

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
December 15, 2014
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me, I would like to find all participants at this time the conference is now being recorded. If you have any objections please disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCPH Intercessional Planning call taking place on Friday, December 05, 2014 at 4:00 pm UTC.

On the call today we have Rafik Dammak, Rudi Vansnick, Marilyn Cade, Elisa Cooper, Jimson Olufuye, Steve Metalitz and Bill Drake.

From staff we have Rob Hogarth and myself, Benedetta Rossi. We have apologies from Tony Holmes.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Rob.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you, Benedetta. This is Rob Hogarth for the record. Greetings, everyone. Thank you, Marilyn, for that suggestion for how to start things. Benedetta, if you - thank you - put up the agenda.

Fairly action-packed agenda, fairly standard things for us all to chat about today. We're going to update you on - we'll just (unintelligible) where we are, that should be relatively brief.

The key element of this call is to discuss, review and revise the draft meeting agenda. Based on our conversations today I'll come out with a version 3 of that document. Thank you, Benedetta, for circulating version 2 the other day.

And then I'd like to, I mean, I'd floated out this concept - topic chairs in the program agenda. I wanted to talk about that just a little bit, see if you all like that I idea. I just think it would be important to have some coordination and some leadership on the various discussion sections. Then it would be great to have the members of this group or others that you designate sort of run some of those topics after the chair and the rest.

Then any other business and we can chat about when our next call will be. Does anyone have anything else they would like to add to the agenda? Great, hearing nothing we'll proceed to this. And, you know, under any other business if anything crops up we'll address it.

In terms of an update on logistics the most important thing that we still need from the staff perspective is a complete list of delegates from the various groups. I have partial lists from just about everybody so far. We'll need to follow up Tony; I don't have anything from the ISPs yet.

I had some - I've been on the run so I don't know, Steve, if - I'll be checking my email to see if you can provide any clarification. I think I sent you a note back on your list of folks.

I understand from the NCUC perspective there's an election going on so there'll be some additional names. Rafik, I think you're the only one who's totally complete at the moment. I need one or two more folks on the BC side confirming that you've all agreed that you're going to add three additional non-travel supported participants per stakeholder group. That means we need another name or two from some folks.

So that's tracking well but if we can close that loop as soon as possible that would work out great. We've got the travel team engaged with the current list so folks should be receiving notices very soon about travel arrangements there.

Obviously they're in the throws of internal adjustments and changes with respect to the changes in meeting location for ICANN 52 from Marrakesh to Singapore so it's a rather stressful time and the quicker we have a finalized list, a complete finalized list the more calm and focused our constituency travel team will be.

Obviously my concern would be any deeper issues that folks have so we'll want to identify those as soon as we possibly can.

The only other major gap that we have is finalizing the actual hotel room block. I'm meeting later today with Stacy Hoffberg from our meetings team. We chatted earlier this week and she thought that we would be able to conclude her negotiations by the end of this week.

If you don't see a notice out from me today or tomorrow I'm hopeful that no later than next Monday or Tuesday we'll have information about that. Regardless Stacy will crank that in with respect to her planning with the

constituency travel team so that'll all be part of the package but she's still negotiating the final costs of the room block.

As many of you would appreciate, that time is now shaping up to be a quite challenging one from a hotel space perspective in Washington DC because we've got a new congress and were some substantial changes in terms of incumbents leaving and the rest so we've got a lot of new folks in Washington whose families are all I guess coming those couple of weeks.

In terms of the meeting space we're still on and everything is tracking well with CSIS. Steve, your point about are we going to be able to do some video? It looks like they've got all those hookups ready and shaped up.

We're going to have two technical folks herding us from a meeting team perspective so I think we'll be in pretty good shape not only for audio but for - for video capabilities during the plenary session and during the big topic. Probably aren't going to be able to do that in the breakout rooms and the rest.

But that should cover us for a good half of the schedule for folks who want to observe remotely via video so we'll have one or two cameras in the room. And then of course all discussions are going to be (polycoms) and phone capabilities so that we'll have audio coverage for the meetings.

Benedetta, am I leaving anything out? That's everything I have on my list.

Marilyn Cade: Rob, it's Marilyn. I have one clarifying question.

Bill Drake: And I'm in the queue.

Rob Hogarth: And I heard somebody else asking to be in the queue?

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hogarth: ...that was Bill. Okay. Yes, Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you for this great summary. I think things really are progressing on the logistics side. And I look forward to our further conversation as we plan content further. My clarifying question, so we have video streaming in the plan; we have audio connection for the breakout rooms. Will we also have transcripts?

Rob Hogarth: If we have recordings, yes, we will provide transcripts. I think that will - if all of you would like that that would be a standard transparency issue and certainly from an openness perspective so you all can review, you know, what you've discussed. So, yeah, we'll make those available. Thanks for the question, Marilyn.

Bill, you're next.

Bill Drake: Okay. Thanks, Rob, and hi everybody. First, we are like a month away from travel I think and have not heard anything from constituency travel. And I know you say that they're working on it but we're getting a little bit concerned because our people are all over. We just were discussing with one of our councilors online yesterday and he was saying he doesn't think he's going to be able to come because he can't get visa clearance in time.

And so this is going to be a problem. This was something I predicted before when I was expressing concern about the timing. We could also run into this with a couple of the people, depending on what happens with the election in NCUC, there as well.

So something - I hope, number one that they really are going to start to move on the travel planning part. And I don't know if there's anything that they can do to accelerate visa clearance issues but if not we're going to have to figure out some way to reallocate our slots, etcetera. So we're getting jammed up by virtue of this dynamic of waiting.

Second and related point was I had asked in one of my emails and also written to you separately, about whether people were doing Wednesday outreach events. I thought that Marilyn had said at one point she was doing something in the CSG side. I thought that I had heard that NPOC was doing something. I didn't know whether others are doing something.

But that - if we were to do one too, if others were, that would affect our departure dates. And so when constituency travel does come back to us we're going to need to know what to tell them about that. So it would be good if I could - and maybe that's an AOB thing for later but it does impact the travel aspect. And we need to get the travel moving. So just to put all those points on the table.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks very much, Bill. We'll - since Benedetta and I are here in Los Angeles this we'll do some immediate follow ups after we get off this call with the constituency travel team to expedite the work that they're working on.

With respect to the Wednesday sessions, I think those of you who have been talking about that have been in touch with Christopher Mondini and we've been working through a number of those.

And, you know, maybe we can do, you know, a separate conversation, Bill. But I thought that we - you, me and Christopher, had settled on our

Wednesday morning activity. I know that I worked with Christopher to get a meeting space that you all had been looking for. So I thought that was on track so let's call him up on that separately.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: ...Rob, it was some further questions and didn't get a reply and that's why I wasn't clear whether we were doing it.

Rob Hogarth: Okay great. Thanks. We'll itemize those so that we close the loop on that stuff today because, yeah, those arrangements are being or have been made. So...

Bill Drake: Okay, so we can assume that we would be leaving then Wednesday if flights out are available, Thursday if not if we're doing the Wednesday thing.

Rob Hogarth: Correct. The strategy that I have attempted to employ there for all of you is the recognition that we need a full day Tuesday because of the challenges of getting back to certain regions of the world. There may simply not be flights available certainly that evening and so folks who don't even have something until the next day will certainly be covered.

And then for those of you who are planning for things the next day we'll, you know, sort of have the same set of circumstances. The hope is that folks will be able to leave later in the day on Wednesday and that's why we focused on many of you having some early morning or, you know, mid-day meetings that next day on Wednesday. So thanks for bringing that up, Bill. Appreciate it.

Anybody else with comments or questions on the logistics side? Okay I just had two final points on that. And thank you, Marilyn, for helping out on the Markus side. I know that you were talking to him. We've got, you know, the

potential slots for the Board member, Markus, and for the NCA, Dan. And I was concerned that we might have a gap there.

I had not spoken directly with Dan. If we want to continue to proceed with that, I don't know of any of the others of you have mentioned that to him in the context of other discussions but if not I'm more than happy to extend the invitation right after we get off this call. Has anyone been in touch with Dan about the possibility of this meeting? Hearing none I will give it a follow up with him this morning here in Los Angeles.

And otherwise, Marilyn, you had spoken with Markus so I passed on his name and information as well to...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Rob Hogarth: ...constituency travel...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Great and I did speak to him again. I was located with him in Geneva. Bill, we missed seeing you in a couple of instances. But Markus is - says, in his usual swift diplomatic way, this could be very feasible. So he is waiting to be contacted but he did indicate the timing would work out.

Rob Hogarth: Great.

Bill Drake: Yes, I had had that conversation a couple weeks prior and mentioned in an email as well. I had a death in the family so I had to miss the IGF meetings.

Rob Hogarth: Great, well I will follow up with Dan then. This is Rob. And we'll make sure that Markus gets the information as well. Constituency travel has that so they may have already begun that process.

I understand in terms of additional ICANN activities that there is - and I think I shared this with you, Steve, there is the potential for an additional meeting of the working group responsible for the IANA stewardship transition. That may be taking place in Washington DC around the same time of this meeting.

And that may help in terms of either additional folks who are looking to identify or last minute substitutes if there are in fact difficulties last minute with travel or things like that. So there are a number of other things I think taking place in the ICANN arena or universe that week that may either be synergistic with what we're doing that week or complicating. I'm not sure which but we're trying to keep track and observe them and if I get more details I'll certainly pass them on to you all.

Let me see, just in terms of looking here at my list, that's everything. Rafik, you had your hand up? Did you want to make a comment as well, sir?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Rob. Thanks for the update. I mean, as Bill expressed the concern, I mean, I understand you are saying that we are going to get - be contacted soon by the constituency travel. But, I mean, we need the more clear date.

It's like one month, it's - there isn't (unintelligible) holidays, be sure about the dates so I can take - I can ask for day off, I mean, you know. So, you know, this kind of thing. For other people it's really about the visa and US visa takes time because just to get the - I mean, to set up the interview it takes weeks. And after the processing and clearance takes weeks too. So it's - can be late for many people. And we have to figure out who can be the replacement. It's

this kind of putting a lot of, I mean, pressure and to figure out and this short timeframe.

So you mentioned about the cross community working group - not the cross community working group, I think the - I think that period of time for some reason also deadline for - to submit the proposal to the ICG. Just wondering if it may impact the different groups because people will maybe get busy in the cross community working group to submit in time. So I don't think we thought prior to that about such impact. But, yes, maybe we need to have that in mind if - about changing date or whatever so.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks very much, Rafik. I'll give - I'll make sure that I give you no - as a group no later than Monday any updates. Although you all will be getting the direct contacts from constituency travel. I'll give you all an update on Monday in terms of where, from my perspective and what they're telling me we've got...

Marilyn Cade: Rob...

Rob Hogarth: ...I hope by then we'll have heard from folks. Marilyn, is that you?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, it is. We perhaps might not want to do it here but I really feel the urgency of taking up this issue of which countries are likely to have problems and maybe having that information sent to you so that where possible, you know, direct contact can be made.

In some countries, as Rafik said, the appointment period is very long. And then in others people actually have to travel to another city to even try to get a visa. So maybe we could take that up - people could send the countries that they anticipate having trouble with directly to you by email and the priority

could be focused on that for the - in the interaction with the constituency travel group.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you, Marilyn. This is Rob. That's an excellent suggestion. So clearly in your case, Bill, since you mentioned there are some specific ones please let us know.

Bill Drake: Yeah, to just illustrate, Amr is Egyptian, lives in Europe and needs to have his passport in order to apply for the visa to go to Singapore. So he can't give it up in order, you know, send it off to the Americans and wait because he has to do the Singapore thing so that's why all the stuff is getting jammed up, you know? So...

Rob Hogarth: Thank you. Yeah, I'll send (Joseph) to that issue so we'll flag Amr's name so that (Joseph) is ready to do some problem solving in that respect. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Thanks. And thanks, Marilyn.

Rob Hogarth: Anything else from a logistical questions? We had some other comments in the chat which we will present with respect to State Department and visa, matters that (Laurie) and Steve are making. Thank you.

Okay let's turn - we're at 8:20, let's turn to the meeting agenda. I shared with you all a revised document version 2 trying to capture the various email comments that you all shared over the last week and a half or so. What I did - thank you, Benedetta, for circulating it, I did on a redline basis so you'd say changes and not have to read through the whole document although I'd be happy to make adjustments, play around or discuss with you all other aspects of the agenda behind the topics.

But I tried to capture your suggestions that I think were supported by Steve, Bill, that you made, with respect to the Topic 1, the first session on Monday morning. And you'll see in other places I just flagged some other thoughts with respect to topic sessions 2, 3 and 4.

What I'd like to do is open the floor to any reaction, comments, further clarification or refinement of some of these slides. As you start thinking about what you might want to say there I'll introduce another potential complication here in that as some of you know, Christopher Mondini has been flooded with requests from other parts of Washington DC once they heard that Fadi was going to be in town and he's been working very hard with Jamie Hedlund to try to identify opportunities for Fadi to talk that don't affect our meeting.

One potential complication we've had - and I think - I don't know that it's been confirmed, having chatted with Chris in the last couple of days, Fadi is going to have some remarks I believe at the US Chamber early on Monday morning.

Someone at some point I think had posited, gee, should, you know, delegates be given the opportunity to go down and watch Fadi's speech. And should we - would that then potentially delay the opening? I don't know if folks have some initial thoughts about that but I think we had potentially some flexibility in the agenda if some folks wanted to do that.

I'm raising it just as a potential logistical item that would affect the agenda. But I confess that I don't have the latest and greatest information as of this morning but that's something that I'll run down with Chris.

Some of you may have heard some other things in your other conversations with Chris and can provide some more detail there. But I want to raise that just as one potential impact on the agenda.

Marilyn Cade: Rob, it's Marilyn.

Rob Hogarth: Yes, Marilyn. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you for updating us with this information. My own view is that from the Business Constituency's perspective I had a very brief conversation with Tony Holmes recently but did not confirm this particular topic. But my sense is from the business community perspective that we would like to be in the audience as observers when Fadi speaks, but I'm only one of the Business reps on the phone so others should speak up as well.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you. Any other comments to that? Because, I mean, one of the things we could potentially do there is - and we don't have to decide this at this moment or on this call but as you all think about that one of the potential activities could be to say let's have the early Monday morning session focus on individual community leading and that would be the case then folks could decide whether they want to do that or not.

The other alternative of course would be once we confirm with Chris, yes Fadi's doing it and here's the times he's doing it, then just crank that into the agenda, make that an open period and either start and take a break or just delay the start of things until folks get back from that session.

Steve Metalitz: Rob, this is Steve. You don't seem to be using the Adobe Connect for the queue so could you put Bill and me in the queue, please?

Rob Hogarth: Yeah, thank you very much. Yes, I'm in a hotel room and there's not the greatest connectivity. It is only the United States and Los Angeles, California as you'd expect...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hogarth: Steve, since you noted that please, you go first and then Bill. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: No, Bill had his hand up first so, Bill.

Rob Hogarth: Okay.

Bill Drake: Go ahead, Steve, I've already spoken.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. Well, just a couple of things. First, on that last point about the Chamber, I don't - I'm not that enthusiastic about taking time from our agenda so we can sit in a room listening to Fadi speak to a large group. I thought that was one thing we kind of wanted to get away from in this meeting.

So, I mean, others may feel differently about it but I don't find that that would - I don't think that that would be that valuable and could be pretty disruptive of the rest of the schedule.

The other point that I wanted to make is - and by the way I think this draft agenda, strawman agenda, is very helpful. And I think our problem now is to kind of figure out which topics go where. And one aspect of that is to try to identify which topics we think are basically just for the delegates to discuss and which ones we want someone from ICANN or possibly outside to come and join us.

Because logistically if we can group those - the, you know, no outsider topics and the topics where we want to invite some briefing or participant from the staff or otherwise, that's logistically easier.

I think I know how some of that sorts looking on the list on the last page. For example, the NCPH procedure in-house issues I presume those probably aren't ones where we need a lot of input from the staff. But one that I wasn't really clear on, and I would welcome other people's thoughts on it, is the ICANN accountability issue.

Is this - this is something that there's been a lot of interest in discussing but it's not clear to me whether we want to discuss it mostly amongst ourselves or do we want to bring in someone from the staff or possibly some other - somebody else from NTIA, for example, and have that discussion?

So that would be helpful if people - to me - if people could give their views on whether that's kind of mostly an insider discussion or is that a discussion where we want some other input? I think most of the others kind of sort of out fairly well between internal and external. But I wasn't really clear about that one and then maybe others where we have uncertainty on that. Thank you.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you, Steve. Bill, you're next and Rafik will be after you.

Bill Drake: Okay. So in email I tried to list the ones that people from both sides had expressed interest in and then the ones that one side and not the other had expressed interest in just to be clear about what we're doing. And the ones that we both seem to be interested in were accountability, GNSO review, including stakeholder constituency issues, and then our sort of in-house coordination and so on.

And on the other issues like NCSG people were interested about IANA in having a conversation CSG, that was part of why the suggestion was there.

And similarly on the EWG and privacy issues there are points of disagreement and it could be productive to try to understand each other better.

On the new gTLDs, Steve - or I don't remember who - expressed interest in that. And - but we weren't clear what specifically was envisioned there. And, yet, now I'm looking at this draft program, Rob, and you've crammed three topics into the first session in order to leave space for new gTLDs which, as far as I'm concerned, we've not agreed to.

So I was just kind of puzzled about that. It would seem to me that we ought to focus on the things - there's lots of interesting issues. The question is which ones do we need to talk together about here, right? I mean, if there's stuff where there's absolutely no possibility of any mutual understanding or something well then okay, maybe you don't bother with it although I tend to think it's worth understanding each other more clearly anyway even if you don't agree.

If there's issues where we might have some shared view, and I would think accountability is one, then I think it's sensible for us to be having the conversation.

So I guess the question is what filter are we using to decide what topics we want to select for here given the limited bandwidth and resources? I would like to know what aspect of new gTLDs people in CSG want to talk about because I can tell you that if it's fraud and abuse, for example, that isn't the number one issue from our standpoint or at least some of our people. So I need to understand what people's preferences are with respect to the specificity of this meeting. If that was clear.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks very much, Bill. I will let the advocates for the new gTLD discussion...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hogarth: You guys want to respond first? Yeah, Steve, you're going to respond directly to Bill, otherwise I'd like to give Rafik his opportunity.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, go ahead with Rafik. And this is Steve. I'll be glad - I'll respond to Bill after Rafik.

Rob Hogarth: Great. Thank you. Rafik. You may have to come off mute.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. This is respond to what - can you hear me?

Rob Hogarth: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Can you hear me?

Rob Hogarth: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Oh so here I'm trying more to respond to what Steve was asking like the case for the accountability session. I guess our session are, I mean, kind of public because it's transcribed and there will be remote participation. So if we are going to talk about internal - kind of internal discussion, I mean, I don't see any problem here.

So if we talk about accountability I would prefer that we have more - to start dialogue between CSG and NCSG and see what our common ground there. We can have ICANN staff would ask more like kind of observer and we need them for kind of clarification we can ask them in time there. But it's mostly I think the main goal for this meeting is really that we want to have this dialogue between the two parts of the un-contracted parties.

So I see it's kind of (unintelligible) we can have the ICANN staff but it's more if we - sometimes we think that we should ask for clarification or input, but a decision about like accountability should be more dialogue between (CHE) and (NCHE).

Rob Hogarth: Thank you Rafik, appreciate that, before I turn it back over to you Steve one observation I'd like to make about the draft agenda is there are a number of ways you can slice and dice this bill.

I was just trying to honor sort of the direct exchange that took place by an email. I could easily see that the in house issues could be moved to session three, you know, topic session three and you move new gTLD's into the first morning.

As you'll note what I did based on what I thought was at least approaching consensus is to say, you're not going to get through these three issues in an hour and one-half so let's just, you know, combine those first two opening sessions, maybe group things.

And now based upon your discussion that might be the way to handle it, you say okay all about those community dialogue things where you're not - you're looking at an exchange of information, an exchange of point of views, an opportunity to achieve some consensus of the rest.

Focus on those during that half day and then move other things like specific in house process issues to another session. We can slide and dice that any way you want, Bill, no I think Steve.

Bill Drake: Yes that was my suggestion by the way Rob was to proceed in that order and have that in house piece delayed a bit so that we have a lot of Kumbaya time together before we talk about where to visit things but anyway.

Rob Hogarth: I can do that and I can do that playing around, thanks. Steve you were going to respond to Bill's question...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Yes thanks this is Steve, first I'm comfortable with the idea that if those - if the three topics that both sides have expressed some interest in are NCPH procedural GNSO review and ICANN accountability then let's make sure those are the three - three of the issues that we discuss in the plannery.

There are different ways to order this and I'm not sure what's going to be the Kumbaya issue there but that's fine. I think that leaves some time for - at the plannery level I hope for other issues and I guess my suggestion would be maybe we take one from the CSG side and one from the NCSG side.

From the CSG side just in terms of the new gTLD issue I'll just say very briefly that I think this is a good topic for the non-contracted party house because - I'm sorry I'm getting some crosstalk.

I think this is a good topic for the non-contracted party house because I think that one of the dangers is that the assessment of the round that is finishing up

now and the planning for the next round is going to be dominated by contracted parties just in the same way I think that the first round was.

And that their interest will be given, you know, to much - their interest will predominate, reinforcing the tendency among some senior ICANN staff that view ICANN as a trade association for the domain name industry.

So I think we have some common ground there, maybe not but I think that's why - that's the aspect of it that I wanted to discuss, that we wanted to discuss, which was I think Tony mentioned this too in an email.

It's just what are the common interests of non-contracted parties and making sure their voices are heard, our voices are heard more effectively - review and review the last round and plan the next round.

So that I hope that helps clarify that a bit. But if we want to take that topic and then you guys choose one of - I think you had mentioned EWG and IANA stewardship, I mean I don't know exactly what you want to talk about on those but, you know, I'm comfortable if this NCSG statute...

Bill Drake: Somebody needs to mute their speakers, Steve's wife if coming on the speakers somewhere.

Rob Hogarth: Yes this is Rob, Benedetta has identified the source and is working to remedy it with the person.

Bill Drake: Okay. So Steve I think we're kind of on the same page. I mean I was suggesting that if we had that last one as an AOB that different kinds of topics like that to be brought up were chunks of time, you know, to taste.

And if we finish the other things earlier we can move to that more quickly. I mean if session three in house coordination ends up only taking us 40 minutes to talk about then we can move on to talking about a mixed bag and different things that people have interest in.

Steve Metalitz: All I'm saying, I think it makes sense to decide in advance what those topics are. Maybe we don't get to every single one of them but people will be prepared then because I think the other thing that would be helpful is a prepared discussion on all of these topics so that people have, you know, ideally a few weeks, a month to actually prepare presentation, you know, their views on these questions.

Bill Drake: Sure.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you that's an excellent exchange guys and it touches a little bit on the role of topic chairs, you know, you were mentioning an interesting approach Steve about saying, we might have some issues that are unique to the CSG or if not unique, you know, that are more important but still have applicability and there is a connection with being able to partner with members from the other side of the house.

And if some of you think that you've got an excellent perspective or would like to take on the coordination role for the discussion of some of these that would be the role of one of the topic chairs.

So for example when we hear the new gTLD discussions you might raise your hands to even say, yes I would like to lead that conversation because I think I've got a good model for how we can approach this.

Bill could say, yes I'm very interested on directing our discussions about the in house conversations we need to have about deciding on processes and mechanisms for deciding the board representative or deciding the vice chair of the GNSO council.

So I mean if there are particular items that are of great interest either to your group or to you personally where you think you can provide some leadership I think that would be a neat way to play it.

The other aspect that exists here where you have substantial agenda time is your individual community sessions. And you're all going to be developing those agendas separately.

If there are matters that you need or think that you will need staff support on, that's something that we can help coordinate, reaching out to the internal staff to either have them available during your call, on call during your session or some other way to make that connection and give you the support that you need.

So we're happy from a staff perspective to be flexible in that regard. I don't know if any of you have any suggestions perhaps as to how to approach then what we've got here in version 2.

Bill you had given me some feedback to say or to suggest that yes maybe we could move the in house discussions into a separate session. Steve your point was more along the lines I believe of wow we have three common areas maybe we should group them as a common - in a common plannery session for us to discuss them.

I don't know if there is some middle ground between those two or if anybody has ideas about other subjects or how we might want to order these topics. I'll throw the microphone open for that feedback.

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve, my view is the grouping is a secondary question. Let's - can we - if we can agree on, you know, five topics the three that seem to have support from both or that have been proposed by both sides and then one each that's been proposed by one side.

And it's not just a question of what - I think they're all interesting topics and they're all important topics, the question is which ones are the ones that are where we can actually, you know, do something constructive in this setting.

So, you know, that would be my proposal let's decide on the five topics. I'm pretty agnostic about how, you know, the ordering and the allocation but I think the other point is that are there ones where we want some outside resources to come meet with us and if so, you know, we need to line that up whether it's ICANN staff or somebody else.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you Steve, right now we have - this is Rob. Right now there was a total of seven potential discussion topics. We had and a number of them you have reached consensus on, NCPH procedural in house issues, agreed.

The ICANN accountability issues, agreed, GNSO review matters, agreed in terms of broad topics now granted there will be, you know, specific aspects of all those that you'll want to talk about.

So it seems as if those are, you know, you've got three of your five right there and we have accounted for them on the agenda. There seems to be some discussion at this moment as to whether new gTLD's and maybe I've just

described it way to broadly and there's a way to sort of narrow that Steve so that folks have an appreciate for particularly what you're looking to talk about.

But as I wrote it in the draft agenda it said an assessment of the current round of new gTLD's and/or issue spot for potential next round improvements. That would strike me as something that's of interest to everybody but right now, you know, I have identified it as a consensus topic.

I don't know if you guys are, you know, modifying that a bit here. If that's the case, you know, you've only got maybe one or two more to add in terms of consensus topics. Would anyone like to suggest what those might be or is it sufficient just to have the ones that we've got already?

Marilyn Cade: Rob.

Rob Hogarth: Yes Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm glad...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: I think Laurie had her hand up too.

Rob Hogarth: And then I see Laurie's hand up, yes thank you Steve, Laurie you'll go next.

Marilyn Cade: ...I'd like us to spend a little bit of time on the commonalities of interest related to the ICANN budget as it affects our work as (SGA's) and constituencies.

It doesn't need to be a lot of time but I think a little bit of time would be very helpful for us to take while we're together.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you I'll put that on the list. I don't know if anyone has a specific reaction to that. You know, in terms of how that might be approached Marilyn is we ultimately get nodded heads from the other leaders.

That might be something where we'd say great thank you for that suggestion Marilyn would you like to be the topic lead for that, something along those lines. So I'll put that on the list here, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Sure, sure Rob and I'll just say a quick word about what I'm thinking about so others can think about it and then come back. What I mean by this is the toolkit, the scope of the toolkit, the making sure that the budget interest we have in providing travel to our participants.

That all of that is stabilized but also even further supported in terms of the outreach activities, et cetera and the diversification that we're all trying to do in our constituencies.

I think David is going to be there, David's budget is only 5% of the overall budget and we think about our needs that may mean we have to be talking not just to David and Rob but to other parts of ICANN as well. So I just wanted to give that as an illustration.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you Marilyn, this is Rob. You also may want to contemplate, you know, having that as a piece of your conversations with Bob either as individual groups or as a plannery group on that.

And I'm - I will write that up Marilyn, it seems as if the direction you're taking that is much more of a stabilizing community resource support or something along those lines.

Clearly the budget is an important aspect of that and the key means by which that is achieved. So I'll play around with some of that language and invite you to comment on it.

Marilyn Cade: I like the language.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you, Laurie you're next in the queue.

Laurie Anderson: Yes I - and I apologize I can't seem to find the red line that you sent. I have the original document (unintelligible) but not the red line but that can be either here nor there.

On the new gTLD program and talking about assessment I'm confused about what that means because, you know, there's a lot of data out there on the Wiki, there was an entire session devoted to sort of the brand owner perspective.

When we were in LA I actually sat in on a little piece of it, some assessments on how some of the rights protection mechanisms are being used by - not by for process, not really focusing on non-commercial or non-profits who may have issues with certain uses of names in the new gTLD space.

But I do believe that just saying that the topic is way too broad because are we talking about assessments that ICANN has done internally from a business perspective, are we talking about assessments that are being independently done in different sectors?

I'm really at this point not clear about what assessment means or is there an assessment plan and that might be a topic. How is this being assessed, let's look at all the different areas that we know about that are being assessed.

Is this the right assessment, this is how the non-contracting parties interests are being well represented or not well represented within the assessment. I just think assessment right now, I don't even understand what it means and maybe that's the topic.

Rob Hogarth: Excellent point Laurie, this is Rob. You're suggesting much more thought process in terms of me trying to capture the discussion. I think Steve's hand is up so maybe he can answer that question for us.

Steve Metalitz: Yes this is Steve, I think Laurie is asking some good questions. There is an ICANN assessment plan that was published prior to LA and there was a session on it in LA.
And then there's the affirmation of commitments review of the new gTLD's. I think those are the two main streams. But this is again I don't - I do think I'm not sure that I would agree with the way Rob phrased it in this red line but it's irrelevant.

I think we do have some common interest in seeing that the perspectives of entities that are not under contract to ICANN and don't plan to be under contract to ICANN are heard in both looking back at the round that's winding up and looking forward to the new round.

And so that would - that's the new gTLD proposal but again on topics I feel like I mean I think I've said this, I think we're - my proposal is let's take the three, let's each choose one additional one and, you know, that would be my view on the topics.

The one other point or two other points I wanted to make on the agenda is first, there has been some talk about bringing in outside people from NTIA or from the Hill, Washington people and I guess I'd just like to hear if people have specific desires on that score, you know, what they're thinking of.

And then second I just - I like this set up with the round tables with (Fahdi), I think they're actually 90 minutes not 110 minutes. But I like this and I wonder whether it makes sense to also have (Fahdi) join us for lunch that day, the second day.

So that, you know, we can together talk with (Fahdi). That's just my suggestion on slot I, I guess it is, thanks.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you Steve, this is Rob. Your last suggestion would certainly streamline preparation and support issues if we could swing that because then, you know, I like the idea it combines the potential for another plannery discussion with (Fahdi) and it fills the lunch slot.

And I am convinced that you would all have a very productive conversation and specifically on day two, Marilyn I think you mentioned David Olive, he is going to be in town he arrives on Monday night.

And so he'll be around for day two so he would be available at lunch. There are going to be another couple of people in this - in indeed this weekend meeting or late in the previous week meeting of the cross community working group leadership takes place.

There will certainly be people who can participate in that event who may be able to offer some either speaking role or contribution role or whatever for that lunch period.

Marilyn Cade: I would - it's Marilyn, I would certainly welcome even though a lot of each of our members are observing on the ICG, if it were possible to have Elisa Cooper from the chair, someone sort of non usual suspect and not from within our house I would really welcome that.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks Marilyn, I'll chat with Marika, Bart or some others from staff perspective to see whether that might be possible.

Bill Drake: Rob I've been in the queue.

Rob Hogarth: Yes Bill your hand was up please sir and I think Laurie and Steve those are old hands now.

Bill Drake: They are.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you Bill.

Bill Drake: All right, first on the slot I, I'd also suggest that I thought we were talking about lunch speakers but maybe it would make sense to have (Fahdi) because he will have had just had separate meetings with us both.

And he could perhaps then try to draw some integrated thoughts about, you know, what he's heard from the different groups and how we can take this forward.

I also kind of think it would be kind of odd to not invite him to address us as a group. So I don't know if when you suggested him for lunch if you meant he just joins us or he speaks to us but I wouldn't mind if he spoke to us briefly just to tee up a little joint conversation or something I think that would be fine.

On the question of bringing in NTIA or so on I - just to say that I had dinner with Fiona the other night and she told me that Larry was in town then and for the accountability bit the first session, I mean if we're talking about bringing anybody in that could potentially be interesting I think to us to have an informal conversation with him in the room.

In order to share common feelings about where we are and try to elicit some response and thoughts. So that's one possibility in terms of bringing people out. Certainly for the things that are kind of really internal us talking about stakeholder groups and constituencies, us talking about how we work together et cetera.

Nobody outside is going to be appropriate or whatever and if we have the last bit of kind of mixed short addressing different topics, new gTLD et cetera, et cetera then it probably wouldn't fit to put anybody there either.

But for the accountability discussion if we did that at the front then to get us started I could imagine it being useful to have a visitor in that context, I don't know about anybody else, just my own view.

Rob Hogarth: What I'll do, if anybody has an immediate reaction to that that would be great, otherwise I'll capture that Bill in terms of this next version and see if I can, you know, after folks have a chance to think a little bit about it they might have some ideas or thoughts there.

Anyone with an immediate reaction to Bill's brainstorm?

Marilyn Cade: (Patty Yen), Larry - it's Marilyn, (Patty Yen), Larry Strickling wearing his NTIA hat to talk with us about accountability mechanisms I think would be interesting to everyone.

I think also it might be interesting for him to hear what the communities very - thinking is at this time. So I would think that might be if he could come in. But I am saying Larry, not Fiona who is a staff person on this but in this case Larry, is that right Bill?

Bill Drake: I thought you might say that, yes.

Rob Hogarth: Great thanks, I'll capture that, I'll - I don't know if there are, you know, other exchanges that ICANN staff are having about the schedule that week, you know, presumably a Larry, (Fahdi) meeting will likely be scheduled if (Fahdi) is in town. So let me explore that with them.

It would seem to me that the best approach to that would be, you know, right off the bat, you know, so that would be the first bit of discussion. There might be some neat connection with whatever discussions were taking place over the previous weekend. So there may be some good synergies there. We'll explore that and I'll include an update on that in the next communication I send out.

We're right at three minutes, Bill I think that's now an old hand I don't know if that's a new hand. Not much time for any other business. I raised the role of topic chairs if you all could continue to think about that.

I mean I heard some excellent suggestions today in terms of topic ideas and how we might approach things that suggest to me that, you know, Steve,

Marilyn, Bill, a number of you would not only - any of you would be really good at doing that for particular topics.

So please think about what you might want to take a quote on quote chair role for some of these discussions. You have emphasized to us that these are going to be discussions that you all want to have among yourselves.

I don't - I think in that context it's best to set you up to have assigned chairs of the various sessions so that you two can take full ownership of that.

Bill Drake: Mr. Chairman can I make a - yes can I make an alternative suggestion?

Rob Hogarth: Sure.

Bill Drake: If you want to have that kind of structure how about co-chairs?

Rob Hogarth: Sure, however you guys want to approach that and I'm just suggesting as a structure in terms of how those periods of time will be run. So yes if you want to have co-chairs where, you know, for each session you have a CSG and NCSG co-chair that might be the best approach to it then there can be separate collaboration.

What I want to avoid being very conscious of everything else you all have on your plates is creating some new infrastructure that you feel compelled to contribute to.

But if it's just even just a handshake where we say, Bill you and Steve are handling session one, Marilyn and Laurie you're handling session two and Lisa and Rudy you're handling session three.

You know, however that's done and it can be in a more informal thing then that's great. I just want to be able to, you know, have you all front and center and being able to adjust change, play around and talk about what you all want to talk about, that's the critical thing.

Well what I'll do then is I'll get out a revised V3 for this based on the conversations we're having here. In terms of a next call I think it would be useful if we could do this, you know, next week same time, same place if that works for all of you.

And then perhaps it needs to be done just one additional week. I really love how you all are very active on the email and having that dialogue back and forth. And if we can sort of inspire that with some calls where we have a combination of the two that might bring us to some fruition here.

On one more call and maybe just two more calls, any thoughts on that real briefly? Thanks for the checkmark Laurie I guess that's what that means.

Marilyn Cade: Rob it's Marilyn I have one final suggestion I wanted to make.

Rob Hogarth: Please.

Marilyn Cade: It's just that on one occasion when I was traveling with a Visa problem and could not get my Visa here, I was able to go into the country Visa in Europe where I was.

So I don't know Bill because of the Singapore trip I really understand the problem that some of your travelers will have but I don't know if that's at all feasible for, you know, this was perhaps an unusual situation.

But I understand because of the Singapore Visa issue that there is a particular challenge for many of the travelers. I know (Jimson) is on the phone and probably has the same challenge.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks for the suggestion Marilyn and Bill I know your election is going to wrap up soon and you'll then have confirmation about some of those individuals.

We'll jump on that immediately as soon as those elections end.

Bill Drake: But can I just understand, is (Joseph) waiting until he has all the names before he works on any of them?

Rob Hogarth: No, no that was the point in getting names ahead of time.

Bill Drake: Okay.

Rob Hogarth: That's what we'll be following up on.

Bill Drake: Because we haven't heard from him.

Rob Hogarth: But yes immediately as we get those other ones so he can jump on those. And we'll followup with you individually, you know, if there are gaps or if we know hey you, you've got eight slots and you've only shared seven or you have ten and you've only shared nine or something like that.

We'll do that individually with all of you, Benedetta or me just to close the loops on any gaps that we notice. I won't, you know, bother the whole list with those inquiries.

Thank you all very much again for doing this I appreciate it's happening at a time with 10 million other things going on but I really like the way this is shaping up and I'm convinced you're going to have a productive conversation.

Just a little bit more work to get there and get everything organized but we're on it and we will not get off the accelerator here given that it's coming up very quickly. Thank you all very much.

Man: Thanks Rob.

Bill Drake: Thank you.

Rob Hogarth: All right, talk to you next week I hope, bye-bye.

Coordinator: This does now conclude today's conference, all participants may disconnect at this time.

END