ICANN

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 5, 2016
1:00 pm CT

Tapani Tarvainen   We do not have a real agenda for this. The notion would be to see what number of pending issues we have been - or reactions to stuff we have been doing in the past and see if something we need to follow-up on.

Please do remind me when I forget something you would want to go and what I pick up a few issues I'm remembering.

One of them was that this NCPH election (unintelligible) vice chair election board member election.

I started a small working group like where none of us is represented in there yet so we would have to have somebody volunteering for that, for working out the process and criteria for NCPH, selecting the vice chair and a board member for representing NCPH.

And they had two volunteers there that - from the commercial side but none from us. So we would like somebody from us to be there as well. Any volunteers? Rudi you want to speak?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. I'm not volunteering because I'm sitting in the SCI. And it's one of the items that we have on the table in the SCI looking into the whole process of selecting a chair electing a chair with the council.

And based on what I have seen in the request is that if it's on the term of - and period of vice chairs it's also a duty of the SCI to bring forward the proposal solution in the procedures and the process itself.

So I'm not going to volunteer for this. But I want eventually to be the liaison that you know what you are discussing over there and what are - what is the status of the discussion.

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you for that Rudi. I know that our SCI representative Stephanie. You are the NCUC rep in SCI so you might also want to keep your eye on this - oh NCSG right, yes of course.

So will you be happy to join this group with? Okay we have one volunteer any others? We could have another one there as well if we need to?

Okay Farzi, perfect. And Rudi we'll be watching from the SCI side what's going on, oh great.

Any - does somebody want to bring up something there's an urgent stuff here? The one that we had discussions yesterday and then apparently more than one place is what we're going to do with the CCWG accountability stuff because we - it was discussed in the NCUC group but it's actually NCSG level stuff. We're going to make decisions on that. Want to talk about - okay Rudi.

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Tapani, Rudi for the transcript. Maybe it's a good time to look a little bit back on how the NCSG is operating, and working and have a clear view on what is the duty of the executive committee, what is the duty of the policy committee and how decisions are taken by the NCSG itself?

Is it the policy committee taking all of the decisions and the executive committee just validating or saying okay we know about or is the executive committee also a decision taking body that has a final vote on where the NCSG has to make a statement?

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you Rudi. When I look at our charter there are some issues which explicitly stated that for example in the case of the binding counselors vote the charter says that the policy committee makes a decision with the approval of the executive committee.

So I think the process would be that the policy committee makes then first besides votes and then executive committee either approves or not so both have to approve them.

In other cases it's not so clear that some things are policy committee stuff, some are executive committee, but some are for the chair and that's not always well-defined so this would be something to look into if we review chart but in the present context in the CCWG case if we - the discussion about binding the councilors. Okay I see Avri you want to speak?

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. On this issue of clarifying all those things one of the things that the charter presumed was that the year after the charter was approved the EC had the task of working on specific procedures and such to meet all of those chartered items.

You know, one of the discussions that comes up is how much detail do you put in a charter? And the assumption of that charter in fact I think it's explicit in that charter is that it's the EC's responsibility to develop with the inclusion of the entire membership, you know, with the vetting process of the entire membership any of those substantial procedures and such. So - and I don't believe that that's ever an effort that's been seriously engaged in yet.

Tapani Tarvainen   Thank you Avri. I know that's our share to actually assess that the NCSG is issued review and approve the policy committee and our financial committee methods and procedures.

So our executive committee with the task the policy committee how we make up your procedures and then we'll validate those, but that's been done yet. So that's something we can put on the executive committee task list to keep this process going.

Okay. Somebody want to bring up what else here we want to follow-up? There have been a number of issues like the financing stuff and outreach. Okay Ed?

Ed Morris: Yes Tapani. I - if I recall correctly you've received some funding from ICANN to redo the database. Is that true?

And in the NCSG we've never really had funds well how does that work? Do we have a bank account? Do we...

Tapani Tarvainen   Okay. We have not received funds but the promise for funds. And we understand that a rather good promise in the sense as soon as we have a plan on how we spend the money we will get it.

But we do not have a bank account yet or any other - that's one of the issues we have to decide on that. We have some (unintelligible) plans on the executive committee agenda.

Possibilities include all the way from totally informally putting it somebody's bank account which I would not like to do but it's really possible to a full blown incorporation and we'd have to consider where we would go do that or which - would some country would be convenient for say lightweight incorporation having an NGO status somewhere.

Another place Estonia has been brought up as a possible location for that. But at the moment there lowest on the e-Residency programs would be - seem to be convenient. Ed?

Ed Morris: Yes. I can point out (Sarah) and I are actually both e-Residents of Estonia. And I've just been able to open actually less night I got the approval a bank account in Estonia on the basis of the e-Residency card. And you can use the program with an association even without an incorporation document.

So you would apply for NCSG if you wanted to if that's what folks wanted to do for a legitimate for a registration card. And then you can use that to set up a bank account. And you'd live obviously across the water so if you had to go and (unintelligible) I'm sure.

Tapani Tarvainen Yes. I have actually had some contact with some Estonian employers and whatnot. So it's most likely would require one personal visit to open the bank account. I could do that easily enough.

After that it could be transferred from person to another without any physical visits to Estonia although you may end up having to visit Estonian Embassy

which is not trivial to all people but it's much easier than flying across continents. Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you Tapani. Well I think we have to resolve first another question is when NCSG would get money how would that be used? What are the objectives? What are the projects we would like to fund?

I think that's the first step before saying okay let's have money. If you get money you have some extra responsibilities. You could have fiscal responsibilities.

So I would like to know first what are the objectives when NCSG is going to have money? And another point that I'm just a little bit afraid of is that when NCSG gets its own funding that ICANN would say well okay now you have your own funding we will not support you anymore on travel or on other occasions. And I'm just wondering if that's not damaging our performance at the end?

Tapani Tarvainen   Thank you Rudi. For the present only anticipated source money for NCSG is ICANN for this specific project of getting our member database set up.

So the idea is just that for whatever reasons I would ICANN does not want to pay directly to whoever set it up. So we'd have to have - I mean so accepting money from ICANN to pay for it.

And we are having a small workgroup. We have Sam and Joan were present here and Brenden (unintelligible) and we're trying to come up with a plan here and see how it works out.

But - and to that extent it should not cause the problems you mention. Of course if we shall do something like start fundraising for NCSG at that level that would change a lot more.

But have - just having minimal organization (unintelligible) will enable us to have a bank account should not do that as far as I can see.

Actually if people want we could take a few moments about discussion what we have been planning for this member database scheme but yes okay suggest - Sam you want to comment on that?

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. Thank you Tapani. The committee that is looking at sort of restructuring how the membership database works is looking at a membership database that has user access to user profiles so the profiles can be kept current.

We'll have a frontend to it that allows member application forms and so forth to come in from the three different NCUC, NCSG, NPOC either in common or separately but using those same fields that are inside it and give us some the application use of in short - and do away with the one now that's very cumbersome that involves essentially asking the Chair of NCUC to update stuff on a Google Docs Web site.

So we're trying to move into at least the 20th century is not the 21st century on how just the management of membership data is handled.

It raises some member - some data issues which we'll also have to confront. But there will be a high degree of transparency about how this rolls forward.

I mean something as simple as what fields should be in the file for a member and how does this link to the fields for application and so forth?

Well some views we put out on that and it will be a dialogue. And part of it will be informed of what we need internally, part of it will be informed on privacy and confidentiality issues, private part of it will be informed by what regulations are that are out there that we have to adhere to.

And we're doing this I mean the amount of money that's involved is very small. And it's basically it'll be accounted for by invoices for the things that need to be bought once we move forward with this.

But it for me the most important thing will be member managed profiles so that if an organization replaces somebody they go in and replace it. If somebody moves they go in and change their email address.

The other possibility and this would be for discussion it's not presumed would be to simply say if in your constituency group you have updated your profile by January 1 or in the last 12 months you are hereby eligible for the next election without having, you know, we may want to still do it the way we've been doing it, send out an email that you have to respond to but it would be easier to do that and we would have a well-organized database.

Then NCUC and NPOC could extract from that their own groups to carry on their own dialogues. It's an efficiency move.

Tapani Tarvainen Yes. Thank you Sam. You identified most of the issues we have. I would like to assess one point that NCSG, NCUC and NPOC members overlap.

And at the moment they are being maintained separately. So somebody changes to their address they have to remember to notify both NCSG and either NCUC or NPOC although our secretary of support is making this easier but still it's kind of a stupid situation.

And I have a comment here sort of remotely that we should have some kind of internal CRM or Customer Registry Management system.

And one of the solutions that's exactly what we are planning to do. One of the solutions we are exploring is CVCRM which is an Open Source CRM solution that would provide exactly these kinds of features.

So we - even though at the moment we are not collecting membership fees we don't anticipate to but we want to have the option there. And all kinds CRM functions like being able to send customized PMS and whatever integrating with our mailing list.

That's another question here that we have mailing lists floating all over the world having them all centralized in one place would be a nice thing to have and so forth.

Okay Ed you want to say something?

Ed Morris: Yes. Just as we put this together I know we have two constituencies that will be working together. I just want to make sure we don't forget that we do have members that are part of neither constituency and we need to make sure that that is captured in the database as well.

Tapani Tarvainen Yes. That is the intent. The notion is that we have NCSG members in the database at the bottom and then out of that way can split out access it from a constituency basis or whatever.

So - but data lives as one and the people are first NCSG members at least from a database technical perspective. And then constituencies can have their own layer of interface then if they need to. Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. One area that will come up and it'll be discussed it'll be open for discussion is that the work of NCSG, NPOC, and NCUC with respect to ICANN takes place across a whole raft of applications. It's in Google Docs, it's on ICANN servers it's here it's there and so forth.

And a customer relations management application can also do a lot of that. But where that work should be done is going to be something that we have to have wider discussions on.

Some of it I'm sure will have to be on ICANN because it's part of what others in ICANN are doing.

But there will be some of these kind of foggy areas where we'll have to have discussions and make - and we may just stick with the status quo or we may come up with good sort of improved ways of handling some of the workflow of NCSG and its component parts.

Tapani Tarvainen Yes. Thank you Sam. And that actually is a good jumping point for another agenda item we might want to bring up is improving the work of NCSG. I'm thinking of another play there how we process public comments.

Having some kind of tool that makes it easier to track what's being done and who's doing what integrated into this would be most useful I think.

And I trust you all have read Rafik's plan here of how it would work? Okay I see Stephanie wants to comment on this.

Stephanie Perrin: I have to confess immediately that I haven't read Rafik's plan of how this would work. I'm here to say though whatever we've got isn't working for me. I can't keep track.

And I find if you're busy working on several PDPs, you know, checking on the wretched Web site signing up for automatic notices just doesn't do it.

We need an interface where we can just look and see okay how are we doing on this comment or that comment? Who is holding the pen? How many people are working? Do they need more volunteers blah, blah blah? Where is the link to the document?

Tapani Tarvainen Yes. Thank you, Stephanie. We - I think we're all very much agree on that. We need better tools for tracking this.

And while we've been promised funding for this member database the option that ICANN was offering is that using their member clicks commercial software.

And that actually is a comprehensive package that involves complete Web site and whatever and we can use the same amount of money for doing similar stuff on our own if we want.

So we can actually set up use this funding. I'm understanding that we can use it for this kind of tools as well as long as we stay within the budget.

So we have at least goals here to go for. I hope we will get something done. A certain kind of timeline here that I'm hoping we could have something more concrete to say about this by Marrakesh and with any luck we'll have something that actually works by Panama.

Okay does Klaus you seem to want to bring up another topic?

Klaus Stoll: Yes. Just quite simply I would like to know where we're standing on the CCWG? And how do we agree or not agree what's going up because Fadi mentioned it time is running out?

I thought Fadi might be how to say that presuming a little bit too much. And that's why I would just like to know where people see things are?

Tapani Tarvainen Yes thank you Klaus. We actually - but I touched (unintelligible) in the introduction but we didn't get more than a procedural concerns.

So now I'm drawing up another CCWG working group members and counselors to comment on this one, where do you stand? Robin you seem to want to talk. I hope you do.

Robin Gross: Hi. This is Robin Gross for the record. So you're - the question is what's happening with the CCWG and where is that going?

So it's actually a moving target right now. And we've got basically there were 12 recommendations that were in the third draft that went out for public comment about a month or a month and a half ago.

And there are some concerns in the community with a couple of the recommendations particularly with respect to the GAC empowerment issue the government getting more power both in Recommendation 1 as a decisional authority and also in number or Recommendation 11 as - which said that the board would have to do what the GAC said unless they can come up with a 2/3 vote against that.

And the GNSO came out pretty much solidly against that. And so that's where we're working right now is trying to come to some kind of a compromise which I think is happening.

There's been a lot of movement in the last few days trying to narrow some of the concerns with those recommendations.

And then also another related concern is with Recommendation 10 because that left GAC exempt from all of the accountability reviews that the rest of us were - have to go through.

And so on the one hand we're giving governments a lot more power and on the other hand we're saying but they don't have to be accountable like we do.

So that was a problem for a lot of people in the GNSO. And we are working very hard enormous number of hours in meetings every other day hundreds of emails it's really impossible to keep up with.

But people are participating in good faith and really trying to come to some conclusions and some consensus. And I think that will probably happen in the next week.

I'd be curious to hear what others who are actively participating in this process think but that's sort of where I think we are now.

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you. Thank you, Robin. Actually since we do have they NCA present at the moment (unintelligible) would you care to comment on you on this?

Man: Don't really have that much to comment at this point. I think we still need to - do a fair bit of talking about where we really want to get with this and I don't think we're quite there yet.

Tapani Tarvainen I think everybody agrees with that assessment. Ed you want to comment?

Ed Morris: Sure. What Robin said about it being a moving target is certainly true today. I went to sleep last night thinking there had been a compromise reached on Recommendation Number 11.

And then I wake up this morning to find out that the GAC isn't happy or at least certain vocal elements within the GAC because they're totally opaque we have no idea what's going on inside the GAC but certain elements of the GAC are not happy with this.

If this agreement falls apart I don't know where this is headed because the offer on Table 3 (unintelligible) clearly will we rejected by the GNSO.

Now personally it's not enough for me. I - its point of principle that giving the government the ability to reject the work of a community even despite the fact that the board agreed with the community it's a no go for me.

So my own personal vote if I'm not directed even with the compromise will likely be no on Recommendation 11, no on Recommendation 10 because as

Robin said they're being the governments being exempted from the accountability review requirements while still in Recommendation 1 a complete participation decision maker.

So you have the government wanting to come in to be our equals as a decision maker, continue to have their special advice taken by the board, making an increased override for - that the board needs to overcome the GAC advice and at the same point avoid accountability mechanisms.

So I just man I want this transition to succeed. I've worked hundreds of hours. Robin's worked thousands of hours in this by comparison.

But I just can't go for something that allows the governments to have an opaque operational system that allows them to override community input and we have nothing to say about it.

We fought for many years to keep governments away from controlling the Internet. But when I look at this proposal I'll say this, the ITU is more transparent than the GAC. If we could get the GAC up to the ITU level of transparency I'd be happy to sign on.

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you Ed. I see that Avri wanted to speak and then Klaus. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you, Avri speaking. In one respect I very much agree with Ed in that he should not have his vote bound. We should not bind any of the votes.

And he should be able to vote both as his conscience directs him and as he interprets to be a represented view of those in the NCSG. So I very much support that.

With due respect I have a problem with the comparison of transparency and opacity, most of our discussions about this and our strategy discussion are on closed chat groups that are not recorded anywhere, not monitored anywhere, no one really knows what we, or the CSG, or the registry or registrar stakeholder groups are indeed discussing when they come to their positions.

Everybody - and the GAC has for a long time their major meetings are indeed open now. Their communicate drafting sessions are not. And they should be at least, you know, we're perhaps we're getting somebody in there with the liaison from the GNSO but I'm not absolutely sure about that. So I think comparisons or opacity are problematic.

As I've argued before I do not see in any way that this is increasing the power of the GAC relative to the rest of our powers.

All of the powers are being increased. One of the important things about this transition and about the community engagement is that all of the community is getting more to say about things that are not in their normal scope.

The GNSO, et cetera, has nothing to say about various issues now like budget. And it will get a say in things like budget.

So we have that the relative power of the community is increasing. And, you know, there's a very large principle of equity and equality in the multi-stakeholder model that says, you know, if we're increasing one we should keep things relatively the same.

Now we understand the ITU for example is horrible in terms of giving us our do place. But I don't think that's a reason for us not to consider equality when we're moving on.

Now we've actually managed to move away from that equality by having cutouts for the SOs that say if the IRP is about one of their PDPs they have to agree.

So we've basically given them a plus one. And we've said in relation to the GAC if their advice is the subject of an IRP they may not be part of the decisional. And it looks like they may or may not accept that.

So at that point we've already taken equality and we've made some of us a little bit more equal than the GAC.

So the compromise that is being as Robin said, you know, genuinely being worked on with such has already made us more equal than them again relative to the solution, relative to the past.

Now I'm not exactly sure where the compromise will settle. I do agree that the issue of ten of GAC review not being included is problematic but they are not at all reviewed now.

And I do believe that, that is a topic we can keep pushing on to get more and more of a peek into this. They have been evolving.

If you look at the work that's been achieved by the ATRT-1s mandate on the board and GAC to get it together, to become more transparent, to become more visible that is working.

That is something in progress. And, you know, if you look back at the GAC this GAC is quite transparent compared to previous GACs.

So basically in terms of how close it is for a while now I've been considering it asymptotically close. We are there as soon as we decide we're there.

It's, you know, then there will be as we go further and further fewer and fewer holdouts on the negotiations of compromise and hopefully we will get to consensus that way.

But we're there. I mean the work is done except for the last hurrah. And, you know, that could take two days, we could be done Tuesday or it could happen in 2018. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you Avri. I'm sure I've missed - I think I, Klaus, Matthew, Stephanie and Robin in that order.

Klaus Stoll: It - to be absolutely honest I feel your pain because I feel the same. Maybe if it helps you and maybe helps it doesn't help you. I think what we are talking about is we are dealing with a birth defect of ICANN.

Inequality of the GAC inside the ICANN system right from the start is a birth defect which we suffer and we will suffer forever or we step by step have to deal with it.

On - from a pragmatic point of view even if I don't like it I have to agree with Avri. On the other hand I would encourage you to go with your conscience and nothing else. But be assured we I feel your pain.

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you, Matthew.

Matthew Shears: I like that. Feel your pain I think we all feel this pain. And that's what makes this so interesting and so difficult.

If we were to move ahead with a compromise as it is now despite as others have noted that it's being questioned yet again I would be comfortable moving ahead with one and 11.

I have the same reservations of about ten. There are other issues and ten which are problematical which have to do with the role of the board and reviews.

I mean this is - that's a pretty - that's a distinct and separate issue that I think we also need to come back on.

But I have to say that, you know, and we talked about this a bit yesterday I think that this is a - this is about as good as we're going to get.

And I say that with something of a heavy heart because this is not where CDT or I personally started out in the process but that's the nature of this bizarre multi-stakeholder process that we're trying to uphold here is that we do have to - it's long, it's awkward, it's difficult and up, you know, making compromises.

And I think at this juncture this is good. And I put that in quotes in a way. But I think it's about as good as were going to get and I would hate to see us not go through with this transition. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you Matthew. Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think I'm probably going to say something that I said after the NetMundial episode and got everybody mad at me.

But if there's one thing governments are good at its despite the apparent chaos of the process it's figuring out the endgame.

So I don't think anybody should be surprised that they are objecting strenuously to attempt to make them more transparent.

I think the governments have genuine needs to be not fully transparent otherwise they don't get full and frank disclosure from different countries who are not used to transparency whatsoever. So it's a continual struggle to push them towards greater transparency.

I don't know whether I like the birth defect image but I agree with Klaus. I mean I see this as significant progress. Yes try and hold the lines against them pushing any further because this was entirely predictable.

I expect histrionic gestures from the GAC at this point about how the world is going to end if they don't get their way. I expect more ammunition coming. And we should be - we should remain calm in the face of this.

And I hate to say it but Fadi was up there basically saying this. There was some pearls in that pile of that lengthy discourse. Sorry.

So I think we should stay calm and carry on. And I certainly will vote the way I'm instructed to vote but at the moment as I said yesterday in the meeting I'm going to consult with all people involved including my former colleagues in government.

I think there's a significant risk in scuttling this thing. I think that we have to sign on to the struggle, admit that we feel burnt out and abused to ourselves but not parade that in public and carry through with this. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen   Thank you Stephanie. And now I see that Robin has raised her flag as Philip

Corwin but I guess you'll do anyway. So Robin, please speak up.

Robin Gross: Thank you. And this is Robin Gross speaking. I just needed to correct the

record regarding the assertion that NCSGs statements were developed in

secret or in some opaque fashion.

I - as the record would - can clearly demonstrate we've discussed these issues

on every one of our monthly policy calls since this process started open to any

member.

We had three weekly calls during the weeks we were drafting our position

statements. Again open to any member and attended by nearly 30 members

three weeks in a row two hour calls each one of them.

We had more than 12 people actually I think we had about 15 different people

participating in the actual drafting of the statements which was on a Google

Doc that anyone could see. It was sent to open lists.

So I just think it's important that - I understand people are frustrated that they

didn't get their way in the end but I don't think it's appropriate to start

slandering the NCSG in the way that we do things.

Tapani Tarvainen   Okay. I see if Avri wants to have quick moment please?

Avri Doria: Yes, a quick comment. I did not say that we developed our whole position in

opacity. What I said is we carry on our ongoing discussions that way on chat

lists. I did not at any point accuse this of having been nor was it of point.

What I would make a point is, is that we're not having ongoing open discussions as these negotiations go on.

Tapani Tarvainen   Thank you. I have Sam and then Brett. I know that we are running out of time. Actually we can go in for half an hour if we don't want to eat but I think we do so please be brief. Sam?

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. It's just a quick but it's a reflective comment and that's for me I keep saying to myself we've asked the GAC to go where they have never gone before basically.

They don't have precedent. They don't have case law to look at other organizations or other involvements to say oh that's how we did it over there.

This is basically the first time I mean ICANN itself that they have tried to live in this kind of universe. So I'm not surprised that they will push for as much as they can get and they will push hard.

But I think that once we nail this thing down it's not nailed down as it is forever because for everybody it's going to be a new reality.

And we're all going to discover things we like and don't like about the new reality that we didn't anticipate and that includes them and the struggles will continue.

Tapani Tarvainen   Thank you Sam. Brett?

Brett Schaefer: I'd just go ahead and - Brett Schaefer for the record. I will just go ahead and echo a little bit of what Matthew Shears said in that I do think that this is the best that we are likely to get at this point.

But I will also say that in response to the emails from some members of the GAC this morning trying to push back on what the agreement or the negotiated position is that that's unacceptable.

At a very minimum what is being proposed on the table addresses at a bare minimum the concerns that have been raised in this group, in the CSG, in other parts of the GNSO in terms of the GAC influencing the ability to act as a decisional participant in the EC while retaining its privileged advisory role to the board.

And that if while I can hold my nose in support the compromise that has been proposed, or weighed, or put forward in the CCWG right now if it does erode if it does move backwards then I wouldn't because I don't think at that point that it does meet the minimum standards necessary to address the concerns that have been raised.

So I just wanted to make that clear and - in terms of the potential evolution of this discussion in the CCWG over the next few days.

Tapani Tarvainen   Thank you. Okay Ed wants to have the last word on the subject. Please be brief.

Ed Morris: Yes sure Tapani. I will try to do so. Two points one is when we talk about scuttling the transition we don't have that power. I think it's important to know that the NCSG alone, the GNSO alone cannot scuttle the transition.

But what I think we can do if we do cast a negative vote is send the message that this is not a perfect plan.

I certainly don't want them to go before Congress where there's going to be questioning where every group votes unanimously in favor of this plan as if the community is completely satisfied with what came out.

Point two is what I'm hearing from Avri and from others. It seems to be complete agreement is the recommendation that we're most concerned about at this point is Recommendation Number 10. I actually feel that way as well.

So in my new role as a participant in the CCWG and on council from this point on I'm going to focus on that specific issue and see if we can make some progress there.

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you Ed. It's 12 o'clock now but if Stephanie you wanted to have a few words on the something we discussed in NCUC session yesterday what to do with the SOI requirements and should we push for more transparency regarding funding there? Just briefly sounding out how we feel about it.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes hi, Stephanie Perrin for the record. Thanks very much. I'll try to be brief as I'm keeping you for lunch I guess.

I raised the concern in the NCUC recently about transparency in our funding partly because I'm about to embark on the what I call Who 2 the replacement for Whois.

And I'm deeply concerned about the large number of people in that group that are newcomers that may or may not have been recruited by the GAC to represent law enforcement interests and who are not accurate in their SOI.

Now my concern with respect to civil society is if I'm going to go in there and start throwing rocks around at particularly at governments who are pretty

good at fighting back I want to make sure that we have a very high standard ourselves.

We're pushing for more activity on the DIDP front for more openness and transparency. We have to do the same ourselves.

So what I was proposing was a modification to our own SOI some kind of a standard template that we use to say how we're funded for what we're doing.

And I think this will be useful to members who would like to be active and put up their hands for various roles but are not necessarily there to do the work on the PDPs which is a bit of a pet peeve of mine do you know so if we're active, and we are being funded explain to everybody how we're funded.

And if we're getting outside funding for a project basically it's your own business if you come from a university for instance and you've got a big grant that is funding you, fine.

But we're going to be getting questions on how our people are funded. I think if we could agree on a kind of a base minimum standard that says, you know, I'll pick on Milton because he's not here. You know, Milton Mueller funded by his Foreign Foundation grant for the Internet Governance Project.

I don't think that's going to kill anybody. And it sets a decent standard. And I'm making that up. I don't actually know whether he's got a current Foreign Foundation Grant but I know he did have.

So that's the kind of disclosure I'm looking for. I think that it can be done through your own organization with a link from your Web site.

I recognize this is real easy for me because the only money I get is from council. And when that stops I'm going to have to crowdsource because I'm not employed.

So, you know, I realized that it's me putting demands on folks who have complex lives. But I think we are going to push and I'm pushing all the time on ICANN as a charity model kind of where the heck are we and we're only on rung one we've got to get to rung two or three then we need to pull ourselves up as well. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen Thank you Stephanie. I notice Klaus wants to comment on this.

Klaus Stoll: First of all Stephanie your 100% right and you got 110% of my support on that one. But we need to do more.

We have to go back again and again and again to explain to ICANN that people inside the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group are not funded by a company. Some of them are not - are basically not paid to do the work.

And I'm not asking again that we are - that the people are doing all that work are getting paid but that our expenses and things that are getting recompensed including time.

Because we are permanently here on the deficit side with volunteers and things like that and on the one side we have to be more transparent on the other - and if ICANN expects us to do the work ICANN also has a duty to enable us to do the work.

And we are not like an employee of a registrar who can just pay somebody and say okay take care of ICANN.

Tapani Tarvainen Yes. Thank you Klaus. I see Brett and Stephanie want to talk.

Brett Schaefer: I actually want to take about 30 seconds of something unrelated to this. So if Stephanie's talking...

Tapani Tarvainen Okay Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes. Believe me I am donating probably 40 hours a week right now that I could usefully be consulting and getting paid and I'm cheap, you know, but even so.

So I'm spending my kid's inheritance doing this job so I have some sympathy with Klaus's wish to be paid for time.

But that is not what I'm proposing. I just want transparency on where the funding is coming if people are paid for their time.

So if you've got a project that will pay you to come to ICANN and work on something great. And if I manage to get a (Shared) Grant which is what I would do in Canada I will declare that. That would be wonderful.

I - as I say I'm going to declare my crowdsourcing if I don't get elected to council next year I'll be sponging from all around trying to get the money because I need to follow the RDS because we have a deficit in privacy expertise.

However once you start asking to be paid for your time then you have ICANN sorting out who they're going to hire to do the civil society function because that's what it becomes in many ways.

It's one thing to recompense you for your travel. It is quite another to pay you for your time. So I would be vigorous in pushing that back plus of course you're running into tax authority problems with the United States. You wouldn't even see the money it would all be taxed away by the IRS. And your life would be a living hell. Thanks bye.

Tapani Tarvainen Okay, thank you Stephanie. We don't have time to discuss this in more detail now but it seems that one thing we have a reasonable agreement that we would need to have better standards of our own for how we declare our funding sources.

And that would be the first step even looking for (unintelligible) and if we go for what Klaus proposed the first thing to do is to have - we know where we're funded and when we can ask for more.

So maybe we're trying to develop our own standards for how we declare our funding. But let's leave it at that. And then I want to give Brett the 30 seconds he wanted for something else. Then we close.

Brett Schaefer: Thank you. This has to do with my question to Fadi earlier. I do want to suggest -- and I don't know if this is the appropriate place -- that this group consider sending a formal letter to the board asking them to explicitly layout what Fadi did declare to them in terms of potential conflict of interest as obligated under the conflict of interest policies and whether the board members who were also covered persons declared and made this made the general council aware their obligated to do on this matter.

And if so where that process stands so that the community can have transparency and understanding as to where this thing is right now, and where it has been and where it is going. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen   Okay. Robin you want to quick reply in that?

Robin Gross: Thanks. Yes this is Robin. I just want to say that I would strongly support that request that we do that. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen   Okay. Well we'll put that under advisement and try to actually get it done but we don't have the time for...

Man: Very quickly I think that will be a PC matter. So Brett you could give me that. I will introduce it to the PC and try to get that through and get that out as soon as we can.

Tapani Tarvainen   Okay. Thank you. Let - we about ten minutes over time but we started ten - the last one ended ten minutes late as well, so not too bad.

                    Let's close the session. Thank you everybody. And let's go...

                              END