICANN.

And frankly accreditation is a much looser reign and some of the oversight and protection are harder to enforce under accreditation. And three was definitely strong recommendation for a contact. And haven't gotten a straight answer on that. So again, might be too detailed but that deep concern that if you want all the balances that the thought of the URS and the look of the URS has put in, contract is probably the best way to go.

Fadi Chehade: Can you hear me? Is it okay now? Okay. So on the second item I took note. I don't know the answer. But I actually like what you're proposing that we actually do put these folks under contract. Let me talk to (Akim) and I owe you and answer. And if I forget, be kind to remind me. But I did take note of that.

Every engagement activity is designed so we can bring people back into our structures. I guarantee you that. And have you all seen the new ICANN infographic? Many people haven't seen it yet? Oh my God.

((Crosstalk))

Fadi Chehade: ...staff yeah. If someone could just go to my - could you go to (Casia) and ask her for the infographics that I took to - that I had with me at (Davos); if she could bring me as many as she can.

So we - yes. So you've seen these. Okay. So we'll get you more, a bigger copy. But we've developed two infographics, one on Internet governance and this one on how ICANN works. And I'm using them at every meeting. They're proving very useful.

So this one is on how ICANN works. The one on how Internet governance works, which is another one, some of you have it. This one we actually don't have our name on it as a owner. We made it a public domain thing. In fact soon when you search Internet governance on Wikipedia, it will show up. That will be the graphic you'll see.

But this one, which is how ICANN works, is what we do at these meetings - these engagement meetings. We sit with people, we walk them through how ICANN works and how can you get involved, where do you participate, what are the groups.

Then for each of our organs, we explain to them what the organ does. And we're developing actually more infographics on every constituency will come to you actually and say hey, walk us through the MPOC constituency, who they are, what they do. And we'll have - this will all be nested also online so you'll be able to click on the big Internet governance one on ICANN, see this one. You click on GNSO, you see the GNSO one.

So we're building this. We hired a great visualizer who's helping us do these. And we'll work with you to do yours. But yes. If we don't bring people to the bottom of the pyramid, what have we done? You know, we distributed buttons and nice bags that say ICANN and frankly - I man some of this is okay. It's important for people to know who we are.

But the idea would be to bring the funnel to bring people. So I designed with Sally the concept of a (unintelligible). I'm a supply chain guy. That's my background. We looked. We built a supply chain model of how we're going to bring people into the fold.

You know, I - everybody that starts as an interested adherence to ICANN all the way to someone who's an ambassador of ICANN. And so we designed that model and we are - as we go to these places, we're starting to think how are we going to get people into that supply chain, into that funnel.

So we - as the years go by we see more and more and more people. So if we could - I'm sorry to trouble you. If you could ask (Casia) if he has enough for everybody to give each one - these are printed on heavy cardboard. And I was distributing them everywhere I go.

So that's on one side we have the Internet. Who governs the Internet is actually because who runs the Internet, which is a provocative question. And then on the other side is just the detail about how ICANN works. Okay.

So each of you should - and we have it also electronically but we'll at least give you one so you can flash it up when you're sitting in a meeting. People say how does this thing work. It's been very helpful. I hope I answered the question Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: Sounds like great materials. And we're looking forward to (unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: To more people signing up. Indeed. Indeed.

(David): Thank you. Thank you Kathy and not Wendy. Bill Drake. (Sentra) you're next.

Bill Drake: Thank you (David). I was going to ask something else but first I just wanted to say Fadi, to offer somewhat dissonant note from the perspective of somebody who spends a lot of time thinking about the Internet governance. If you're showing this around to a lot of people, this is a conversation worth having.

To me this is a highly idealized misrepresentation of a lot of what goes on in the Internet governance environment. It's very selective. It's - and it kind of depicts kind of a happy world that really doesn't quite capture a lot of the key dynamics there working in Internet governance. So I'm not sure what the - how you're using it or what kind of response you've got. I'd be interested to talk to you about that.

Let me say what I wanted to say though. Just because I wanted to be clear when I heard you talking about transparency and you were making reference to the particular meetings that you were holding. When we talked with you yesterday, I understood the discussion to be more a broader look at transparency across the community.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Bill Drake: Okay. That too. I just wanted to make sure. It is important I think when if you're going to be holding more meetings here kind of offline that you find the right balance for reporting and making available what happens so the people who are not here and so on. But there's just a more fundamental set of questions across constituencies, stakeholder groups, SOs, ACs how we all can part with standards of good governance.

That not only would encourage I think a higher level of trust and comity across the community if people evolve towards some shared standards but also would strengthen ICANN's ability to represent itself externally as example of strong multi stakeholders and rather than sort of weaker multi stakeholders.

And I think that's an important point especially when we're out there defending ICANN's prophecies in other environments and people kind of point and go oh yeah, really. So you can claim it's like that. Well then how about this. And you say well, yes, there's some exceptions. Some things don't fit the pattern. So the more we're able to push towards those common standards I think strengthens ICANN internally and externally.

The other point that I would make about this conversation that it's a piece of the conversation. We had like also came up a lot yesterday I think is in a number of the discussions we had with staff was just that ongoing challenge of finding a way to really integrate the efforts of staff as you're growing rapidly dealing with all these new pressures, you're bringing on new people and expanding activities and make sure that as you do that you're bringing along the community at every step of the way and really having sufficient kind of feedback loops of information and checking and go them with you.

Because there's real risks. And a number of these initiatives that we hear about that staff because of the pressures they're facing and the incentive structures they have could end up sort of over here with the community back here wondering how did that happen. And how do we then post hoc reengage

this when the table's already been set in a way that isn't what we would have done in the first place?

So whether it's outreach or whether it's a number of different things we talked about yesterday, I think that this is - (Dan) and I were talking last night after the session over far too many drinks and I was saying, you know, to him that you're actually really creating something fundamentally different here.

I mean this is unlike any other organization I think in a lot of ways as a stakeholder organization where you've got this substantial staff and the organization itself, the paid people with this deeply integrated and (righteously) divided at some points to (energy) that you're trying to integrate with.

I can't think of a lot of organizations that really work like that. So if you can make that work, you're really pioneering in a way an entirely new kind of paradigm of magic. But it's going to be very challenging to do it and do it right. And the only way you can make sure you do is to leverage all the assets you have in the community all the way through (unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: Bill, three things you brought up. On the first one, please yes, if you have any input on this, please do give it to us. It's very important. This of course says Version 1 so there'll be many versions, more input, more insight. We put it on the Web site for three months, got a ton of input, incorporated it. We shared it to the ISOC community. ISOC, the hours I spent time with them on this and they've given us input.

But yes, this is an evolving thing. But let me tell you, a picture that we can sit around the table with a minister of telecommunications in Nigeria who says I don't understand. You guys are very confusing. I like the IT. I just go there. It's simple. It's one organization. I raise my hand, I vote and it's done. You know, what is this thing you have? It's very confusing for them.

So all I'm trying to do - all we were trying to do is let's get it onto at least a page. And in fact the IT use here because they have a role too. You know, everybody should be here.

But anyway, your help would be appreciated. Please do give us insight. Please do give us input. This is not our picture. We even made it a completely open, you know, open source attribution. So anybody can participate in this.

You're second point was to make sure that I did not intend to limit my comments on focusing on transparency to meetings. I was just bringing up the meetings that (Maria) and I discussed.

What I promised yesterday was that we're going to look at a more comprehensive project on meetings across ICANN and its structures and benchmarking that against the rest of the world. And yes, I'm committed to that. I have it as an action and I'll add it to our long list. But it's critical. It's vital for us.

The third thing you bring up is actually very important. I want to focus on that a little bit. You say we're moving so fast, which we are. You're growing. You have staff. Make sure you don't get too far ahead of the community because that breaks the whole model. That's not - it's not about staff coming up with ideas.

And let me just be very candid with you. I view us all in three eccentric circles. I view the community as the main circle. Of course outside of that there's a fourth circle, which is the world At Large who are all our community. In a way they're an extended community. But by community I mean the structures that are at ICANN and all the people like you within them.

Inside that there is of course the Board who represents in many ways the community. And then inside that there is the staff (unintelligible) to make it work for this group.

When I arrived, I committed from the beginning. I said these three eccentric circles have to all advance together and mature together. They cannot go alone. And I'll be candid with you. I tried a few initiatives that kind of crossed all three circles.

And I'll be blunt. I think I felt a lot of (classification). I just could not move everybody out of a mode of - and the need was great. The need was great. I'll give you one example so I'm clear on what I'm saying.

So I arrived and a month after I - a day after I arrived they sit me down and they say there is this thing called the wicket. I'd never heard about the wicket. I know - and (Marilyn Wells) I mean she was chasing me in the hall with a picture. Said pay attention to this because I have no clue what this stuff is.

So I was educated on the fly. This is very important. You have to be - and by the time I figured it all out, I joined you guys September 19. By the time I figured it out, they were checking with me and my flight arrangements to Dubai.

So go to Dubai and defend the Internet. Well, you know, what's going on here? So to be serious about this, I tried very quickly to do certain things and we did everything we can. You know, I called my ISTAR organizations. I called people who know about the wicket. I got educated day and night.

And I went there and as you know we had some things to deal with. As soon as I left the wicket, the first email I wrote was a three-page email to the CEOs of all the ISTAR organizations; to Lynn St. Amour, the CEO of ISOC; to the CEOs of the RARs, to the CEO - to Jeff from the W3C.

And I told them guys, on my God. We've got to do something. You know, we just escaped this bullet but I don't know what the other bullets is coming and according to (Marilyn)'s little graph, you know, we have another thing happening in May. Right.

And that was the next thing. It's happening in May. We have the WPPS and I told them what are we going to do till May. Here are some ideas. So I threw some ideas at them. Concrete ideas. And I said hey, I'm going to put - here's a quarter million dollars. I'm going to put money on this. Let's go do work. Silence. Radio silence.

The most I got was good stuff. Okay. Maybe it's Christmas. Let me wait a little bit. We'll kind of - nothing happened. So I sat there and I said okay. I'm supposed to work with these guys. We're supposed to pull them along and make them part of the solution. But I - catharsis, nothing.

So I moved. I moved. I sent them all invitations and I said look, you know. I'm not going to call it an ICANN event. We'll call it - and they wrote me back. They said oh, you can't call it an ICANN event. I said what can I call it. They said get the IGF to back it, right.

So we called the IGF. And we had a great team of people. We got on the phone. We called the IGF. Within a week we got the IGF to back both events. Great. Now who else do we need to involve? We couldn't get the system to move the community. That's the community, right. I couldn't get them to move.

So we took some steps and we broke the kind of classification a little bit. And I put it all in their lap. I said this is yours. It's not mine. Fine. You have no money. I'll fund it. But let's do something. We cannot show up at the WPPS in May and stay the wicket was hard.

I'd like to show up to the (WTFMA). We listened. We're all over it. We did two events. Hundreds of people showed up. We told them why multi stakeholders is good. That's what I'm used to do.

And so today I had a very tough call with the ISTAR CEOs who spent an hour telling me that, you know, I broke all the norms of conduct. Right. But you're doing the right thing. Thank you. But you broke norms of conduct. Good people. They're good people. I understand.

Now I promised them this is the last time I do this. I will go meet them in Singapore because we have a meeting and I'll put it all at their feet. I'll tell them look, this is ours to go do together. What can we do? Let's back up. Let's back up.

Let's think strategy. Let's think planning. Let's think funding. Let's think how we do it together. It's not about ICANN. It's not about me. It's not - it's about reaching out to people and starting to talk about our model before it's too late. Because when I arrived at the wicket, it was too late.

I was tired of meeting people who walked into meetings - senior people who are sitting and voting and one of them asked me how to spell ICANN. He was a minister. He was voting on the wicket (source). Can you spell ICANN for me? Never heard of us. Didn't know who we are.

So and I'm not blaming - I'm not sitting her to blame. I'm saying it's just getting to me that we have to get out there and do things and yes, I have to pull everyone together. And I promised you. But somehow we need to decalcify ICANN first. I'll be candid with you. Then I have to decalcify our Board because our Board was calcified too.

Oh but we can't do that. We have to check on, you know, the quality of the coffee beans in the kitchen. And I said no. You can't - that's - you should not be checking on the quality of the - I can do that. So that's also happening.

With all due respect to our Board, our Board has spent the last four years telling ICANN staff what do to on Wednesday. It's not the proper use of the Board's time. I need to go to get strategic to guide me to show me where to go to bring the community together to do all the things that a good Board needs to do.

So we're working with them and the response has been superb. This Board meeting we have this weekend I think will be remarkable. And I saw the Board make a massive u-turn right before the wicket because I don't know if you know this but I'm going tell you -- right before the wickets our Board and our staff was divided if I should accept (Hamadu)'s invitation to speak at the opening of the wickets.

Our Board is divided, our community's divided, our staff was divided. It almost split ICANN. Does he speak or does he not speak? Right? And it was another moment of growth for us because we had come together -- staff, Board and key community members -- sit around the table and discuss what is the right thing to do for this community? What is the right thing to do for the world?

And I must tell you this was remarkable. It is what gives me energy that we all came together and that's why I subscribe to your point. And I subscribe to a blended (unintelligible). It's when the collective ICANN which is all of us, not the staff -- when the collective ICANN comes to a consensus after hard fought discussion that it actually makes all of this worth it. I know that. I know that. And I'm not going to deviate from that.

Man: Can I just make one suggestion?

Fadi Chehade: Please.

Man: A broader rolodex.

Fadi Chehade: A what now?

Man: A broader rolodex.

Fadi Chehade: Absolutely, absolutely.

Man: There's some others you could have called with less calcification, you would have gotten different responses.

Fadi Chehade: Absolutely. I take that to heart. I take that to heart. Thank you. Thanks for your concern on this.

Man: Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you. Cintra Sooknanan. There was an ICANN strategic plan update -- it was released two days ago. One statement in the update says that due to significantly large and above gTLDs an updated definition of ICANN 's rule relative to consumer trust is required.

                  I just want to know Fadi if you can say a few words on this point and if there are any specific initiatives in mind?

Fadi Chehade: Look, we have - just let me comment on the strategic plan. Then I'll comment on the point you brought up if I got it right.

                  We made minor adjustments to the strategic plan which is frankly the old strategic plan that we've had for years. We are going to kick a new strategic plan phase mid-year with the community and the Board. So this - there's going to be, I think, a major refresh together of our strategic plan.

                  And the current strategic plan had evolved, in my opinion, to be too much of an operational plan. This is not a strategic plan. If you really read it and as many of us have built strategic plans and operational plans -- our current 'strategic plan' is really an operational plan.

And what we're going to do starting mid-year is focus on true strategic planning with the community. Who we are, where are we heading, the broad line of things and then the why. They why we're all here and the whats are important. The hows should be left, you know, for people to go make happen in the SO and AC and staff work groups.

Now as to your point on - please reread that point so everyone hears it. You were not very loud so please speak into the microphone.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay. I'll just reread the statement. Due to the significantly large and above gTLDs an updated definition of ICANN 's rule relative to consumer trust is required.

Fadi Chehade: Yes so this is back to the whole point about the fact that our community is evolving and evolving fast. It's evolving because of the new gTLDs. It's evolving because of the massive engagement efforts which we're just kicking off around the world.
So as more and more people come to the floor and participate in your organs that make ICANN what it is, I think we need to make sure that in all of this we don't lose the focus on the public and its interests.

But it's very easy for us to fail into, you know, either focusing only on the people who speak loudest, who scream loudest, who are most numerous, who are most rich, you know, it's easy to fall into these traps.

I think this is a statement simply saying that it is important for us as we see our community go from a village to a city that we do not lose the essence of the consumer trust that we have to achieve our goals.

Some of the specific things we're going to do there will avail themselves in, for example, what (Steve) was bringing up and what I talked about yesterday. A well-articulated, comprehensive bill of rights for the registrants in this

industry that would show a commitment at an industry level that we are serious, we take our registrants seriously and we will serve them with distinction. And these are their responsibility but also (unintelligible). That needs to happen.

Now again, some people on the contracted side, oh but that's there already, it's back to (Steve)'s point. Even if it's there already -- although I don't think it's quite there already -- is it in force? And do we have a contractual mechanism to make sure it is in force? And who's signing up to?

Is it the part of the industry and another part of the industry is not because it's against each point? Do you know that everybody is going to be on board on this? And how are we going to do that?

So these are fundamental things and yesterday also in the - in this room, in the discussion about the registrants bills of rights -- these was also a discussion about a user's bill of rights. Okay, so I took that under consideration. I know that goes a step further and it gets beyond the realms of what is contractually manageable immediately or maybe not. That's why I asked for some guidance on that but I will also think about that.

But for now, for sure, a registrants bill of rights is going to be a central part of how our industry matures and how ICANN fulfills its obligation to protect the consumer.

Man: Marie. And Mikey you're last.

Marie McCann: Yes, just a tiny suggestion about (unintelligible) graphics. I don't know whether you planning to do so but it would be useful if you could translate them in different languages so that we could use the maps as a tool when we do our outreach in different regions of the world.

Man: They are going in all of our languages -- five plus one and we're doing the Arabic on first because the first (Nigworks) is in Dubai. But we're going to do them in all the languages, yes. That's a - and I'll - if you want more detail I'll make sure someone gets back to you (Marie) on that. But that goes back to (unintelligible) on that but I will confirm that.

Man: And Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm delighted to say that I'm taking another bite at the apple. Sorry, I couldn't resist. I just want to bring us back to the point that I made while you were eating (unintelligible).

Man: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: And I want to put it in the terms that you just described because I'm a supply chain guy too -- back when I worked for a living. And one of the key concepts of a chain -- especially a supply chain -- is that it's weakest link is the place that you have to pay attention.

                   And my sort of personal mission for this meeting is to sound an alarm that says we have a very weak link at the Working Group level. I would point out that there are really two places in ICANN where all of the ACs and SOs meet -- at the top, Board, etcetera and at the bottom.

                   At the top there's a lot of attention, there's a lot of resources, there's a lot of - etcetera, etcetera. But my concern as I listen to the outreach is that we are building a gigantic front end to a link in the supply chain that can't scale very well right now.

                   And so my mission for this - and, you know, I put (David) and he said he's heard this about a million times already but we have to pay attention and put a little more resource and attention on the Working Group process. And I've bent his ear enough.

Man: How many (unintelligible) that we have that support (unintelligible) to (David)?

Mikey O'Connor: Well you - I'm going to take words out of his mouth because you can talk to him any time.

Man: I will. (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Here's the key is - the things that we do for the Working Groups today we do fabulously.

Man: Yes. But they (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: It's that there are whole disciplines that are missing. And I'll bend his ear some more -- I'll happily bend your two. You know, it requires a picture or two, etcetera. But mostly what I want to get on your radar is that you do have another puzzler that you should be aware of now.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, I'm there. Thank you Mikey for making the (unintelligible). Once the (unintelligible) mentioned. How many people here have used My ICANN? The site? Okay. Has it been somewhat helpful, a little bit on finding stuff? A little bit more helpful. Okay.

My ICANN Version 2 is about to come out and I think it comes out in Beijing. It will have a substantially new set of functions and features. One of them -- that I think will be very, very helpful -- is a feature that we're rolling out also within ICANN. And I know it's some strength in any system you need people, processes and tools which is just the tool part but I'm mentioning it.

One of the tools that we're rolling out is a very powerful asynchronous meeting management tool -- very powerful. That I think will make our - pardon me, synchronous meetings, not asynchronous. Our synchronous meetings far

more efficient and trackable so you'll be able to - if you have a meeting on a particular subject to hold the meeting within that room.

And unlike Acrobat you'll be able to -- in that room -- manage and track month after month, year after year, everything that is happening in that meeting in a very powerful way. It's a very nice tool and it will be one of the many tools we will roll out to enable a blogger more scalable participation of people into our processes.

Having said that I'm - I understand the Working Group issues is separate and requires additional attention and I'll look at the resources with you (David) and - if we could please. Make sure that we don't get all this fish and we don't have places to work with them.

Who was next?

Man: Klaus and then (Hector). Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Fadi.

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: On a very quick note I think it's superfluous but you're putting a lot of emphasis on transparency on your side.

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Klaus Stoll: And I think you have to demand the same from the whole organization and everybody and (unintelligible) including the people in this room. I think we have to make it really a corporate creed.

Fadi Chehade: Okay.

Klaus Stoll: And that means that ICANN (unintelligible) doesn't really make sense to engage with it. And then Fadi I must say that I am very, very concerned that you are not cutting this job anymore on Monday.

Because you said yesterday in the meeting with the NCSG that you were trying to somehow manage to travel of the ICANN Board and as somebody who knows ICANN you can do everything, you can change everything, you can demand everything. But you can't control to travel of the Board so be careful.

Fadi Chehade: This is a very fair warning and a good one so I'm indeed, I built a personal spreadsheet of how I plan to manage the Board's travel that I'm presenting to them for the first time on Friday. So yes, I may not be here Monday. I be sent on a trip to Siberia or something but look I want, in a joking way I say that but frankly I'll be candid with you.

I've heard Board Members in the last two/three months several times go into meetings with me or with my team and say the following -- yesterday there was a meeting right here where a Board Member was meeting with one of my executives and in the middle of the meeting my executive says, "You mean, you're not going to do X, Y Z?"

And the Board Member looked at him and he said, "No, it's a new season." Quote. And the executive ran to my office and said, "This is amazing. I mean, the Board Members are really embracing the fact that it's a new season now."

And it's happening across the Board and it is really contagious when we're open, as you said, when we're transparent. When we're doing the right thing from here it's contagious. You know, then people know, it's okay, you know, I - it's okay to be straight and transparent because that's the right thing to do.

And similarly with the Board I think I'm seeing a positive embrace. And the Board guides me on many things. I take them with me on trips as opposed to

having them say, "I want to go to this place." I say, "Look, I need your help. I'm taking (Coraway) to Japan because he knows a lot of people at meetings." I'm taking (George) to China because he has a lot of contacts there that will help me."

That's the proper way for me to leverage their great knowledge. And when I send them somewhere where they're alone I ask them for a report because they owe this not to me, they owe this to you. This is our money. We send them place they need to come back and give me a report. That never happened before.

And I'm - part of my transparency plan it to publish theses. So we're moving, we're moving. It will take time but thank you. And if I'm not here Monday, you know, we'll - I'll call you and we can go on a safari together or something.

All right, who's next?

Man: Probably (Hector) because we have to...

(Hector Manoff): Hello, this is (Hector Manoff) from the IPC from Argentina. In yesterday I - we were all surprised about the possibility to a working (unintelligible) right of the users of consumers. But coming from South America I have the experience every day about (unintelligible) and many of the people that creative. Most of - part of the reality in internet (unintelligible) creator of a all kind of work on they don't have a really bill of rights in this orientation until now.

Because they participate in the IPC but they don't have the means to really have a voice in the internet. And I think - thinking about outreach, we should create a way to protect the rights of this individual authors, individual artists and all kind of people that create things.

They (unintelligible) ICANN essentially that if they know something they say it's very far away and impossible to reach because they don't have the means and the knowledge to have a representation.

Sometimes then inject our property (unintelligible) perceive us the ownership of the (unintelligible) companies that there are many, many others that are suffering because they - the work that they create are diminished by all of this system. And for (unintelligible) users I would like to work with organization with - in this field.

Man: And one last question.

(Heather Forrest): This is (Heather Forrest) from the IPC.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you (Heather).

(Heather Forrest): Fadi two things. One thing -- in your comment about the My ICANN it reminded me of a comment that was made yesterday about if when a student or any person wanted to find out information about the UN and how it worked one could to the library and find any number of books about the UN. And that these books don't exactly exist about ICANN.

I've recently finished a work on the new gTLD policy development process and this is not an advertisement in any way. However, picking up on your comment about the My ICANN website -- it's an administrative point and a very simple one but I think one that needs to be raised.

One of the things that I find extremely difficult was in the course of three years of putting together this work. I couldn't actually count the number of times that ICANN URLs changed.

You made the point, I hope that you find that My ICANN makes things easier to find. In fact, ICANN information moves every six months. And that makes --

in terms of our longevity, in terms of tracking our processes -- even for us internally it's hard to find our own documents and where they're hidden on the ICANN website.

And I don't mean hidden in terms of the site is difficult to use but from an archival purpose it's very, very difficult to track. So as we progress in developing information and developing our online resources it would be very, very helpful if ICANN staff could bear that in mind and not make such tremendous changes to the URLs on such a frequent basis.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you (Heather). You should have asked for a roundtrip ticket to Tahiti because I just appointed a full time ICANN archivist. And she -- many of you this has not been announced publicly -- many of you know her. She's actually a current staff member but it's a new role.

It's a new job and it's because precisely I found out not just from you but from many people that the people who manage our websites are current communications people that just want to get the information out but they do not have a sense of a librarian or an archivist who wants to track things. So this new job which was just created will be to electronically manage as a librarian would all the information of ICANN. We are also starting - she - the person will be starting an external effort to collect all the information of ICANN. For example, (Jones Dey) is a law firm that has worked with us since the beginning.

When she called them they said actually we have 20 boxes of stuff about ICANN and we've been looking for a place to put it. If you guys want it you can have it. So we're going to start a proper effort to manage it electronically and in paper an archive of ICANN paperwork.

Secondly, I'm now in search of a full time ICANN historian. So we can have proper history recorded and kept about ICANN. Thank god (Vince) and

(Steve) and all these good people are still here and alive and with us and that's a great thing.

And I have already called (Vince) and called (Steve) and others and checked if they would be willing to submit to a historian to start building the history of ICANN before it's too late for all of us. And they have all agreed.

So I'm very sensitive to this. I believe your comment is spot on and I'm happy to tell you that at least on that we're going to start thinking differently in this case on.

In terms of books, I asked also - I - in the job definition of the historian I've also asked that historian could produce what I would call, you know, a log of history but also at the same time he or she could be working with a third party to produce an actual book that would at least record the last, say 15 years of the history of this work. Thank you.

Man: Do you have some more time for two other questions?

Fadi Chehade: Any time for Mar.

Man: Marilyn and then Kathy.

Fadi Chehade: And Kathy too.

Marilyn Cade: This is very quick statement and question.

Fadi Chehade: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: The person who knows the most about the history of ICANN is called (Mike Brothers).

Fadi Chehade: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: And many people here don't know (Mike).

Fadi Chehade: You should know (Mike).

Marilyn Cade: But (Mike) is the first CEO and President. And when ICANN was founded there was four staff, a line of credit of $1.3 million and (Mike)'s personal credit card.

Fadi Chehade: Oh my god.

Marilyn Cade: So I hope - a real - and there are many people like Mike.

Fadi Chehade: Yes there are.

Marilyn Cade: But I really applaud the effort but I just wanted to...

Fadi Chehade: No, thank you. I met (Mike) and couldn't second you more strongly just the personality, the commitment. See this is what ICANN is. This is what - that's why I was frankly surprised we don't have neither an archivist nor a librarian - a historian nor a concerted effort to capture the greatness of what we've built here.

I want our children to know about this one day that these good people gave all this time. You know, one of you wrote me yesterday, just, you know, (Mike Pallay) of the hours you put in on ICANN it's remarkable. All of you, you know, it's really - we need to record that. So yes, I'm all over this one.

Man: And finally Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: I get the last word? No, Fadi gets the last word.

Fadi Chehade: No, you. You get the last word.

Kath Kleinman: But from - I'm excited about the archivist and from a policy perspective -- and I'm sure it's already there as part of the bullet point -- the ability to search backwards across policy. Maybe not every discussion but to know the Whois reports for example across ten years.

We had great trouble with this in the (Village Review Team) and we were talking about it yesterday in the meeting of NCU, NCSG. That ability to go backward across time to see where the policy has been and how it's evolved quickly and clearly would save us (unintelligible) hours so thank you.

Fadi Chehade: Yes, you have - I'm with you on that. So we'll do our best. I thank you again for the time you gave me. It was a pleasure to see you. I will see many of you in Beijing.

In the meantime I'm going to communicate -- over communicate -- as much as I can. Because (Bill) is right. If I can't have you all with me on this journey I'm going nowhere. So we all need to be together.

One of the thoughts I have and I want to see kind of a quick reaction from you -- I felt that the public forum that you - we do at these ICANN meeting is just a remarkable event. My wife came with me to only one ICANN meeting and she told me which session should I attend?

And I told her if you do nothing else just come to the public forum. And someone from ICANN told me, "Are you nuts? This is where you, you know, usually get bludgeoned." I said, "Precisely, precisely. This is - I wish if my kids could come and see this." Because that's what matters, that's what makes this superb, right?

So one of the thoughts I have is to do a community forum on the phone once a month. Where I'm available to you and anybody can do what we just did. Now somebody told me that I'm really nuts now to think about that but I don't

know. I just - I need to break the lock of the meetings as the only place where we communicate.

And yes, one on one communications is good and people call me on the time and I'm literally on calls from 6:00 am until many times 10:00 pm but that's not sustainable either. You know, not for me but for the community, the community's growing. Everybody wants to chat about something.

And I hope more people chat with my great team. Not, you know, not just me. I'm not the decider here. There's a lot more to this team than me.

But having said that, a forum where people just feel like they can come up to the phone and ask a question.

You're worried. Tell me why you're worried. And I'm - I really want to...

Man: Let them email you a question and answer it on your blog. Better.

Fadi Chehade: And so everybody knows - well everybody would know but you're saying it will overwhelm me. Yes. What do you think Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I think it would overwhelm us. And I'm going to just look at a comment (Elisa) made. We are barely...

Fadi Chehade: I see.

Marilyn Cade: Touching the service of the work we need to do. And yes, we need to communicate and hear from each other but I have to say...

Fadi Chehade: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Give the operational excellence imperatives that we have all asked you for maybe we could postpone making a decision about such an idea until we get the...

Fadi Chehade: Oh, certainly, yes, no, no. This is why I was putting it out but I see your point as well about it being another thing on your calendar basically. Avri what are - what do you think?

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Fadi Chehade: Okay, all right. Mikey what do you think?

Mikey O'Connor: Me too. You know, I think one of the things about what's going on right now in this new season is changing the pattern of communication in ICANN and so I like that idea a lot.

Fadi Chehade: Okay. Who else wanted to share something? (Maria)?

(Maria):   Yes, I think it's a terrific idea because what it does it makes it a level playing field, you know, for, I mean a lot of us here know who to pick up the phone to if you want to pick up the phone. But not everyone in the community does.

                   And I think it makes, you know, for people who can't come to the meeting or people who don't feel they have access or insider knowledge. I think it's terrific.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, good input. I appreciate it very much. I thank you again. Have safe trips back to your families and your home.

Man: Thank you very much.

Man: Thanks everyone. Thank you.

Man: And now a program note from me. We'll have a ten minute break and we apologize to people on remote participation but maybe you would need a break there as well. And so we will start at - and the rest of the program with the CFO's discussion at 3:30 to 4:30, the wrap up from 4:30 to 5:00 and then 5:00 pm, of course, with the Board. Ten minute break. We'll be back.

So now we would like to reconvene for our topic on community needs. This I think I would like to organize in a way that we first give the constituency or stakeholder leaders a chance to comment and/or their designees. And then we can open it up.

The point here is to have you think about what additional support, resources and the like you need to do your work. In particular I have a parochial interest in promoting the inputs and involvement in the policy development process that ICANN my first (unintelligible).

But also you heard from Salieu and myself on stakeholder engagement and in particular my new role of (SOAC) engagement. How to then operationalize some of those needs, if you will, as we go forward.

So with that I would like to turn to (Mark), if I could from the IPA. Would you be ready to lead off on this comment? I'm sorry, IPC, excuse me. No.

(Mark): I think yesterday and, you know, earlier today we discussed a desire for, you know, some sort of, you know, web site solution or solution to handle, you know, various aspects of administering and maintaining the constituencies such as, you know, a membership management and invoicing so I won't really, you know, repeat those comments.

You know, some other things I think that I also mentioned yesterday which I'll go more into detail on I think are two things. And again, I think the needs are - - as you have identified -- probably going to be different by constituency.

For the IPC we have less of a need for outreach to bring in new members. Where we do have needs is really in two areas. One which Claudio and others have mentioned, I believe Marilyn as well is the need for secretariat. Especially now with new gTLDs and, you know, other various significant policy issues.

There is an incredible number of comment periods with, you know, seems very often, very tight deadlines. Figuring the IPC, you know, we all have full time jobs and clients and, you know, we're very happy to participate in ICANN when we can but there's only so much time to give, you know, during the week.

And with the increased number of things that we need to comment on and consider or maybe there's not an official comment period but we feel that it would be necessary and appropriate to put together some sort of comments and response becomes very difficult for us to coordinate our members, particularly when our membership is quite diverse with people on multiple continents.

And so our most significant need, I think, is some sort of secretariat funded by ICANN to assist us in organizing ourselves, organizing our thoughts, formatting and adding substance to various comments, proposals and other written submissions that we would provide to ICANN.

So that is definitely number one on our list of probably our most critical need to really enable us to engage effectively with ICANN.

The second need, I think is probably additional funding for travel to ICANN meetings. We certainly understand that, you know, there's only so much money to go around and that ICANN cannot fund an unlimited number of people to attend meetings.

But again, you know, for the IPC in particular we feel that to have maybe five or six people, you know, attend meetings if possible or whatever number is possible would most effectively again enable us to participate in the various meetings and events with, again, hopefully the support of a secretariat who we would not expect to attend but would enable us to, again, more properly coordinate our thoughts and prepare documents that would be useful for submissions and these meetings.

Man: (Mark) thank you very much. The other point is that we did hear some of the earlier comments on which we're creating a list which we have -- it's not ready to display yet -- it will incorporate some of those other comments.

But thank you for the note of secretariat support to help coordinate the comments, the formats, the organization for those inputs as well as additional travel to ICANN meetings.

Any other comments?

Man: You know, again, our needs would change based on what the goals are for engagement but assuming that as a constituency we're able to determine ourselves what the appropriate goals are. Those would be our most critical needs at this time.

Man: Can we ask each other questions?

Man: Yes, I think that's great. I was...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Mark) I'm just curious, when you say you don't have any need for outreach or greater internationalization -- I'm looking at your website and I can't figure out who your members are. The only list on here is the category three

members which are these various associations. It's all (unintelligible) you have individuals as well so you've got different categories of members.

Is there a full list of members somewhere? And where you could see, like how international they are -- these members?

(Mark):   There definitely is a full list. It's - at this time it has not been published on the website. I mean, I manage the website so I have not been instructed by leadership to post that list and I don't know if there is a particular policy or strategy reason for not doing so. It's just at this time it's not published.

Man: Can I just ask you how international the membership is?

(Mark):   I believe we have members from every continent. I mean, I don't have the exact numbers from each country. I'm sure I can get that information for you but...

Man: No, (unintelligible).

(Mark):   I don't have this readily off the top of my head.

Man: (Unintelligible) everybody. And so I just.

(Mark):   I mean, you know, is it possible we could be more internationalized? I think definitely it is. However, you know, I think for intellectual property interests and for protection of intellectual property, you know, interests are more aligned and there tend to be less difference among regions -- at least we found.

And again, you know, we have found that we have an increasing number of applications, an increasing amount of interest in the IPC so it's not to say that we don't want new members or that we don't think it could be important to have more input.

We're just saying, you know, to prioritize what we view our needs are. Those are our least important needs. It's always good to have more input and a wider diversity of membership but, you know, again being asked to prioritize and decide what our greatest needs are we don't feel that's our greatest need.

Man: Okay and I don't mean - I hope you don't think I'm pressing you in a way I shouldn't.

(Mark): No, not at all.

Man: Because I don't know that much about it so it. Do you turn down people for membership because they have different views on issues or does anybody who comes to you and says I have a legitimate specialization and interest in intellectual property get into the constituency.

(Mark): We don't turn down people based on their views. We only turn them down based on whether they meet the eligibility requirements for membership. So we definitely welcome divergent views and I think, you know, in the many cases when you're in a particular constituency you have - there's just a tendency for people to - like-minded people to have like-minded opinions.

And so we welcome people who have kind of a different slant on what we should be doing because I think that maybe moves us a little bit more towards the middle and helps us provide more valuable input then just a more extreme view which, you know, usually is not effective or useful.

Man: Okay.

(David): (Elisa) did you have a quick question, please.

(Mark): You know, if I could make one more comment.

(David):   Yes, yes.

(Mark):   That I was just reminded of. I should have actually realized and made this comment. We also, you know, have various large international organizations that are members. For example, (INTA). And so through those large international intellectual property protection organizations we have access to a very wide and divergent collection of viewpoints and interests.

                  So those are definitely communicated to us and, you know, into certainly the most active of the international organizations in the IPC and so, you know, I think it definitely is a goal for them to effectively communicate the interests of their very diverse body of members.

(David):   Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: You're done, right?

(David):   (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: No, I was going to do one of my own. I'm sort of channeling Tony Holmes. If Tony Harris or any of the other actual leaders of the ISP want to join me in this but Tony's not here at the moment.

                  I was in the queue leftover from the last time and one of the things that I think we can say as the ISPs is sort of the opposite. We love the idea of getting help with outreach.

                  We are actually much better at onboarding people who have been reached out for us rather than being the people that actually do the outreach because we're sparse. Is that a safe characterization, you know?

So to the extent that ICANN can do outreach I think that we would feel very strongly that that would be a great thing and that we would love to help them. So it's just to come down on the other side of the outreach issue we're pretty firmly on that side.

(David):   Great. Thank you. That - from the IPC. Did you want to speak on other matters for Tony on the - no? Because I know he's...

Mikey O'Connor: Tony's in another meeting but Tony Harris do you want to speak to the question of ISPs needs? That would be great.

(David):   Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: Yes. I'll just (unintelligible) what Mikey said. We're not adverse to receiving any assistance and outreach but we do as a norm, do quite a bit of outreach. Always focusing on the next event that's coming up and trying to get people from the region to participate.

                 We feel that outreach must be increased with a new gTLD program because ISP and connectivity providers are not only the large companies and associations (unintelligible) in the industry that tend to come to ICANN and the IATF and the IGF and all these forums.

                 But you should consider that -- at least in developing countries -- you have very many SMEs, small and medium enterprises that are telephone cooperatives. Small, wireless ISPs -- some of them are even social entrepreneurs who - does nothing in their village so they set up some sort of connectivity for the people there.

                 And all those actors who are providing access to the internet which is perhaps we can say that without that the internet is irrelevant and if you can't get access to it.

We'll need to be apprised of the role out of the new top level domains. Basically they need to know these exist. If their users have a problem and they don't know there are new TLDs they will just say, "Oh, you've written the wrong address, this TLD doesn't exist." End of story.

We had that problem when DotCoop and the first gTLD were rolled out with more than three characters. A lot of software and email platforms were throwing these new extensions out every time they saw them and that took quite a while to sort out.

And so it is important to recognize that at least in us - in our industry in connectivity there are a large number of players who are not visible who are small, who are in remote places who somehow have to be reached and educated on this big expansion that is coming on domain names. Thank you.

(David): Thank you Tony. Any questions for Tony of the IPS group? Chris Chaplow do you want to go next? Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Thank (unintelligible) yes. Chris Chaplow from the BC. The three things that come to my mind for the BC -- some which have been taught before but I think it's worth repeating -- one is the secretariat support, the secretariat support on travel to the ICANN meetings. We already have part time secretarial support and I think we need more to be more effective.

The newsletter -- as you probably know -- we produce for each ICANN meeting a four or eight page newsletter which we will continue to do so but we'd very much like within the organization to upgrade that and to make it a quarterly or ultimately a monthly business briefing (unintelligible) newsletter to actually something that we can use to explain to businesses who don't really understand ICANN of what's happening -- what's going on - the highlights that they need to be alert to and get a significant distribution on that. And that will hopefully bring people into the community -- those that are interested.

We definitely want new members. There's no doubt about us in the business constituency. And I bring up again outreach events. And I think that's getting more critical because actually when I cross check back to the FY '13 budget and one of the days for this event -- according to the budget -- was one day at the program would offer communities the opportunity to reach out to perspective members.

So that didn't happen this year so I think it's more important next year we do have funding for outreach events.

And just on that, on the experience of organizing events -- we always, I think many people do, try to work with a local organization. I think it's much more successful.

They can help with on the ground organization and tap into their members and one of the experiences I had with trying to organize something in Madrid with a Chamber of Commerce was that everybody was saying, yes it's great idea to have a joint Chamber of Commerce, business constituency ICANN event but it sort of needed underwriting.

Because everybody was nodding in agreement and there were parts of the organization that said, oh no, it's too tacky and what if nobody turn up and we all (unintelligible) on our faces and we'll lose a fortune.

And it was almost as if -- and there's no mechanism for it fortunately -- if ICANN could have sort of underwrote that so somebody could have actually said push the button and said, yes we will do it on December the 15th and once the dates there then things roll.

So it's - that was a sort of practical, perhaps a way forward in some of this. Yes. Thanks.

(David):   Any questions - yes, (Elisa) and then Kathy. Comments or questions?

(Elisa): So just to kind of add on to that. I think also the BC needs support more than just secretariat support but actual guidance with understanding, you know, the different policies and the different reports and the different comments that are out there that are open -- basically somebody to help act as a Sherpa but to kind of guide us.

And that's more than just sort of secretariat support, more than just somebody that's, you know, just scheduling the meetings and setting up the phone calls and, you know, making sure that the transcripts happen. I really think we need greater support probably from the policy department.

(David): Thank you. Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: Pretty different - different thoughts. Kathy Kleinman.

One is when people hold outreach events; this is more to each of us here rather than just to (David). When people hold outreach events, feel free to invite other constituencies and other stakeholder groups.

I was really, really happy when I went to NCSG event in Toronto, it was event for the local community. But there was a number of (unintelligible), Evans was - there were a number of people there. Stéphane was there from other constituencies and communities.

And I think that's a great precedent because there are questions that sometimes - one of the panels there was talking about (Unintelligible) Director which was a takedown that has been challenged, a takedown through ice in the United States. It was a rapid takedown and it was challenged.

The alternative then is a great discussion, and so not necessarily dead on in terms of ICANN policy, but certainly in terms of dominion policy.

A lot of great questions because there was a diversity in the audience; it was a great discussion. So, and we had never met her before, so that was great.

So you know, please expand your outreach events to include others.

A question or quest for (David) which is now I'm hearing about a lot of different things going around. And we need help; engagement, lots of things going on, lots of events. I'm now hearing about public notices I never saw and things happening in lots of different places.

And it's great. The train is moving and it's moving fast. But how we keep people who are all ready so engaged and so involved and so focused on the working group, on our review teams, on our tax forces to see the big picture so that we can even at a bullet point as that train rolls by and say, "Don't forget this or we tried that a dozen years ago," or something.

Then the last statement is staff. And this is kind of a media thing, and I'm speaking personally here and not for NCSG or anything you say.

But there seems to be an issue about neutrality of staff. I guess over the year this is something that we've learned. I think it goes way back before you (David). That sometimes staff wasn't as neutral as we might hope; there's been a growth in this.

In the Whois Review Team we had amazing staff; Olof Nordling and Alice Jansen. And we couldn't have done it without them; the way they held the pen as documents went around and a dozen people were editing. Completely neutral, absolutely neutral, religiously neutral.

But if that were part of the fabric of the discussion was neutrality, the assurance of neutrality, that no one's coming in to make policy. Obviously, you know, the policy is going to be left for the stakeholder groups and the constituencies. That was kind of built into the framework.

And then how to do that, how to assure that it might help provide some reassurance that would really - they're kind of the way my secretary is. She has no clue what's going on with all these acronyms. But the document looks a lot better when she finishes with it.

(David): I will - I think I must comment on that one because there we have to have specificity Kathy. Frankly, I was in a meeting in Toronto with a group and someone raised that in front of the Board Chairman about the skewed nature of the policy support that was given.

And when pressed the person said, "Oh that happened four and-a-half years ago." And when pressed, "What about now?" Well they couldn't come up with an example.

But the issue was that the particular statement before it was published was changed and then edited as if no one would notice the difference which was not the case. And it was just a comment of something happening some several years ago.

We looked into that, and of course we don't do that. But it's very important to say that under my regime at least, the staff is to be neutral and perceived that way. And so if you have any cases of or examples of to the contrary, you call me.

Kathy Kleinman: It's ancient history from a long time ago in the dark days. Long before you came and brought light.

But no seriously, I'm not trying to cast. I'm just trying - memories are long here. And so if that is part of the DNA and the fabric, just tell people, because I think it is.

(David):	No, that's very important especially with some new people coming on board they're assuming that there is something current in that. So thank you.

Bill Drake.

Bill Drake:	So we had quite a lot of discussions in SCUC about this topic because we're not used to having support. And so we all kind of went, "Well gee, what would that mean?" And we all kind of sat around and stared at each other and thought, "This will be a completely different universe."

We do have the support that's been put in place recently with the toolkit things and as I say those are all really great and we very much appreciate them. We very much appreciate having the Adobe Connect, the transcription, all that kind of stuff; that's fantastic. Help with elections, postings; they're really all really good.

Looking beyond that though, what would we need to grow and gage more effectively?

So one topic that of course has all ready come up and is a subject of some controversy internally, and I think what Kathy just said perhaps presages the point of secretarial support.

So some of us believe, I think, that we very much would need to go forward effectively to have some secretary support to do at a minimum the really kind of administrative work of keeping people on top of, you know, deadlines of public commentary and submissions of things, and notifications of ICANN wide things that effective all of us, etcetera, etcetera.

Support for perhaps getting people funneled into working groups as anticipated in the toolkit that I mentioned before, the difficulties that a lot of people have figuring out how to connect with one of those things.

At the same time, I think there is a feeling among some people that what we would most prefer would be to be given some ability to hire the kind of person that we would want to work with effectively. Or at least some have some say over the selection to ensure - because the needs of the different parts of the community are just quite different.

If you don't know the culture of civil society, and civil society organizations and what the global spread of actors is like, it's a lot harder to figure out how to support people who are doing that kind of work. So it would matter to us to have somebody who is in tune, you know, so (unintelligible) I guess would be the better word.

So that's one thing. Secretary support we would I think value, but it would have to be configured in a way that everybody was satisfied that somebody had met our needs.

Secondly, with regard to financial support, clearly a key thing for us is travel support. I don't really know what the status is of the plan that went into effect last year where the constituencies are each getting three travel slots for Fiscal Year 2013. I mean is that expected to continue? He's not heard anything at this point. Do you know?

(David): I think that would have to be - well we could talk to (Zabia) about that, but I think that was just for the one year because of the two ICANN meetings. So it could be a subject of additional requests within the SOAC.

Bill Drake: Okay. So for us it's especially important because one of the sad things about civil society is they don't make any money. So relative to all the colleagues who work in the private sector, you're talking about a lot of people who are often working pretty low-paid positions. And they're not really going to be a position to ever self-finance attending meetings on the other side of the planet.

And so if we want to engage them and grow their participation in working groups and all the other stuff, we've got to be able to get people to some meetings from time to time.

So that's certainly a big priority for us I think. Both, you know, at the ICANN meetings but also for doing outreach stuff like the IGF as we've discussed before.

Resources to do events; we've done a couple of very successful policy conferences. We've been able to raise funds externally from PIR and other sources that have supported these initiatives. But we also need a component of support from ICANN for the sites and so on.

We want to continue to do those kinds of things; people seem to find them useful. We want to be able to do Webinars. Again, I don't know how much resource is involved there but it's something that would need to be financed.

And then the outreach stuff. As I pointed out the other day, you know, we have a grown to 277 members without any support. So obviously it's not absolutely a barrier to not have any money, but certainly it couldn't hurt.

And obviously if we had an ability to have a structured program that had some - a little bit more resource minded, we could probably grow substantially faster and gage, and not just in bringing people in, but then get them plugged in and get them engaged in stuff. So that matters to us.

And then I guess the last thing if you ask, what do we need? Access to staff. In fame, to staff time and leadership time on the same terms as other stakeholders to be able to share our ideas and make sure that what we stand for, what we've advocated, what our positions have been are fully understood. And not just filtered through narratives, but fully understood directly from what we our self have put together.

So those, I guess, are the main points; secretary, money and access.

(David): Great. Thank you for the various heads of the stakeholder or constituency groups. We'll open up generally for any other comments or questions, and then I would have some comments.

(Mark)?

(Mark): I would point out that, you know, while if it is possible that some members of the IPC or BC or people in "the private sector," may generally, you know, make more money than people in so many other constituencies.

You know, we're not generally in the business of self financing our travel to ICANN meetings. Some members are fortunate enough to have - who are willing to partially or fully fund attendance at these meetings because it is beneficial for their clients' interests, but that is certainly the exception and not the norm.

And although we need to do a letter better than our colleagues in other constituencies, you know, we're not in the business of self-financing a trip to Dakar on a regular basis. Many of us, you know, don't have that financial ability to do that.

So I would just like to make that clear. So when we request funds for travel, you know, understand that the request in that context of, you know, we have to take time off work are significant challenges for us to even get time to attend. And the challenges become even greater when an addition to the time and the potential monitoring loss for taking time off work and attending, you know, the ability of most of us to self-finance just doesn't really exist.

(David): Very good. Hector and then John.

Hector Manoff: Only to compliment (Mark) in words. We have among our members we have a lot of small firms, law firms from Turkey, from Mexico, from different companies all over the world that they represent sometimes big companies, sometimes small companies that have all kinds of interest in ICANN or Internet.

It's like when they were asking what kind of members we have, we have a lot of these kinds of members. Yes, like a medium size or smaller firms that represents different clients that have interest in property and Internet.

(David):   Thank you Hector. John.

John Berard: John Berard from the Business Constituency. I don't want to get into an argument over what's more important, time or money, but I would say that I was intrigued at a secondary level by Fadi's comments about the deployment of new technology to support the project management at ICANN.

And I wonder in thinking about that, if he's as committed to deploying technology that would allow participation in a more regular fashion, and perhaps even take some of the pressure off feeling that one needs to be at the site of the meeting in order to effectively participate.

My personal experience over the last couple of years, I did not attend the meeting in Dakar. But I participated in every meeting from, you know, from my home during the course of that week.

I found the technology to support remote participation reasonable, but not enthusiastic. I had responsibilities that caused me to want to participate, I had an interest in some of the discussion which caused me to want to participate, but I didn't feel - at this point I don't feel that the remote participation embraces participation.

And so I would encourage the continued investigation, identification and deployment of technology, not just for ICANN staff use, but for the advantage for the community and perhaps we could reduce the organization's carbon footprint in terms of having to fly all those people to all those meetings.

(David): Thank you John. Any other comments? Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sure other BC members have spoken, but I'm going to, I think, speak about something that hasn't been perhaps in my mind, identified sufficiently. And I think other constituencies and stakeholder representatives will perhaps want to comment about this.

Participating in ICANN whether it's remotely or in person, and managing the process - so the people who are here at the session in many cases are officers or designated representatives - and if they're not an officer, they're obviously a leader or heavily involved usually in their own community.

There is a human factor - human resource cost factor to the work we do that I really don't feel like ICANN really understands at all, (David). And that means that when we come as executive committees, to (Exec Coms) to an ICANN meeting, we're continuing to consult remotely and consult on sites around things that are happening.

And ICANN gives us no support at all for that, in the sense of there are no extra rooms - side bar rooms that you can - those of us that are active in the IGF are very familiar with the fact that a few extra small rooms are scheduled under available, you can book them. You know, they are ad hoc available.

So I just think ICANN hasn't recognized that, you know, running a constituency or stakeholder group is a huge amount of human coordination and resource commitment on our part - even if ICANN puts additional resources into it. So that's one point.

The second point is that it would really be helpful if ICANN significantly approved the Internet café approach so that if we needed to be able to print something out which we often need to do, we could do that.

And then I think we'd probably - I'm going to say this as tactfully as I can - it would be really helpful if when a member of the community wanders into the backroom or the press room, if people didn't run screaming from the room and chase them out of the room. You know, if we just sort of gently nudge them out of the room. I think...

(David):   We have a laser for that.

Marilyn Cade: I think one of my members is still in shock. And it was just a, "Oh my God, you're a member of the community! Why are you in here?"

You know, I think we need to learn more. And by the way, I think I'll take this opportunity to compliment the generosity and welcoming nature of the ICANN staff who have been here.

But you know, in some cases there's additional - and maybe it's not a big deal, right. Just put in a couple of printers, make sure there's papers, you know, so people could do ad hoc printing, etcetera.

But in another case, I think it is a little bit of big deal. And that is, you know, what can we - we're going to be making more demands on the media requirements. And I'm not trying to project for everyone else, but you know, I think it maybe something to kind of think about.

(David):   Other comments along those lines or other comments?

Okay, in terms of how best to operationalize this, I think we - I'm looking at it in really two parts. One is the possibility through the SOAC requests that may

indeed be good to kind of echo some of the issues that you're talking about. That in particular I'll point out travel let's say.

I know in this fiscal year, we were able to increase the travel allotments to the various groups. The rationale was quite clearly getting those leaders to the meeting to help them organize and do their work. And - but that was again because of the nature of the request and annual event.

And so I would say you would have to give that some consideration going forward because eventually, there is going to be a decision of how do we put into a regularized part of the budget. And so the more you can - maybe don't quote me - but the more that you can show that this has been working and helpful, that's the better way to regularize that into the budget. And so that would be I think very helpful.

In terms of secretary, I would like to turn it back to the group and ask a little more detail about that. I know Glen doesn't have quadruplets, we can't clone her. But are you talking about that type of level of support or that type of support when you say secretary support?

Marilyn Cade: I think we may each be a little more individualized. So I'll just talk about the BC okay.

We have a part time secretary that is really is thought of as an administrative support person, not a substance person. And I will personally mug anyone who tries to hire her away from us.

She works only part-time for us. And I think our view is we're going to need more time. She does our Web site, she does a number of things for us.

But our needs for secretarial support in that case, we're looking for administrative support to the constituency, to the officers. There's a different underneath term for this, I think (Lisa) probably talked about this.

I think there's a different kind of support that we also think is needed that might be more of a policy support officer, and I don't know what the term - something like that. I don't think that's a full-time need, but I think others might have as well.

This is not to compete with the counselors or compete with the advisory policy coordination, but someone - the more your community grows, the more you need help to be able to coordinate, draw them in, help them get up to speed on finding documents, etcetera. And familiar with policy is an experience set while administrative coordination brings other experience set.

We've all ready talked about the need for financial support. We prefer to hire our own and supervise our own administrative support person. But we do think ICANN should under-ride or contribute to that.

I will say, my own view not well developed fully within the BC, is that a policy support person could be shared within an SG and I would see no reason why that person couldn't be on the ICANN table or be a contractor. But I think there has to be a clear understanding that they report to the people that they are supporting similar to the understanding that exists today in the BC NSO that (Bart) is accountable to the BC NSO even though he is an ICANN staff person.

Bill Drake: That is the ideal that we would like as well. and I can tell you that, like for example, in the OECD, the OECD after the (unintelligible) process and after their 2008 Internet Summit in Soule, decided that they really wanted to become more multi-stakeholder in their discussion of Internet governance.

And they long had of course the business industry advisory committee and the trade union advisory committee. And they went ahead and established a civil society advisory committee and advisory committee for the technical community, the (I-Star) people.

And the Soule society people have somebody that they hire who is under their management. Who gets - they get some resources for that, they raise other resources to complement, and that person works for them and is fully in sync with what the leadership of the coalition that works in that organization is doing. And it works very, very effectively and it avoids any kind of conflict of interests or, you know, who you are reporting to and all those kinds of questions.

And so I think the model that Marilyn is talking about is really - maybe it sounds a little bit harder than that, but it actually works fairly well given the differences amongst our constituencies.

(David):   (Mark).

(Mark):   I think for the IPC, you know as I mentioned before, I think we have less need for the administrative support...

(David):   I'm sorry, again; I missed that.

(Mark):   I said as I mentioned before, you know, for the IPC we have less need for the administrative support. You know, we can handle that ourselves and hopefully Web site support as far as managing our membership and so forth.

But the area that the secretary would be more helpful to us would be in helping us organize our responses to, you know, various documents and policy stances that we would take.

So I think in following what Marilyn said, to be able to hire somebody to support in that regard. You know, I don't know that we need a full-time person, but somebody who would have substantial time to dedicate to interfacing with our various members and helping us collect a various

viewpoints and help us coordinate our responses to various ICANN issues. That would probably be the most helpful I think.

As far as having a person who is on ICANN staff and is kind of responsible to the constituency, you know, I told an idea like that to several people last night at the cocktail reception, but I think that's probably kind of a separate position as opposed to a secretary, someone who's maybe a policy advocate, which I'm in favor of. That would be very useful to actually have a policy advocate for each constituency group that is on ICANN staff.

And I think that would maybe facilitate certain decision making within ICANN as direct access to a person who's actually advocating for constituency group.

But you know, back to the secretarial, I - you know, pretty much in agreement with Marilyn.

(David): Yes, but that's an important difference. I think the constituencies are the advocates of their position, and they don't need a staff person from ICANN to advocate that position. But I want to hear what you're saying on this.

I was hearing from Marilyn this would be a person who would be able to say, "Oh, we have a public comment or we have a working group input needed for that." That person would coordinate from within the constituency the views, the inputs, and then help create and push the document to ICANN forward for public comment.

Man: Maybe beyond the - we usually use (unintelligible) or the vice-chair, Steve may drive a process that would be on the call, they might do the first draft, make sure all of the inputs of the various members. But they would not be an advocate. We assume that the members are the advocates. That's why I called it a policy support officer or policy support.

I don't know which (Mark) - I didn't understand if (Mark) was saying...

(Mark): I was saying the advocate would be, to the extent there is one, that would be something separate from the secretarial. The secretary would be along the lines of what you said.

((Crosstalk))

(David): Oh, okay. I'm sorry, I misunderstood.

(Mark): Yes, assisting in preparing the drafts, coordinating all these means of course. You know, the constituency would have the final say in what's actually submitted because that person would just be working for the constituency. But just to have that support to reduce the really heavy burden that exists on the members right now to actually take time from their schedule and create all the various drafts and to keep track of all the deadlines, some of which change frequently.

To have one person who is responsible for that, to be able to communicate with the constituency and say, "Look, this may change, or here's a date, I've only heard from these people, I need to hear from these other people. Here's a draft of what a person's (AUF) has told me, you know, let me know if, you know, if this draft is along the lines of where the situation stands and we'll move towards a more final draft for the constituency's approval."

That would take a substantial burden off our shoulders and I think allow us to I think much more effectively to communicate and engage with ICANN.

(David): Okay, got it. Robin.

Robin Gross: My name is Robin Gross, I'm the Chair in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder's Group. And I can tell you what some of our basic needs are. Bill had

mentioned travel support to get to these meetings and I think that's definitely one of the most important things.

Just simply having the bodies at the meetings, the people who are participating in the working groups, being able to get them to the actual ICANN meeting, meet the other people in the working group, forms some coalitions and alliances, the kinds of things that, you know, happen in hallways and over cocktails and these kinds of discussions where people can work together in a real ad-hoc way tend to be really helpful.

And so it's really important to us to get bodies at the meetings. And without travel support, there's no way that we can - none of our members can finance their own way to these meetings. So that's really important.

The other issue is secretarial support. I think the non-commercial users are just about the only stakeholder group or rather constituency that doesn't have some kind of secretarial support internally. So we have to do everything ourselves.

And that takes an enormous amount of time and energy that frankly should be spent on policy development and engaging our members, growing the community. But we have to spend our time on things like getting transcripts on the Web site and getting agendas together.

And these sources - really secretarial things that absolutely must be done but there's nobody to do it. So I have to do it and it takes an enormous out of time.

So I would say secretarial support is one our biggest priorities in the NCSG.

And also resources like membership database. I know I've talked with a number of staff members about this before and I think we're on some possible solutions for us.

But again, simple, very basic things like a data base that integrates our membership everything from the time they apply to the time their accepted to each year when they have to check in and all of these different processes. Having them all put in one managed, integrated place would be enormously helpful.

Because we spend so much time trying to just track down these simple details that we have technology now days, so just all these things. So let's use that.

So I think these would be three of the most important things that we see in NCSG meetings. Thank you.

(David): Yes, (Tony).

(Tony): Thanks, but I don't know whether anyone's talking for the ISP.

(David): Some other, please go ahead.

(Tony): Okay. Certainly our views go inside with a lot of others here. The secretary support is number one for us without any doubt.

And for us, I don't think it should be a surprise for everyone, ISP has a specific travel budget for ICANN. That's always been an issue for us. They will have a budget to attend various meetings and they are always in conflict; there is never enough budgets to cover everything.

And there's also conflicts on time as well. Having the travel budget has really given us continuity that we've never had before. We get people now can commit and follow through meeting after meeting because that takes away that continue about spreading yourself around.

So that's certainly the - also I would suggest it's probably on the same level as secretarial support. It's absolutely essential if we want to be effective and have that continuity.

The issue of policy support is certainly welcome, but it should never be for us a priority over those over two (unintelligible).

(David): Thank you (Tony). Any other comments? Ms. Cade.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm just looking at (Stephen), (Lisa) and (Chris) who may have all ready spoken about this. But if no one has, you can stop me after I tell you what the topic is.

I think most of you by now are bored by getting copies of the BC's lovely newsletter that (Chris) is really the chief architect for.

We started the newsletter though because ICANN has no suitable materials at all that can be used with the general population regardless whether they're business people or they're NGOs or they're civil society or they're governments. In terms of, you know, you can't just hand date a newsletter that has a bunch of links and call the newsletter to a minister your meeting with or a CEO or a policy person.

Providing general useful, informative materials that can be used by everyone to update about things that are happening, I think (David), it's really a missing - I'm not talking about putting a spin on it, right. But I think right now we're really missing the kinds of layman written content.

And we will in our SOAC request be putting in again - I just want to mention it to others who are here. We get a small amount of funding to help pay for the cost of printing but we do all the content. But I just want to mention it for others who are here in case that is something they also think is a very important resource to them.

So it's not the content, but it is a little bit of money to help us to actually be able to do layouts and pay for the general things than just the printing.

(David):   On occasion Marilyn, if I can ask you, you probably do use some of the ICANN documents or inputs if you're trying to - in other words, cut and paste or do you write everything?

Marilyn Cade: We write everything. And I'll say as an example, the ICANN staff could not build this (jargon). Because there's actually no central place at ICANN that tracks - to Robin's view point.

The only way that Chris knows that this is occupied, if he goes and meets with the Chair. Because most of the constituencies in the SGs just don't have the resources to even have that information.

So it's not a criticism, it's just, you know, we haven't been resourced and the other SOs may not share the need that this SO has.

(David):   Any other comments? This has been helpful.

I've been - I think you should - in terms of the BC Newsletter, other groups if they look at that they should try to see if that could be helpful and if it adjusts for your work.

We do have some - there was a small allocation in the FY13 budget for this. And if you want that to continue, I think one might want to comment on that. Because that would be a way of using those materials or if you wanted to have them translated or whatever, I think that's a good vehicle and you can build upon that vehicle because you could also make it available online as well as in hard copy as you see fit.

The other element I think would be helpful to mention, and people were talking about, Webinars or some sort of informational video or other ways to promote your constituencies and what you do.

This has been a concern for me in particular, if you will, more people looking at who are the constituencies and stakeholders? What do they do and how do they work? This is very important as we're trying to grow and fit people or new comers into that, how best to do that.

And so this is something I want you to kind of think about when you talk about the SOAC budgets to build on. Some of what I call promotional material and online materials that could do that including, now that you're talking about it, some sort of membership data management. That might be helpful or a membership data tool that could help with communicating, tracking - I'm not sure.

Marilyn Cade: (David), this made me remember this. I'm looking around to see who may have been.

There was a proposal before from the staff to create a unified membership database that the BC did not support and had concerns about the PLI issues, etcetera. So I think - I just want to check with Robin, but I think what the question is managing your own members...

(David): I'm sorry. No, that's what I was referring - that type of tool that you could use. Sorry; no, no, not centralized. That you could use or some other tools that we tool at.

You also mentioned Webinars, and that might be something we should look although you might want to talk about or mention that in the SOAC budget as part of the media and promotion of the work you do and all because that could be a helpful way to communicate with your members.

Or that this is mentioned about policy support, have a member of the policy team, the subject matter expert, be on call. We've done this somewhat with some other groups in ICANN to explain Whois or IRTP and things like this. And that could be a way to help generate interest and/or comment or organize and focus.

Someone said, "What does it mean here? What does it mean to us to be involved with that working group?"

That might also be an element for the working groups to encourage the support of that, have the Chair of the working group have Mikey kind of have a little talk about what this all means and use that type of Webinar to generate after the participation.

Yes?

Mikey O'Connor: It's Mikey again back from neutral and all.

I want to put in a plug for working groups again. And that is that remember that this is all fine. But from my jaundiced view, this is overhead. You know, it's a lovely thing and I'm delighted you do what you do.

But the work of the working groups is different than this. Working groups don't need newsletters. Working groups need a couple of things that we don't really do very well right now.

Back to Fadi's point; he's out recruiting all kinds of new folks in the value chain to come pouring into this model. And we dump them into working groups with absolutely no training, with absolutely no background with what's going on.

I'm writing one right now that's got a bunch of relatively new members of the ICANN community and they're just blown away by what's going on because

we're right in the middle of a pretty activity group. A lot of emails going back-and-forth, they don't know what to make of this.

There's also - and now speaking personally as a Chair, not much in the way of sort of council for me. I mean Marika is fabulous, you know, she plays in that rock band with the guitar. And she's a brain surgeon, she's very good at that. She's raising 17 orphans and takes time out to do ICANN work as well.

But when I'm stuck in a situation as Chair where I would really like to have a sounding voice, there's really no where to go.

And so there's a whole layer of thinking and support for both member of working groups and leaders of working groups that is the thing I'm thinking about when I talk to Fadi and say, "Look, in the value chain there are some weaknesses in the working group."

I think I will promise that I will only do this rant one more time when the Board is here.

(David):   Thank you. Would someone else? Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow with the Business Constituency.

                 Mikey, I just wanted to come back on your comment because like everybody we heard your (unintelligible) and it brought tears to our eyes. But it inspired us. And I for one have been trying to bring people into working groups, people outside of the community as we know it.

                 Let me tell you where I am. I've mentioned it to people, I forwarded Glen's request for IRTP-D which is a reasonable entry point. I sent it out to various people both young and old.

I followed it up with telephone calls and what people have said to me - and this is (unintelligible), "Oh well, you know, there's no letter." "Yes, but you can join and you don't have to do too much."

And they ask, "What if I pull out half way through?" And I don't tell them what the real attrition rates on working groups are. When you look at the number of people on the list, you know there are actually, you know. So they will be in normal company, but they see it from the outside that expecting once you start something, you've got to finish something.

So it just occurs to me two things. One, turning Glen's document, Glen's request into something more attractive with more explanation around it. And two, maybe some sort of observer status on the working group or something where people feel, "I'm on my first one, I can do that and not too much will be expected of me." And then the second one they'll be into their feet.

Mikey O'Connor: If it's okay (David), let me just...

(David): Yes, please.

Mikey O'Connor: We're co-conspirators in this. Let me build on that just a little bit.

Because, you know, in addition to sort of the observer. You know, what would be nice is to give people more runway to come into this so that they don't just splash in to the deep end right away.

So maybe there's sort of a little program that says, "Okay, you're new to ICANN, you're new member of the BC or any of the other constituencies, and here is sort of the normal progression to get you up to speed to being in a working group. Expect to take a year or two at this."

Your first time you might be an observer and there might be something built into the working group process where there was sort of separate observer

meetings so that when the observers are going, "What in the heck is going on here?"

Then they don't have to stick their hand up in the middle of a working group call and ask that. They know that the Chair or maybe some other people in the constituency can take those questions offline.

And then, you know, there's sort of a gradiated progression so that at the end of this process, they haven't put in - because an hour a week or two or whatever it is isn't a lot of time. So maybe it's less time per week over a fair amount of time.

And then at the end of that they've sort of got the tools they need to really dive into the next one. I think that's a fantastic idea.

(David):   Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I applaud Mikey's enthusiasm about working groups and I also applaud the amount of time he spends on them.

But I will just say that I think it is, the working group model, as important as it is, I think it does need a little more on-ramping and off-ramping as Mikey said, right. But I also think we have to be realistic about how burdensome the time commitment is.

I did an audit of the participation in some of the working groups about two years ago. And there would be 60 to 70 people signed up for them, there might even be some names that you would recognize.

And some of the people - I'm not going to look at Glen - some of the people attended zero meetings, some attended two. Some attended three meetings and voted on something.

So I think maybe we need to, you know, I think maybe Mikey is sort of saying, "Remember we have a vehicle." We also need to think about whether all working groups are created equal because some working groups might be largely informational, right, and not preparatory to a PDP process.

So maybe it's more, you know, trying to think through taking some of the - but also going back and asking our members who've been on working groups. The review team experience is also (unintelligible) where in some cases, if you look at the statistics, less than half of the members have been unable to regularly attend.

It may be that two-hour conference calls twice a week, or you know, maybe there are other models of doing work in more concentrated buckets just as we've done a lot of work in a concentrated bucket here.

I certainly could not have devoted this much time over a month and-a-half trying to complete with - so I think there's some goals and then some hills. But I think it probably takes - or some kind of mineral.

(David): Any other comments or questions? Let me then just raise, you know, I think the focus here would - I appreciate the comments for needs and resources and staffing to support what you're doing. We're keeping a list of that which we will take on. Please be aware of the fact that SOAC request is a good vehicle for that.

In terms of another area to think before we go on break, and we have the CFO at 3:30 to talk about FY14 budget and that SOAC budget request, to think as we're trying to operationalize what (Sally Costerson) said about the stakeholder side in the regions. That is again, something to consider.

But I think it might be better attached to the strategies of the regional groups when they come out, which I haven't seen them, to see where there might be synergy mapping or linkages there for your various groups. And so that would

kind of be a separate track. I don't want to divert you from the FY14 budget or your other needs.

And of course we're listening too because we as a department have to create our budget, and we're sensitive to growing needs and growing demands as well even though the policy budget is mostly people and not projects, and the travel budget is apart from that. And so you have to make sure to put in your ideas for the travel funding.

With that I want to thank you for that. We want to kind of focus on the secretarial support that you need to help your stakeholders and constituencies participate more deeply, more fully in the working groups and/or the other requirements of ICANN for comments, public comments and inputs. Travel was an important one as well.

Meeting support was another area mentioned. Ideally in the perfect world, if we had a large conference center, we would provide each stakeholder and constituency group with a place, an office or something like that to meet on an ad hoc basis to use. And I see that as important.

And also what type of online tools, membership tools, database, management tools, communication tools might indeed help your work and make it automatic if you will, and less human intensive. And there of course, we hope to tap (Chris Gift) and some of the other groups that he deals with to seeing if My ICANN, next phase or other kind of tools that we are beginning to see here in ICANN internally, might be applicable or useable for your groups.

And so with that, I thank you for these inputs which we've collected and luckily we'll be able to track that way.

And we now ask for a break until 3:30 when the CTO will come over. Then we have the wrap-up session from 4:30 to 5:00. And then at 5:00 pm here in

this room, the board meeting here with us, and then there's a reception in the cafeteria, the café after that. And that would be the completion of our day.

So with that I thank you very much for your input and comments. We have a break until 3:30.

END