

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White  
January 13, 2015  
2:48 pm CT**

Avri Doria: Wow that's small print up there. Avri - I'm realizing it's going to be difficult to compete with John Berard's humor but I bet you we can do it. I wouldn't try to compete with John Berard on anything. Then again I'm not into competition you see.

Do folks want to come in and start or do we want to start with just who is here? Start, let's start...

Woman: I'll play herd.

Avria Doria: ...okay you'll get the people in. Okay so this is the last session, this is session four. This session has been called any other business. It's also been nicknamed by those of us that were putting it together, the grab bag. Basically though we've put three basic things on the agenda for this one and hopefully we can get through the three of them.

The first one is to come back to the letter that (Tony) and (David) were assigned or agreed to work on which had to do with the non-contracted parties being concerned about the structural portions of the review for the GNSO, so

that's the first thing. There's a draft of the letter that (Tony) will walk us through and then we can look at what are next steps in it.

The second part of this was to find out from you all whether there was any issue and it shouldn't be public interest, whether there was any issue that still had an incomplete discussion that we really needed to get some few extra bits in on. If there are none that's great.

And then the third part had to do with sort of the beginning of the evaluation of this. What do I take away from this? Is this something that we want to be doing again in the future, how do we get it in the budget, what are our next steps, questions like that and then we pretty much will be over.

So we are what is between being here now and being out there later. So (Tony) if I can turn it over to you on the letter at this point.

(Tony): Sure, thank you very much Avri. What this letter attempts to do is to pull together the report from our discussion the other day. I think the start of this I want to make a point that this is not a letter that would be sent where it had the back end of constituencies or SGA's at all.

This is aimed as a letter from this meeting nothing more than that. So my approach to that is, that I don't want to get involved in a lengthy process where this would go out to constituencies and everyone will decide how they feel about this.

This should be on the table as an output from our discussion and I think that it's got some real positives because it shows that we discussed some pretty substantial issues here but as a group, as a large group, a group that as the letter says it represents those stakeholder who form 50% of the GNSO.

Just saying there needs to be some action taken on this. We're basically trying to do the best that we can with a structure that isn't working. And if there's one thing I think we'll agree on here, we might not agree on the answer but we all agree on the problem that we have a structure that's not working at all.

The other part of this is right at the end of the letter it's the last couple of sentences if we can move down. Right, the piece at the bottom is an issue I would like to discuss because this is the draft that (David) has come back on and I think there's a change of approach here, whether I think we're on the same page the words may not be quite summing up where we were.

I do not believe and certainly my constituency doesn't believe that if we go back at this late stage and say, well we've got a real issue of a structure. So the (Westlake) review should take this on board. I don't think that we're going to get the answer that we want.

It's late in the day for them to pick up on this issue. They haven't recognized it in the past. And I also believe because of that, the impact of that element of the study would be watered down, it probably isn't going to give us what we want.

So I have no problem in this going back into counsel if that's where we would deem it wants to go for discussion. But the point I was trying to make in this initial draft was that this is an action, it's a really big issue. It affects as I said 50% of the current GNSO and it needs to be given some priority for attention.

However that's done is up for a discussion but not part of the current GNSO review at this late stage. So with that back to you Avri, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you and I have Steve with his flag up first and then Marilyn and then (John).

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, Steve Metalitz. First of all I just want to make sure this is the end of the letter here where it says term of reference can be expanded to cover these concerns.

I generally support this but I think that we need to make sure that the references in here are not to the NCPH but to the NCPH participants or something like that because as (Tony) pointed out we haven't taken this out to our constituencies for a vote. Again I'm comfortable as the NCPH participants perhaps.

The other point I would raise is it's kind of the punch line here. This says, you know, the board has to do something and the GNSO council has to do something and so forth but the fact is that if we, if we as the house had a proposal to make and I know we don't right now on this topic, on how the GNSO should be structured then there's nothing that prevents us from doing so whether or not that's covered by the terms of reference.

So I just wanted to flag that too as something to think about in the future. I think this is a very good step forward and basically I'm supportive with that change to participants, I would be supportive, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, (David).

(David): First, the change to participants that Steve - I think that's perfectly fine. I think that's a perfectly good change. Avri I'm going to actually put you on the spot because the tricky, the sentence that (Tony) was talking about the one, you know, that was your suggestion at the end.

And I do see the issue which is that it is the section about how the terms of reference for the review can be amended does imply that about the process. I think it does imply things about the process but I think we do not have full agreement on.

So perhaps we could change that to the board consult the GNSO council on something like how the review process can be - how on a process to address, just simply on a process to address these concerns or something like that.

Avri Doria: So basically what you're saying is if I understand is could we just drop the on the (how) of terms of reference and basically consult the GNSO...

(David): I think put the terms of reference for the review.

Avri Doria: ...okay.

(David): Because that implies that it would, we would have to...

Avri Doria: It's too specific.

(David): ...it's too specific yes.

Avri Doria: I offered that as an edit as you were going through, I'm fine with dropping that phrase. Marilyn and then (John).

Marilyn Cade: So I put myself in the queue because while I support the spirit, Marilyn Cade speaking. I support the spirit of the message I have and I appreciate the fact that we have said participants.

I might even prefer it say we as individual participants but I - the point is the people who are participating in this meeting after a discussion we have not taken it back.

Some of us have had a chance to consult and know there is support but I think it's - I'm just going to point out in some cases I think the language is a little obscure like while a - what is required is a thorough written route and branch review. And I prefer us to streamline the language to get the message very clearly across.

Secondly I'm a little bit concerned about we're revising terms of reference about a review that is largely done or we are actually saying the area of work that we think must be addressed was not included in the original terms of reference and the participants in this meeting propose that it must be addressed. Because I think otherwise we're going back and we're saying it's that same consultant.

And I can tell you guys the consultants did not write that narrow terms of reference.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, I have (John) but you're raising your flag as the pen holder.

(John): Yes if you'd like just to try and clarify the points that Marilyn raised. The reason those words were in there and we often think by streamlining words you do far from clarify things you just leave it open.

The reason it was in there as a route and branch issue was because you could view this and say, there's a problem with the non-contracted party side of the house so we just need to focus on that.

I don't think that's where we want to go. I think what we're looking at is looking at the structure and thinking of other ways to do things to try and get away from a structure that emanated from the Internet as it was 15 years ago.

So I think it needs to be broader than that and if you don't have something that makes that point it is likely to be interpreted as just our particular house has got a problem. Just do that a different way, that's not where we're going or I don't believe it's where we're going.

And your second point Marilyn, I think that's going away because we're not talking about terms of reference because the point is we are specifically not saying that we want this embraced by the (Westlake) review, that's what we're not saying so those words have gone now I think.

Avri Doria: Yes on the last intervention Marilyn those words were removed. In other words I was the one that offered the words and at that point said sure take them out.

John Berard: This is John Berard of the BC. The last intervention was before this thing was put up here on the screen or was it after it was put up there on the screen?

Woman: After.

John Berard: Okay cool, I feel as if I've stumbled into a GAC communique.

Avri Doria: Indeed you have but it's an NCPH communique.

Man: Portugal.

John Berard: I agree, I disagree. I would like, it's both. I would like someone to help me, remind me why I agree that in the view of the NCPH that this will not adequately produce the required focus on such an important issue.

Why are we certain about that? I mean I feel that that's true I just don't remember why I feel it's true.

(Tony): Well the reason likely that wouldn't get addressed if I can answer that (John) is that they are a long way through this process. Until we had the last ICANN meeting they didn't even seem to recognize there was a problem in structure, they hadn't tackled it any way.

So whatever they do now is going to be (unintelligible) to the rest of the focus of their report. And this is such a big issue that it needs to be considered with due waiting. I do not believe it would get that due waiting when they're looking up process and all of the other issues that surround the GNSO as such.

And what we're asking for is a pretty substantial review that will only get addressed in due manner if it's tackled as a stand-alone piece of work.

Avri Doria: Okay are there any other? If not then we reached the point of we have three changes at the moment I think, at least two possibly three. There was the first one that was changing NCPH to individual NCPH participants.

Okay and then we can come back I'm just (unintelligible). Then there was a question on whether it was sufficient basically to say a thorough review of current GNSO structure as opposed to route and branch, which, you know, may in some ways be confusing to people.



Perhaps a thorough, I don't know (unintelligible) thorough review doesn't seem to say it's only our house. And then there was the removal of the terms of reference for the review and it became consult the GNSO council on how the review can be expanded to cover these concerns.

So those were the three candidate changes and (Bill) raised his hand sort of almost, maybe when we said individual NCPH participants, so (Bill).

(Bill): I would say...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Bill): ...when you start getting into all of that it starts to sound a little bit like, you know, we've (lowered) to being very specific about things. I just think participants in the NCPH meeting, you know.

I would also say isn't NCPH urge, that should be urges but it...

Woman: It's individual...

(Bill): ...okay so then you have to conform the last the beginning of the last paragraph too from the way it reads.

Avri Doria: So there was a suggestion that instead of the individual NCPH participants just the participants from NCPH at the intercessional meeting, does that work for you? That works I see a couple thumbs a couple bumps, is that okay with you (Bill)?

You got that (Tony)? Okay so any other issues on the language? Is there a consensus of sending this letter as we have just amended it? Is there anyone that objects to it and has a reason they want to put forward for objecting to it?

Marilyn Cade: Avri it's Marilyn speaking. I don't know if I object or not. I really need to see the final...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: But the problem is after we finish in this room we won't be together any longer.

Marilyn Cade: ...(Tony) can edit it and we can put it...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): Yes we can get you text back up in 20 minutes or something.

Avri Doria: Okay if we come back at the end if (Tony) edits it and then sends it and then it can be posted again after we've gone through the rest of the exercise. Marilyn, sorry yes go ahead Steve.

Steve Metalitz: I was just going to say I think that's a good way to proceed and I'm sure we'll have the full text by then.

Avri Doria: Okay so that's where we are. So we'll call this one paused, this discussion paused and we'll come back to the text at the end of the meeting. Any other last sentences on it before we follow that pause?

No in which case I'll pass the microphone to Marilyn for the next session, which - I mean the next part of this session.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks Avri, so I'm going to describe this as your opportunity to identify what's on the burning platform that you have not addressed and must before you leave the room.

So is it something we didn't spend enough time on, is it something that isn't closed that we might try to close? Is it something new that we must talk about before we leave?

And I see Steve and I think Cheryl had a point as well so let's - and Kathy. So let's start with Steve and then I'll go to Cheryl and then I'll bring the microphone to Kathy, she's got a microphone.

Steve Metalitz: I just - this is Steve Metalitz. I just wanted to clarify where we are on the issues we discussed in I think our first session yesterday. We've put - CSG put forward two proposals.

One having to do with hard wiring a meeting at each ICANN meeting and I think Rafik and I have discussed this and we will try by email and/or conference call whatever is most convenient to move that forward.

We have an agreement in principle and we'll work out the details. Again we're not setting this up for the Singapore, the first such meeting would occur at Buenos Aires. So we have a little time to work that out.

Second, the second point was the election procedure for vice chair. We actually discussed this within the CSG and I think where we came out was to leave things where they are, excuse me where they were at the end of our

session on Monday, which as I understand it but I welcome any correction or amplification of this.

Was that the NC side would get back to us preferably before Singapore but no later than the Singapore meeting with whatever proposal they wish to make either a modification of ours or a brand new one so that we could move forward from there.

And again if it can be done before Singapore then we CSG at least will have the ability to discuss it in Singapore. So I think that's where that was left but I just wanted to get that out and see if anybody wants to correct that, amplify that, complain about that or my summary or anything else, thank you.

Avri Doria: Rafik, just to say I - and before giving it to Rafik just to answer I had also told Rafik that I would hold within NCV the token for producing our first draft so that we could do that.

Rafik Dammak: Yes this is Rafik speaking. Yes I mean I confirm that we have the same I mean understanding and I wish to use Steve for that so yes that's our homework for the (unintelligible).

Man: Yes actually I just wanted to just from I mean my experience with the process that you used to elect me that when I was first elected as vice chair the CSG asked me to have a meeting and to chat.

And you asked me a bunch of questions about how I'd respond. Do you still - and I thought that was actually quite a useful bit of the process and you did not write that into the process, so - this one, do you still - do you think it was a good idea or did you just - it's not a formal part of the process but you still consider it?

Steve Metalitz: So you're asking whether we, whether our proposal includes having a session with the candidate?

Man: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: I - we do not specify that but I can't imagine that we would think that would be a bad idea. So I think we think it will be a good idea.

Man: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: If our proposal were accepted that's how we would hope that would be part of the implementation of it, thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Okay thanks, anymore on this topic? In which case so I want to go to another, I want to go to Cheryl and then to Kathy and then I have a burning platform issue.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Who did Klaus? Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you and this perhaps this is more suited toward the second session but I just wanted to say thank you to everyone because for me this meeting was very valuable and I think I gained a lot from it being someone who is new to ICANN.

And I've had these discussions with other sort of ICANN newcomers on the sidelines in the Los Angeles meeting. There were a lot of people who it was sort of their first meeting, they weren't really sure if they would come to another meeting or not.

And, you know, we're trying to make that decision with respect to how they can sort of engage at that particular meeting. And so I would love to if not now if closer towards the end if there were other burning issues have a discussion on outreach and think about new ways where we can kind of pull in some of those people and maybe spread all the knowledge that you all have.

Whether it's an intercessional or maybe there is another type of a forum that is better suited. But I just wanted to take an opportunity to say that and to actually, you know, to thank you all, that's it.

Kathy Kleinman: I'm a nice person.

Marilyn Cade: It's good that we have some.

Kathy Kleinman: Just because I work for Verizon.

John Berard: This goes to show we have some good BC people as well.

Marilyn Cade: Moving onto Kathy.

Kathy Kleinman: That was a nice comment. Okay I'm going to raise two issues, one which I heard about very briefly from (Karen) and the other which I haven't heard about but I know there are people at the table who have a lot more knowledge and I'm looking for timeframes.

The issues are the UDRP review that's coming up and the rights protection mechanism review in the new gTLD's. If there are people here at the table who know what the timeframes are, who is scoping the issues, how they're being prepared I would, you know, on behalf of those of us who are going to be working on it on the NCSG side we'd love to know.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Any flags I see yours up but I expect that you're not answering that one.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Can I respond first Kathy.

Marilyn Cade: I was wondering if can we ask (Mary) a question? I was going to ask (Mary) that question.

(Mary): Right so I have an email from (Karen) Lentz that outlines kind of the four main things, which I can just briefly read for you. The rights protection review paper is going to be posted for public comment before the ICANN 52 meeting and as Steve rightly pointed out the deadline for those materials is Monday, so I'm assuming that will come on Monday.

And that paper should be kind of outlining I think is what she said, outlining the issues that will be - that they've kind of identified for the review but making no preliminary conclusions or anything to that effect.

The second main thing is the trademark clearinghouse independent review, which was our GAC advice. She says they're currently drafting terms of reference for the study. The schedule for the actual study is March through July of 2015 and for reference the GAC comment that that was asked for in was the May 26, 2011 comment.

So the third issue is the issue report to the GNSO on the status of all rights protection mechanisms was scheduled for April 2015, now proposed for October 2015.

And then the fourth is the anticipated formation of the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review. I call that the (zook) review. That's specified in 9.3 of the AOC is scheduled for October of 2015 as well.

So the potential for the UDRP to be reviewed I think to specifically answer your question should - information about that should be contained in the document that is coming on Monday. Yes I think, so I think that answers your question thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you great.

Woman: So the paper coming out on Monday will involve what issues do you think? What do we need to be looking for?

Kathy Kleinman: `So I think that was the one that was also asked for by the GAC, which was about, you know, whether the rights protection mechanism served their general purpose.

What? No go ahead, Susan is going to answer that question.

(Susan Pen): Thank you (Susan Pen), it's the results of various information gathering that has been going on as I understand it. So they've been doing their own research around things like utilization of the TMCH, numbers of URS's, numbers of (unintelligible) trademark claims that have bene issued.

And also gathering some of the feedback that came from the session that was in LA that was kind of the panel session on Wednesday I think it was where I was there on behalf of the IPC and there were some people from registries and some of them were TMCH.



So also using some of the information that was gathered as a result of that exercise and I think some other exercises as well. (Karen) was very clear that it's not a - there are not conclusions in there and it's being issued for public comment and feedback both in terms of the content and in terms of what the suggestions are in that.

But the reason for the suggested postponement of the issues report is because obviously that document in its final form will be very relevant to the issue report.

Marilyn Cade: So I'm going to go to Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much, I just want to extend the invitation the (unintelligible) partnership together in partnership with the (NPOC) is having tomorrow. (Unintelligible) at the ICANN offices here at 10 o'clock in the morning and the topic (unintelligible) what do you want to know about the government system and never dared to ask.

And it is specific on the one side it's specifically targeted to NGO's but I think it's of interest to everybody. Speakers are (Theresa Sweinhart), Brian Winterfeldt, me and we are getting controlled and managed by Laurie.

And everybody who would like to come to the office tomorrow to participate live in that meeting you're more than welcome just come to the ICANN offices here in Washington, DC.

Everybody else who would like to participate online also just please ask me or Laurie or Rudy or (Sam) and we can give you information and thank you very much for everybody participating and I also want to thank everybody for this meeting here.

I think I know they are two hard days but I think the outcome is worthwhile.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, I'm going to do burning platform topics one more round. I'm going to introduce what to me is a burning platform. It has been a burning platform now for a number of meetings.

And a number of meetings ago a number of us were quite insistent that there had to be deadlines for the public development and publication of the agenda for the ICANN face-to-face meetings.

It was such a big deal to us that we complained to board members, we complained to the previous CEO and we are in case you have encountered if you're going to Singapore and you are flying on the Wednesday or Thursday your 22 days away from having a face-to-face at which we're going to be dealing with a number of very serious topics.

And we're going to be inundated with updates and reports et cetera and there is no agenda for ICANN 52. So (Rob) knew I was going to say this, I gave him a heads up.

The commitment was made all the way from the board that there would be a deadline by which the agendas would be posted and by which the materials would be posted.

I have done a review of the last three schedules for the ICANN meetings and over and over and over the deadline for the agenda is missed and when you click on the meetings when it is posted and you click on the meetings, the schedule for your meeting and agenda is posted.

And the meetings that are hosted or organized by the ICANN staff have no agenda and in some cases the agenda is posted the morning of the meeting. I don't know about you but we're talking about outreach and participation.

We're talking about trying to reach business people or NGO leaders or others, we're trying to help you justify your ability to prepare but also to get approval to come to a meeting. If we are operating with operational excellence we got to fix that problem. It is a major problem.

Secondly, two meetings ago we were told in the budget working group that ICANN saved almost \$230,000 by changing the due dates on the transcripts. And instead of doing transcripts in real time delivery some of them are delayed.

Many of the meetings compete with each other and the way we all cover multiple meetings is to have a member of our community go into a meeting, clip the relevant points, share the transcript.

If you don't do that in some cases because it's the real time transcript and the real time script, you cannot, you will not see a transcript for three to four days and in some cases it's been more than a week.

There's a meeting from the last ICANN meeting that still doesn't have a transcript. Tell me about operational excellence here. So guys it may just be my burning platform but we cannot prepare for meetings, we cannot be informed for meetings and we cannot walk into a meeting where the board is sitting in a meeting, staff have organized a session and there's no agenda.

So maybe it's only a problem to me, anyone else?

Steve Metalitz: With regard to the first issue, yes the board adopted a policy. This is one of the first things that happened when Rod Beckstrom became president and that was the 21 day rule about public, items to be published and for discussion at an ICANN meeting and the agendas.

And in general with several notable exceptions ICANN, you know, let me just remind you that there actually once was a day when I was almost as associated with this issue as Jonathan Zuck was with metrics.

This is the one I kept bugging the board about and insisting for example that the board's public participation committee, which wasn't even meeting anymore should hold a meeting to discuss compliance with this policy, which at that point was very questionable.

Anyway long story short they do publish, generally publish the documents in advance but they don't publish - and they publish an agenda, which is the overall five-day thing, you know, who is going - we're going to have a session at, you know, who meets when on constituency day and that type of thing.

But they do not publish the agendas of what's going to happen at the ICANN organized sessions until much later and I agree with you, this is a big problem, thank you.

John Berard: This is John Berard from the BC. Do we have any feedback from anybody as to why the deadlines are missed as often as they are? From a - from the perspective of someone who has been a staff guy for a long time the way a meeting runs can help you manage a fair bit of unruly behavior.

And if you badly run a meeting then you're more likely to encourage people to run amuck. And I was just curious has there been any organizational feedback as to why the deadlines are persistently missed?

Marilyn Cade: Avri.

Avri Doria: I have a quick question and I wonder whether they actually believe that they're following the letter of the law in terms of the documents coming out and the schedule coming out.

And the next degree down somehow they've decided isn't part of that same requirement. So I'm wondering whether we actually have an issue here of clarification.

And if we went and they said, hey you didn't say what you said you would do and I say no, we get the schedule out and we get to the documents, you know, and we did not specify.

I'm, you know, maybe I'm making excuses for them but I'm just asking that question. Do we know that schedule and detailed agenda are conjoined in their understanding of their mandate because personally from what I've seen of the staff while they could miss a deadline every once in a while they would not consistently miss a deadline like that with no explanation.

Marilyn Cade: So Avri it's Marilyn again, my comment would be that the policy staff never missed those deadlines, the SVAC staff don't miss those deadlines. The people who are missing the deadlines and I'll give you an example.

The CCWG, sorry the Internet governance session traditionally people find out that they're speaking on the panel once they arrive or the night before. I'm

just using that as an example of something that I tend to pay very close attention to.

There are other sessions like that, not organized around policy because I don't see those deadlines being missed. What I see being missed are sort of the bigger sessions that are taking up in the main room.

Kathy and then we can come back to - we can ask that question Avri, is...

Kathy Kleinman: Cool, just a short comment on the transcripts. I would absolutely agree with you that real time transcripts are very valuable and especially dealing with your point about outreach.

There are people coming in where English is a second language and so I see lots of people watching the transcripts and sometimes I do too, there's an accent, there's something or there's noise in the back of the room and I can't hear somebody but you can watch the transcript.

So I think it's valuable for many, many reasons and if ICANN is looking at cost effectiveness I can see why they would think this might not be a relevant issue. I love the issue of pinning in and saying yes this is very important.

Marilyn Cade: Okay let me move us to any other burning platform issues because if not we're going to go to kind of a wrap up approach that Avri is going to moderate. Any other burning issues?

I'm going to introduce a opportunity to invite our board member elected from our house to perhaps make some comments if he's willing to about his experience or anything else.

(Marcus): Yes thank you (unintelligible) (Klaus) thank you very much I appreciate being part of this meeting. For me it was very interesting and I am fully aware that there are different interests in the house.

But I was deeply impressed by the collegial atmosphere and open exchanges and I think this kind of meeting indeed is very productive and helps ICANN to grow stronger.

And the fact that there is a concrete result of an outcome of the meeting the letter you're going to address to my colleagues and myself so I look forward to receiving it and to see what we can do to act on this.

And I really hope that we can build on this meeting and I also stand ready to participate in calls if you would like to invite me, if you would like to invite me to be part of these calls.

So I'm here to listen I said so at the beginning and I listen a lot and I think I learned a lot and it's good to see also to recognize new faces and to know who is the face behind the voice and where you're coming from. It was great, great meeting thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you yes, (Ron).

(Ron) Andruff: Thank you very much (Marcus), it's (Ron) Andruff speaking. I just wanted to - you and I had a little side chat about the amount of work that a board member undertakes when they join.

And I wondered if you might just enlighten the rest of the group so they can understand just what we've asked of you and what you're delivering for us in terms of board work, number of hours and types of things that are, you know,

that you found kind of impressive, what impressed you now since you've been a board member if I may, thank you.

(Marcus): Well I think it's hard to assess how much, how many - I mean you all put in many hours so I mean there's a lot of voluntary work and I think that this is truly impressive to see the workloads the community takes on to make this happen.

ICANN is a very complex organization, a very complex structure, maybe over complex and I was struck by Avri's comments yesterday that she said there was trust at the individual basis but the kind of structural mistrust.

And I think that is a barrier we have to overcome. And I think meetings like these help to overcome distrust. We had also obviously many offline exchanges with many of you and that I think was equally helpful.

And (Fahdi) mentioned that they have every year a survey to see the recognition of ICANN and what he said also confirmed in a way Avri's assessment.

That the board for instance is highly regarded, it seems by the outside world on an individual basis but not collectively. And that in a way reflects that we maybe interact well from person-to-person but there is room for improvement in that collective basis and on a structural basis.

And I think this is something we have to work at and as I said meetings like these can be very productive in helping build common ground and overcoming barriers.



I mean we live that also in the broader Internet governance sphere where coalitions are possible now that were unthinkable ten years ago. Business then speak to stable society and governments are held separate.

And when I first attended the ICANN meeting I do remember that was more than ten years ago in (unintelligible) governments, they were behind closed doors nobody was allowed in.

They all have opened up and they have much more I think cross community work going on. In this house I think this is also with all the difficulties I think very important to come together.

Again I think not to answer your question but as a diplomat I learned to avoid answering questions.

(Ron) Andruff: You're well trained sir.

Avri Doria: Thank you (Marcus), any other questions on - for (Marcus) or about that? In which case seeing none unless I'm missing a flag somewhere, no I am not. I'd actually like to move back that we've reposted the - excuse me yes.

Marilyn Cade: After you - and after you do the letter then can we do the question of how - what...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, right I just basically the letter was there I wanted to try and get that done. The other reason I wanted to do that Marilyn is because I looked at the 5:30 to 6 o'clock that also includes the notion of next steps.

So basically wanted to start that discussion and if it runs into the other one no biggy. So yes, so the wording has been changed. I'd like people to look at it and then I'd like to ask the question I asked before, which I put on pause is, is there any objection in the room. Yes (Tony) please.

(Tony): Well I was just going to offer to try and help people through...

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Tony): ...the changes if I may.

Avri Doria: Can this also be blown up? I know you can make like full screen out of these things so people can read it easily. Sorry for interrupting you (Tony). I know they keep telling us whenever we complain they say, yes just blow it to full screen.

It's that expanding one over the - yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Sorry, sorry I snuck that up on you it was mean of me. I don't think (unintelligible).

(Tony): You're going to break it.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay (Tony) the floor is yours thank you.

(Tony): Okay so the changes that have been made in the paragraph that begins was it is appreciated, it's being changed to the view of the individual NCPH participants.

In the following paragraph the word route and branch has been removed so it just says what is required and say (throughout) the review. And the final change is in...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): ...so I've given people the opportunity if we can move to the last paragraph.

Man: (Tony) there's one - yes it should be actually to NCPH...

(Tony): Right.

Man: ...intercessional participants.

(Tony): Okay so the same wording as before.

Man: Yes because intercessional should be included that way it means those who are here.

(Tony): That's a good catch thank you. And the - that paragraph was changed to say to address this as a matter of urgency rather than with all haste. And we recommend the board also consult the GNSO council on how and the words added best to address this issue.

Avri Doria: And it probably needs to be inter-paragraph gap just, you know, a small thing.

(Tony): Yes that was in there I don't know quite what's happened (David) with that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Tony): That was on the version I sent you I thought.

Avri Doria: Okay Marilyn I see your hand up.

Marilyn Cade: I agree with the change.

(Tony): Okay.

Marilyn Cade: I would cover a big but (unintelligible). I have a concern here. I understand the intent but it's in the last paragraph where it says, maybe it wasn't the last paragraph.

The one where it says the evolution of the Internet.

Man: (Unintelligible) the last one.

Marilyn Cade: Yes I think the Internet is always going to evolve. I think the point is that we should be focused on what we should be doing at ICANN and I'm just concerned this almost opens up the idea that we're going to be talking about different changes in the Internet and that's not really...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: You got to talk into your microphone.

Marilyn Cade: ...I think that's not really what we're talking about. We're talking about an effective structure within the GNSO in order to be able to fulfill our role.

Avri Doria: Okay (Laurie).

Laurie Anderson: Hi, if we stick with the evolution concept what I would recommend to say, it takes full account of the evolution of the domain name system not the Internet. The Internet is much bigger.

Avri Doria: Okay so we've had two more change to this version. (Tony) were you clear on - yes please.

(Tony): So the last one is just to change the evolution of the Internet to the evolution of the DNS?

Woman: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay and then there was the inter-paragraph gap and then there was the changing the NCPH to the - what was the stock phrase we're using?

(Tony): Yes.

Avri Doria: The NCPH participant's right.

(Tony): Got it.

Avri Doria: Now can I ask about the acceptability again or do people need to see the new? Okay there's comments from Anne in the Adobe, which I guess I should read out.

Let me see there's just two of them. Read the statement second paragraph, need a comma after the word expressed. Fourth paragraph after appreciate following concerns initially expressed during ICANN 51 by commas or parenthesis for ease of reading.

Is the next paragraph also - no the next paragraph was a different issue.

Marilyn Cade: And Avri...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I should probably read it but not as part of this.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to let you do it, Steve has a point but I want to ask a question about the last sentence. This is the GNSO review, we're referring them back to the council because this comment...

Steve Metalitz: Also consult, not only.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

(Tony): I think we explained it's not the GNSO review, this is something that we're asking to take place outside of the existing GNSO review. Because the GNSO review to me refers to the work that's being done by the consultants now and that is not what we're asking for. So we cleared that point earlier.

Steve Metalitz: It's just not the consultant's part of the review

(Tony): Can't hear you Steve.

Marilyn Cade: But (Tony) the last sentence says we recommend that the board also consult the GNSO council on how best to address the issue.

(Tony): Right.

Marilyn Cade: My point is maybe I'm using the term GNSO review inadequately but the whole point was we want to look at the structure in relation to the GNSO not just in relation to the policy council.

Avri Doria: Right but it wasn't how to reorganize the GNSO council.

Marilyn Cade: I know.

Avri Doria: It was asked and it's the council that's supposed to come to the GNSO and say, you know, we're not asking the board to come directly to the whole GNSO or is that what you want to do?

I mean I would not suggest it but it's not asking them to come to the whole GNSO and say how do you want to do it but to come to the council then the council needs to go to the GNSO as it normally does in dealing with issues.

(Tony): I just love drafting for our committee.

Avri Doria: Well this was, it's the wordsmithing by committee, the drafting is done but, you know, yes Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, if you would please scroll up just a tiny bit to the paragraph that has the words without any conflicting views being expressed. Thank you it's the second paragraph, second sentence.

So without any conflicting views being expressed if the readers of this letter know that - well the NCPH was meeting that will strain credibility because we express conflicting views as a matter of course I think.

I'm so grateful that we came together on the accountability and the transition while in London and we're still together on that. But do you need that phrase without any conflicting views being expressed?

Can we just go straight to there was a strong consensus opinion at the current review?

Avri Doria: Okay also, this is actually getting complicated I'm beginning to have my doubts whether we'll actually be able to get this letter out but we'll see if I'm wrong. Anne has hands up is she able to speak?

Anne: Yes thank you I already dialed in and very quickly just for the consideration of those who are there. I do recall that (Westlake) encouraged us all when filling out this survey that if we had comments with respect to structure that we were all very free to write those into the freehand comment sections.

And yet we later learned that even where the survey participant said I don't mind if you publish my comments but there's no plan to release the actual results in terms of the written comments that were provided in the surveys.

And so my fear is, you know, there may be a lot of comments regarding structure and the inadequacy of the survey within those surveys themselves that will never see the light of day.

Now (Ron) may have more comments on this than I can provide but I think we need to consider asking to see those survey comments, you know, related to structure where the participant said I don't mind if you publish my comments, thank you.



Avri Doria: Thank you, I think that's an issue that is beyond this letter and something that we should make to the GNSO review working party to do that. So I think it's a very good suggestion that we should take that way but I don't see it as being something and I looked around the room and saw heads moving and the no not in this letter direction.

Who else was on the schedule to speak? Do we have - (Tony) do you have an understanding of the letter that - okay please.

(Tony): Yes, what I'm going to do is to change the last paragraph to reflect the same way we reflected participants earlier. And I'm going to remove the text that says without any conflicting views being expressed.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you, with those changes and trusting (Tony) to make those changes is there any objection to this letter going forward as indicated to the board? I would assume we would also send a copy to the council or not.

Man: Or we just get published.

Avri Doria: Right, right okay so no objections? Send to board, copy to council.

(Tony): Okay.

(David): It may just need one more proofread.

Avri Doria: Yes, fantastic thank you.

(Tony): So I will do those amendments and I'll check with (David) as a final check and then we'll take that action.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you very much, thank you all for that. Okay, well we have an outcome and it wasn't the most painful editing by committee that I've seen by any means.

Man: I think we've learned from this process why there will never be a NCPH communique.

Avri Doria: Okay now going to the last one, which was the issue that was framed of it's not so much the follow ons from this one but it's in - and Marilyn it's funny that I'm stuck with this one because you, it was your question and you understand it better than me.

So I'm going to turn it over to you to correct me briefly. But it's - we've done this, we've done it now twice this time with a two-year gap. Is it something, I get the impression it's something we see worth doing.

Is it something that's worth doing every two years, every one year? Is it something we need to - if it is it's something we need to get into the budget and open up that particular issue and Marilyn I'm going to give you the microphone first so you can amplify on the theme and then...

Marilyn Cade: That's exactly - I'll read the question that we need to ask ourselves and (Rob) is here, other ICANN staff are here. We've used a lot of staff resources and a lot of planning resources ourselves to put this together but we decided it was worth doing.

Okay we've done it so I would say having been in the first intercessional session it's not a policy meeting it's an effort to focus on areas of kind of management and administration and identify a few things.

One of the benefits that I got out of this is a few recruits from other groups who are now interested in collaborating with (Gimson) and myself on the budget and strap plan reviews, volunteers to do work.

But do we do this again? If we do it again how often and what did we learn? Are there things we think we need to do differently and I'll turn it back to Avri to manage the queue and we might ask (Rob) if there are other questions that he wants to throw in.

Avri Doria: Okay (Ron), I have (Ron) first and then I have Matthew and then Rafik and then - yes okay I'm beginning to see lots of other - and there's a flag up. Laurie is your still - flag up from before? Okay.

(Ron): So this is (Ron) for the record. This has been exceptional, it's really been exceptional. It's been awesome to have the opportunity to sit with colleagues from the other side of the house and thrash through issues and understand what issues are amongst us that we all share in common.

And when we started this conversation we kind of went around the table and introduced ourselves and my comment was I really look forward to seeing how we can work through things and get to know each other.

And so for me my part I think this has been really a very, very helpful process. Doing it once a year may be too much but at this stage of the game we need to work more closely together.

So it may be something we want to visit again next year. I would certainly be supportive of that but I also thought that the comment about trying to create a bit of a like we have in the CSG right now we have representatives from all three constituencies kind of huddled together so that all three constituencies

are aware of the issues that each individual one are kind of working through or thinking about.

And I would like to see that our colleagues from the other side of the house join in that that we can get more dialogue going on regular, on issues on a regular basis because I think that will go a long way to help us all to understand what are the issues, where we have support, where if there is no support, build support.

We are a consensus based organization so I think that will really move us in the right direction. So thank you all very much for the contributions this week it's been a week that's been excellent from my point of view, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, okay so then I've got Matt, Rafik and (Karen).

(Matthew Shears): Yes (Matthew Shears) I just wanted to also say this is like with Cheryl that we very much appreciated this opportunity to come to this intercessional, my first.

It's also a great opportunity to see the various components of the house at work. I would like to say that this is incredibly important. This builds trust and we talked a lot about trust.

This builds trust. I think we should do it more often, every two years I don't think is enough. And to support your point (Ron) I think it's incredibly important that we do this more often but on an issue specific basis, thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Avri, first I would be happy to work with - I am, sorry. I am happy to work with Marilyn about the budget it will be fine I guess. But about the intercessional I think we improve it from the first edition and it was more really the non-contracted party house working together.

What I guess we need to revisit is maybe to think about the timing. Maybe it didn't work and somehow for some of our members they couldn't come because of the short time constraint to get the Visa. That's something we need to, maybe to work on that.

And maybe in more practical point I'm not sure we need I think to make again a common official financial request to get this intercessional meeting and we have a deadline to do that.

So I guess we need to start working on that after this meeting. Other than that I guess, you know, I'm happy with what we achieved in these two days. I guess we can maybe start working more earlier to do the planning and I think can be much better for next edition next year.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you, we're hitting time so I'm going to do a last listing of the names I see and if I didn't get your name or it's time to get the flag up. So I've got (Karen), then I have (Joan), I have Steve and I have Bill Drake and I have Cheryl and that is it. Please (Karen).

(Karen): Hi, so I feel like asking us if we want to do this again on the end of the second day of solid meetings with no breaks. It's like asking a woman if she wants to have a second child like two seconds after she's given birth.

Like so I would like right now I'm thinking at best every two years because this is a very tough meeting to attend. But in all seriousness because I may not

be able to attend the next one or be elected to, so it has less to do with my preference and I think more to do with whether or not this is useful to our constituencies if our participation here was useful to them, was useful to kind of the community stuff.

And so I would prefer to table this discussion until maybe we get together and Singapore to really be able to assess the usefulness of the meeting. I did have a good time here I thought it was really useful and productive meeting.

I'm not as nice as Cheryl so I'm not going to act poetic about it, but it was...

Avri Doria: A few people are.

(Karen): ...right, yes right exactly. Good job Cheryl we need people like you please come back next time. But the - but I mean I do think it's useful I just don't think that we should be making that determination at this point or with this limited group of people. So that's just my point thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you, hearing this equated to childbirth truly amazes me.

(Karen): I may be just as exhausted now as I was then.

Avri Doria: Interesting it must have been an easy birth. (Joan) please.

(Joan): Great thank you. I'd like to thank Marilyn for inviting me to actually make a comment. Let me first say that I do a lot of attendance at different meetings and two things that I always assess a meeting from a personal point of view is hospitality and courtesy and then the meeting itself.

So the first thing I want to say is, when I first sat down two people came up and introduced themselves and welcomed me to the meeting within less than a minute and the first one was Marilyn and (Ron).

So I thought that was such a nice thing because how they approached me was I haven't met you before, thank you for coming. And I thought that was such a nice thing to do.

And I always say to people whenever there are new people in a room to do that if you don't recognize the face. It's a very friendly and welcoming thing to do so I just wanted to personally thank you for that.

The other thing is that throughout the last couple of days I want to say that I really learned a lot. I listened and took a lot of notes, very important for our committee.

I mean I know Kathy and I know Avri so they didn't have to - they just have to sort of wave and that was it and of course our committee. But I really learned a lot and I think it's really important to outreach to new members.

And ask them to participate more because I think when you're new you hesitate and as I did to come to this meeting because I thought it would be a chock full of information and you don't really want to hear new ideas it's more about the task that has to be done as opposed to new ideas or new aspects of things.

So I think that there should be some room about that, you know, turning things on their heads is always a good thing. But I just want to say thank you to everyone I really did learn a lot and I think it is very crucial to have intercessional meetings between groups and as you call it houses. So a house well built is one that stands, right? So thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, Steve Metalitz speaking. Three points, first I think this was a good meeting and I'm very please in particular to see so many new people or relatively new people not the same dinosaurs that often are stalking near here.

Avri Dori: Excuse me.

Steve Metalitz: And I...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...anyway you know who I'm referring to here. Second, I also agree with (Karen) that we need a little time to reflect on whether to repeat this again next year but I think we should have that discussion soon so that we can make that decision.

My third point really has to do with the staff. I want to thank the staff for all the work that they've put into making this possible. And I'm not here simply to applaud the staff because actually I have two questions to ask (Rob).

First I think it is the case that if we decide we want to have another intercessional next year, next fiscal year, we probably better make that decision before the end of February because that's the point at which the application for it would come through.

So my first question is asking to confirm or modify that. My second question is to ask him does the staff currently plan to do any type of evaluation? I'm thinking even more in terms of even logistical items and so forth with the



participants because I would encourage you to do that and I'm sure you probably are already planning but maybe you could say what is planned on that, thank you.

(Rob): Yes sir thank you for that. We traditionally do that within the policy arena and that's something that Marika and her team have started to do with council meetings and the rest.

We've got a really nice format that Marika has used that we'll tweak for purposes of this meeting. And that includes feedback on how the travel arrangements and thank you, many of you for your patience in that respect and also just the logistics of the room.

A number of you have been great to share with me gee let's not have to crawl under the tables to plug in our laptops and things like that, so that's much appreciated so we will have that.

Strategically even if you haven't collectively decided let's do it again you should ask. I mean as you all know after the first one we were inclined to do a second but we simply couldn't do it last year because we have four ICANN meetings in one year.

So I think that there is certainly a recognition on the part of senior ICANN staff that this is a successful event as (David) walks into the room. And so I think it's something that certainly if you're at all inclined you should definitely collaborate on a request, collaborate with me on it if you'd like and we can get that in.

Then we can start discussing scheduling and timing if indeed it makes sense to do it again on your part, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay I thought I just had a few more but a bunch more flags have gone up. So I have Cheryl next, then I had (Bill), then I've got (Tony) and (Joan) and (Joan) will have the last word at the end of all - sorry there will be Marilyn then (Joan) so I'm still giving (Joan) the last word.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I just wanted to comment on the regularity of the meeting. I think while you're all deciding, for me I think having it next year would be beneficial.

Perhaps one thing that we can do in the interim period I don't know if there's a way to organize it really quickly but just find a way to jot down things that we thought worked very well or things that we might tweak so that we have some substantive considerations as we try and go ahead and make that decision.

One kind of top level thing that worked really well for me is the fact that everyone is so busy at the actual ICANN meetings and it's all moving so quickly you don't really have the time to have the actual face-to-face.

And so if we were to do this again it would be interesting to possibly have smaller breakout sessions with a mixture of all the different groups rather than, you know, there's a little bit of separation between both groups.

And then we came together as one large group but smaller sessions might be interesting. Maybe we could pick different topics and have smaller groups that are interested in those topics working on that.

And then I also do like the idea of having - I know we can't always have a deliverable or some type of outcome like that but it's nice to have something at the end that you've worked toward.

And so that worked well this meeting I don't know if it would work well in others.

Avri Doria: Thanks, you reminded me of something and before I hand the mike to Bill I am going to take this chance. (Ron) last night at the cocktail thing sort of said, you know, we're always going off to dinner with our own groups.

We really should perhaps have a hat where, you know, we all draw a number and all the ones go out to dinner together and the twos go out to dinner together and the threes.

I thought that was a great idea and since he didn't have his hand up and you reminded me of it, Bill.

Bill Drake: I do think this was a very useful meeting. The fact that people are still in a good mood and laughing at the end of two days of intensive conversation in an ICANN event is really pretty unique I think actually.

I remember the one we did two years ago, it didn't have that feeling for all kinds of reasons. I think we came into the first encounter a little bit more stressed about how is this going to work and how do we interact, da, da, da.

There was the whole question of, you know, how much staff, how much community. This one I think we really managed to get it right in terms of the flow.

We spent a lot of time in the planning thinking about how to structure the event in a way that would lead to building of, you know, cooperation et cetera, working for (unintelligible) or at least trying to.

So I think it all worked very well and I personally would like to see us do it again. It's not that we all need more meetings to go to but we have started to articulate an agenda of common interests that we want to take forward.

And if we don't actually meet together and talk about it we are not going to advance that agenda that's all there is to it. If you think we're going to simply do this on the sidelines of regular ICANN meetings when we are all running around like chickens with our heads cut off for a week it's not going to happen.

We are all already wildly over committed during those meetings. So if you really want to get head space together and have time to focus it has to be something like this and if we're going to try and do something like this then again yes the budget request that we did last year the deadline is February 28.

So we would have and we do have a very positive outcome to build on. I mean in approaching staff with a proposal it's, you know, when you can propose for the basis of having had a very positive experience you're in a hell of a lot better position to be able to say this is what we're looking for and so on.

And so I think, you know, personally I would like to see us take it forward and get serious and I would like to not have the discussion just be limited to the chairs, which is kind of like how a lot of the planning for this worked before.

I say again we have this list serve, mail list that we don't use and we could add more people to it. I would think why not, you know, and try to have a broader discussion around this.

But in any event so thank you to everybody and thanks to (Rob) especially for all the work he did on this, working with us and I hope that we can continue to dialogue.

Avri Doria: Okay I have (Tony), Marilyn, (Joan) and then (David) wants to say a word. Okay so (Tony).

(Tony): Okay, personally I found this a very good meeting and I've certainly heard nothing from any of the other ISP's other than to say that they feel the same way about this.

So I think if we were taking a decision today whether to go ahead or not I'm pretty sure that we would support that. I don't think that view is going to change either.

But certainly agree we need to make that decision quickly so maybe a short period of reflection. I can remember when there was a landmark for the GNSO when they came together with one common view that we never achieved before.

And I think here there's been a landmark situation where we've actually even produced a piece of text, it may be small but we've actually achieved something.

We've also set in place an agreement that we're going to meet at ICANN meetings and somehow or the other we need to carve out that piece of time. I agree with (Bill) that you don't really get the same level of interaction there but I think if we do get together at ICANN meetings and I sincerely hope that's the case then what we've done here is really just set the scene for that. It will be so much easier, so much more collegial.

And finally just to endorse what Steve said, I know that we gave one particular person here a really hard time in organizing this across the holiday period.

So (Rob) thanks to you it must have been a situation where you were having a tough time to try to fix this so very much appreciate what you've done and appreciate the problems that you had to handle across a very difficult timeframe with all the other demands that were on ICANN staff and ICANN travel team at that time. So thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you very much, I'm jumping the queue I know. I appreciate those comments but I cannot take all of the credit. I think you should also acknowledge (Carlos Reyes) who is here and Benedetta Rossi who has been tremendously helpful with us on Adobe Connect, thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Avri Doria: The last time I'll call on you.

Marilyn Cade: When we - Marilyn Cade speaking. When we did the first intercessional one of our requests to (Fahdi) was that we have the commitment that the senior staff would join us during the session and participate.

And because the board was meeting in the LA offices at the time we also asked to have interaction with the board. And I just want to note that we, when we did this we had a commitment from (Fahdi) that he would participate.

He did, he more than fulfilled and met our expectations on the dedication of time he gave us. We've had (David) here as well, we've had (Theresa), we've had Crocker come as the chair, we've had (Marcus) with us.

And I think it's important to recognize that that additional contribution that ICANN made has been I think has contributed to why we are so satisfied. Why we are so satisfied with the meeting.

I will predict that when we all go back and confer with our members we may find more members who would be willing to commit the amount of time for the next session.

And so I think it is important that we take the time to go back and say here's what the intercessional did, it's not a policy session but here's our experience and we take that input into account.

But my comment to (David) and to (Rob) and Benedetta and to (Carlos) is I think you can expect us to continue to ask to have access to the CEO and to some of the senior staff.

Avri Doria: Thank you, (Joan).

(Joan Kerr): Okay so very quickly I just want to say that my favorite husband came with me to this meeting and he is doing the tourist thing and I'm at the meeting. I usually am the one that is doing the tourist thing and he's at the meetings. So I just want to say that that has changed our lives number one. And number two is to thank whomever organized this meeting for making this a delicious meeting with all the really great food, I'm a really big (foodie) in real life. So I just want to say it was a delicious meeting thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes, actually I - the best sandwiches we've had at a meeting, best sandwiches ever at a meeting. Okay so I have (David) but I have another (David) so (David) please go and then.

(David): Of all the staff we think that sort of said - this one I think we really gave constituency travel a hard time. And so a lot of thanks to (Joseph). I think he may have - he's been worked pretty hard lately. We really may need to...

Avri Doria: He needs to be cloned.

(David): ...cloned yes. But we certainly didn't give him an easy time I know there's been quite a few dramas and changes and yes that we really appreciate it.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you (Joseph).

Man: I thank all of you for the time spent traveling to come and how you (unintelligible). I would like to consider two others that we make some changes.

And one would be the structure of the board interaction with the (unintelligible) constituencies. Now would be a good time to take a part at (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: So we're extending this meeting by three hours to discuss that one?

Man: (Unintelligible) on these strategies to (unintelligible) type meeting. The (unintelligible) like this to draft across every constituency and stakeholders in addition to leading the workgroup and council.



But think about it as well as (unintelligible) for another part of that agenda for the next (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Thank you, is that up there on the board the place that provided the sandwiches is that why that's posted? Good people to know I would write that one down for people that come to DC.

I was handed something and asked to make sure that you all knew before I end the meeting and that's the Internet society's meet and greet with President (Cathy Brown) tonight.

It's at 6:30, it's at the science club at 1136 19th and I'll leave this. Most importantly I was assured there is free booze. And thank you all for this session and now it's - do you have a final or...

Man: I do not.

Avri Doria: ...you do not in which case we are all excused, we are all excused thank you.

END