

ICANN

Moderator: Rob Hogarth
January 15, 2015
8:00 am CT

Rob Hogarth: ...that everybody sees where I am. Good morning. For those of you who don't know me, my name is Rob Hogarth. I'm one of the Senior Directors of the ICANN Policy Development Support Team and also have some community engagement responsibilities which somehow qualifies me to hold the microphone today. I'm not quite sure how that worked but thank you, Steve, and other organizers to sort of encourage me to kick things off this morning.

A little bit loud. Does that work? But then I can't see you, Steve, so it makes it a little more difficult.

I'm standing over here to try to make a point about the atmosphere of the next couple of days. I could be standing over there or here or over there. The point is, this is a circle, somewhat squared off, but the idea being that there is no head to the table.

The idea is to bring all of you members of the Non Contracted Party's House leadership together to collaborate, work together, build bridges, identify areas of commonality, work together to identify areas where there are differences how you might achieve some consensus.

This is a relatively new concept ICANN. This is our second Non Contracted Party's House meeting. The first one took place two years ago in Los Angeles. Some have already observed that the decision to have the second meeting in Washington DC, at least for me whether perspective, may not have been the best one. But it's nice for you all to come to a different place at least from a Washington perspective, it's really nice to have all of you here. A number of us did not have to travel.

I hope that we'll be able to do these types of meetings again. But the important thing is that you all really help us understand what works for these types of meetings, what doesn't work, how we can improve them, how we can, you know, basically do a better job when we bring you altogether and to make these meetings the most efficient and productive as possible. So I'm hopeful you'll have that spirit throughout the next couple of days as well.

What I'd like to do, as sort of an introduction, is give you a many of the land in terms of some of the logistics. We'll do a quick review of today's agenda and then sort of flow into our first session or two.

This is designed to be a meeting where most of the time you are all together. And it's worked out pretty well that most of the time we are here in this room together. There will be a couple of breakout sessions that I'll flag for you, but for the most part this is going to be our place.

If you need a restroom, they're down on the far end of the hallway near the coat racks so those of you who are a little bit too bunched up - and I apologize for some of the squeezing here - we can put our coats down on the racks on the hangers down at the end of the hallway so there's an opportunity to do that.

In many respects you'll see from the agenda we're flowing right through. We've got some good break times around lunch but otherwise please feel free, from to time, if you have to get up and take a break, take a call or something like that please feel free to do that and step out of the room.

Am I leaving anything out? Carlos or Reed? I think that's pretty much from a logistic standpoint. You do know that from the perspective of ICANN's tradition of remote participation and because we do have a tight room here not everybody could participate that you would have liked to have participated.

We have an Adobe Connect chat room which we're always going to have displayed up on there on the screen. I imagine that many of you will have logged in and will be observing or being able to have chats with some of your colleagues who are not here in person.

So if for some reason Carlos or I miss a comment someone wants to make or if there's someone outside of the meeting who would like to make a comment if you can direct that through one of your representatives here or raise your hand and we'll do our best to have people participate remotely. But we want to try to get a good back and forth dialogue in the room.

Is there anything - yes, Avri?

Avri Doria: It sounds like someone may already be watching that and have their sound on because we are getting an echo as you speak.

Rob Hogarth: Reed, if we could check into that. I don't know if that's...

Avri Doria: Just people should make sure their mute...

Rob Hogarth: Some of the speakers, if you can turn off your laptop speakers that would be great. Usually when that happens we need up not with just a nice little echo but some terrible interference. I'm glad that hasn't happened yet.

And a quick apology to those who are participating remotely, Reed is holding up the camera for the room so if any of you are getting motion sickness it's his fault, not mine. I'm doing my best, Reed, not to start walking around to emphasize the table in the round concept.

Let's do a quick review of the agenda if we can. As you know, this is a two-day meeting. And the planners who did a tremendous job over the last three or four months developing the agenda, trying to work through things, have constantly been challenged particularly over the last week or so with some changes and differences in the speakers and things like that so I appreciate you all being flexible.

I did share a note with the planners about two or three days ago thanking them for their flexibility and noting that we will all need to remain flexible throughout the course of the next couple of days just because we'll play around with the agenda and move things back and forth. We'll try not to do that too much because we recognize there are folks who are participating remotely who may have scheduled things based on some of the agenda items so we'll do our best in that regard.

Let me pause for a second and see if any of the meeting planners wanted to say a word or two? Anything from...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rob Hogarth: Oh thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rob Hogarth: I'm glad that (Andrew) mentioned that. We have set up a wiki page for this meeting. When you look on the community wiki under GNSO Non Contract Party House Meetings you'll see the wiki that has all of the remote participation information for the next two days particularly for your colleagues who were not able to participate here in person, please share that with them.

I've done - a couple of people have reached out to me and I've shared that link with them. But that has all the information about what room we're using, the room address that Reed just shared with many of you is the Adobe Connect room that we'll use for most of the session.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rob Hogarth: And I'll read on the microphone one more time.
ICANN.adobeconnect.com/community-engagement. Our first consensus item of the two days.

Reed, if you can flip me to the next slide I'll begin just a general overview for you all about what our day looks like today. Thank you for all for joining us for breakfast. We're now doing the introductions and welcome.

Then we'll move into Plenary Session 1 followed by Plenary Session 2. Again, an opportunity for you all to say yes, we want to stop five minutes early and start five minutes later to allow for a little break. We can also push things a little bit into lunch. A number of you, I know, appreciated that we had reached

out to Larry Strickling of NTIA for him to come speak with us today. But he's unable to do that.

I had posited to the meeting organizers an alternative to that. Steve Crocker will be joining us for lunch. Theresa Swinehart. We also have Markus here in the room and so the opportunity potentially to talk a little bit about the ICANN accountability issue that Larry was prepared to speak on may also be something that you all want to talk about.

But both of our lunches right now are set up to be quite informal in terms of you all deciding what you want to talk about and what the agenda might be. I'm seeing a questioning look from Mr. Andruff. Ron, is there any point that you wanted to make?

Oh okay. All right. Okay I just - I wanted to address any questions. So that's the morning. That takes us through about two o'clock. Then the next slide read this afternoon we're looking to connect with Fadi Chehadé. He'll be here from two to four o'clock. He may actually be here a little bit early during the lunch period. A lot depends on the weather and some of the other meetings he had that are being rescheduled or moved around a bit. But he'll definitely be here between the 1400 and 1600 timeframe.

And then what we've set up in the agenda is the opportunity for breakout sessions. The CSG is going to stay in this room and then we have two rooms down on the conference level here at CSIS set up for the NCUC and the NPOC. We've got Adobe Connect room for those meetings for those of you who would like to take advantage of that. And we'll have full remote participation for those meetings.

For Dan and Markus you might be invited to some of those sessions or just decide to float to either of those sessions if you'd like. I'm sure you'd be most welcomed by the community leaders for those areas.

Then, you know, give you an opportunity to head back to your hotels across the street or locally, freshen up a bit. We were able to swing a reception for this evening across the street at the Beacon Hotel in the Overlook room so we'd really like to have you all join us for that if you can. That's scheduled for about two hours or so.

And then something odd, Carlos, I think it's still scheduled, the hotel, for those of you who are there, it's called Sip and Swing or something odd. There's some karaoke thing next door or in the hotel that I'm sure some of you would just love to take advantage of after a relaxing reception.

So that's what our day looks like so far today. Again, this is your meeting. Staff is here to facilitate, help out where we can but it's really your opportunity to engage, talk about the issues that are important to you, get to know each other and the rest.

Before we start to move to anything specific I would point out that for those of you who do have agendas the meeting planners got together, we started a little bit late because I had dragged them all outside, we're flipping the two plenary sessions.

So the group wants to lead off with the internal discussions and so that's what we'll do. And then we'll move to the - we'll flip the session and then talk about the GNSO review and the other matter when we get to that. So Reed and Carlos will just have to pay attention to that when we're looking at our slides.

A number of you thought it was very important, particularly if you try to look across the room at someone else's name tag that it's kind of difficult to do so. And so we thought that we would give everybody an opportunity around the room to introduce themselves, say whatever you would like about your organization or why you're here.

But we thought that would be a really good way to sort of start things off, break the ice a little bit. Don't worry, we're not doing any breakout sessions where we're team building or anything like that. Just very simple, hi, I'm so and so from so and so and we're more than happy to do that. But, again, feel free to expand if you'd like.

We have mics spread around but I think what I'll do is I'll just walk around and offer to hand the mic to some folks if they'd like to use that. And we're going to start with Mr. Drake who I'm standing behind. And we're going to go this direction so, Jonathan, you'll be next.

Bill Drake: Good morning, everyone. I'm very nervous. I've never spoken like this before. I'm Bill Drake and I teach at the University of Zurich. And I'm the Chair of the Non Commercial Users Constituency. Or I can pass it this way.

Jonathan Zuck: Either way. Jonathan Zuck from ACT, the App association and member of the IPC. And I'm here as the result of a plot reminiscent of Show Girls because through some suspicious circumstances one of our members isn't able to make it and so I'm here at the show and I hope I don't let anybody down.

Dan Reed: I'm not sure I can follow that introduction. I'm Dan Reed. I'm NomComm appointee to the GNSO Council. Look forward to discussion today.

(Adrian Ho): Hi, I'm (Adrian Ho) from (Extensure) in England. And we organize conferences and business summits around ICT and telecoms in Africa predominantly. And I'm here really to see how we can involve more of the Internet governance elements towards the events we organize in Africa. Thank you.

Walid Al-Saqaf: It's Walid Al-Saqaf an NCUC member, kindly invited to attend this first meeting of its kind. I'm from Yemen but based in Sweden where I'm a post-doctoral fellow in media and communications. I've been involved in ICANN through the ICANN fellowship which I'm grateful for. It introduced me to this world, confusing it rather. And much learning to do. I'm also involved in the Arab (IGS). And I'm also proud ISOC chapter of the Yemen chapter. Thank you.

Klaus Stoll: Hello, good morning. My name is Klaus Stoll. I would like to wish my mother and my father - I'm sorry, that was last night. I'm a member of the NPOC, and Executive Committee. And the reason why I'm here is quite simply because I believe in the multisector process and that's where we need to go.

Rudi Vansnick: Good morning. My name is Rudi Vansnick. I'm the Chair of NPOC. And the reason why I'm here is not to just fill up a seat but try to bring some value to the discussions and look forward to take away from here all the positive elements that we are going to discuss and leave the negative ones here.

Sam Lanfranco: I'm San Lanfranco, Policy Chair - Committee Chair for NPOC. I'm here to help, as others, move things forward.

Martin Silva: Hello. I'm Martin. I'm Secretariat of the NPOC. I'm a lawyer in Argentina. I specialize in Internet law. I do teach and research in my hometown university.

And I collaborate with many NGOs from the region in Internet-related matters. Thank you.

(Joan Kern): Good morning. My name is (Joan Kern). And I haven't been on any other committees but it just so happened that I ended up being on one of the best committees because our members are really friendly and really helpful and that committee is the NPOC. So thank you for inviting me. I'm the Membership Chair for that committee.

And my role and intention is to create value and engagement for the members and to consistently inform them. And I think that that's what the committee wants to do so I'm happy to be here to learn where we're going and how we're doing it and to meet many of you. Thank you.

Zuan Zhang: Hello, everybody. My name is Zuan Zhang. And I come from Beijing China. Recently I was elected to the Executive Committee of NCUC. Thank you.

Andrew Mack: Good morning, everyone. My name is Andrew Mack. I'm with AIM Global Consulting here in Washington. Welcome to our fair city; sorry about the weather. And I'm a BC member, long-time veteran of work with ICANN and IGF and a specialist and work with emerging markets and with outreach.

Greg Shatan: Good morning, everybody. My name is Greg Shatan. I'm a member of the Intellectual Property Constituency. I'm an attorney based in New York currently with the law firm of Ableman, Frayne and Schwab. I'm an intellectual property and technology transactions attorney.

In the IPC I serve as the IPC's participation coordinator. I'm also representing the Commercial Stakeholder Group on the IANA Transition CWG and also on a couple of other working groups and the like. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Good morning. My name is Heather Forrest. I've come from Melbourne, Australia. I'm guaranteed to win the longest in the plane award. I'm a GNSO councilor representing the Intellectual Property Constituency. And I was involved in the first intercessional so I'm very interested to see what we can do in version 2.0. Thank you very much.

Susan Payne: Hi, I'm Susan Payne. I'm also from the IPC. I'm an IP lawyer based in London working for Valideus which is a consultancy which works with brand new gTLD applicants.

John McElwaine: I'm John McElwaine and I'm an attorney based in Charleston, South Carolina. I also have an office in Washington DC. As you can tell from the weather I spend most of my time in Charleston but enjoy being up here when I can. I'm an IP lawyer, as I said. I've been on the IPC for about six years now and have served with a number of you on various committees within ICANN including - I just rotated off of the Nominating Committee for ICANN.

And I really think my purpose - my goal here is to listen, to learn a lot and hopefully be able to contribute to some of the dialogue.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi, I'm Kiran Malancharuvil, trademark attorney based in San Francisco. I am the Policy Counselor at Mark Monitor and a member of the IPC. Did I say that? I am here to take advantage of this unique opportunity to have a smaller group discussion with our colleagues. I'm really looking forward to making progress on our, you know, relationship, and working together to ensure that we continue to have a voice here at ICANN. Thanks.

Markus Kumar: Hello. I'm Markus Kumar. Thanks to you I'm a Board member of ICANN since the LA meeting. Thanks for inviting me here. And I'm here mainly in a listening mode. And I look forward to our discussions.

Stephanie Perrin: Hi. I'm Stephanie Perrin. I'm one of the newly-elected GNSO councilors, relatively new to ICANN. Recently retired from the Canadian federal government where I spent 35 years on information policy issues. And so I'm no longer gainfully employed. I'm a doctoral candidate at the University of Toronto Faculty of Information. Thanks.

Matthew Shears: Good morning. My name is Matthew Shears of the Center for Democracy and Technology and a member of NCSG.

David Cake: Hi. I'm David Cake. I'm a member of NCSG. And at least the councilors (unintelligible) one of the currently vice chair of the - one of the vice chairs of the GNSO Council. I have to say, Heather, you said you were guaranteed to be the person who traveled the longest but I have you beaten by the length of Australia because I'm from the West Coast so I think I'm - have a fair claim to have traveled the furthest.

I'm particularly keen for this meeting, as I said, I'm the vice chair but besides Markus's position on the Board that's one of the two positions that's elected from the entire - from both stakeholder groups. And I'm definitely keen to see us work more constructively across the stakeholder groups and constituencies is what I'd like to see out of this meeting. Thank you.

João Carlos Caribe: My name is João Carlos Caribe. I'm from Brazil. And I'm representing here NCUC. I was elected to Executive Committee for NCUC this time. (Unintelligible) and I here completely committed to NCUC agenda.

- Grace Githaiga: Hi, everyone. My name is Grace Githaiga from the Kenya ICT Action Network. I'm based in Nairobi. And I'm here as a member of the NCUC representing Africa.
- Tony Holmes: I'm Tony Holmes, long-term member of the ISPCP based in London, UK. I currently chair the constituency and I'm also currently sitting on the GNSO Council.
- Tony Harris: Yes, my name is Tony Harris. I'm the Executive Director of the Argentina Internet Association, CABASE, and also the Latin America Federation of Internet and Electronic Commerce, ECOMLAC. And I am a member of the ISPCP since ICANN was formed actually, so I'm not exactly a newcomer we might say.
- Oswaldo Novoa: Good morning. My name is Oswaldo Novoa. I am Deputy General Director of ANTEL. That's a telecommunications provider in Uruguay. I am in the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency. And I'm a member of the GNSO Council for them.
- Avri Doria: Thank you. I'm Avri Doria. I'm an independent itinerant researcher. I'm a member of the NCSG. And I'm on the GNSO Council for NCSG. And I'm here because I was asked to be here.
- Marilia Maciel: Hi, good morning everybody. My name is Marilia Maciel. I am a researcher and I coordinate the Center for Technology and Society which is one of the research centers of Getulio Vargas Foundation in Rio de Janeiro Brazil. I'm a GNSO Council member representing the CSG.
- I've been working with Internet governance mostly in UN related spaces for almost 10 years now. And more recently I've been in NETmundial Executive

Committee and I'm also part of the Coordination Council of NETmundial initiative (unintelligible) looking for (unintelligible) to know how the initiative is going to move forward constructively. And I'm really looking forward to our discussions here and to learn with you. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. My name is Rafik Dammak. I'm from Tunisia but living in Japan. And I work as engineer. I am here as the chair of the NCSG. And I hope that we can make some progress, I mean, in the Non Contracted Party House.

Steve Metalitz: Good morning. I'm Steve Metalitz. Perhaps I'm the only native of Washington DC around this table. I do live in this area. I'm a lawyer and - copyright lawyer primarily representing the trade associations, individuals and membership groups that depend on copyright protection. I've been a member of the Intellectual Property Constituency since its founding and currently somewhat to my chagrin am serving as the acting president of the constituency until a permanent president is selected.

I'm looking forward to our discussions today. And I want to thank all of the people who work with us on the planning of this. I think it was a good example. We worked well collaboratively and I hope that's a good omen for some constructive and productive conversations over the next two days.

Alain Berranger: Good morning. My name is Alain Berranger. I come from France. I'm based in Paris where I'm in charge of numbering, naming and addressing (unintelligible) Group. And I am a member of the ISPCP Constituency.

Jimson Olufuye: Good morning, all. My name is Jimson Olufuye. I run - CEO of Kontemporary, an IT consulting company based in Abuja. That is my day job. And my community work is as the Chair of the Africa ICT Alliance of

(unintelligible) stakeholders. I'm also member of the BC and the Vice Chair of Finance and Operations.

I'm looking forward to finding some solution to banking issues here (unintelligible) are involved in banking activities for members. And also to evolve a new spirit for the community working together to move forward.
Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. And if in fact you like ICANN you can blame me, Becky Burr, Tony Holmes, Antonio Harris and a few other people - and Steve Metalitz. I'm here because I'm very interested in the continued evolution and enhancement of the role of the non-contracted participants in ICANN.

When we set ICANN up we debated the concept of ensuring that ICANN would act in the public interest in the decisions that it took. And it's really clear that we're in a unique window of opportunity to evolve ICANN perhaps not just to ICANN 2.0 but to ICANN 3.0 with a true commitment to bottom up, consensus-based decision making, not only in policy but in governance.

And my passion is really about how we work together to strengthen ICANN governance so that there's a broad diverse group of voices and participants from all around the world that are making sure this unique multistakeholder organization thrives but fits within its core mission and not tries to encroach in everybody else's mission.

Ron Andruff: Good morning, everyone. My name is Ron Andruff. I'm a fellow Canadian of Stephanie and also my - Sam and other colleagues so it's nice to - for me to make that comment simply because these are colleagues who are sitting in other constituencies.

I've been with ICANN from the early days as well, a little long in the tooth like many here who've been working in the trenches. And we've watched ICANN grow from a few hundred people at a meeting. I recall one of my first meetings in Uruguay, there were four or five meeting - four or five people in each room and those were the constituencies.

So we've come a long ways where we have meetings of thousands of people. So for me I was very grateful to have this opportunity to have an intercessional to come together with colleagues in our house because the - we find ourselves with very different viewpoints on many ICANN issues but we are all part of a group, a body.

So for me to have this opportunity to come and spend time, meet each one of you and see if we can create more inroads and develop more relationships because it's all about the relationships we have with each other that where the policy begins. And so that's why I'm here, a member of the BC, as I mentioned, and also the chair elect for the Nominating Committee. Thank you.

Cheryl Miller: Good morning. My name is Cheryl Miller and I'm an attorney with Verizon. I am a newcomer to ICANN and so I really look forward to getting to know some of you better, to working with you and also to learning from all of you. Thank you.

Man: Thank you. I'm grabbing the microphone offered to Jessica.

Jessica Jones: Hi. I'm Jessica Jones. I'm with British Telecom and I'm also newer to ICANN so I'm here in listening mode. But I'm looking forward to today's discussion.

Susan Kawaguchi: Hi. I'm Susan Kawaguchi. I am a domain name manager for Facebook and BC councilor and I'm glad to be here.

Laura Schulman: Hello. My name is Laura Schulman and I am the General Counsel to ASCG which is a nonprofit organization based here in the metro DC area. We do educational publishing as our main source of fundraising. I am here as a member of the NCSG Executive Committee as well as Vice Chair of NPOC.

And the reason I'm here in general is I feel that there is a lot more that unites us rather than divides us particularly among the people in this room and how we approach the issues of accountability, transparency, consistency and fairness across the spectrum of ICANN issues. And I echo Marilyn's sentiment that I'm particularly interested in governance; how we govern, how we are governed, how we organize our processes is key to our success particularly in a year of transition.

Stefanie Milan: Hello, everyone. My name is Stefania Milan. I'm an academic with the University of Amsterdam. And I'm here presenting the Non Commercial User Constituency and in particular I was appointed to represent Europe in the Executive Committee NCUC. And it is my first intercessional meeting.

And with so much history in the room I feel really like a newcomer even if I've been around ICANN for a couple of years. So please remember there also some people who are not extremely familiar with all the acronyms. Thank you.

Jen Taylor Hodges: Hi. I am Jen Taylor Hodges. I am with BT heading up our Washington office here. And part of the ISPCP.

Phil Marano: Hi. My name is Phil Marano. I'm an intellectual property law attorney, also an IPC member. And contrary to what the program says, I am not with Thomas Reuters, Mark Monitor, I'm with Katten Muchin Rosenman. That's a IP firm in Georgetown.

Eduard Parajo: Good morning. My name is Eduardo Parajo. I'm from Brazil. I'm representing Abranet. Abranet is a Brazilian association for Internet so I'm happy to here. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Good morning. I'm Steve DelBianco from Washington DC so my 30-minute commute turned into two hours this morning because in Washington we can't drive in the rain. A lot of you know that.

I'm also the Executive Director of NetChoice, a trade association of Internet companies based here in Washington. I'm a member of the Business Constituency where I serve as the Vice Chair for Policy Coordination. And on this cross community working group that Marilyn mentioned on accountability I represent the Commercial Stakeholders Group.

Marilyn said that working group is a window of opportunity; well it is a window from which I have been tempted to leap several times in the last couple of weeks as we try to get our traction and move ahead. But I think we'll have the next couple of days to talk more about that.

John Berard: And my name is John Berard. I am an independent business consultant based here in the United States and a member of the Business Constituency.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hogarth: I was hoping to get all the papers handed out before, you know, I was expecting a 10-minute introduction from Mr. Berard and I was somewhat surprised by that.

Carlos and I have begun to hand out a document that Mr. Metalitz drafted up so as that gets distributed around the room we'll be prepared to hit Plenary Session Number 1.

Just one final note for everybody, again, thank you very much for going around the room. We are going to be logging everybody who is participating remotely as well for the record of this meeting. And that's going to be, you know, a permanent part of the wiki.

Right now if you wanted to go back and see who participated and what the documents were for the 2013 meeting you could do that. I would hope that two, three years from now you'll be able to go back and look at the record from this meeting as well. It might be useful for ICANN historians in the future.

But, again, I just wanted to acknowledge those you who may be participating remotely that we will have you logged and make sure that we recognize you participated in the meeting as well.

I think we've been able to make the rounds now.

Benedetta Rossi: Excuse me, Rob. This is Benedetta speaking. Can you hear me?

Rob Hogarth: I can, Benedetta.

Benedetta Rossi: Can you please just allow the remote participants to introduce themselves as well for the record please? There's Gabriella who would like to speak.

Rob Hogarth: Certainly. And anyone else remotely who would like to say hello please do so. Gabriella, you first.

Gabriella Szlak: Can you hear me? Hello?

Ron Andruff: Yes we can.

Rob Hogarth: Yes, we can hear you.

Gabriella Szlak: Excellent. So hello everyone. I'm so sorry that I'm not there with you. My name is Gabriella Szlak and I'm from Argentina. I'm one of the GNSO councilors representing the Business Constituency. And the organization that I represent at eInstituto - is eInstituto. Sorry, the name in Spanish is Institutor Latinamericano de Comercio Electronico. I always like to say this in Spanish.

And we are still the only Latin American member of the Business Constituency and we are really working to change this. eInstituto is a federation of e-commerce chambers in Latin America. And we develop many initiatives.

And the ones related to ICANN are in particular (unintelligible) which is focused on bringing the Latin American voices of these companies as users of the Internet into our community. So I'm really looking forward to work with you. I'm really sorry, again, that I'm not there. Thank you.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you. Benedetta, I'll let you run the queue for anybody who's remotely since you're helping us in that regard.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, I can follow. My name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm also sorry not to be with you. I am sitting in Germany and have just time today, well, to follow the meeting. I am with the ISPCP Constituency. And I used to be in GNSO councilor and a vice chair of the GNSO Council before. And from that time I know what the real problem for this meeting is and this is just building trust. I think that's the basic what should be done at those meetings. And I hope - I wish you all much success for that. Thank you.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you. I notice also that we have Desiree in the remote room. I don't know if you would like to say anything?

Benedetta Rossi: Rob, Desiree is not actually on the audio bridge so she cannot speak but we have...

Rob Hogarth: Okay great.

Benedetta Rossi: ...Michael Graham who could - if you want to speak next?

Michael Graham: Yes, very quickly. Good morning, everyone. Michael Graham. I'm on the IPC. I am a Global Intellectual Property Director of Expedia here in Seattle so I'm up a bit early this morning. I was going to attend, unfortunately my businesses kept me away but I'm very interested in how the group works together to build these bridges in both communication and getting work done. And I appreciate the opportunity to monitor the meetings and participate where appropriate. Thank you.

Rob Hogarth: Benedetta, anybody else? We'll close off the remote introductions. Hearing nothing else we're ready for Plenary Session 1. I believe - well, oh can you flip up Plenary Session 2? Thanks.

The planners agreed, and thank you, Steve, for noting that we flipped 1 and 2. Pay no attention to the timeframes up there. Other than to note that we've got this discussion up until 11 o'clock. Again, as you're going through the conversations if it looks like it's running longer we can adjust the timeframe just the key is to be able to give you the opportunity to go through the various issues that you've identified.

For the CSG I think, Steve, you were taking leadership on this? You're shaking your head no. Tony is going to handle the internal discussion. And I believe Rafik, you were going to be the discussion leader from the Non Commercial side.

So, gentlemen, I'll turn it over to you. I think everybody has their paperwork. You can either talk from there or if you want the microphone I'd be happy to share it with you.

Marilyn Cade: Ron, sorry it's Marilyn...

Tony Holmes: Thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Rob...

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Rob. It may be easier if I share...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: ...this. And, Rafik, if you use your mic there then we can see everybody. Did you want something else, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Just wanted to verify that the mics in front of us work.

Tony Holmes: Yeah. Okay so I think there are two main issues for this session. There is the paper that's been circulated that is a copy of an email that Steve sent across before this meeting started.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Okay. And the other main item is the budget item. So if we start with the first one, if I can open up, Steve, by asking you to just give us a quick update of where we are with this.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you very much, Tony. This is Steve Metalitz. As we - I mentioned the planning group that brought this agenda together. And one of the first thing we talked about was using this meeting to improve the functioning of our house both in terms of the - our constitutional duties, if you will, which David has already referred to, the two posts we're required to fill, and also in terms of our discussion of other issues that - affecting ICANN policy issues and otherwise.

There was unanimous agreement that this was one thing we wanted to focus on. And there was also a sense that it would be helpful if we had some discussion prior to this meeting or at least got some issue set up for discussion at this meeting.

While we - I can't say we really have had a robust discussion among the planning group about a number of these issues, I did take advantage of that opportunity to put forward a couple of ideas to help to structure our discussion. And these are at the - has been endorsed by the leadership of the

Commercial Stakeholder Group and I know they've been discussed a well within the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group.

So there are two issues on the paper before you. And we can discuss them in whichever order seems most appropriate. One is our obligation to select a - every year a vice chair of the GNSO Council, a role which David Cake currently holds and has - is not in his second year.

We have spent a lot of time on this, frankly, over the years. Each time it comes up we have to more or less ad hoc figure out how we're going to make this selection and what are the ground rules and so forth. And I think, frankly, we can probably use our time more effectively working on substantive issues.

So what I've proposed is a - is a method for dealing with this going forward which is that we would alternate the Commercial side and the Non Commercial side having the privilege to nominate a candidate and if that candidate received a majority of the votes, and as we're currently structured that's 7 votes out of 13, six from each stakeholder group and then one from the NCA, then - so long as somebody receives seven votes and at least one vote from each side to show that it wasn't simply the candidate of one side, that that person would serve as the vice chair.

And the next year the other side would have the privilege to nominate someone for that election. It wouldn't necessarily, by the way, have to be someone from that side of the house, it could be someone else.

I'm also suggesting that we have an understanding that in effect we are agreeing to a rotation here. And unless there's a very compelling reason - excuse me - for the side which doesn't nominate that year, to reject the

nominee - unless there is such a compelling reason they would provide sufficient support in order to meet that election threshold.

Finally, as part of this, and this has been discussed in the last election cycle or two, we'd like to set a clear and common expectation about the role of the vice chair in keeping both sides of the house informed and being available to answer questions about Council activities and so forth so that the expectation would be that if either side wish to meet with the vice chair by phone once a quarter, or less often, then the vice chair would commit to doing that. So that's the first topic.

The second topic has to do with - is more of a structural question. As we approach each ICANN meeting there are certain slots that everybody knows, you know, we're going to have a GNSO Council session in the two days prior to - or GNSO workshops two days prior to the meeting; we know we'll have Constituency Day on Tuesdays when our various constituencies and sometimes stakeholder groups meet, etcetera.

And the proposal here is that we hardwire into that process having a one-hour meeting at least the leadership of the Non Contracted Party's House. And the leadership would work out the specific agenda items that are relevant to that meeting. They could decide if they wish to maybe to have a broader meeting if logistically that's feasible at the meeting site.

But just so we'd all have an expectation that there would be this meeting at the place where we could come and discuss issues, whatever they happen to be, of current concern to the groups represented in the Non Contacted Party's House.

The proposal is that this not begin with Singapore which is only three or four weeks away, and it's not really feasible perhaps to get this on the schedule, but

that starting with the next meeting in Buenos Aires that we would make sure this was part of the schedule and it would be the job of the leadership of both of the stakeholder groups to figure out the agenda.

So that briefly summarizes these proposals. As I said, they're put forward to stimulate discussion. And I'm looking forward to that now. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Steve. So we have two proposals that have been put forward on two separate issues. The first one is one that we've all struggled with and it takes lots of resource and effort every time we come up against it. I think that's probably going to generate more discussion so I would suggest we take the second one first which is the proposal to hardwire in a meeting at the ICANN meetings.

So does anybody want to comment on that? Avri. Thanks.

Avri Doria: I have an extended comment on the first one. On the second one I'm wondering about the definition of leadership. Is this what we mean by leadership or is it just the Council members plus the Executive Committee? What do we mean by leadership?

Tony Holmes: That's a good question because I don't think it's defined. Steve, did you want to offer something on that?

Steve Metalitz: I think that would be up to each side really. I mean, on the CSG side - we have an Executive Committee which I assume would take the lead in doing this. And I don't know how it's organized on the other side. But I'm comfortable whichever way. It's really just a plan the agenda.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I saw Ron, I think and then John. Ron. Oh, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. My comment is going to be about the idea of the hardwired meeting. I'll come back perhaps and make comments about the other topic later. ICANN meetings are increasingly so busy with events and topical agenda items where we need to be either coordinating among our own group or trying to deal with so many conflicts and overlaps of other meetings.

While I support the idea of a discussion at the ICANN meetings I think we need to be very pragmatic and realistic about the time that it would take and what it would compete with.

On the issue of openness of the meeting, in the past when we've had some of these meetings we've had sort of designated coordinators that made the meetings open to any of our members who wanted to come in the room and observe.

And I think that would continue to be really important because we are trying to model being a bottom-up organization, not just a top-down organization. So that brings me to the question of that means we have to ask ICANN should be able to make sure meeting space is available for this meeting and potentially try to squeeze it in on Saturday or Sunday when more of our members can attend.

So while I also am not sure we need a meeting - we need to meet at every ICANN meeting but I think maybe we ought to have a goal of establishing a meeting if we have an agenda doing it. That we are going to be competing with other work that is going on on Saturday and Sunday and I think we need to take that into account. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Marilyn. Bill.

Bill Drake: (Unintelligible).

Ron Andruff: May I step in while we're getting that mic organized?

Bill Drake: I actually wanted to speak to the first point...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: That just on this point, quickly, I'm perfectly - we have met informally a number of times, we've had receptions together, some of us have had dinner together, drinks together. I think it's good when we talk to each other, it builds bridges. I understand Marilyn's point, we would have to try to figure out how to put this, I mean, Constituency Day is already insane.

So the only thing I can imagine would be a drink at the end of the day or a late session in any event or else and breakfast session, which personally I find offensive on principle. But I'm totally open to whatever people want to do, whether they want to do it at the level of chairs or more open, it's totally fine by me.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. I've just been reminded that before you speak can you identify yourself for the transcript? John.

John Berard: Thank you, Tony. This is John Berard from the Business Constituency. I am in favor of hardwiring a meeting that would occur before Constituency Day and that would be open to anybody from the NCPH - the NCPH - who would like to or feel compelled to attend.

I do think that if we use perhaps the Council as an analog that the people around the table, there should be a specific guideline for how many from each are selected. But I think it would be a good idea to do.

And while there is a lot of random contact at the ICANN meetings there really isn't very much formal discussion that actually could lead to increased collaboration or even the possibility of decision-making. And as we know that the more business and society relied upon the Internet the greater the value of the face-to-face time that we do get.

Tony Holmes: Ron.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much. Ron Andruff, Business Constituency. I echo a lot of the comments that have been made. And I want to go take it a step further, I congratulate you, Steve, for having brought this forward because this is a really critical component.

As we are seeing over the years what happens within the ICANN body as a whole, within the community, is that there is so much work. One of the problems we had in the beginning there was not enough staff to be able to manage all the stuff we as a community threw at them. Now it's in the reverse; there's lots of staff and there's lots of stuff coming out. It's all we can do as constituencies to keep abreast of things and let alone fight the battles that we within our own groups feel need to be fought.

One of the problems I'm observing, and I've worked with most of you around this table on different issues, how do we get consensus? You know, I say, Greg, I really need your help on this and Greg says I'd like to, Ron, but we are so focused on this, not that.

So I think this idea of bringing the people around the table from this group, having a very serious conversation about what's about to happen over the next couple of days is a great idea. I would suggest that may be even, as most of us around this table fly in on Fridays for those meetings, maybe it's a Friday evening dinner or a cocktail but it's an idea of getting everyone together, having this conversation.

And I think it should just be the leadership group that speaks so whether it's the chairs, vice chairs, presidents, whatever those people are called within the various groups is fine, and all the rest of the community members from this house would be welcome to the observers so that in fact you can have 10 to 12 people have a conversation within that time period.

But I think it's a great idea and I commend you for that, thank you, Steve.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Rafik, my co-chair.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, supposed to be. So I think we have consensus around to have this formal meeting at every, I mean, ICANN meeting. I think we can discuss more details later between the two groups and we figure out which the best day. We are getting here some feedback before that Constituency Day, maybe in the beginning of Constituency Day, maybe in the weekend. So we can discuss and see the pro and the cons because I don't think we can really decide for now.

For example, for me, Friday it will be impossible probably. So let's, I mean, we have an agreement here I guess, if I don't see any objection then we can move on to other topic.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks. That's a great summary for the first issue. We've got agreement to do it, to make it work, all we've got to fix is the final detail how and when it

will operate. It won't be for Singapore; it's planned for the first meeting after Singapore so we've got plenty of time to make that work. And indeed we could have some further off-line discussions in Singapore just to fix the bits that are open.

So with that can we go back to the first issue that Steve raised? And I was aware Bill wanted to comment and Avri as well. So, Bill, over to you. I should give you a mic.

Bill Drake: This is Bill Drake for the record. Hello. Okay so I was just, by way of preparation, looking back at some of the emails exchanged two years ago when we had a problem. And, indeed ended up asking for the ombudsman to help us resolve it.

We don't want to have to - I don't want - there's no point in is going back through all the history of that again. It was just for me to refresh my mind as to what it happened and why we were having an issue.

It strikes me when we spoke amongst ourselves on the NCSG side about this text that basically this is what we had had in mind a couple years ago. So, it's kind of hard for us to disagree with it now.

The one concern I had and I think others shared was a specification of what a compelling reason for rejecting might be. And I guess we might want to have a little bit more agreement on that point.

To me a compelling reason for rejecting a nominee would not be things like we don't like the positions they've taken in the GNSO council or we don't like the way in which they've advocated those positions or the strength and vigor with which they've expressed them -- things like that.

That to me shouldn't be an issue. We all have strong views. We all have different positions. That's understood and should be acceptable to all of us. I would think that the only strong compelling reason for rejecting the - a nomination suggested from the other side would be for example something like this person has never really participated in GNSO council work.

And just and hence would not appear to be well-qualified to serve the function. That's reasonable or this person, you know, if you had some other kind of gross incompetence that one could agree on then that would be okay too. But it shouldn't be to me a matter of policy preferences or whatever else. We all understand that the vice chair role is actually a fairly administrative role.

And so precisely what people's positions have been is really not that germane. What the vice chair has to do is work with another vice chair and the chair in setting up an agenda for meetings and things like that.

So it's really not that relevant in my view exactly what their views are on any specific GNSO issue. And I would hope that that wouldn't become the basis upon which we would have a contested case.

So the last time when we did it - my sense was, our suspicion was that that was precisely the kind of problem that we were having and we wouldn't want to go back there. So I would just put that on the table. The criteria for rejection should be an objective one that is not a subject of policy preferences.

Man: Sure. Is it my turn?

Rafik Dammak: Well, I think Avri - thanks Bill I think Avri was next.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. In one sense I agree with Bill we don't want to go back there. But for me it's going back to this process at all. We tried this process. It was a disaster. It resulted in all kinds of mess. I don't need to go back to the email to remember the disaster that it was. And to me going back to this process is sort of we had a process, it failed. Now let's be insane about it and try it again.

I think the compelling reason is part of the crux of the matter. What is compelling reason to one is not compelling reason to another. It requires a juridical act to decide if compelling reason rises to an agreed upon level of compelling reasons.

And I just don't see this method is working. We tried it. I mean there's a few tweaks in this. It doesn't take eight votes. It takes seven, you know, but it still has the requirement of one from the other from stakeholder groups so it's essentially the same, you know, pattern.

So I, you know, at the time we had other discussions. You know, at the time we were having the disaster people were saying let's have open nominations. Let's have voting. Let's have ranked voting. Let's have, you know, sequenced voting. And I would much prefer to see padding towards something like that as opposed to a model we know does not work. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Avri just to qualify on that you feel that way even if we can get the level of clarification that Bill was referring to?

Avri Doria: Yes because...

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...as I say it requires that even if we spend the time now to come to an agreement on what compelling reason is we will then have to spend the time interpreting that reason to make sure that your compelling reason, my compelling reason actually matches the definition.

And if we don't want someone from either side we know it's in our nature, all of our natures to argue it to the law. And we will argue it to the law one way or another. So I really say that we should come up with something that works on a voting mechanism and not on a something that requires judgment.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. John?

John Berard: Thank you (Tony). This is John Berard from the Business Constituency. I would argue that the role of the vice chair has become far more substantive and influential as the board has increased its attention on securing point of view from the council.

I would also suggest that looking at the GAC Consultation Group which was initially a product of the chair and the two vice chairs which then led to what I think is a groundbreaking change in the relationship between the GNSO Council and the GAC suggests that the vice chair is far more than, you know, the point person on a Rose Bowl Parade float. I do think that there is substance in the role and we should treat it accordingly.

Rafik Dammak: So it's probably time to hear from the vice chair. David?

David Cake: Right. It's David Cake speaking. First on the role of the vice chair I think John sort of has it right actually.

The sort of position what you actually, the sort of mandated role of the position is fairly administrative as Bill said that you help put the meeting agenda together and things like that.

But the- as we - moving into things like a much more collaborative process with the GAC I think the significance of the role is increasing. And I think that will be something that we, you know, that will become more important.

I do think it's not a, you know, it's not a huge role. I really don't think and from my experience of having been vice chair I don't think it's worth all the, you know, anger that's - or bitterness that seems to have happened in the past.

It's not - I - do you think that this proposal - I mean I find it a little confusing in some way. I find the voting changes a bit odd like it requires a bylaws change and so on. But it's actually a very small change that I don't really understand the significance of because it's a change from eight to seven votes required.

But they only - the eight votes, the only real significance of the eight to seven votes to me seems to be that with eight votes you need someone from the other stakeholder group and they put that requirement back in any way. So it's a very small change I don't really understand the motivation for.

I actually think that this bit about the compelling reasons probably goes in the sort of the opposite direction. This proposal more or less is let's have a strict back and forth rotation.

And I think actually what we need is a little bit more sort of input from the two houses, a little more opportunity for the other stakeholder group to have some say.

I think what we need to avoid is a situation where one stakeholder group and I think both stakeholder groups have probably been - have done this in the past have said well we've decided in our candidate and it's the member of our six counselors it's the one you want the least except that, you know, accept it or not.

And I think actually having the opportunity to go well actually our, you know, maybe if your house puts forward, you know, two or three candidates and we'll vote for them in, you know, or something, you know, some process where at least the other stakeholder group has some say or some more involvement in the process of working out who that will be.

It's going to represent all of us I understand that it will be, you know, so the one side stakeholder group will have the primary concern. But as process it says one has the primary concern and the other one has to find a really, really, you know, really, really strong reason to reject them is probably going in the opposite direction.

I think we probably need a process where there is more dialogue and back and forth about who would be a preferred candidate.

Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: (Unintelligible) to learn more about the other side. And it's obvious to (unintelligible) that a prep call would be really, really helpful and I like to pick up on what (unintelligible) was saying. (Unintelligible) to those of us that

want to do that (unintelligible). It looks like we're going to have a tea party now.

So to just insert another meeting into that without some prep and nobody wants more calls. I'm (unintelligible) right now. But I still think would be necessary so that we could at least come to that meeting (unintelligible) speaking. And (unintelligible) people feel (unintelligible) because it's insider baseball just to take a (unintelligible) from the beginning didn't know that. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Interestingly you're the second person that's used that word trust. And I hope after this week that will be something that should be getting a little bit better. Anyway, but Dan?

Dan Reed: Dan Reed for the record. I want to pick up on the trust issue because as a NonCom appointee part of what I find myself doing is trying to step across what are fundamentally two different worldviews that are represented by the people around this table with a very small degree of practical overlap and what the implications of that mean in practice. And that's fundamentally the issue that underlies these particular topics.

And the best way to address that in my judgment is to try to build trust and some shared perspective because then the mechanics become much more easy if you actually achieve those objectives.

That's the real issue is a shared worldview of about what we're trying to accomplish. And as long as that isn't resolved effectively we're two scorpions in a bottle to use another metaphor.

And no process is going to actually address that problem. The fundamental thing that will address it is a shared understanding of our objectives and some mutual trust about the things that people trying to accomplish to achieve those objectives.

As a business constituency and a noncommercial groups are very different perspectives and timescales and outcomes and necessities and their stakeholders expectations. And unless we be honest about some of those things were never going to reach closure on the issues because process won't fix it.

And having said that I think these are reasonable proposals to address those given the realities but we need to talk about the fundamental issue and that's what I think the most important thing that could happen at this meeting could be.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. So, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Tony. Steve DelBianco with the BC. When Steve Metalitz passed this out I was actually delighted that early in our two day meeting together we'd have such a great opportunity to take on something that we would all believe was mutually beneficial, collegial and that would set the tone for a really positive two days.

And I sense that it may not be that simple right? The CSG endorsed these ideas thinking that they would be better than the status quo.

And when I say the status quo I'm suggesting that the status quo selection of vice chair strength to me is chaotic and might actually lead to less mutual

trust. And I think that the lack of interaction probably means that we have a low level of mutual trust and relationships.

So I applauded the idea of putting it early in the agenda. But the intention here was to be better than we are today better than we were the last time we selected a vice chair.

So let's please compare it to the status quo and not just poke holes in the actual proposal. We may be able to improve the proposal but ultimately we want to make it better than the status quo.

Rafik Dammak: Well it is what it is. It is a proposal and it's there to be discussed. But what I'd like to do is go to Ron, Greg, back to Avri then to Steve as the proposer and then to Rafik as the co-chair.

Ron Andruff: Thank you very much. Thanks Dan for bringing that up and Stephanie. It's really quite true it's - it is a trust factor. And so as you said that Dan you made the comment about what's the fundamental issue, that's when I put my tent card up.

And I realize the fundamental thing that we all share well some may say we're looking at it from a business perspective or you're looking at it from an ISPs perspective I think the fundamental issue is that we should also maybe consider our starting point is that we are all as constituencies or as bodies looking at this issue from the point of view of users.

We're all users. We're the user side of the house. So as you - as we start to look at the policy development as users we may find we have more commonality than we had as opposed to say well I, you know, I see that's the BC position.

It's not a BC position. It's a BC user perspective. We the BC is takes the position that we're supposed to be out there looking at the world of the Internet from the point of the view of business users whereas the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group are looking at it as individual users.

But we're all users of the Internet. And I think that's where if we can build trust around a commonality around this fundamental element I think we can take some big steps forward because that's really where we're starting.

I don't come at things from a business, a BC point of view. I come at it as how can we solve this problem within ICANN, how can we solve this Internet problem? But I have a background coming from business as opposed to being an individual. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Greg?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan from the IPC. I think that this is in a sense a test of the Noncommercial's party has Noncommercial party's house.

Avri Doria: Non-contracted.

Greg Shatan: Non-contracted, sorry. This is my fourth straight day of meetings so I'm a little bit foggy coming off of an intensive work weekend and now having an intensive work week to follow it.

In any case the NCPH is this is a test. This is only a test. Scorpions in a bottle is one, shotgun marriage is a another. It shouldn't be that way. There we do need to look for areas of commonality.

We have a lot of history. Some of us have been around a long time, some of us have a medium amount, some are relatively new. Some know all the history, some lived it. Some are still wondering what it is.

Regardless we shouldn't be prisoners of history. We should try as we all in the end have to do to reach consensus to look for ways to give not necessarily to fight everything to the wall. Because if - we certainly can all do that until we're blue in the face what will we accomplish other than to suggest that we failed the test? Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. First of all I'd like to say to me this looks like the status quo. So to say we're coming up with something that's different from the status quo to me this looks like it. I mean we may have said it was a temporary solution that we had before and that temporary has gone by but this is what we had essentially.

So then I think the trust, you know, since we're talking about trust it's important. And I think there's lots of trust here among many of the individuals regardless of which of the constituencies or stakeholder groups they're in.

What there tends to be less of is organizational trust. And but organizational trust isn't built by saying let's have it. It isn't built by one meeting. It isn't built by the bonding of individuals.

Is something that's built over time. And it's built based on actions. I've seen that you can trust an organization to behave. And, you know, and I'm not taking this view from either perspective because it strikes me that from any perspective you can have that issue.

So I don't think there's a test here. I think we pretty much get along as people. It's - and we trust each other is people. You know, we don't expect any of the people here to do anything untoward to us as people. It's an organizational issue.

So I really think that we have to look for though a method of electing that does not require organizational trust, that does not that somehow gets beyond the do people vote as blocks, do people not vote as blocks?

Well they're all voting the same but that's because they all agree, not because they have been forced, that these elections become elections of by individual counselors of whatever.

So the notion of coming up with something objective, something that's beyond those organizational politics like multiple candidates that are nominated by someone that are self-nominated with votes. And I had a long lecture - got a long lecture last night on what was it option voting or...

Man: Ranked...

Avri Doria: ...ranked right, that there were voting methods that basically allow you to select beyond the immediate biases beyond that so that we take this to sort of a more neutral space for having it where trust or the battle that we happen to have.

Because while it's true we should not take everything to the wall we know that there are times when we will. I just think given the nature of the things we support sometimes they're going to come into opposition.

And at those point in time we are going to be oppositional even if we're not the rest of the time. And if that happens to be an election period or that all comes and gets concentrated in an election period.

So I really would prefer to see us work on some voting mechanism, nomination and voting mechanism that sort of takes that partisanship out and leaves it in a voting methodology.

So that's just - but as I start this is the status quo and it hasn't worked. And I apologize for being the negative voice that destroyed your dream of consensus from the first hour but I just don't see this.

Greg Shatan: But at least there's consensus the status quo sucks right?

Avri Doria: Yes. I think we do have consensus on that. And this is the status quo?

Rafik Dammak: I saw there was one person who haven't spoken before and I'm back to (Steve) and Rafik because we've got another item on the agenda so we do need to get somewhere with this. So Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much. Well I think the new spirit is very important. And the proposal of Steve is highly welcome.

Avri mention something very important about need for more thorough preparation. And this what I'm going to focus on this is what I think we should focus on are prepared.

I took a cue from NonCom they have a process whereby if you have a chair you have a chair elects and you - and then the chair elects on that study the chair and (unintelligible). Well, I was looking that maybe we about talk

because each constituency really needs to see their vote counts and who it represents it is quite important.

What we call having a scenario or a process whereby we have possible candidates may be up to three levels wherein others can get to have privy to to viewed confidence. And if we have early warning about candidates we can begin to review and discuss others issue that affect confidence.

So the point I'm making is that we need to prepare candidates well in advance. And it may be over three steps behind. Like Steve suggested every year well we have each hours making suggestions and nomination then we can have say three candidates down the line of two over three years to vie for that.

Because the issue of trust with it a point to trust somebody is very, very crucial. And to gain that trust requires really confidence built over preparation and time. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Jimson. The only problem we've got there of course is during that cycle the council has changed. That's the only problem. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Steve Metalitz. I really just raised my hand to respond to Bill's initial comment. I'm generally in agreement with him about what would constitute a compelling reason. But I think I'm comfortable letting each side decide what is a compelling reasoning and let them state it.

If they decide to that as a block they cannot give one vote to the person nominated by the other side they should state their reason and do it honestly. And I think I trust the electors from both sides not to abuse that privilege if you will knowing also that the result of it is we go back into the chaos a bit and we don't at that point have a vice chair that we have selected.

The other point - I have two other points. One is I think this is not the status quo. A change from seven from eight to seven is significant. But finally on David's comments, I wouldn't be adverse to allowing if it wished either side to put forward more than one candidate and then have a vote again with a majority required.

I don't know if that would work better or not but I'm not adverse to that change to the proposal but I still think this is the appropriate framework to start from. Thank you.

Man: Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, maybe to add some positive part here. I think in the last year we tried to work between the two account - I mean part yes Bill. I think over the last year we tried to work between the two part of the house regarding the election to organize this in decisional. And it started when we did a common financial request last year.

So we tried to improve in the relation between CIGN and (CIGN). I think we are moving forward. So things are changing. So also we have maybe those meetings we can have prep call whatever. We can agree later in more details.

Regarding the election I guess we are not going to find a solution today but at least maybe from our side we will make a counter proposal explaining what kind of voting process we see and so on and some details that we can discuss and those details later.

I mean I acknowledge we have some differences about the current proposal from the CHE side but we can make it another one until we find a common ground. So that's my proposal.

I mean, we cannot spend more. We cannot find consensus for today. But at least if we agree on timeline when we're to - and what we want to achieve so how we see when we want to finalize the proposal and so on that can make sense for this time being.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. I tend to agree with that. I think we do have to try and focus down because the very worst thing that can happen is we get into the same position we have before where we have no defined process and we're back into election.

So could I ask is there a chance that as Steve's put his initial proposal out there that we could suggest we have some comments back on that and even from the CSG side refine it as a result of this conversation? Avri are you suggesting that there's better ways to doing it? Maybe we could look to have another proposal that puts something else on the table.

Could we try and do that by the time we get to Singapore even if we haven't gotten an official meeting so we can continue this discussion there and get something set out before we run into time constraints again?

So a willingness to do that Avri?

Avri Doria: Just to say sure.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So if nothing else it's throwing it out there. Sorry Bill, over to you with (Mike).

Bill Drake: I simply wanted to respond to Steve on the notion of each side defining what's a compelling reason. It seems to me that if we go that route then we haven't moved anywhere at all. I mean I think unless we have a shared conception of what a compelling reason constitutes we haven't made any progress.

I assumed two years ago when you guys rejected the nomination that we put forward you had a compelling reason. We didn't know what it was. But the person that we were suggesting certainly would have been competent to do the functions of vice chair. And you guys were pretty adamant that she was not acceptable and we didn't know why.

So compelling reason is obviously going to be in the eye of the beholder if unless we have a joint understanding of what it is and it's going to generate conflict.

So if we're not going to resolve this now and we're going to try to carry forward the process I simply leave it on the table that it would seem to me we need to have a clean elegant bounded definition of the conditions under which one side would say no to a proposal from the other side otherwise I just think we're lost personally.

Rafik Dammak: John is itching to say something but I'm going to cut him off.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rafik Dammak: Because of time we've got another item on the agenda here which is ICANN budget and resources. And we have - we've had a fair discussion on this last issue so let's work on having further dialogue when we get to Singapore on that.

And I was standing over that side to get this roving mic to Rafik but whilst I do that Marilyn this was something you tabled. I think you maybe should open this discussion.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade speaking. And I think there are others here who are prepared to also comment.

I want to address this in as two buckets. One bucket being the need for participants in this house to be informed and engaged in the overall strat plan and budget review process including analyzing the budget overall in terms of a governance issue and how we can perhaps collaborate in sharing the work load.

I am seated next to the vice chair for finance and operations for the BC, Jimson. His predecessor Chris Chaplow has done a tremendous amount of work for the BC on analyzing following the budget process.

I have also attended and participated in the budget working groups. It is not a simple matter to analyze the ICANN budget and to understand what it is what is doing and what is not doing.

But analyzing that budget which to me is a governance issue is something I'd like to come back to. And I'd like to focus on how the decisions about funding affect us.

When we started ICANN some of you will know the zero dollars from ICANN went into supporting the GNSO council work because we had no money. We had a 4 - \$1.3 million line of credit, (ford) stash and Mike

Robert's personal credit card. So there's no surprise that there was no ICANN support.

We did not have policy staff. In fact Glen Desaintgery when she was recruited to become the secretariat was paid by a voluntary contribution of \$5000 US from each of the constituencies and I acted as a collector of the money.

When Tony Holmes, Bruce Tonkin and I wrote the first draft of the policy counselor job description and we had no money in the budget to pay them. We've come a very, very long way.

ICANN today does provide support to us that allows us not only to effectively participate in policy development -- and that is not what I want to focus on -- but it also provides resources that we are able to take advantage of to build and strengthen our constituencies and SGs. And that's what I'd like to focus on.

In order to get that money we have to submit requests to ICANN which are reviewed and then go into the budget.

Among the tools that ICANN provides to us is something called a toolkit which includes the Adobe Connect, the conference calls, the transcripts, the scheduling of the support that we use both in running our constituencies and in governing our constituencies.

The toolkit is in the budget but the elements of the toolkit are very important for us to be aware of because ICANN has to put the resources into making sure that there's enough people to schedule the transcript, schedule the Adobe Connect to be available.

The second thing that ICANN does now and it is a pilot is they fund up to 12 hours per week from a secretariat support service that helps us with administrative coordination. There is one person spread across the CSG. (Brenda) is with us here. And there's another person shared by the other SG.

That is a pilot. It's only 12 hours per group. We need to be paying attention to how is that pilot working and ensuring that we're giving feedback and we're also contributing to managing the use of those resources.

The other thing that ICANN does now is in addition to funding travel for counselors it also provides up to three travelers per entity. But for most of us we have four officers, not just three. But if - we are now we are in an open comment, open submission period on the request for support from ICANN.

ICANN also now funds the printing of materials. And I will say the BC has been perhaps the most directly aggressive in collaborating with ICANN and in partnering with ICANN to take advantage of resources on materials.

You all know that we do a newsletter. One other thing that I will just pass around as an FYI and I'll send one each direction through working with ICANN not just with the Global Outreach Group but also with the SSI team and using some of the BC money we have been able to actually do major outreach events.

We just did one in Cairo with Jimson will talk about later.

But the point is giving that money into the ICANN budget and designated so that you can then apply for it and be able to use it requires collaboration in putting in the request to ICANN.

The more we are totally not aligned in what we ask for the more difficult it is for ICANN to allocate money for us to be able to use to build and strengthen our entities.

I'm purposely not using the word constituency or SG because we each do this differently. But to me and preparing these requests is time-consuming but it's also very important. And if you're not aware of how the process works happy to spend time with anybody on it, have copies of the - what the requests look like that come in.

Then we go through a period where it's processed inside the ICANN budget process. And sometimes we hear after the fact that the allocation is there when we would have expected the allocation to have been fulfilled while ICANN may put money into something else that we didn't really understand but the benefit was.

So my proposal is we look at this input process collaboratively not that we do everything together but where it's about process. We find better ways to collaborate and share work in two areas. One, the input on the budget request that affect us and two about how we may be able to collaborate in analyzing the overall budget and strat plan.

Thank you. And I know there are others who are prepared to speak on this as well.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Marilyn for this concise briefing. So I think the process started already from the 5th of January and it's going till 28 February. So yes.

(John Aquins): Thanks (John Aquins) from IPC for the record. As I said I was going to be doing a lot of listening. And Marilyn I'd like to take you up on your offer to

sit down with you and kind of go over the budget and understand that process. I'm new to it all.

Having reviewed what was on the ICANN Web site it really is hard to get a good understanding of. And so if there are any folks here that have a better understanding -- I know Marilyn does -- I would appreciate to learn more from you.

One of the thoughts that we've had and discussed at the IPC is perhaps using some of the option funds to help support secretariat support for I was going to use the word constituencies but entities.

I think all - not all entities have the same number of members, dues structures, et cetera, seeing the BC's glossy newsletter is getting passed around whereas the IPC has barely updated its Web site in probably a year.

So we just - we're just a bunch of lawyers. We don't have that technology experience to do all that fancy marketing. So anyways we would definitely like - I didn't even know that there was an open comment on the request for support so that's something that we're very interested in, you know, dialoguing about and understanding more.

Man: So maybe I want to this for to take the opportunity to ask Rob yes please. Since we talked about the secret (unintelligible). So do we have any assurance that we will get that for the next year it's because for now it's just a pilot project. And also all clarification about the special budget for the non-constructive back house.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you. I promise to give this back. I thought it might be helpful to address some of Marilyn's points and then move into yours.

(John) made a comment and I wanted to clarify his perception of things as well. The concept of special community budget requests for some of you who have been in ICANN for a good period of time may recall happened around the Brussels meeting.

Don't ask me what year that is please. I can't remember -- 2010. Thank you. You guys are much more savvy to that than I am.

Around that time there were general concerns expressed by the community about the overall budget process and in particular the ability for members of the community to come forward and from at least my perspective and understanding be able to present and have staff and the board really be able to understand where there might be new opportunities, where there might be new ideas and concepts beyond the existing status quo to be able to provide service and capabilities to the community not only broadly but individually and specifically.

I think everything came to the head at one point where there was this strange convolution of events where basically the comment period actually around the Brussels meeting for the budget literally ended about 12 hours before the board was going to be making the decision or if it was even that close I don't know.

But that's what prompted the CFO and COO at the time to essentially say wait, we've got to create some additional mechanism or capability so that there's an ability to have members of the community come forward with new ideas and concepts and be able to very specifically state what their interests were.

And that gave birth to what we invariably call the SOAC, special budget request process, the community special budget request process what - the name seems to change but the concept has remained the same up through now.

And I can't speak for Xavier our CFO but he has continued the process because he believes it provides an excellent window and opportunity for individual entities if I can use that term coined by Marilyn, to come forward.

Because it's not just the GNSO, At-Large, SSAC, RSAC -- the other major communities within ICANN. And so that process is continuing. It's available (John) again this year. Xavier typically reaches out to the SOAC chairs to alert them to this opportunity.

And I think the group has expanded over time to include the Stakeholder Group chairs to let them know that the opportunity is open and available. He typically sends something out in mid-December timeframe and I know that went out this year as well.

The timeframe is between now and the end of February and we'll find and circulate to the group what the wiki connection and link is. The information for where the application form is and what you need to ask about. Clearly Carlos myself, Benedetta and others are more than happy from a staff perspective to work with you on that.

Individually Glen Desaintgery who supports the GNSO council also plays a role in conversations with Jonathan and other members of the GNSO about those.

But I think that would be very useful again this year for you to have those conversations. I agree with Marilyn that what we have experienced in the past

have been individual groups coming forward, individual entities asking for variations along some similar themes which is great.

But sometimes that means we get requests for apples and oranges and bananas and pears. And then when staff responds with fruit salad nobody's really happy.

But what we have been able to do over time is to provide new pilot programs that provide some degree of support. I mean if we can give the IPC and ISPs and the NCSG exactly what they wanted a thought has been gee can we fashion a program that helps provide granted not everything everyone wanted but a standard level of service and everybody can sort of buy into or have the capability of using.

And I'll use one example from the slides up there. Maybe I'll used two. Oh heck I can use all three. One example is this, this intercessional meeting. This was the product of a number of requests from different groups saying we would like to get together between ICANN public meetings and have a chance to talk and collaborate and come up with decisions.

What did that translate into? Well in addition to the potential financial impact of some of these recommendations the staff and board also look at well what are the resource implications from an HR standpoint, staffing standpoint and the rest?

And we very quickly gathered the perception that we couldn't sponsor and hold individual meetings like this for every group within the calendar and time frame that we had available to us.

So what was the fruit salad? The fruit salad was this intercessional meeting of a house or of a larger group of community members. And while the first intercessional meeting got some positive reviews it prompted us to do it again.

Now that we've done it twice with this community maybe it's something that works with other communities. So that's the concept that senior staff have had in terms of developing pilots.

Another example is the CROP program, Community Regional Outreach Pilot program. A number of groups would come forward and say we want to have funding for us to go to this event or to that event. We want to promote our interest someplace else.

What did that prompt? That prompted the CROP program which said we can provide some materials and capabilities and allocation of trips if you will to a community on a broader standpoint.

So those are just some examples in sort of a context as to where we are. Thank you Rafik. I'll give the microphone back.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think we have till the 11:00 now. We can go beyond that.

Man: (Unintelligible) little bit later.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes. So we have Steve and Anthony wants to speak. Yes Steve?

Steve Metalitz Thank you. This is Steve Metalitz. This issue does exist in two dimensions. One is not to be - not to be too crass about it, what do we get? What do our Constituency Stakeholder Groups get from ICANN?

And the other is the more global picture of how does ICANN raise and spend its money, the bigger budget questions and operating plan questions? I noticed that in the five year plan, the draft five year plan that was put out in November it was stated that the SOAC special request process, what Rob was just describing will be eliminated after fiscal year 17.

And we in the IPC asked and what will replace it and how will this be handled in the future? We haven't received an answer yet. I don't know if the noncommercial side had similar concerns although I know at least one of your leaders filed comments in the individual capacity that raised the same question. What is going to happen after fiscal year '17?

So this is an example where we may have some common interests in getting the process to work better. I'm not going to go through a detailed critique of these community's special requests in the right-hand box on the screen.

But my sense is that many of them have not worked very well and there are a lot of improvements that would help both our constituencies within the Commercial Stakeholder Group and the entities on the noncommercial side do their jobs better, bring more people into ICANN actively.

And I think this is a fruitful area for us to work together starting with trying to find out not only improving the process over the next two years but finding out what ICANN plans to replace it with. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Just wanted to respond to we share the same concern in NCAG about the elimination of the problem for fiscal year '17 and that's a lot of concern. Anthony please?

Tony Harris: Yes. For the record I am Tony Harris from the ISBCB Constituency. Regarding the references to possible application of the funds that are derived from motions on the new gTLD process I think we should not overlook one sector that doesn't need these funds. And I'm talking about universal acceptance of the work that should shortly begin to resolve these issues.

This is not a minor issue. This is a real-life problem. It's happening. And it needs to be resolved and it needs resources to be resolved. So we should keep this in mind when there are - I know there are other valid interests applying for these funds but we should not overlook the fact that some of this money should be dedicated to resolving universal acceptance issues.

I mean that has directly related to new gTLDs and it's going to affect everybody. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: I think we don't have that much time so we will go with Jimson integration and that we need to go to the other, the last item in for this lot. Yes Jimson.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you Rafik. Well I just want to quickly on the call the importance of this subject matter utilizing community resources for outreach and for many that thing I call broadening the diversity of our house.

Well we've said here that there's still a lot of work for us to do now both trying to catch up, so catch up with input coming from - or output coming from this task.

Well I think the solution is in diversity, bringing in more people, resourceful people, quality people that could add value.

I recall that the effort of BC as leaders on foot but we need to do much more across the house. We need to do much more across the house. Like in BC is like we are the only one in Africa that are then okay two, we have increased to two members from Africa. So we're going to increase down the line.

Now we need to pay attention it should not be only for BC but all of the SG so that we can have capable hand that could really help carry the responsibility forward.

At a global level ICANN is more involved. It needs to be matched with appropriate budget for each constituency or each house to also take the responsibility of going forward.

I doubt - somebody said something sometimes back that sometimes before that ICANN was never interested no one's agreeing on every - on elsewhere. They didn't want to have their name associated with what was going on in Africa.

So and then some say have that sentiment that maybe ICANN is just doing what they want. So we need to spend some time with appropriate budgeting to reach out to other communities or other stakeholders around the world to make the work what to do in the community more effective result oriented. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. So Rob you want to explain something?

Rob Hogarth: Thank you. We need to take a quick one minute break pause so that we can reset some of the remote participation. And so we're going to do that. So (Klaus) if you can hold your thought there for a moment unless you don't want recorded or transcribed?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Rob Hogarth: Yes thank Benedetta thanks. We're stopping for the moment. If you could do a - your reset and then confirm for me Benedetta when that's done. Thank you.

END