ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
April 25, 2016
2:00 pm CT

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much Tapani. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCSG Budget call. On the call today was have Ed Morris, Marilia Maciel, Tapani Tarvainen, Matthew Shears. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you Tapani.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Maryam. So we are having a quick discussion and if we can come up with a comment for the ICANN budget in time. And without further ado, I will hand over to Ed Morris who's been the only person really up to date on what we might want to say. Ed, over to you.

Ed Morris: Thanks Tapani. Is Matt here? I just want to say hello. Matthew, can you hear me?

Matthew Shears: Absolutely. Can you hear me?

Ed Morris: Yes I can. Fantastic. Thanks for coming. Thanks for having an interest in the budget, which for some strange reason I absolutely love looking at but it

doesn't appear that anyone else in the entire GNSO likes. So I'm doing the Council letter. And I think there are some things we need to look at as a stakeholder group.

And the first it's something I just came up with today. One group has a public comment in. It's RSSAC. And they're using the public comment period to ask for an additional travel support.

So I never considered using a budget comment to ask for more money or more support in any areas. I just thought I should throw that out to - we have one of the Chair - Vice Chair of the PC and the Chair of the NCSG. Is there something we want to request money for to start before we even look at the budget?

Matthew Shears: I think it's a great question. I mean is that what we typically would do in this part of the process? I mean or is it really too late. I would have thought it was really too late. But if there's still possibilities, why not?

Ed Morris: RSSAC literally their only public comment is we want one more traveler. That's the extent. And as a matter of fact, its public comments been open for over a month and that is the only public comment received from the entire ICANN community to date.

Tapani Tarvainen: Well we can't help it if they do the same thing and say we want more travelers but it sounds kind of a silly comment to make to me. I have to be frank at this point anyway.

Ed Morris: Yes. I don't know if there's something you've been trying to get to - I obviously - the administrative wing is something I haven't been paying much attention of. Is there something you've been trying to get money for? I know -

if I'm not mistaken, you've been able to receive some money to upgrade the membership database.

Has that happened? Is there something else that in what you're trying to do you need funding for? Because if RSSAC has started out doing that, I assume anyone else submitting comments will at least be considering this.

Tapani Tarvainen: Just about membership database, yes, we have been promised money. We haven't so far been able to - unable to use it. But we'll try to get it - make it happen before the budget year is over. And as for other provisions, I can't at this point really think of anything other than of course we can always ask for more travelers but it is - well, kind of strange request to make.

Ed Morris: We do - we need travelers. I would argue that we need to make better use of the travel funding we have now. We have the RPM starting up with the other working groups and Lord knows, when we're trying to get people involved and trying to get - we're outnumbered literally on that group 40 to 1 by the IPC.

Yet we're not going to be able to take sub-chairmanships and the like with the few people we have because we're not going to be able to get them all to meetings unless they also take other positions in our organization.

So would it be fair that we would like to - would we - are we in favor as a support group and we - a supporting organization. There's only four of us here. Would we be in favor of additional funding for working group participants? Just a general comment like that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Sounds good to me.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: No. Go ahead Matt.

Matthew Shears: I was just going to say why don't we add it to our list of issues we need to take back to the PC and the SC I assume. But it's - we should if that's what it's going to be used for. Why not?

Ed Morris: Okay. So (Marilia), are you taking notes or (Mia) or who is? Okay. No - all right. So travel - increase travel support for working participants I think is an issue. Okay.

                  Going into detail here. Lord knows I - I don't know who's taking notes and who's going to write this up. I was unfortunately fairly clear that I just don't have the time to do it this week. So I don't know how we're going to do this.

                  But in terms of what comment we're going to do, I thought the first thing we should be starting out with is somewhat similar to what I'm doing with GNSO but also a bit different.

                  And that we - as Matthew certainly knows, we have an - okay. (Marilia) is speaking on Adobe I'm told. Okay. I'm sorry. I - where is Adobe. My apologies. Okay. The - (Marilia) is opening up the Google doc. I don't have a - I'm not Google doc proficient. So if somebody could actually do that, I would be grateful.

                  But I think that one of the things we need to start with is although there is increased transparency in the budget operating plan, it is nowhere near at the level we're going to need to fulfill our roles as member of an SO and as a

constituent component of the GNSO to be able to fulfill our new obligations under the corporate reorganization that's taking place.

And I - there are a few points that I've come up with if you look through the budget. We don't have any departmental budgets. So for example, I can't tell you how much of the budget goes to ICANN legal. We have no idea. It's spread throughout the objectives in the way that they've sort of marketed their budget.

We have no idea how much money, for example, (Nora) has although we have an idea of her projects are very well funded. So one of the things I would want to call for is in future years we need more detail budget line items, we need budgets by departments, we need to have the full time employee.

If you look in the spreadsheet, you notice that they have full time employees but not at the project level. So we could say there's 3.5 full time employees assigned to global development. But we have no idea what, for example, an engagement - we know that a certain number of employees are being done in regional outreach but we have no idea how many hours are being spent in Asia versus North America versus Africa.

And I think that's quite important as we analyze the budget that we actually know how - the employee hours at the project level. So those were two things that I wanted to say at the outset. Departmental budget line items and also FTE numbers at the project level.

Have you guys looked at the budget or I'm the only one that's really gone through it in detail?

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: Okay. So I'm pretty much it right now. Do we have access to the spreadsheet, which I sent to Maryam? I'm sorry. It's hard to do this without having the numbers in front of you. All right.

Going through here, their Goals 1.1 and 1.2 broadly are engaged with global engagement and outreach. The Project Numbers 1.3 is policy development where most of our stuff is thrown in.

One of the concerns I have - actually I'm sorry I'm not as organized as I should be but let's go back a little bit. Three years ago when Fadi took over and Tapani and I were in the room in Los Angeles for that - for a intersessional meeting where we all met Fadi.

And there was a big discussion over whether ICANN itself should be doing outreach or whether that should be the providence of folks like us, the constituent components of ICANN, the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

There was division within the NCSG at that point. Well what I find amazing in the past three years is if you look at the global engagement budget, which are Items 1.1 and 1.2, that budget now is twice as large as the budget for policy development.

So we literally are spending twice as much money in engaging with the public through ICANN programs as we are in developing policy in ICANN. And to me that seems wrong.

And when you start looking at 1.1 and 1.2, there's not really a lot of detail about what they're actually doing. The projects are very vague. You know, you're looking in here. Communication (social) - the Speakers Bureau. They

have a Speakers Bureau but it's being funded under professional services for $100,000. No personnel, no employees, no travel meetings, no capital, no administration. What are they doing there?

And there's a lot of items in 1.1 and 1.2 that are like that where there's just a little bit here and we have no idea what these line items are. So I think one of the things that I would want to put in the comment is we're concerned that global engagement now accounts for twice the budgeting resources as policy development in ICANN.

But we're a little bit confused as to what they actually do with that money because the project names are somewhat vague. And we actually do, excuse me, I have another call here. They actually - we actually don't know how frankly (Nora) is spending the money. Any comments on how we can word - a comment like or is that an appropriate comment?

Matthew Shears: Ed, it's Matthew.

Ed Morris: Hi Matt.

Matthew Shears: I think this is entirely, entirely appropriate. I mean the fact that as you point out and I, you know, from what you say the fact that global engagement is now twice as much - twice funded over policy development is quite staggering actually.

Ed Morris: Yes.

Matthew Shears: And the fact that we don't know what that global engagement is actually doing…

Ed Morris: (No we don't).

Matthew Shears: …is deeply worrying because, you know, when I looked at the strategic plan, I had to say it was incredibly vague as to what the plans were. It was about - it was - there was no specificity to it. So this in terms of budgeting process is really inadequate.

Ed Morris: Yes. No. I'm just happy somebody else has discovered that it was. You look at the spreadsheet. The key spreadsheet if anybody's going to look at this stuff is the spreadsheet that has both the operating plan and budget by both portfolio and project.

                  So you can go in there and see the portfolio. Then you go look at the projects. And again, academic outreach is now zero line. They're not doing any more academic outreach. I guess that is something we could - because we have so many academics, we should be concerned that they're no longer doing academic outreach. It's been zeroed out. Why? What's it being replaced by?

                  In other words, part of the problem in going through this budget is I can't tell what the money is being spent on. And next year or in July of this year actually we as a community are now going to have the obligation to monitor the budget because we have the power to reject the budget.

                  And with this level - lack of specificity we're not going to be able to do that. It's troubling. Okay. So global…

Matthew Shears: Hey Ed.

Ed Morris: …engagement is that - go ahead.

Matthew Shears: So just on that very specific point the thing that is occurring to me now and maybe I should have focused on this before now. But the thing that's occurring to me now as somebody who's been through the IANA CWG and the Accountability CWG is that we have within this budget period that we're talking about a considerable number of changes that have to be made and a considerable amount of money that is supposed to be put aside for IANA functions continuity as well as accounting for however we're going to deal with PTI and PTI staff, et cetera, et cetera.

So have you seen - have you seen or looked at and are you at all comfortable with those levels of funding and how those issues been accounted for?

Ed Morris: No. I think one of the problems is we really don't know what the expenses are going to be going forward. This is all new to us. And I asked (Xavier), "How are you managing?" "It's our best guess" is his response. And no, I'm not comfortable with that.

One of my fears is they're going to budget - over budget for some of these - well we seen this in Consumer Choice and Trust where at the first CT meeting they came up to the group that were selected and said you have $400,000. You need to spend it by the end of June or you might not have the money next year.

And so I'm a bit concerned about the budget process. I have not - Chuck Gomes was looking at the IANA transition costs and frankly he didn't come back to us with much of anything on that. So I guess I should say I've only taken a general look. I've looked at the line items. I've asked (Xavier) where you're coming up with the numbers and the answer is best guess. So it's hard.

One of the other problems we may want to list in terms of improvements for the future - I would really, really like it if we could compare same to same on an ongoing yearly basis.

When you take the FY17 draft budget and try to take a look at FY16, they keep changing project categories, portfolio names and it's very hard to do a same by same comparison. So it's hard to know who's getting more money, who's getting less.

The only ones I'm picking up on are things like academic outreach where we've been zeroed out. So back to your question Matt, no I don't. I don't think anybody knows how this is being budgeted.

We have an idea because of our membership in the CWG that we're going to keep going back to them with proposals to the Board and the findings going to be the Board every few months. I don't know how the CWG is working. Do you have any idea?

Matthew Shears: Well you're absolutely right. It's Chuck's design team that's been following the budget process. So I noted in the chat that I'll follow up with him. And if there any key points that he's been seeing then that we feel that we should incorporate then I'll take care of that.

Ed Morris: I appreciate that. Well if you done some stuff that actually is germane to the GNSO or actually to the NCSG. That's my hat today? Okay. The GNSO Secretariat support program is continuing as a line item. That's in kind support. I believe that's Maryam and where she is budgeted.

It apparently has not yet been made a permanent part of the budgeting process. Let me give you a contrary example. The Council weekend where the new

Council is coming in October and we have that extra day. That was on a trial basis. It was a separate line in the budget but now has been wrapped into Council support.

So in other words, they've taken a look at the temporary program and they no longer are financing it on a temporary year-by-year basis. And I think one of the things we should state if we are pleased with this program and I don't want to make that judgment. My assumption is we are.

We'd like to know firm that this is not yet permanent and would like to know when it will be considered to become a permanent part of the budgeting - a permanent part of the support system for supporting organizations and constituencies going forward. So I think that's something we should probably put in in our comment, which is NCSG specific.

Another issue is the NCPH intersessional. That is a line in 1.3 and this past year it was budgeted at $100,000. We have heard some of our friends in Contracted Party House yell about this and say what are you doing. This is a lot of money.

Well, they have their own meeting during the GDD summit, which is budgeted at $400,000. So I don't know if we want to put a comment in supporting the intersessional meeting. I know that it's in the budget but it's not - from what I understand it's in the budget but is not a definite go.

So folks who want to have the intersessional meeting, we should probably point out that it is - we do see it in the budget, $100,000 and we want to point out that this is far less than is spent on the GDD, which the Contracted Party House uses for similar purposes. I don't know if that's a fair comment or not. But if we want the intersessional, someone has to step up and support it.

Matthew Shears: I'm a big fan of the intersessional. So I would support including a comment on that.

Ed Morris: Okay. Is somebody taking down what we're commenting on? Please. Is it just you and me Matt?

Matthew Shears: Yes.

Ed Morris: Tapani, Marilia, you guys still here?

Tapani Tarvainen: I'm still here and I know that we are getting a transcript of this at least if nothing else.

Ed Morris: Okay. I'm…

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: The public comment is due on the 30th, which is just a few days away.

Matthew Shears: Ed, we're taking notes in the Google doc. Both (Marilia)…

Ed Morris: I can't see that on my screen. I'm sorry. I'll take a look afterwards. I apologize Matt. Thank you.

Matthew Shears: (No problem).

Ed Morris: Okay. On the intersessional, let's see. Okay. One of my concerns is they finally came out with their list of the top 15 baseline projects; the projects that we spend the most money on.

And none of the top 15 are directed to the community. There are some where there is some offshoot. For example, language support is something that the community takes advantage of, but of the top 15 projects, not one of them are oriented towards the community.

The CEO's office is budgeted at 1.9 mil. You got compliance but there is - again, it goes into the comment that they're spending twice as much in global engagement as they are in policy. They're spending oodles more under administration that is not geared to community support. And again, I don't know if we can kind of merge those two comments together.

So the official lingo of the document they produced is the top 15 baseline projects. And they're, again, not being oriented towards the community.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: I'm sorry. Go ahead Matt.

Matthew Shears: Matthew again. In addition to global engagement is there anything else in that top 15 that kind of jumps out at you as being perhaps excessive?

Ed Morris: I wonder is there any way we could get this document on the Adobe. It's just a PDF - one page PDF. Is anybody capable of doing that? Maryam?

Maryam Bakoshi: (Unintelligible).

Ed Morris: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: I'm sorry.

Maryam Bakoshi: Where's the document you're talking about? Where is it please?

Ed Morris: Can you - if you go to the public comment page - the overall page, which I
                    sent you for the budget OP…

Maryam Bakoshi: Yes.

Ed Morris: …it's down below. It's a PDF that says top 15 projects I believe. I'll…

Maryam Bakoshi: Okay. I'll get that in a minute.

Ed Morris: Thanks. Maybe we can all look at this together. Really this is the only way
                    you can go through the budget is go going item-by-item. And there we go. It's
                    up there. Beautiful. Everybody see it.

Matthew Shears: Yes.

Ed Morris: So we - meeting costs can be part of it but that's where the top 15 projects at
                    ICANN, that's them. And just for comparison purposes, the entire policy
                    development program at ICANN comes out at about $10 million. But that's
                    made up of somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 to 30 different projects.

                    Take a look at 12 - this (used to be) litigation management. So that is a bit of
                    the legal expenditure. But again, you - the legal pops up throughout many
                    projects and there's not one (definite) place to actually try to get those
                    numbers. And you come over here and it's classified as a governance issue.
                    Yet we'll find legal and operations will find legal pretty much everywhere.

Okay. I guess the only other thing I noted we may want to comment on is Line Item Number 1.2.1. And that's regional engagement. And let me get the exact numbers. I can get this up fairly quickly on my computer. So the regional engagement 1.2, sorry, come on.

Matthew Shears: So I'm finding the third item - third of the 15 an interesting one.

Ed Morris: Right.

Matthew Shears: Ongoing administrative services hub offices.

Ed Morris: Right.

Matthew Shears: If I'm reading the numbers right, we're talking about 4.6 million in which global human resources is administrative, (APAC) rent, facilities, et cetera, et cetera.

Ed Morris: You are reading the numbers right.

Matthew Shears: I mean I don't know how - whether or not that's excessive. It seems quite high. But then again, you know, given everything at those hub offices, I can imagine they're quite expensive, specifically the rather fancy offices they have in Rond Point Schuman in Brussels.

Ed Morris: The Istanbul offices and Singapore offices are quite nice as well. Like actually the Istanbul offices used to be the Turkish headquarters of Burger King. Yes. Should we note?

Although let me tell you there are two options for any of the issues we come across right now. One is to put it in a public comment and the other is if we have questions, you set up a special email address controller@icann.org where they will take our question and respond on their Wiki. Unless it's a question - I should note that there are questions - I have even gotten questions outstanding.

But one of them is causing some consternation. And that I've noticed they have an expenditure for GAC Secretariat, which is above that - any other SO/AC gets.

And when I've inquired about this, I was told well what that is, is certain governments given ICANN money and then ICANN spends it. And it was ICANN is being used to launder the money. Is the governments can't directly support the Secretariat. There seems to be some problems with governments actually giving money to a secretary type organization.

So ICANN is actually involved in laundering the money, which my - a friend of mine who actually is a professional accountant tells me might be illegal. (Xavier) is aware of this and we are not three staff members into investigating whether in fact ICANN has broken the law in this regard.

I don't think we should put that in our comment but I'll just mention that's ongoing. But you can ask questions. So for something like that Matt, is it worth - instead of commenting on it, posing the question, you know, what is this?

Matthew Shears: Yes. Yes.

Ed Morris: If that's the problem - look at the - we look at these huge amounts and we have no idea what they're actually doing with this money.

Matthew Shears: Yes.

Ed Morris: Let me get to - this is the regional stuff. I don't know if we want to make a comment on this. So you have under 1…

Matthew Shears: (Unintelligible).

Ed Morris: …I'm sorry.

Matthew Shears: It's just interesting. These numbers are interesting. Sorry. I just know I haven't seen…

Ed Morris: Well yes. Okay. You're - I love it. I mean I - this is - I still am not completely confident of what I'm doing. But i.e., this is my favorite thing I've done at ICANN since I've been involved here for the last 3-1/2 years. I really like going through these numbers.

And with the inspection rights that we have next year Matt, someone in our community has to start getting to understand how this works.

Matthew Shears: Absolutely.

Ed Morris: Because we're going to have to understand - and we need to pound on them right now. We need to know what these numbers mean. Okay. I'm going to the 1.2.1, which is the portfolio is engaging stakeholders regionally. I have no idea what that means.

But then we have these project numbers of ongoing regional engagement. And it goes by the regions. Not just the officially approved regions but now we break it down into Asia, Africa, Europe, Middle East, Eastern Europe. Latin America, North American and Oceania.

I guess one of the questions I have the rest of ICANN seems to be operating on these five region basis. Where does (Nora) get off creating more regions shifting money to those regions?

Then you start looking at the amount of money that's spent on the regions. Asia gets twice as much money as every other region. North America gets less than half the money of Latin America.

So my question is why are we not funding engagement at equal levels in equal parts of the world? Or are there - is there a reason for this? The Middle East is well funded. Eastern Europe pretty much doesn't exist. So my question is what decisions are being made that lead to this funding disparage?

Then you keep looking on here. We have - all right. I had - again, you look at this. I have an actual public comment. They're spending $400,000 on ongoing business engagement yet I see absolutely nothing budgeted or a project number for ongoing non-commercial engagement. Is that something we'd like to bring up?

Matthew Shears: Well it certainly would be interesting to know what business engagement is. And actually whether or not it's really necessary.

Ed Morris: Yes. The description is this project covers ongoing business engagement. But $300,000 for personnel, $100,000 for travel and meetings, $400,000 total. I'm just going through all of the engagements. There is absolutely nothing…

Matthew Shears: Is that Chris Mondini?

Ed Morris: …oriented towards non-business people specifically.

Matthew Shears: Is that Chris Mondini who does business engagement?

Ed Morris: Good question. I don't know. The overall portfolio is under (Nora). Does
                  Chris report to (Nora)?

Matthew Shears: I spoke global engagement with Sally Costerton.

Ed Morris: I don't know. Sally has so many roles. They keep shifting. We were talking on
                  Council that this was (Nora)'s program but we might be wrong.

Matthew Shears: (Yes). The - which other parts of this - sorry, I'm jumping around a bit here.
                  Which other…

Ed Morris: Yes. Well I am too. I should…

Matthew Shears: Which other parts - which other parts of the community have - are in the
                  process of compiling comments and can we - would they be willing to share
                  do you think?

Ed Morris: I don't know. My anticipation with it every other GNSO group was going to
                  have a comment of some kind. I saw the ALAC comment today, their draft
                  comment went online and it's about six paragraphs. It's nothing substantive. I
                  don't know. We can ask. We can reach out to other people. I just don't know
                  who to ask at this point.

On the Council I can tell you that the Budget Committee consisted of Carlos, myself, Keith Drazek. We had one call with James and bluntly I wrote with staff the entire comment with one contribution from Carlos. So just even those who signed up weren't all that interested in it.

Matthew Shears: Okay. And that comment can you - where is that? Can we see that?

Ed Morris: I've already - I've sent that to you but I certainly can re-email that to you.

Matthew Shears: I think it would be helpful for us pulling this together.

Ed Morris: Yes. Okay. I - once we're done with this meeting, I'll send a copy to everybody. And that is still in progress. There's still some stuff I have to do. So I think in terms, you know, actually, you know, man I - again, you start looking at this and you find things.

Why do we find a DNS entrepreneurship center in Egypt? We're spending $200,000 on it. Why do they get one and no one else?

Matthew Shears: Yes.

Ed Morris: Okay. Are you on this page Matt by any chance?

Matthew Shears: No, I'm not on that page but I'm laughing.

Ed Morris: Yes. No, we are financing the - this project covers the activities in support of a DNS entrepreneurship center in Cairo, Egypt. Where did that come from? What CCWG approved this? Or - we're spending 600 grand on IPB6 initiatives.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: But my assumption is that's because Steve Crocker wants to. That's his pet
                 project. But why?

Matthew Shears: You know, that's…

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: Yes it is. Now you're going to love this. I go right under this. That's Line Item
                 128307. Then they go to Line Item 111814 and we're doing more IPV6 at
                 $200,000. That's - the problem going through this is they spread the expenses
                 out through different project areas so you really can't get your handle on what
                 we're spending in one particular area.

                 I would love to know what ICANN legal spends. We have all of this
                 information and none of that can tell me that. I can't tell you how much money
                 is being spent by the CEO's office on travel for example because that's spread
                 out and that's a different project number than the CEO's office operation.

                 So it's a real problem that again you're helping me realize that I'm not losing
                 my mind. You can't really tell what we're spending the money on despite all of
                 these numbers.

                 I can tell you on GNSO policy development support outside of our own
                 budget, 1.3, we're getting $1.2 million per year, $1.1 million of it is on
                 personnel. Then we're spending $100,000 in professional services whatever
                 they are.

Matthew Shears: And we're getting - so we're getting 2.3 in total? You said 1.2 and 1.1. Is that right?

Ed Morris: No. One point two and .1. That is…

Matthew Shears: Oh .1.

Ed Morris: …but again, that is - that's coming under Line Items 1.2, which is not David Olive's line item. I don't know what that money goes to. Now 1.3.1 is our money, which travel support literally we're spending $3.1 million on travel support for policy development this year to the ICANN meetings.

Matthew Shears: How much?

Ed Morris: Then we're zero budgeting this year for face-to-face meetings. The Council of Governance session has been zero budgeted but that's because that's been moved into the policy team line. Public input is at $100,000, which is to maintain and improve ICANN public input - 100 grand for that.

Again, we're - you keep going down in - this is the area where we actually probably should know a little bit more about because this is where we are, which is 1.3.1.

We have spent zero on research related to the multi stakeholder model. Zero in strategic planning. Zero on account - evolved review on accountability improvement mechanisms. We spent zero on that.

A lot of our items have been just zeroed out. Multi stakeholder engagement best practices zero. Now we are spending - doing something. We're spending three - well here's the mathematical error. You're going to love this.

They have this down as 100,000 on personnel, 200,000 in professional services, one plus two equals two; 200,000 total. We found a few of these before. This is a new one. On the ongoing evolution of ICANN's multi stakeholder model in the post transition environment.

Matt, you're involved in the transition as much as anybody in our group. What the heck does that mean? What are we spending that money on?

Matthew Shears: I have no idea. Maybe it has to do with that CCWG principles development thing that they've been going, you know, that's underway. I don't know.

Ed Morris: We seem to now be spending very little on looking into the multi stakeholder model and researching the multi stakeholder model. These line items are here because they were funded last year. Now they're zeroed out. Is that worth a comment? Do we want the research to continue? We're concerned about this or no?

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: Go ahead.

Matthew Shears: My personal opinion on this kind of stuff is that if we believe in an incredibly narrow and a demonstrative role for ICANN, it shouldn't be spending money on the multi stakeholder model.

Ed Morris: Okay. I have no strong view. What I do have a strong view on is we're - I still can't get over - and for the first time I saw this about a month ago, we're spending twice as much money on basically public relations as we are on policy development.

Matthew Shears: What? Sorry, say that again.

Ed Morris: When I look at global stakeholder engagement, I'm seeing that mostly as public relations because I'm not seeing - I'm not seeing in terms of what I know GSE does a lot of added value to ICANN. Engagement sounds good but what are we actually doing other than saying we're ICANN, we're great.

Are we really bringing people in? Are we engaging - are we engaging with people to bring them into the policy development area? In the GNSO comment we're going to say gee, GSE is nice. Wish they'd stop by now and then to tell us what they're doing because what's good…

Matthew Shears: I think it's a very good (metric) to comment.

Ed Morris: That's more GNSO. But again, this is not - unfortunately we have so few - (let's see) four of us here, two of us doing the talking. How do we want to approach the public comment? We actually have a goal for this call.

So those are some of the highlights. (Marilia) asked me to point out some of the things I noticed. Those are some of the highlights. And the question is what do we do with it.

You know, Tapani did a great job of trying to set up a Finance Committee to actually look at this but unfortunately doesn't appear that those on the Finance Committee are able to join the call tonight. So how do we want to handle this going forward?

And Matt, I want to thank you because when you're looking at this by yourself and you're trying to figure it out as I have been for the past 30 days or so, you start wondering if you've lost touch with reality.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: …tell from your comment when you heard of our DNS entrepreneur center in Cairo, that didn't make much sense to you either.

Matthew Shears: Not really. I don't know. (Marilia), what do you think? How should we take this forward? I think my gut feeling is that we can look at the budget. We probably don't have enough time to do a thorough analysis of the specifics.

But we probably do have if we take a little bit of time and look at it, kind of match it back to the strategic plan, we probably do have at least the ability to make some higher level comments about the budget process and what we see as perhaps deficiencies or imbalances. Does that make sense?

Ed Morris: I agree. And my apologies for not having this a bit better organized. I wasn't really sure how this call was going to be structured. But yes, I think there's enough here and just working through it together there's enough here to suggest that next year this becomes even a more major problem because we actually have responsibilities in the budget. And I don't see how we meet those.

Matthew Shears: I think we're going to have to really focus hard on identifying the appropriate resources and expertise.

Ed Morris: Then again, yes. I mean it's - always comes back to that we have to get the people. We have to get people involved doing this.

Matthew Shears: Yes.

Ed Morris: For the record Matt, I wrote the budget comment the last two years. It was always the last minute thing. And I didn't really go in depth on the budget. I would just pick out a few things that would actually show we need to do a better job in this. But even at the GNSO level there's really no interest in this.

Matthew Shears: Okay. You know what I think that…

Ed Morris: (All right).

Matthew Shears: …I think, you know, I think Tapani is setting up the Finance Committee. I think that's the right way to go with this going forward. I think there needs to be once, you know, once the process starts then that needs to be a priority of the Finance Committee and the Policy Committee to work together on this.

Ed Morris: Okay. We have to have a comment in by Saturday. Strangely enough I said I had no time to do it and I really don't have any time to author the first draft. But I'm happy to free up time at the end of the week to try to improve it if anybody is able to take the pen (in) first. And I'll send what I've done on Council to everyone once this call is completed.

Matthew Shears: Okay. So I think - I mean I don't want to speak for (Marilia) and Tapani but I think if we spend a little bit of - if we have time and spend a little bit of time, each of us looking at the budget tomorrow because I think we need to do that. Then we can hopefully start to draft into the Google doc and invite others on the PC and the FC to join and do the same. And hopefully that will start a groundswell of interest and support. How's that sound?

Ed Morris: It sounds like you're starting your political career on a good level. Thanks Matt. Marilia, Tapani, you guys here?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes. Tapani here. Yes. Matthew, that sounds very good although a bit optimistic. Unfortunately I can't promise to do much about this tomorrow but I'll see what I can do.

Matthew Shears: All right. So I think - I don't know. Marilia, do you think we can - I think once we - I think maybe if you and I try and maybe work a little bit on this tomorrow and then we can put out an urgent call to others on the PC and FC. I'd rather us work on it a little bit before we do so, so it looks a bit more formed (unintelligible).

Ed Morris: Agreed in the chat.

Matthew Shears: Okay. Do we have a plan? I think we have a plan.

Ed Morris: There is a plan. I have to look at the Google doc. I will get the Council thing I've been working on to you guys right after this call. I'll also put in links to the various documents so you have a start point. I'll have to figure out Google docs. Google does not like Ed. It never wants to let me into these things. But I'll see if I can get in and help (unintelligible).

                    I guess the other thing we should be thinking about is do we actually want to ask for money for something since that apparently is what other groups are doing. And I don't have the answer to that. That's beyond my limited remit at the Council. But those involved in administration should probably think about that a little bit.

Matthew Shears: Yes. I agree.

Ed Morris: Okay.

Matthew Shears: Great.

Ed Morris: Should we wrap it up?

Matthew Shears: I don't know. Tapani. Up to you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Matthew. And if you're happy with it at this point I have nothing
                  else to add. So…

Ed Morris: Yes. It's going to be the last minute - the NCSG traditional last minute group
                   rush to the deadline. But I'll tell you the other comments are so poor that we
                   actually will shine here. And Xavier is listening to us. Unlike a lot of folks in
                   ICANN, he actually does seem to want to engage.

                   If you notice at the meetings when he shows up and talk and the glazed look
                   on most people eyes. He has to go through that at the meetings time after time.
                   And at least from my experience within the past few weeks, showing an
                   interest in the budget just makes him want to work with you more closely. So
                   if we can do something halfway decent, I think it could pay off in the end.

                   Tapani, are you - do you have a regular correspondence with David Olive by
                   any chance?

Tapani Tarvainen: Not very frequent anyway but…

Ed Morris: All right. Let me reach out to David then and ask him if there are things that
                   he'd like to ask for budget wise that would relate to the constituencies and SGs

and just try to get - see if he can give me some input as well. Does that sound good?

Tapani Tarvainen: That sounds perfect to do that.

Ed Morris: All right.

((Crosstalk))

Ed Morris: Did you want us to put in the bit about building you a castle, the NCSG palace? Is that still in the plan?

Matthew Shears: I'll support that.

Ed Morris: Yes. I do too. You know, the other thing I was looking for is trying to figure out how much Fadi was getting to walk away and I - this stuff just isn't there. And Matt, you'd be aware of this. In the Americans for Limited Government says that the Board members are getting $90,000 each. That's not in the 990 and I can't find that in the budge either. So I don't know if they made that up or not.

All right. I'm sorry. This is how I spend my time lying in bed at night wondering about ICANN's budgets and why…

Matthew Shears: Ed, let's hope those are - let's hope those are (furious) rumors and rumor mongering to sink the IANA transition and not reality. Because if they were getting paid…

Ed Morris: Well I…

Matthew Shears: …(unintelligible).

Ed Morris: Well I was going to look for it because if they're making 90 grand, I want to nominate myself (to the) position. Sounded good to me. But as far as I know, Crocker got 38 and he was the top runner when you look at the tax forms. And most of the Board members got in the low teens to four digits. So okay.

((Crosstalk))

Matthew Shears: Maybe it's their total package when you factor in all the travel and expenses and everything else.

Ed Morris: We're not getting value for money from some of these people Matt. Ninety grand we should be able to upgrade the quality of some of the Board -- not all -- some of the Board members I have deep admiration for. Some I don't. Okay.

                  So why don't we go with Matt's plan. Take a look at it. Go do Google docs, put up the call and all that and I will get out the promised information in minutes and then I'll send a message off to David Olive within the hour and see what he comes back with. And I guess we should wrap it up.

Matthew Shears: Sounds good.

Ed Morris: Thanks Maryam.

                              END