ICANN San Francisco Meeting
NCSG
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 15 March 2011 at 14:00 local

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Steve

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. This call is being recorded. If you do have any objections, please feel free to disconnect. You may begin.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay, so this is the meeting of the NCSG, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. It's an open meeting. Anyone is welcome. We don't have an Adobe room. I thought we would, but we don't. I've got a draft agenda that I've put in front of us, sort of this has been gone through a couple times on the list, but see if there's anything that needs to be changed.

Two things I wanted to point out. One is I just got a message from Glen saying be sure we were done by 5:30, because somebody else wants the room. I thought we scheduled it until 6:00.

But in any case, there's also the Board and GAC meeting is on hiatus now until 4:00 or 5:00. I know that perhaps many of us, some of us, want to go listen to that. So if we get through things quickly, that might be good. If not, we definitely have the time.

In terms of the agenda, the first thing I had was updates from constituencies and candidate constituencies -- basically like five

minutes each -- since they all had meetings this morning, if they wanted to just give an update on those meetings.

And perhaps as part of that, I can fulfill Robin's request that I report on the Board/GAC thing I went and watched. I certainly don't have more than two or three minutes of things to say.

Status on our (unintelligible) stakeholder group activities including status of charter -- definitely can do an update on where we're at on that. Some of us were at a meeting yesterday with the Board's - I can't remember its acronym, but the Structural Improvements Committee, the SIC.

Then I have NomCom on the agenda, but I don't know if we'll move that around, if we're waiting for (Adam) or not. If we're waiting for (Adam), we can move it. If not, Maria can do it.

Then issues before Council, especially those to be voted on during the meeting, I'm not even sure what they are. But I'm sure one of the Councilors in the room can fill us in on what you're actually going to vote on.

We did get a notification from (Rosemary) that she needs a proxy. I've asked Mary to do it but, you know, and I've also asked her to check with (Rosemary) in terms of what (Rosemary)'s views were on those issues. And that counts as the voting instructions we're supposed to give. Check with (Rosemary).

Then there's the new gTLD scorecard issues. As far as I can tell, there was a little bit of discontent from just about every constituency on

those. So some people for toning it down too much. Some people for toning it up too much. Some people for whatever. And I did get yelled at for it this morning in one of the constituency meetings. So it's on the agenda to talk about.

Then one of the things that's been on there for a while is any policy plans for this year. Are there any policy initiatives -- not just the things we're reacting to because they're on the agenda. But are there things that we really want to try and tackle, and if so, getting them started.

A motion that I put here all the time on the agenda is fundraising for the stakeholder group. We have no funds. We have no money. We have no secretariat. We have nothing. And if we want anything, then again we have to think about how to get some funds to do that.

I know the constituencies are getting their own funds for their own activities, but there's nothing for the stakeholder group, and so just talk about ideas and any other business. And of course I don't know if anybody had anything else now.

Oh, yeah, I probably should have remembered to introduce myself as Avri Doria at the beginning of this. We all need to introduce ourselves when we talk. So is the agenda okay? Should we go with it? Okay. And if we can get done early, great. But I'll try to keep it to these times. Obviously I'm already a couple minutes late.

Okay, so which constituency framework would like to go first? Should we start alphabetical? In which case it would be Alex? And I love picking on you today.

Alex Gakuru: Thank you very much. I'm happy to do that. My name is Alex Gakuru, and I'm reporting on behalf of the Consumer Constituency Group meeting we had this morning from 8:30 to 12:00.

We started off on a bit of an uneven footing, but we stabilized and found our ground, and made some, a little, good progress. We had several attendees. I estimate the number to be about 35, although I've asked for the list of the people that attended so that I can report on the exact number (unintelligible).

We had people from various parts of the community, right? From the US FTC, Federal Trade Commission. We had people from the (Gambia), and the Supreme Court, to barristers from (unintelligible). We had the LTC members, ALAC, several newcomers, and it was noted that a comment was made that there are many more ladies than men.

Now besides that, we had speakers. Avri spoke. Wendy attended and spoke about registrant rights. You had Mark Rosenberg. We had (unintelligible). I was there. (Rosemary) was unable to join us for reasons she already communicated to us. We were hoping she'd be a remote participant.

One of the questions that was raised by the people was the many acronyms in ICANN as usual, and we decided we shall have a document that can handle all the people into ICANN to understand what they are. We managed to come up with something we're calling the Living Document of the Consumer Agenda in ICANN, which we shall keep updating so that the charter can remain.

I'll report on the charter. The charter can be made more (unintelligible) by the Living Document, and also can be updated to reflect on the various issues that emerged in the course of our questions, like is the Consumer Constituency, in the first place, necessary; given that the issues that are being discussed are so broad, and (unintelligible) NCUC and stakeholder groups (unintelligible) to deal with them.

So we said maybe just to fit in the structure and because of the Board, and other requirements, we might do it. We will continue with it, but we have to work together with the stakeholder group and the NCUC, because the issues are entwined and they cannot be separated, for example, human rights, cost-cutting for the entire group.

We discussed among others, a PDP. We discussed work teams. We explained how work groups work, the structure of ICANN. We spoke about data and one of the speakers impressed upon the need to have data as a basis of the analysis we shall be making; and how we should set targets; and when things should happen and what should happen.

Questions were raised whether we should be dealing with issues about competition and (unintelligible) and access. And of course based on what Nairobi is about (unintelligible), that we have to restrict ourselves to (unintelligible) policy issues.

So we explained to that, and we discussed the next steps. We tried to solidify the discussions that went there, Boards taking a lot of note. We were hoping you'd have the entire session recorded so that you can revisit everything that was said, but I think the recording didn't function. So we will send the (unintelligible) deliberations and that document

(unintelligible) requested. And from then on, we carry on with what the group requested.

Besides that, there are a lot of details which we shall share with the bigger stakeholder group as and when we finalize on our documentation and what is that. And I think that's what I could report for now, and people like (Didi Hallock) and (Inca Cansiata), stakeholder members were here. (Unintelligible) there.

Yeah, so it was an interesting session towards the end. We quite liked how it ended, though like I said, how it was starting was not exactly what we had hoped, but we all ended up very well. So some commendable progress, and thank you for listening to me. Bye-bye.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So I'm glad to hear that more people came later, because when I left the room, there was fewer than ten. So I'm glad it got better. Any questions for Alex? Yes, Milton. Milton and then (Didi).

Milton Mueller: Alex, just the nature of the consumer protection constituency, to what degree do (unintelligible) consumer presume basically an economic focus in which you're dealing exclusively with buyer/seller relationships from the consumer side of the equation, trying to seek certain forms of consumer protection? Or is it broader than that?

Because a lot of people claim to be doing things on behalf of the consumer, and they pack a lot of things into that. I just wonder how focused you plan to be, or did you discuss that?

Alex Gakuru: The issue arose, and we - rather than repeating the definition of the consumer, because of the water that has gone under the bridge, but

we made it quite clear that we have a very simple definition of a consumer as an end-user, so consumer if one was (unintelligible) user. And we also (unintelligible) at the point of that particular (unintelligible) what has been missing and has been presented by others, others than the consumer, other than that end-user.

So what we are trying to do, or what we intend to do, based on the draft charter that we presented, is to get the voice of the particular people that are actually consumers -- whether they are organizations or partners or affiliates, but not institutions that are claiming to be speaking on behalf of consumers.

Now if I get your question right, we are very cautious about who is going to be a member, because we have to do due diligence to establish who (unintelligible) so that the opinion that is coming can tell us the relationship between them and whom they are purporting or they're indeed representing, so that we are clear from the outset.

We also looked at the possibility of having different kinds of membership where - charter for meeting, where we can have some people that could remain as non-voting, or there could be people who can be as observers. But the real members who can actually be part of this constituency can only be those ones who, of course, fulfill the conditions of the larger NCSG.

This is what the charter is saying -- the draft charter of the CC, which I shall share. I had shared a copy with the chair, Konstantinos. And I don't know if I've quite answered your question, but the relationship we are looking for is for exactly that, and (unintelligible) oriented towards human rights, towards the rights of the user. Not just human rights, but

also the end-user of the (unintelligible), not an intermediary (unintelligible) pays for the service.

Milton Mueller: Yeah, that's my point, kind of the end-user is not the same thing as a consumer. So you can be using the Internet and not really relating to it as a consumer of services in an economic sense.

So if you're taking that broader than the overlap between the NCUC -- which is a non-commercial users constituency -- and the Consumer, you know, it becomes very confusing. If you had a very narrow, specialized focus on the economic side, that would make a little more sense in my opinion. But I don't know whether you're approaching it that way.

Alex Gakuru: I'll review how we handle that question, but we had a very good discussion on it. But I want to check on the final position we adopted. But indeed we are careful not to take, for example, registrars and the opinions they have had, because they also say they are also consumers of a certain service.

But we are careful that we want the human being, the (unintelligible) repeated there, the human being at the end of it, (unintelligible) as a consumer. So maybe (unintelligible) economic issue that will arise, they will have to be oriented to what that human being on the end of the user, as opposed to a corporate body or (unintelligible) of that nature.

Avri Doria: And we'll probably have extensive discussion on it once the charter's complete and it goes through review and public review. Yes, please.

(Didi Hallock):   Yeah, actually, a lot of time was spent on that, Milton.

Avri Doria: Give your name, please, too.

(Didi Hallock):   My name is (Didi Hallock). It's unfortunate it wasn't taped, but there is documentation which - actually the very first kind of definition of consumers was very limited. And then I think we added maybe ten or twelve more points. And they're all, I think, quite interesting and useful to think about.

                    But also just for - I don't know if Robin and Konstantinos can do this but, I did - Milton made a real exquisite discussion about how to organize consumers. Because I'm sure (unintelligible), but he's had enormous amount of experience at the Consumer Federation of the United States. And I videotaped it, and it's a very low quality. But I'll have to check with him, but I'd like to put it up. Maybe it could be put aside on the Web page somehow.

                    Because I think you'd find it really interesting. What he said, I think, was quite challenging about the need to really, if you're going to say that this is the consumer interest, how that is defined. It's very important. And to me, the whole word consumer is a problem. I would rather use citizen or something more broad. But he was quite articulate about it, and I think it'd be important to share it with you all.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes. Name first.

David Cake: David Cake. So the session was labeled as consumer agenda rather than consumer constituency. And that sort of, to me, raised the question of organizations that consider themselves consumer

organization, but essentially represent small business to large businesses, which sort of a lot of telecommunications consumer organizations do.

Are you intending to kind of fit them into an agenda? Or are you (unintelligible) instead of a constituency, that would obviously mean within NCSG, it would mean that they are not eligible for the part.

Alex Gakuru: Yeah, for the - Alex again. For the record, I think (Didi) meant Mike Rodenbaugh was the person who was recorded (unintelligible).

In terms of that question of those small organizations that represent businesses, we, as I said, we avoided dwelling on that, given the water that has gone under the bridge and we were trying to have a successful meeting.

But we knew and we relate to, we (unintelligible) that issue and we said we are aware of it as a troubled (unintelligible). And so we also cautioned that we want to do the human. That's where the element of the finding our consumer, and we thought we'd tackle it from there.

But we do know the definition of the consumer will be much more clearer (unintelligible) on the charter, so that eligibility of joining will be to conform with the NCSG charter, and also the charter we are developing, which, obviously I want to share yet again to the wider stakeholder group for further input before we submit it. And we are supposed to submit it sometime before the end of this week. But I'll still submit it again. Thank you.

Avri Doria: I think one space that may help is to be a member of an NCSG constituency may be one thing. To have an observer status in a constituency may have another meeting. And so that may be a way.

Because, for example, we're supposed to be one of the observers in many other constituencies. So not having a vote, not having - but and that's probably one way where you'll be able to balance some of those issues as they come up.

Okay, I'd like to move on to, I guess, alphabetically would be NCUC Konstantinos.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Thanks, Avri. This is Konstantinos. I'm not going to say nearly as much as Alex did say. The NCUC met and we dedicated the morning discussing various issues. We discussed a little bit about how membership and (unintelligible) for coming Singapore meeting.

We also discussed with the Councilor who participated the issues that are currently before the Council, and where we should be paying attention to and what are the most contentious issues.

We also discussed about (unintelligible) groups and we were very lucky because 40 new people under the fellowship program attended our meeting, and they asked a lot of really, really interesting questions about ICANN and the organizational structure of the (unintelligible).

And one of the points that was also raised -- and I think that if I understood correctly we might be discussing it later in the context of this NCSG meeting -- was the fact about the statement and the various statements and how best it would be for constituencies to

communicate in which they exist under the same umbrella of NCSG, and also how Councilors should communicate, and what sort of channels of communication should exist. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Andy questions for Konstantinos? Okay, no? Then it would be Amber, please.

Amber Sterling: Hi, Amber Sterling on behalf of the Not-For-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency or NPOC. We had about 20 participants are out meeting, with strong representation from Latin America and Spain, with many new potential members expecting to join soon.

It was very exciting to see lots of new faces in the room. We discussed the (unintelligible) domain names, and continued the conversation started by Debbie during - Debra Hughes, I'm sorry - during the GAC/Board accepting of comments yesterday, and heard discussion of her organization, the American Red Cross.

And how some organizations, and specifically in the not-for-profit sphere, sometimes three to four weeks for a dispute mechanism may not be ideal in the greater consumer purpose across the board. It's not good for their organization. It's not good for the end-user who is trying to donate funds and things of that nature.

And we continued onto discussion of access of WHOIS and the pending WHOIS study. We had a woman, Lynn - oh, gracious. I would have to grab her name. She's on the WHOIS review team. And she discussed some of the data and the potential studies that are coming out.

And we are in support of the work she is doing and the work of the WHOIS review team in general. That is a very important group and we were excited to hear updates.

We also spoke of the joint applicant support group, and we are hoping that one of our folks will be joining that group (unintelligible) discussion this morning, Avri, about creating a foundation if necessary on verifying NGO applicants and matching applicants with resources. And so we're hoping one of our folks will stand up and be able to participate and get into those issues.

And then we did the very boring and very necessary discussion of procedural and operational matters that will bore people to tears if we get into it right now. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yeah, I don't think anybody wants to delve too deeply into other peoples' processes. Any questions for Amber? Okay, in which case then I'll put my - since I managed to spend most of the morning watching the GAC and Board discussion.

The discussion was supposed to be primarily the GAC making a response to the Board's scorecard of their scorecard. And so that's what they did. They basically went through the issues one by one, repeating many of the arguments as they felt were important.

Much of it was a repeat of discussions that they'd had before, but this was the first time that American Red Cross and Debbie was brought up as an example of why the American position is what it is. So they now are definitely invoking your name.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yeah, yeah. So obviously they had been listening to the previous day's meeting. There were other references to things that were said. The Board was supposed to just be asking clarifying questions. But, of course, the Board being who they are sometimes got into rather elaborate discussions that bordered on the philosophical.

For example, what is a city? They had a discussion for a long time trying to answer that question. I personally, coming out of a philosophical background, have infinite patience and liking for "What is X?" discussions. So I found it quite entertaining, but a lot of people thought, "This is just ridiculous."

So and as I say, now they've basically - okay, now we've heard your responses and we're going - the Board is basically going to - has retreated, I'm sure, to their rooms, to their separate groups, to deal with it and to see what further comments, changes, accommodations.

It was interesting, and I wouldn't want to get into any details because I didn't pay that kind of attention. But while they were discussing, you could see people stretching a little bit to try and maybe open this bit of possibility or that possibility at spaces where they might be able to find accommodations of some sort. But nothing tangible was supposed to come out of that meeting.

And then the next thing is so they'll come back 4:00 or 5:00 today. The Board will respond to the responses, and then they'll set an agenda for how to go at it on those on Thursday. There will be another workshop tomorrow morning. I have absolutely no idea whether anybody will be

invited to speak, whether everybody will be invited to speak, how it's going to work. No idea.

We may find out later. It's very much being sort of organized on the fly. But and we can talk a little bit more when we get to the scorecard about how, if we're invited to make comments on what they say today, how we want to go about doing that. But I'll save that for when we're talking about scorecard thingies.

That's about all I have to say on that. Anybody want to ask me anything? I don't know much. There's a transcript which, you know, should already be out. I intend to read it again to know what I heard. But, okay, in which case we'll move to the next one, which is status on outstanding stakeholder group activities, including status of charter, and the status of charter being the main one.

As people probably noticed, some of the stuff that had been about constituency process and how constituencies go through a two-stage process, and how constituencies first get approval from the stakeholder group, and then from oversight get approval from the Board, has sort of been removed from our charter and made into a separate, free-standing document that would apply to any constituencies with some changes, and then our charter will just reference that.

That went through public comment, and several of you were at the meeting yesterday with the SIC, with the Structural Improvements Committee, so you'll be able to amplify what I say. So that went through public comment, but I guess it didn't follow quite the right

process for going through public comment, because there wasn't a Board motion prior to it going to comment.

So there's going to be a Board motion on it and back to comment. And it'll go back into comment for a little while, and then the Board plans to act on that in, I guess, the April time frame.

Our charter is going to go through public comment starting with a motion in this meeting. And then once that public comment has ended, our charter will then be in the process to be voted on. It probably won't make the April; would make the May -- the May agenda meeting.

Actually what there is in May is one of their retreats. And those retreats have meetings tacked onto them, to actually do some voting on stuff. So we're hoping to get into that.

Likewise, the NPOC charter, which has been through public review and public commentary, is waiting. And I'm not exactly sure when they're putting it up for a vote, but I think it's in the same time frame. And it'll probably happen in the May time frame. I'm not sure. And I don't know what came out of the meeting. And, Deb, you were there, so...

Amber Sterling: This is Amber. We have no idea either.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I believe it'll be in the May time frame, but I'm not sure.

Amber Sterling: Yeah, and I think that's what we heard, too. So we don't know.

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay. And I understand that you wanted it to come sooner and, you know, but and I wanted it to come at the same time as ours. And (Ray)'s got a very specific way of I want to do this. Then I want to do that. Then I want to do that. Then I want to do that. And I'm not going to argue with (Ray) about what he wants to do. At least not - content, I might. Procedurally, I won't.

And that's about it on the charter. I think we asked them specifically. I asked specifically. Milton asked specifically. I think we asked two or three times are there any roadblocks or are there any bumps in the road. Is there anything we don't know about that's in our way, other than the fact that new gTLDs is taking all the air out of the room, and there's no time to think about anything else? And we were told no.

It's process issues and there's just no time to think about anything else. So now, of course, I don't know where they're going to find the time in April or May, since they won't have made the new gTLD solution. But I'll take it that they're going to, and hope that that's the case.

I don't know if there are any other outstanding stakeholder group activity issues. I put that there two months ago just in case there were. Does anyone have any other issue that needs to be addressed that's a pending stakeholder group activity issue that I'm forgetting about? Yes, (Didi).

(Didi Hallock):   Well I think it needs to be clarified what the difference is between the non-commercial users group and the consumers (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, but that - I think that's good. But that would need to happen at the point at which they bring their charter. They say, "This is who we are. This is what we're going to do." Their charter goes out for review. I don't have to hog two seats. I can move my bag. Their charter goes out for review and, you know, there comes discussion.

You know, it'll be posted publicly. There'll be public discussion both within the NCSG and then the executive committee makes a determination on it. And then, you know, depending on that, it goes forward to the Board for approval either way. And whether we decide yea or we decide no, it goes to the board for further discussion. Yes, Milton?

Milton Mueller: Yeah, I don't think it's a good idea for us to wait until a full-fledged charter has been produced and then say, "Oh, this is crazy. We don't like it. It's wrong." I think there should be some discussion on...

Avri Doria: Well they've been sending us stuff to review and read for a while now, so we can discuss - I don't have it on the agenda for now.

((Crosstalk))

Milton Mueller: If I could just finish what I was going to say...

Avri Doria: Certainly.

Milton Mueller: It'd be nice. Okay.

Avri Doria: Yes, sir.

Milton Mueller: This is a very fundamental issue. We have been maintaining for three years that it is not optimal to divide non-commercial stakeholders into separate siloed constituencies. Now we have been, to some extent, reached a compromise in which there are constituencies, which is also integrated voting, at the NCSG level.

Now there's no doubt among us that there are certain people who would like to specialize in what we call consumer protection issues. And in many ways this could be done without a separate constituency structure. But some people who are advocates for consumers believe they need and want a separate structure. So we've got that or we're going to get it probably.

So the question you have to ask is how can we avoid confusing and fragmenting everybody that comes into this stakeholder group, such that, you know, (Didi) knows whether she should join NCUC, which does all kinds of consumer protection and user protection and advocacy; or whether she wants to join the consumer group; or whether she wants to join both.

I think the way it's looking is that many people will need to join both, and that will be again confusing and somewhat burdensome. But so from my point of view, if there's some definitional way that the thing can be chartered in a way that avoids that as much as possible, I would like to see it.

I would like to see the definition of what is consumer not confused with what is user at all. Because they are very distinct categories, and one is much broader than the other. I would like to see the consumer constituency specialize on the sort of more economic side of the

issues. That's just my view. You may agree or disagree, but I think it would help if that was made known to the people drafting the charter.

Avri Doria: I think they probably heard you. Yeah, I mean I'm not saying that we shouldn't discuss it until we've seen it, but I certainly don't have it on the agenda to discuss in today's at any length. But we can add it to any other business at the end, if you'd like to get really into it. No? Okay.

Anything else on outstanding stakeholder group activities and status of charter? Any questions? No? Okay, NomCom. Maria, can I give it to you?

Maria Farrell: Sorry. Just Tweeting about NomCom. Okay, so I'm Maria Farrell, and I am the NCUC appointee to the Nominating Committee this year. And for those who are new to the process, our job is to appoint Board Directors and Councilors to the GNSO and ccNSO Council, and also individuals onto the At-Large Advisory Committee.

And just a way of update, we are still in the phase of the process where we are trying to recruit people to come and apply to the process. Typically the NomCom gets about 80 or so applicants a year. And this year I think we have eight open positions. The closing date for applications is the 4th of April, and although possibly as in previous years, that often is extended by a week or so.

A couple of things re the update. We are having a roundtable, the Nominating Committee roundtable, tomorrow from 2:00 until 3:30. And we have been asked to have a couple of people from the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group to come along and be part of that roundtable, basically sit at a roundtable and be part of the discussion.

The discussion is going to be about a couple of things. One, how the Nominating Committee can do its job better and more transparently, more effectively. Two, what sort of people does the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group think should be appointed by the Nominating Committee, so what's the profile or background characteristics of people that we in the non-commercial world would like to see appointed to the various open positions.

And the third aspect is asking for help in doing outreach and encouraging people to apply to the Nomination Committee process. So I guess my two takeaway messages to us all here today are one, please think of people you know of, or perhaps yourself consider applying via the NomCom process. I've got fliers here. I'll hand them out and you can see which positions are open.

And two, volunteers, please. Didn't quite manage to get any earlier this morning. But if anybody would like to come along and put across the non-commercial point of view at this roundtable tomorrow between 2:00 and 3:30, do please come, bearing in mind it does clash with the new gTLD workshop. So it's not for everybody, but I think it would be great to have some people.

Avri Doria: Actually I think it clashes with the GNSO Council meeting. And because the workshop's in the morning, Council meeting's in the afternoon. And for anybody that was planning to skip out of the GNSO Council meeting, it also conflicts with the IDN, the working group that's going to be working on variance. It's having its initial meeting then, too.

So is there anyone who's here now who does not plan to attend the GNSO Council meeting or the IDN variance meeting, and is therefore available to go participate in the NomCom - because it's like an hour and a half, right?

Right, so because I was going to say well if I could go for ten minutes at the beginning and then leave, but no. Is there anyone that would be free to be at NomCom? Because we have up to three seats at this roundtable. So, as I say, you won't be at the GNSO and you won't be at the IDN, but you'd be at the NomCom, which is a good thing.

So I actually said it was a good thing, and I've been campaigning against NomCom. But I'm in a polite position now as opposed to my normal rabblerousing. So, yes, you're about to stick your hand up.

Amber Sterling: This is Amber. I would be happy to join. I'm not sure if I can participate, but I can listen.

Avri Doria: Okay. But you're looking for people at the table to actually answer questions and have opinions. Right.

Amber Sterling: I can always have an opinion. Whether or not it's a good one is entirely different.

Avri Doria: That's true for all of us. Are there anybody else that's willing to go be on this workshop? I'll keep looking for more people, but I don't see any at the moment. But we'll keep asking. Sure.

Maria Farrell: Here's a slightly more compelling question. One of the things that this year's NomCom is doing is employing a recruitment firm, (Ocriss and

Bernsen), to go and speak and find people who meet the profile, and particularly for Board Director positions.

The message we've been getting very clearly from the CEO and the Chair and from various Board members is that they want to see people who - potential Board Directors, who have pretty high-profile backgrounds and lots of leadership, technology people coming along.

From the non-commercial point of view, I think there is a real opportunity for us to -- I hate the expression blue-sky thinking -- come up with names. Who are the, you know, non-profit leaders globally that we can think of. We think, "Wow, why that person would be an amazing person to have on the Board, who is from the non-profit world."

And so, you know, you don't have to think of people right now, but tell me names and, you know, all we can do is send them over and say, "Can you approach this person or that person?"

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes, (Didi).

(Didi Hallock): I can go to that meeting.

Avri Doria: Okay, so that's two. We still have one slot open. Volunteer now or volunteer later. Okay, anything else on NomCom? Okay, thank you. And please tell (Adam) that I was polite on the whole thing. Thank you.

Okay, issues before the Council, especially those to be voted on during the meeting. Is there a member of Council here that's willing to take the

lead on this discussion, who actually knows what the issues are and can walk us through them? I don't pretend to be able to do that. I see two. I see three. Yes, I see a volunteer. Thank you.

Debra Hughes: Debbie Hughes. I can try to help, and I'll turn to my Councilor friends to kind of help me with the presentation. So I know that there are a couple of motions that are pending, the first being a series of WHOIS motions. I'll just list them first and then I guess we can step ourselves through them.

There's two WHOIS motions. There's a motion to adopt the GNSO working group guidelines. There is a motion to approve a proposal in the final report of the drafting team on the RAA, regarding a process for getting those amendments through.

And there is a motion to approve the amended recommendation in the final report on proposals for improvements to the registrar accreditation agreement. And I think that's all of the pending motions. Is that accurate? I see my Councilor friend is kind of looking down. Mary's saying yes, so that must - if Mary says so, then it is.

So that's where we are. Those are the motions. I notice that they are - if we can just start back up at the top, there are two WHOIS motions, one that was made by Tim and then seconded by Wendy. And then the second WHOIS motion was made by John and seconded by myself.

And so the Council decided that it was going to do those motions in the order I just described. And I don't know if you want to - how much time do we have for this? Or...

Avri Doria: Forty-five minutes for this whole thing, although, you know, if we do it in 35, then we'll catch up with time. But 45 minutes is what I allocated for this discussion.

Debra Hughes: Okay, so we can just kind of step through. So Wendy, do you want to talk about yours?

Avri Doria: And I'm trying to bring up the motions now, so then I'll put them on the screen. I'm still looking for them, but I'll...

Debra Hughes: Okay.

Wendy Seltzer: So I think the WHOIS motions are dead for this meeting, because Tim's motion that I seconded was a request for more information, or a request to ask the staff for more information. Liz Gasster responded providing most of the information directly without even requiring the motion. So while we may or may not vote on that motion, it's pretty much moved.

                If we get to the second motion, I believe I've heard that the registrars are going to ask for a delay.

Debra Hughes: Right, and that was what I was going to add on my second motion, that I doubt they'll even get to a vote. So while we mention it here, we doubt that there'll be any action on it. So and that's where we are. And just to back up, so these are motions...

Avri Doria: So here's the second one with John Berard?

Debra Hughes: Yes, I'm sorry. I'm sorry for moving kind of fast. These are motions related to WHOIS studies and the expenditures for WHOIS studies. So I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Okay, you were still talking and then Wendy had her hand - I mean Mary had her hand up. And I'm not sure who was first.

Wendy Seltzer: Well I'll just say anticipating that these motions will come back again, it could be useful at a later date to prepare some stakeholder group discussion on what strategy we would like for the continuation or discontinuation of WHOIS studies. But if we have to prioritize, I would suggest moving on.

Avri Doria: Mary?

Mary Wong: So just for the benefit of those who (unintelligible) speak in Council arcane processes, I think that we don't currently have a rule about what happens when one stakeholder group or constituency asks to essentially postpone a vote on a motion.

                 We have a custom or a practice which some of us are not particularly fond of where it is the first time that the request has been made to postpone the vote, that in the interest of everybody getting along, we all agree to it. If the members want to talk about whether this is something we want to defer or not to defer, then maybe this is a good time to talk about it because otherwise we would probably just follow the custom.

                 I mean I personally agree just want WHOIS to either go away or have something done. I don't want to keep voting on studies and feasibility

estimates and costs in the courts. But that doesn't mean I won't be happy to agree to table the motion, because I think I would need a really good reason to stand up and say, "You know what? We really want to vote," especially if the vote's not going to go favorably.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I think practice has been followed. It would be interesting to see somebody for the first time stand up and say, "We hate this practice. Make it go away." I should warn you that when you review the new PDP documentation, it's actually included as a defined practice that would no longer just be common practice. It would be the case.

So it would be a good time to argue against it being institutionalized forever, if you really hate it. Yes, please. Give your name first, please. Yeah, use the microphone and - yes, sorry.

Daniel del Solar: My name is Daniel del Solar. I'm a former general manager of a non-commercial radio station in San Francisco school district, and general manager of a PBS affiliate in Philadelphia, and I used to work at (CPB), so policy matters at a national level are my experience.

I strongly suggest that the group here consider the fact that everywhere else, people are taking positive decisions, final resolutions, moving this thing forward. Whatever difficulties might obtain here should be made evident and clearly stated, and then take a vote and move on.

Avri Doria: Yeah, great advice. Hope you don't get too frustrated. Please turn off your mic when you're finished. Thank you. So, Debbie, yes.

Debra Hughes: Oh, so are we finished with that one?

Avri Doria: I don't know. Does anyone else want to make any other comments on either of the two motions? Their content? Their substance? I was going to say there was - the first one was the Tim Ruiz (unintelligible) which was just basically asking for more information, correct?

Right, and so that one you figure you already got your answer to, so that one may never need to happen. It's even better than making a decision and making a motion if you don't need it.

And the second one was substantive, correct? So was there anyone who wanted to talk more or wanted more explanation about - yes, Maria.

Maria Farrell: Yeah, just a word of context, I suppose. I spent two years of my life managing the WHOIS policy process. And the final act -- I hesitate to call it my reign -- of my endurance, was to pass the motion that got this whole process of having studies entered in, and that would be - I guess it would be two to three years ago now.

And the rationale behind that, at the time, was very much that this was a whole pattern, and that the studies were effectively a delay mechanism to enable the status quo to obtain for longer. And so as it just - I understand there's tactical considerations that play here as well.

But I think the broad sense, anything that moves these studies along to some point of conclusion to then allow a substantive policy discussion possibly to happen again, and I think would generally be a good thing. I think the original principle here was that the longer the status quote obtains, the harder it is to change it.

Avri Doria: Okay, I want to make a comment after Milton, but yeah, I'll make a comment after Milton.

Milton Mueller: Just a factual supplement to what Maria said, and also I just wondered if you've recovered now from that. So another reason for the delay was that the GAC asked for studies. The GAC insisted on studies, which may have been motivated by this delaying tactic or it may not have been.

But the point is these poor governments that we never listen to and never pay attention to actually had quite an impact on this process as well, because the GNSO voted by a two-thirds majority to do some change in WHOIS, and then the governments put the brake on and insisted on these studies before they went further. So just so you know the background.

Avri Doria: Actually as someone that was actually chair at the time, there's probably a year between those events. And the thing that they put a brake on was one where it was actually going to prevail by one vote. But the committee had...

Milton Mueller: One vote is a two-thirds majority.

Avri Doria: No, no -- on a regular majority. Yes. But anyhow, there was more reason than just a delaying tactic at the time. The whole notion of everybody was claiming to have facts and no one knew whose facts were really facts, if there were any facts, was part of it also.

So I'll admit that I was happy when it was the first time that we actually had a WHOIS motion that was voted on unanimously in the GNSO Council, and yes, it did take WHOIS off the table at that time. That wasn't so much to delay it as to just stop talking about it for a while for them. But yes, there were more views to it. Yes?

Debra Hughes: And I wanted to add the reason that I had seconded this motion was for that very reason -- to try to get this done already. And I understand the concern with the funding and that sort of thing, but I think that there's a huge value -- and we talked about this today during the NPOC meeting -- in getting the facts out, so then we can have a conversation.

If it yields something positive, great. If it doesn't, then that's great, too. We can't keep pointing back to the fact that we never did the studies, you know, or talking, you know, over each other and pointing past each other.

I would just like to have the studies performed. If the studies yield what we already do, then great. If they yield something new, then that's wonderful as well. So my intent was to at least get the conversation moving.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Can I ask one question? Is this something that the Council members from the NCSG have come to agreement on their positions on? Or is this something that's still an open discussion, an open debate -- whether this has the NCSG vote or not? Yes?

Woman: So at this morning's NCUC meeting before I had to leave, I raised the possibility of whether or not you might vote whether now or eventually

in favor of all these outstanding studies or only of some. Because my understanding from talking to PIR and other people is that at least one of those studies may be problematic.

I don't know enough to know why, but I think that the study in question was the registrant identification study. And there may have been more discussions after I left the meeting today. But to the extent that this motion's being tabled, I think it's worthwhile for our SG to think about how we want to not just vote, but maybe since Debbie seconded that motion, we can work on some specifics with regard to that.

Avri Doria: I have Milton, and then Debbie and then Wendy.

Milton Mueller: Oh, I just noted one of the studies, nobody applied to do it. And that was because there's some methodological issues related to how difficult it would be to actually execute it.

And the other thing I wanted to say was that in terms of not having the facts, you know, it's not like the facts that these studies are going to produce are now going to change anybody's position. They are, for example, there was a study on the accuracy of WHOIS, but there had already been a study on the accuracy of WHOIS done by the GAO. So we redid a study, which sort of lends some weight to the delay hypothesis.

And then the other study, you know, they're studying proxy services, right? And the way that study is designed, it's basically - it's not going to answer any of the questions that - the policy questions that revolve around these proxy services.

It's going to tell us a little bit more statistically about how many people are using them. But it cannot, based on its methodology, say that there is more domain name-based crime or less because of these proxy services. It's just not going to do that. So whatever the result of this study, nobody's going to change their mind about proxy services.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Debbie?

Debra Hughes: Thanks, and what I would also encourage this group to think about is that I think that not only will these studies help put to bed the conversation we haven't done them yet, but also the fact that, you know, if the studies reveal that there is a certain amount of inaccurate or updated result of inaccurate information, you know, we get that back.

That data could be used to actually encourage perhaps increased compliance resources or, you know, maybe encourage IDN to start maybe aggressively auditing its own registrars with whom they have a contract, to make sure they're doing the right thing.

Maybe these facts, if they reveal something new, could be used for good to maybe encourage IDN Contract Compliance in other ways, and encourage them to get additional resources.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: I think the issue of studies often comes down to our underlying substantive disagreement on the purpose, nature and uses of WHOIS. I oppose the publication of personal information of registrants -- the

forced publication of registrants' personal identifying information -- in a publicly accessible database.

I oppose studies that are crafted so that they would be more useful to those seeking to compel the publication of accurate, punishable-on-pain-of-losing-your-domain information in the WHOIS. And because I see problems in these studies and limited ways that the studies could be used to enlighten the policymaking here, I do not support the studies.

And I think that there are better places to use the $400,000 that's allocated for this work, or rather the total that's sought of $540,000. If you gave me that money or gave it to Council to allocate, I think there are far higher priority items for the benefit of domain registrants and non-commercial users of the Internet.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. And I think that's one reason why we'd never have sort of enforced NCSG voting positions, so I think that that's good. Now when I'm looking at this motion, is the one that PIR is recommending against - it's one of these three, right? Is it the WHOIS registration identification study? Is that the one PIR has a problem with? Or is the privacy and proxy abuse study?

Mary Wong: It's either the identification or abuse, and I wish I remember which one, because it was a very quick conversation.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: And Wendy might know more about the issue than I do, as in what the concern might be. It has to do with proxies, I believe, and forced

publication information. But I just can't tell which study they had in mind. I mean there's a different issue than the last one, because there's a pre-study of the study that's different.

Wendy Seltzer: I believe from conversations with (Cathy) that PIR was particularly concerned about distinguishing between individual and corporate and commercial and non-commercial registrants because that is...

Avri Doria: In all of those studies? Or is that just one of those?

Wendy Seltzer: The registrant identification study.

Avri Doria: Okay. So I guess then the question is - I'm sure nothing changes your view on being against any of them. But I'm wondering whether there's any difference in terms of - and whether any Councilor is planning to either make a proposal to friend the amendment or an actual vote amendment to remove the one that is PIR's - that has PIR's issue. Yes, Mary?

Mary Wong: So coming back to the tabling issue, it might be a good reason for us to support tabling or postponing the time, simply because if we're not so sure ourselves, having not had a discussion, it might be an item for the next policy call.

And make sure that we've had the conversation with (Cathy) or someone at PIR to fully understand the issue, with the possibility that when this comes up again at the next meeting, the next Council meeting, we might be in a position to propose a friendly amendment on at least one of the studies.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Policy calls -- that's one of the things I forgot to put on the agenda. And so I'm going to take a slight aside, since you brought it up now, to just mention. The policy calls have been disastrously underpopulated of late. And I start out by saying even with the Council members, or especially with Council members, whoever else wants to participate or not, it's always their option.

One of the things that Konstantinos and I have been talking about, and I've sort of been trying to socialize it with other people, is that -- and I think I talked to (Bill), who's not here, so I can use his name in vain. Yeah. But we get to tell him about it later -- is that, you know, that each member of Council is responsible for one of them.

I mean it will help you with the setup and the getting the phone call bridge and all that, but they're basically going to put up a sign up sheet as it were for the next six council meetings and try and get each one of the council members to say yes, I take that one.

Yet that council member can even schedule it closely to a time zone that makes sense to their world that they're sure they can make with them being around the world.

Hopefully that gives us more distribution on timing and that we know that we have at least one council member at each one of these things and we continue doing them.

I think they're great but I think they've been underpopulated and I'll take one or two comments on this and then we'll come back to it but I want to get you back to this.

But Konstantinos you wanted to comment on what I was just saying?

Konstantinos Komaitis: Yes thank you Avri it's Konstantinos, I would like to support actually what you said and I mean I've only done it once and it's not so much the preparation of it evolved but I think that it links perfectly well to what we were discussing in the morning concerning communication between the councilors.

And I think this is something that can and should be waiting to do and engage in conversation amongst them considering the fact that there's so many issues before the council.

But they need to address and there are six of them.

Avri Doria: One other piece to this is these meetings generally happen once two days before the council meeting. At that point it's fairly safe to assume that the council members know what motions they have to deal with and should be able to talk people through them.

I had - yes Amber and then Robin.

Amber Sterling: This is Amber, I would like to ask that the meetings be booked as far in advance as possible just so we can block the time on our calendars because the week before I know all of our calendars are probably inevitably booked for the recommended time.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, so yeah, I will try to work with the six council members to get them to set up for weeks. Robin.

Robin Gross: Thanks. Yeah, I think this was a great plan to try to engage the council members in developing the policy within the constituency a little bit more.

One - I think this is a great idea, and I would also like to request that maybe some of this discussion is additionally brought onto the main mailing list, because I think a lot of times our rank and file members really don't know what are the motions pending before the council and what are the issues.

And you know we forward the agenda, we say here's the list of motions and without somebody doing a quick explanation at the beginning, this is what we're discussing this week on council, this is why it matters, this is why NCUC cares about it or NCSG cares about it.

I think that would be really helpful in terms of trying to engage the membership in the policy a little bit more.

Avri Doria: One other piece to go to that to bring back something I think it was Debbie that first suggested a long time ago, the write ups that we were supposed to get from our local experts on every issue and what was happening in working group A and working group D and those things that we've never got.

We've got the website hopefully we'll get them, I forget who's hand was just up on this side, okay. So going back now, sorry for the aside but wanted to take that while we had it.

The next motion I guess, who's going to talk to it, the motion to adopt the GNSO working group guidelines. I can talk to that one if you want since I was on the working group.

But Jeff was the chair, I think it's a fairly decent document, I hope people have read it. It is guidelines, it's very few rules because the group there decided that you know there wasn't going to be one way of doing a working group that worked for everyone.

But of course working group having chairs, being liaisons to the council, it being open, people being able to join late, but if they joined late they had to catch up first before they reopened issues, etcetera.

So hopefully people have read it. I'm hoping that it gets the support of the council. Is it perfect? Is any set of working group guidelines perfect? No.

There are things that I disagreed with etcetera but I think that you know it's a decent set of guidelines for you know the council to go on and just to stop talking about what the guidelines are and to start using them.

Oh one other thing, we have been using them in a sense over the last year while these guidelines were being talked about, each successive working group was working on an earlier draft of them.

And so sometimes feedback came in of we've been using this and this is broken and so it got adjusted and so there has been a certain amount. Any questions on that one? So good to have that group over.

Motion to approve a proposal in the final drafting team and the registrar accreditation agreement, the RAA regarding a process for amendment to the RAA and I'm definitely not the one volunteering to talk on this one because I'd get almost rabid about it.

So who would want to - thank you Mary.

Mary Wong: Since it's my motion, I think Avri's right, the NCUC meeting this morning got my spiel on it already but there are those who are not so I'll try and reach a happy medium by making it short. What I'll say is that this is one area, one topic where both sides of the non-contracted party hope that it (unintelligible) NCSG and the commercial stakeholder group (unintelligible).

Because essentially it's a very long motion but you'll note that the motion talks about something called Process A in the right hand side, the top line. This was a process that was recommended by the group that worked on these recommendations, not by full consensus but with strong support.

And that it is a process that would mean that observers, not participants, not negotiators but observers get to do the end of room when registrars really negotiation their accreditation agreement or the RAA with ICANN.

We have many reasons for believing why that should be the case including the fact that ICANN is a multi-stakeholder community, ICANN is one of the contracting parties, should represent all of us.

There's no reason why we should not be in the room to at least know what's going on. As I explained this morning, it's very strongly resisted by both the registries who are afraid of the precedent that it would set and by the registrars who would then have to agree to have some of us in the room.

This is already a watered down version of the proposal and the fight is still going on and I'll conclude by saying what I said this morning, that the registrars have already told me in no uncertain terms that it doesn't matter what happens, they're going to go ahead and negotiate with ICANN staff anyway without anybody.

So the expectation is that this motion will just die, but we will vote on it and the entire room will see the contracted party voting against it, so I have refused to withdraw the motion even though I know it's not going to pass.

Avri Doria: Thank you, I'm glad you did it, I find it amazing that I find myself hoping this passes now since I was the strongest dissenting voice from this saying we shouldn't be there as observers, we should be there as negotiators.

But I lost. So any questions or comments on that? Yes Amber.

Amber Sterling: I just wanted to say thank you for all your hard work on that because I know that was a very contentious issue and time consuming and patients requiring so thank you.

Avri Doria: Thanks. One of the things - I'll come to you in a second - one of the things is I have trouble with the registry's position. The RAA and the

registrars have this one RAA that we actually as GNSO have to approve the changing of.

So it's a very specific condition in the RAA that makes us have some degree of responsibility for as GNSO members. The registry contracts are not engineered that way.

While there is the picket fence that defines the issues that we have consensus policies on, we don't have to approve their contracts when they're renegotiated.

So I don't know how the registries see this slippery slope working because I see a real discontinuity between the RAA and an individual registry contract.

So I keep trying to move the registries away from this but I have failed miserably. Maria?

Maria Farrell: When we discussed this, this morning at (unintelligible) meeting and I suggested and (unintelligible) volunteered like I commented the public forum on Thursday about this just to show up how ludicrous it really is.

So depending on what happens to it the GNSO council meeting and I plan to do that and talking to Mary and Bill to make sure know the background.

Avri Doria: Fantastic, and if I can help let me know. Okay, so any other questions or issues? Yes Mary?

Mary Wong: I had two questions I guess. The first question is - well it almost doesn't matter how we're supposed to gather, the other house is going to vote no anyway.

I had two questions I guess. The first question is - well it almost doesn't matter how we're supposed to gather, the other house is going to vote no anyway.

Because for a vote to pass it need a majority of both houses, so that's not going to happen. So the second question I guess is the ultimate motion which is - yeah, my motion's called Process A, there's been an alternate motion that a little more lightweight that's being called Process B Plus.

I've asked the registries and registrars if they can come back with a Process A Minus but I cannot run it by everybody. So I think this is where you'll need some direction as to whether or not we'll even support Process B Plus.

Avri Doria: So we don't know if we support B Plus, or we don't support B Plus. I didn't support - I was hoping that we didn't support any of the Bs but...

Mary Wong: Right, and I think that's kind of the guide in that I for one think and would be helpful to get some input from the community on.

Avri Doria: Okay, is that one in here? Sorry I lost that before but I got it back. That one we went through. Tell me when I get there, this is still A, right? Is five B Plus? Okay, so we don't need the whereas, I need the now be it therefore resolved.

Okay, so do you want to talk about what is B Plus, B Minus, B.

Mary Wong: Let's hope it doesn't go any less than that. But the essential difference between process A and Process B Plus is that Process B Plus does not have the observer requirement.

Essentially what it has is a regular reporting back requirement so it is an attempt to try to get the transparency without going to the registrar's sole point of having other people in the room.

Now obviously not matter because I don't think the registrars like Process B Plus either which Avri I know you're looking at me going but they're the ones that used Process B for the final report, it doesn't matter.

They're not going to support this, so whether or not we support it, it might not go through anyway but I think I just don't know whether or not we support it at all.

Do we want to say Process A or nothing or do we say okay, if we don't get process A we can go to something else.

Avri Doria: I know I've already made my opinion obvious, what do other people think? Is A bad enough and B just too awful to think about or are we willing to say we want B even though I don't know, what do people think?

As I say, I've been pretty obvious in my opinion.

Woman: I join you in the A or nothing and if we get it, end up with a motion saying we accept the report perhaps we can grudgingly accept the report.

Avri Doria: I think that's okay, the report's okay because at least it also - it lists the minority viewpoint. Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: I promise I won't talk that much, but okay so that comes up and the registrars have asked me about is there a friendly amendment to my motion that simply accepts the report and I said on what planet is that friendly?

                 If it takes up Process A, so obviously I said no, I mean to the extent that any motion, that's the only motion they will accept and I've also said that then Process A is just going to keep coming back.

                 I mean to the extent that our community wants us to have Process A of this motion, it's just going to keep coming back and keep coming back and become like WHOIS.

Avri Doria: I don't think it will become like WHOIS, but yes Amber.

Amber Sterling: Mary I remember in Cartagena you wanted to do an unfriendly amendment to one of your motions, that might be an opportunity to make an unfriendly amendment to your own motion.

Avri Doria: So any other comments on this? I mean obviously as in all votes all the NCSG councilors vote as they believe is the best for the NCSG.

                 But, yes Debbie.

Debra Hughes: I just wanted to say for the record that I'll be supporting all of Mary's very hard efforts in supporting it.

Avri Doria: So that means you're supporting A. But Mary you're also part of B, right?

Mary Wong: I discussed A and B with Kristina but you'll notice that I did not second the motion and she knows why.

Avri Doria: In fact it didn't get a seconded motion by anyone is it?

Mary Wong: It hasn't been seconded yet but chances are it could get seconded from someone in the CSG but she understands why even though I talked about it with her I could not second it.

Avri Doria: So any other issues on the RAA? I think it's a wonderful issue to have at an impasse because I personally think that this is one of the more - I think this is more dangerous than what's going on with the GAC in many ways in terms of one of the regulated parties basically saying we're telling you what we're going to do and that's it, and if you don't like it tough. And I think that that one's a real problem so I think that this being impassed and further discussion on it is not a bad thing.

                 Any other comments? Okay, any other motions? No, are there any other issues, discussions upcoming as part of that meeting that we should talk about? Anything that's not a motion but is substantive?

Mary Wong: You can go on to something else while I look through the last version of the agenda for tomorrow, just to make sure there's nothing else because I apologize to the rest of the council, we haven't gotten the agenda out to everybody yet, we're still working on it.

Avri Doria: Okay. Oh so it's not the one that's online at the moment.

Mary Wong: Unless it's been put up in the last hour, then no.

Avri Doria: No, I don't think it's been updated in the last hour.

Mary Wong: Let me just do a quick check.

Avri Doria: Okay well the next item I guess we can come back to it later but the next item was the whole discussion of - where is it, I lost that - the confluence, I mean the responses to the scorecards.

But I think we should wait and see - not go to that until you're sure that there's not anything we need to further do. Oh is it the Skype - that's not me is it? No, I'm on silence, that's somebody else's.

Is everybody okay on other issues? I have started working on our new confluence based web page, you'll notice that I've create - and it just got turned back to this week and I apologize to all the people that wanted to edit things, but I don't know that editing rights have been dealt with yet.

I managed to get editing rights by demanding them from the staff for myself because I didn't want to wait until they were done.

And I haven't settled out how everyone else in it - but basically have put in a spot even if you only use it to point to some other spot but for each of the constituency type units, so a CC, an NCUC and MPOC.

I've started a policy issues page where hopefully we can have lots of different policy issues discussed but that's where I put the board back, workshop scorecard, that I've been working on.

And like I told people in the mail about (Turkwell) the elephant, I've got all the watercolors of (Turkwell) online at the moment, so you guys can all look at the elephants if you want to.

Isn't she a cute elephant? Little pink skirt? That's our elephant. That's the - we are elephant - we the NCSG adopted an elephant. Right and so basically once I got confluence I put the picture, all the watercolors that I have, each month I receive a new watercolor of the elephant.

I also receive an update on how she's doing, on how her keeper's doing, it's wonderful. And I can now start putting those there too although you can find them all on line.

But yeah, if you want to know more about the elephant and the elephant place and pictures, it's on our website.

Mary Wong: Because there is another little elephant there that gives our elephant a hard time.

Avri Doria: Yeah. It's good stuff really. Anyway, just wanted to people to know that the information's there and it's the NCSG elephant and for anybody that goes to the IGF at the end of the year in Kenya because we are the adoptive parents of an elephant we not only get to watch the lunch time feeding but we can go at the evening feeding and we can even get to go to the reserve where they let the adolescents go free.

Okay, more than you wanted to know about elephants. Do we have - have I filled the gap enough with other - are there any other council discussions that are worth...

Mary Wong: I didn't realize that was a diversion.

Avri Doria: That was a diversion, it was kill the dead air space.

Mary Wong: So there are no other motions before the council but there are a couple of other topics that might be of interest to SG members.

One is the promoting consumer choice and trust agenda for ICANN, I forget what it is. But the board sent - made a resolution in Cartagena asking the GNSO to do something about it.

And we're - the GNSO council (unintelligible) by Rosemarie who unfortunately can't be with us this meeting and consultation of Bruce on the board.

I can say that the council really doesn't quite know what it's supposed to do, but there actually is - we discussed should we go back and ask the board what the meant, should we just go ahead and do something, what should that something be?

The reason why I'm bringing it up is not just because obviously it's an issue of interest but because I believe there is an open mic portion allocated to that part of the meeting so anybody who has anything to say that would be an opportunity to talk about it then.

With respect to any other thing, I don't know if we care about the joint DNS security and stability working group which has just started.

I think they need to choose a chair or vice chair. We do have members who are on that working group and then there's a couple of other items where there's also an open mic but I thought these might be the two that are most relevant at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Any comments, questions, issues? Okay so then I guess we can call issues before the council, especially those to be voted on during the meeting done.

Moving on to the next item and we've caught up a little bit on our schedule. The new gTLD scorecard issues, okay so basically what happened here is we found out on Sunday afternoon that we would have the opportunity to comment.

We had no idea what form the comment would take. We didn't know whether it was going to be stand up and making a statement at the beginning or whether it was going to be at each issue, come up make an issue.

So basically a few of us got together and went through just trying to correlate from discussions that had been had over the previous months on the various issues what were the various NCSG positions and basically presented that to the policy committee and generally to the group to discuss.

But certainly wasn't a whole lot of time to make you know great decisions or great changes in it. Basically though I believe that we got

from the policy committee after we put it together and basically the initial putting together was Konstantinos, Robin and I then Mary took an edit and it was sent out to everyone.

There was some discussion and then the policy committee basically looking for objections. I did get a - you know very definitive comment from MPOC and CC that there were issues that they were at variance with NCSG on.

And so made a note of that at the top on those issues. And then MPOC gave me a specific comment which I also you'll probably notice I cut into the report as a minority viewpoint.

I truly believe that that's essentially important to do on any of these things. You do get a near consensus, there are people that think - you know have a different view and that view should be included in any report.

So - and I think what happened yesterday was actually a fairly good - this was by and large I think accurate to the majority view of the NCSG.

I know a couple times it was thought to be a little too soft and it could be a stronger point. And because of the way the microphones worked out, it was possible for those that wanted to make a stronger point to actually make it and you made a couple NCUC stronger points at a couple times which is good.

I think it also gave Debbie and Amber a chance to get up there and make their view heard in the words they want to be heard in and obviously that was very successful also.

I do not know - so first of all there's this, this obviously can be changed if there's anything here where you know the wording was especially wrong or needed to be fixed, this is a record, I'm not going to get rid of it. As I say if there's a need to edit it we can walk through and do any edits on it now.

I think this is now past its time, it's a historical record. The board has the information from yesterday's workshop, it's doing what it's doing. Now - so the question is, is there any need to talk about this any further, any of it in any depth and then there's the issue of we don't know what this evening is going to face us with.

We could have the board come back, make certain things and put out a letter, put out a bulletin that says we have the following you know new number 2s and new 1Bs and new paths to resolution.

And we invite comment from the community again tomorrow morning. My inclination with what has happened based on the past, I would still try to build something coordinated like this for the website. But I would also try and get the NCUC, the MPOC and the consumer constituency if they wanted to make their own comments.

If I can't, if again you know with the NCSG is invited and it's your job then I'll try to do something like I did before. But if I can pass the buck onto the three of you to do it, I would still like to do a compendium, you know and get the three of you to sort of feed the views in.

Pass it out to the policy committee, see if we can form an NCSG majority view, minority view and post it. But in terms of getting up there to speak, if I can avoid speaking I'm find with that.

So I don't know what people want to do further with this, I don't know if we need to discuss any of these issues in terms of changing the current record, I think it's sort of a moot point at the moment.

Oh there's coffee and cookies. And you did bring enough for everybody. I'm kidding. So anybody have anything they want to comment on on this? Yes, (Didi), I see a hand almost up.

(Didi Hallock):   Yes, it's just - it's so hard to relate to it without the original document. I was very confused.

Avri Doria: I did give a reference to the original document up here at the top so anybody could print it out. I didn't have the time while doing this overnight to actually cut and paste the original.

But their document was referenced up there at the top.

(Didi Hallock):   Well I went to the site and I couldn't - I mean I just - it would be a lot easier if people are serious about actually making changes to do it as a wiki.

Avri Doria: This is a wiki. It wasn't open to - and to be quite honest on a wiki when there's weeks to work on something I'm happy to have everybody working on it.

On the wiki when I have one night to produce something to deliver I tend to be less gregarious about having multiple editors because it's just impossible.

But you're right, I mean anything we've got weeks on, it's a wiki with editing. I'm sorry, I just - when I had one night to produce something, first of all I hadn't gotten control of this to be able to even grant people editing permission.

But beyond that just - any other comment on that or did I - do you have more comment (Didi)? Your mic's still on.

(Didi Hallock):   No, I just - I did - I'm sorry, I did email you to try to get the URL and I never got an answer.

Avri Doria: Oh you mean the URL for the whole document? It's in there. I didn't see your email, I must have missed that but I put it in there, it says reference at the top and that's the board letter with their stuff down at the bottom.

So that's the document that is being refreshed, referred to with the numbers that I used as a reference in ours. So when I said all of you know 617 it referred to - and let me open this, it referred to 617.

That was insane, and people acted like I was nuts when I said could you three just use the old numbers? But anyway, so there would be 617 there. But anyhow I mean - and I just did not have the time to build a table that included all the reference. Yes?

Amber Sterling: Avri, I just want to thank you, this is Amber I'm sorry, but for putting together such a tremendous amount of information with limited resources and such a short period of time. That was very ambitious and thank you, even though I am the minority viewpoint.

But the work went into it definitely requires thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And as I say if we get a similar requirement tonight I'll do the same thing because it's kind of like my job, but thank you.

Amber Sterling: We should all be thanked for doing our jobs.

Avri Doria: No, I'm not rejecting the thanks at all. I like the thanks. Okay, anything else, yes Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yeah, some have noted that Beau had saved (unintelligible) but we never had a chance to meet after the position you presented the solicitation as it were so I was quite happy with the minority view and I think that's just given the short testing time. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, and as I say, at the moment it's a historical record, if there's anything I need to correct in it, if people want further appended you know minority views to it, I have no problem, it's just no one will look at them other than history.

But okay, so as I say I will follow so watch your - I don't know if people plan to go to the board GAC meeting but watch for the news. If there is a chance to comment I will be working on it.

I'll be working on it with whomever I can grab at the time. I will put it out on email as soon as I've got it.

I will invite the - all the constituencies to make their own comments, but as I said if I can get you guys up there to speak I will.

And anything else on this topic? If not, yes, please. And please state your name because I didn't catch your name.

(Gondola Esprink): Sure, my name's (Gondola Esprink) from Australia and we're an applicant for a new gTLD called dot lap, the idea of dot lap is to get the funds from registrations and then use those funds to distribute them to people who need money, be it organizations in various countries for various causes.

And my question is and I know someone raised it yesterday at the GAC board discussion, that in the applications they've no possibility to say how the process will be once you have a registration and we are going to use it for non-profit, non-commercial causes.

And I think the board had just said there's a person on the floor that's being discussed that's out of the question. So I'm just wondering your responses to that, has that been something discussed in the past?

Avri Doria: I actually, you have your hand up.

Wendy Seltzer: I'm happy to respond, Wendy Seltzer and the board has been fairly rigorous in rejecting categorization for new TLDs for a long time and I for one thing that a useful position because the board isn't in a good position to enforce those categorizations once it grants the TLD.

So unless ICANN could subsequently monitor all of the uses to make sure that you adhered to that mission it would not be you know right to give somebody preference and then watch them change their terms a few months later.

As we've seen in lots of the applicants for sponsored TLDs in the earlier rounds, they had a notion of sponsorship and lots of the sponsors then said oh, this business plan doesn't work, now we're going to open dot pro up to everybody.

And the board can't do anything about it so why not just be clear about that up front that they're not going to try.

Avri Doria: I mean obviously if you prevail in a community versus anyone else then you sort of get what you want without being judged through a category. Any other comments on any of the GAC, gTLD stuff? And you got a t-shirt and that wasn't fair.

Man: Are you telling her to become a community, the love community?

Avri Doria: I'm not telling her.

Man: I'd like to hear more about that. It might liven up this meeting.

Woman: We could have some interesting discussions.

Avri Doria: You never know, I mean people are doing all kinds of things in community that I don't understand.

Woman: We'll have our discussion in the hot tub.

Avri Doria: Oh dear, okay let's move on. Yes, on this, Mary.

Mary Wong: Just a very quick comment, I thought it was really effective and I hope others agree with me that we can make statements as a stakeholder group on things that we have similar positions on and that individual constituencies can have individual statements on specific points.

                  I really thought sitting in the audience that that was very effective. I think it did show the breadth of our stakeholder group and it showed that our stakeholder group can come together over things of mutual concern.

                  So I would encourage that approach going forward.

Avri Doria: No, I think it works very well that we both agree and disagree. Anything else on this topic before I move on to the next one? And since we're a little ahead of schedule and I'm jealous of everybody getting coffee and cookies and me not, I was going to take five minutes where people could get coffee and cookie.

                  But you know if to try and finish earlier, yeah, please. So no break. Yeah, black coffee and just the nutty kind of cookie. Yes, the cookies with nuts in them.

Milton Mueller: If you turn over the chair to me I'll run it for you for ten minutes.

Avri Doria: Sure, okay. You want it? You're on the executive committee, why not. The next one is one you'll like and then I'll go get coffee.

It's policy plans for 2011. Is there anything other than knee jerk reacting to the latest topic that comes to the top of the GNSO list that we want to tackle that's important, that's whatever?

And Milton is chair.

Milton Mueller: All in favor of having a new chair?

Mary Wong: I actually wanted a Milton mask that we should all wear to the public meeting. But just a very brief thing as well, it follows on something that was discussed at the NCUC meeting this morning, that there are some things that will come before the council but one of the most immediate is likely to be the registration of these policy staff including the UDRP which as many of you know was a consensus recommendation from that working group.

And I also mentioned this morning that the staff is seeking input as to what that issues report should look like and it is on the council agenda for tomorrow.

And I think there is some time again for an open mic on this. I know this is an issue of concern to some members. It would be a good time to start putting in feedback.

Then I would also follow that by saying something that I know many of us have said before that we do need more warm bodies on other working groups.

I think again it's effective if we can show that we have not just a large membership body but a large active and engaged one. And I take Robin's earlier point that we do need to find better ways to inform the members so that those that are interested can get informed and then can participate.

But I think that may not (unintelligible) a policy issue for us going forward but I think it certainly is something that we need to try to work on very seriously.

Amber Sterling: To jump in on that, sorry this is Amber, Avri and I had an offline conversation sometime I can't remember because I've lost all track of time and we were talking about having an NCSG list serve and it would really be informational purposes only, very little discussion would be part of it.

But it would be that information line, like vote now, here's your link. The policy meeting's going to be held on these days, you know working groups are available please join. And then that would free up the NCUC list serve to operate at the constituency list serve since for now I'm going to have three constituencies hopefully officially by the end of the year all three of us will make it.

But have that one list serve that has just sporadic updates that are very necessary and pertinent so all of our inboxes you know if we got an email from this email address that we really should read it and so things don't get lost in the clutter.

Milton Mueller: Not sure I understood what you were suggesting but it sounded interesting. You could - so there is an NCSG generalized discussion

list, right? And you're suggesting that we take the sort of procedural deadline stuff off of that and put it where exactly?

Amber Sterling: I think maybe we're talking about two separate things. That the list serve that I thought would be only list serve for the community be justified the BC and the policy and the whatnot was NCSG -NCUC, is that the term?

And so we're talking about the same with those, okay so what I'm proposing is that we leave that and keep that for the NCUC and the conversations of the NCUC, so for example there would be a conversation about whether or not my name would remain on that list.

And that's fine if you remove me but those are conversations that could be had. And so that would be a space for the NCUC members to discuss, debate, have a good time and then there would be an NCSG list serve that would be open and all members of all constituencies would be on that list.

And that would be kind of for the informational purposes and that list would help feed the conversations on the CC, the NCUC and the NPOC list serves.

Milton Mueller: Okay yeah, that's what we're trying to do now so that the one that's dual is because the only constituency now is the NCUC so the - we want everybody to be on that list and we thought people would be confused if there suddenly became a new list and they had to resign them up for it.

So I basically just took the NCUC list, added NCSG in the header as I understand it and then kept the lists that way.

Now most - I think most people in NCUC would want to stay you know have most of the conversation about issues on that broad list. I think that's - but there would be a narrower list that are constituency specific for administrative things related to the constituencies is the way I see it.

So once your - new constituencies are created I would think that we would remove NCUC from the header of the board list that you're on now, everybody would remain on that.

And then NCUC would create its own separate list for all the NCUC members. Yeah Debbie.

Debra Hughes: Yes, I think that looks good. I think the idea was to try to make sure that when we have policy decisions or if there's important notices everybody to take attention to that it's easy to identify those separate from let's talk about this issue over here which people may or may not want to engage in.

And I agree that everybody might want to be involved in all those conversations but I fear because I know I'm admitting to it, sometimes I miss the call for action.

And like what I do in another organization is whenever there's an action required we put in the subject line Action Required to kind of draw attention to this is one where there's either a meeting notice or

we're asking you to vote or something as opposed to just the regular conversations that are also very important.

Milton Mueller: Yeah, but I'm not sure what solution you're proposing to that problem and I certain sympathize with that, I mean I actually objected to the creation of a separate list for the policy committee and the executive committee.

I wanted you know you get lost in that stuff, people are making decisions that you're supposed to be in on and there's five different lists you have to follow so I'm very sensitive to that.

So what exactly was your solution?

Debra Hughes: I'm throwing it out, I don't know. I guess the solution was if there's a way to have either if it's one list but come up with a way to identify emails or messages that require action or where we're providing specific you know important information as opposed to let's talk about this topic over here that may be on topic, off topic or whatever.

You know an interesting article or whatever to kind of separate those conversations from conversations about there's a policy call at this time, that time or you know we need to vote on this issue.

You know just to kind of separate those conversations in a way that makes sense, if that's coming out with email protocols so that we understand you know subject line or there's a separate list, I don't know what it is, but I know it would be very helpful for me to be able to call out the important action item or notices as opposed to just the conversations.

Avri Doria: Oh you had your hand up before but also I'll put you in a queue but I wanted to ask - okay, who did I have? I had Wendy and - okay but I wanted to ask a question before I pass it on to the queue because you're talking here about someone's out of the room and playing hooky, the overall discuss list, is that the list?

So you haven't actually been into particular policy issues, it was discuss list. I just wanted to let people know that - and it's been over a quarter now, but I did have the allegedly ICANN's approval and they were creating another list for just information.

And of course you know Milton would hate that because it's yet another list to pay attention to.

But it was a list that was purely the information for the actions for the list for that stuff as opposed to the free wheeling discuss list.

But anyhow, I'm still waiting on that informational list. It went into - something that happens a lot when they ask for a simple thing at ICANN they look at it and say well we can't do a simple thing, we have to generalize it for what anybody might want.

And then it becomes a complicated thing that takes lots of ICANN people figuring out lots of stuff, how to build us a list that can have a few authorized senders and - etcetera.

So okay, Wendy, David, Brendan, Alex. Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: You know our limited time in face to face mode, I would love to focus on some strategic big picture issues and one of the issues that I see coming to the table is issues of domain name take down.

And while lots of the policy around domain name take down happens outside of ICANN space in national law enforcement demands and ICANN likely may choose not to comment on those.

I think the issue of domain name take down and domain name blocking at intermediary levels is a matter of stability and security of domain name and domain name usage.

And I think it would be useful for non-commercial as the home of lots of users trying to make political and critical uses of domain names to develop some further discussion with that.

Avri Doria: Thank you. David.

David Cake: Just on the mal list issue, just want to say I do like the idea of there being asset administrative list, it does - but I also think and I also think obviously each constituency is going to want to develop some of their internal network of users.

But I really do want there to be a cross stakeholder discussion list. Basically ICANN, the one problem that seems to exist at every level of ICANN is silo mentality.

Let's not create silo strictly within NCSG so keep the discussion list forward. I also just wanted to - I wanted to say something very similar to policy issues for - that Wendy was saying that there is obviously a

very strong in terms of policy issues we need to look at this year, there's obviously a very strong push by law enforcement for take downs and so on.

There are - it is quite a complicated issue, some of which goes outside ICANN, I know that that would be sort of fighting a political campaign against blocking at a national level.

So I think this is definitely an issue that is going to crop up within ICANN in the near future and we should be - we should have policy in place. We should really be - we need to be proactive on this one because law enforcement is coming in very hard if anyone saw the DNS abuse stuff.

Avri Doria: No, it's probably a very good issue for us to discuss but I think we probably find that we have a fairly broad range of views in it as a stakeholder group which could be a very good thing because maybe we're the right place to find out what some of those balances are since we have strong views on both sides of the issue.

David Cake: Well I think there's more than one side, I mean particular blocking versus take down is something where we probably - that's an interesting point.

And I also think yes we do have a broad range of views, that's why we need to start talking pretty quickly, because we have a lot to say.

Avri Doria: No, I think it's probably a good thing, Konstantinos, I've got you after Brendan, Alex and Milton.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Just want to make a very quick comment...

Avri Doria: So do they all.

Konstantinos Komaitis: The GAC meeting is over so you don't need to rush it.

Avri Doria: It's over, they never even started it.

Konstantinos Komaitis: They cancelled it.

Avri Doria: They cancelled it, oh a point of order.

Konstantinos Komaitis: That's what I wanted to say only.

Avri Doria: Point of order thing. Why did they do that? I guess the board was still working. Okay, I'll get to you, I've got a list. Okay, Brendan.

Brenden Kuerbis: It was mostly what David was saying, we should have any to Debra's point we could have cross community announce list, cross community discuss list, individual constituency discuss list.

But on the other issues, yeah, so another policy issue I think that's coming up obviously this year is the IANA contract and we have the technical communities calling for some evolution of the IANA contract.

Obviously ICANN wants to maintain it and perhaps we have a position that we want to take on it with respect to that.

Avri Doria: Okay. Alex.

Alex Gakuru: I have three quick points. One of them is to say that maybe in view of the CC, the one that we are talking about, partly we could spend a bit more time on developing a broader consumer policy development area so that we have a clear position on our agenda for the next year, also bearing in mind that the term consumer seems to be getting quite a lot of political structure, not overall but the second one is the NCSG on David's view.

But you know as we create so many links I sometimes also find that I'm unobserved at least one list, I mean so when I'm replying I think I'm replying to a few people only to find that (unintelligible) I'm replying from my mobile phone it's going to a whole big list which I didn't expect.

Sometimes the list increases so much sometimes you wonder where you are. Plus when you think of the CC like right now it's probably easier for me to just send both an email directly and with the list it's probably changing in the two of us, it might not be wanted.

I would just to discuss our composition in the broader list so that we are in touch with what's happening with everybody else. Because our issues are broadly speaking meant to be all non-commercial.

And then the third point I was going to say is maybe we could focus more on how to also grow (unintelligible) and also acknowledging support from the Brazilian and also want to reach out to the Portuguese speaking African communities because we tend to have English and French.

And so for the next year that's one of the things I also want to consider is outreach as far as both other regions and other representatives. Because I think we have the need to grow it further.

Also we have a new constituency also so that a (unintelligible) you have outreach to the interest group who can do it also for the broader constituency or stakeholder group. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Milton.

Milton Mueller: Basically all I was going to do was promote the IANA contract as an issue that we need to look at this year. We're already going to miss the NTIA comment period probably which is March 31 but September there will be the actual recontract and we'll be done sometime around there.

So there's time to influence less formally or to at least develop a position on that and what I heard informally is that there would not be any significant change in the IANA contract this time but based on public comments they might prepare for the next round to do something more substantive.

So it is a long term issue.

Avri Doria: That's interesting. Okay, thank you. Okay, it's yours.

(Gondola Esprink): Okay, (Gondola Esprink), just following up on comments before I try to get into the GAC board meeting but I was told that was closed to people outside the process.

I just thought I'd take the opportunity of order to find something else, I've worked in the disability area for a long time and I don't believe that this is something that has been discussed very much at ICANN.

And one of the things is that I've just done a check of the ICANN website and it has a lot of accessibility errors so for someone who wants to actually look at the website, who might have a disability, especially vision impairment, they're going to have trouble.

And it seems to me that's a very fundamental issue for an organization like ICANN, it should be not the stakeholder that people with disabilities should be able to access the process just like anyone else.

Avri Doria: Thank you. That's actually a good point. Yes (Didi).

(Didi Hallock):   Yes, I just - I don't know quite what happened with the whole topic of the law enforcement and it just - and it was sort of dismissive, we can't talk about that because there's so many different opinions.

Avri Doria: Actually I said the opposite, that we should talk about it because we have such a broad range of opinion that if we can come to some sort of viewpoint on it that could be really quite rich.

(Didi Hallock):   So what can we...

Avri Doria: Okay, that was going to be my next question, great topic, now what? But thank you for...

(Didi Hallock):   I mean how can - where do we go? I mean under what (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: Okay, David.

David Cake: I mean the issue is I mean that even anything concrete that we've seen on the issue at the moment is still I think is the big - so we - it seems to be a very clear push from law enforcement but has not yet turned into a policy (unintelligible) or anything like that.

I think we just need to start discussing how - what our opinions are, whether we - you know I think if we stop putting forward policy ideas first we have a chance of actually controlling the debate rather than having to just be on the back foot from law enforcement proposals which in the nature of law enforcement will probably be overly strong.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. (Didi) your mic is still on. Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: Yeah, I think the discussion that the main name take downs could be one for internal group discussion to bring before the GNSO council to put together a white paper for others in the community and perhaps to make a matter of policy.

I also think that there are very useful communications on the subject probably going on within groups like FSAC on the particular security and stability implications and it might be a useful, you know, cross - it's not even across constituency but across parts of the organization discussion on the implications of these kinds of enforcement mechanisms.

Avri Doria: Okay. That's good. Because you also brought up something that I was thinking of in terms of what - how do we handle things? What do we do?

There was the one part educating ourselves and coming to some sort of view point. The other is actually putting things on the table at the GNSO in other words those of you that are counselors, once there's a formed view can definitely take that to the council.

So what we had several topics. I don't have anybody on the list at the moment though. We had the domain takedowns with the law enforcement and the blocking versus takedown as sub-issues.

We have the IANA issue. We had disability area which is more of an internal ICANN but not a bad thing for us to champion and make a cause that, you know, it actually could be a quite good thing to do within ICANN. It's one of those things that you're sort of never in trouble for arguing strongly for disability support and gets brownie points too.

And I have a terrible attitude because I live with a disabled person. So why I'll get beat up at home.

Did I miss any of the issues, the IANA, the whole domain name takedown and the disability area?

Yes (Didi)?

(Didi Hallock): One of the things that was Rosenberg brought up was the compiling data is important to making a case about anything.

And I - you know I know that it hasn't passed but there is this COICA law in the U.S. And it would be really - I don't know what mechanisms

or if there's any funding for this. But if there could be a compilation or maybe ESS is doing this already.

But not just in the U.S. but if we could have a kind of global look at what regulations are being passed would enable not just domain takedown but Internet takedowns around the world. And see this as a kind of overall threat to the freedom of the Internet.

And that kind of documentation I think would be extremely useful in all of our discussions whatever side of what fence we sit on.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Yeah. It's quite a bit of work too I thought.

(Didi Hallock): Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes. I mean it would be an interesting thing to have. I'm not sure that we have the volunteers here. Do we have the volunteers here to do that kind of work because I think it would be quite useful; it could certainly make, you know, all kinds of space available for on the wikis for people that we're collecting that kind of information on, you know, especially the global regulations as you were saying related to things like COICA or Internet takedown, etcetera and to actually build a case.

I haven't seen one yet. There may be one. But it's definitely useful. But as I say it's a lot of work and it's something I'm not picking up.

(Didi Hallock): Well I guess I don't understand. Is there a budget for...

Avri Doria: No.

(Didi Hallock):   ...(NC).

Avri Doria: No.

(Didi Hallock)::   There's nothing. There's...

Avri Doria: That was that last thing. SG fundraising if there's going to be a budget first we have to find money. There is no budget.

There's ICANN assistance in terms - I mean okay. To say there's no budget is actually not quite true. There's a budget that covers us getting these rooms. That covers getting the support for - huh?

No it's not our budget. But I'm saying is there a budget for NCSG for me to flatly say no. There is no budget is not strictly speaking true. Strictly speaking there is a budget that covers our telephone calls and conference calls. And there's a budget that covers the council members traveling to the meetings.

And so ICANN has budgeted some money to support Stakeholder Groups and constituencies. But in terms of actually doing the work, in terms of having a secretariat function that could split between the Stakeholder Groups - the Stakeholder Group and the constituencies. Any sort of, you know, pay an intern to do a strategic database type of thing. No.

That's that next item when we get the SG fundraising do we want to budget.

What kind of things do we want to do?

And if we want one how do we go about getting one?

Yeah Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yeah. Just to add onto that because the question was arose in our last meeting in the morning. But that's really part of the reasons why you find the noncommercial dual because the constituency or stakeholder group have been having a participation problem, a priority issue at ICANN because all the constituencies are in this to make the money.

You know so that is a different feature. I mean a difference (unintelligible) whether (unintelligible) whether there's ISVs, whether there's business constituency. I mean they're there but they make money out of their participation.

But we are here mainly for public interest. So indeed that has been a major problem.

Thank you.

Avri Doria: The thing I want to point out, are we ready to jump to the fundraising and the money issue? And Andre you had your hand up. Or were you still on policy plans?

Okay, great please.

Andre Philip: I wouldn't mind volunteering to help with the documentation. I might need some help with the viewing, whatever I can get my hands on. I've

already been in touch with the owner of torrent-finder.com. I've spoken to him and we've been exchanging emails.

I'm assuming he would be willing to help as well. So if anyone else would be willing just even if you don't want to get too involved just helping with the reviewing whatever like documents and seeing whether that's helpful. Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, that's great. And I can certainly make, you know, get a page for it on the wiki space within NCSG's place to start building it there.

Andre Philip: Excellent.

Avri Doria: So it's in that (unintelligible) place. Yes Konstantinos.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Thanks Avri. It's Konstantinos. I can certainly help you. I mean I am researching academically on COICA and domain name takedowns and results. So I think seeing that happen in the UK so I will certainly be willing to help you with this.

Avri Doria: Okay. So that's actually one of the policy things that actually has people working on it. That's cool.

Thank you.

So now that was basically - that was a combining of two things. That was the - if I understand it correctly and I might not. It was the COICA and the regulatory and defining stuff. And that also reflects to the takedown and what's being done there.

Would you also be documenting that only regulatory stuff but actually actions that occurred? Would that be useful to both have a - so that as actions occurred...

Andre Philip: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...there was a list of them so you could go and see where things had happened or is that going too far?

Andre Philip: What do you mean by the actions?

Avri Doria: Well in other words there's two sides of this. There's the process of building whether it's COICA or other regulatory and there's various efforts and various bills, various documents in various parliaments and countries are going through some progress.

So I'm assuming that you would be documenting in some sense what was approaching, the approaching regulatory framework. And in another sense you could be documenting and, you know, using the regulations of the customs officials. So and so just took down that.

And I'm just asking, you know, what's the scope of what you would document? Would you look at documenting both or is it just one versus the other?

Konstantinos Komaitis: I'm not sure, because this is Andre's vision so.

Andre Philip: Yeah (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Konstantinos Komaitis: I will let him decide and I will just...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah. And I'm just asking.

Andre Philip: The owner for torrent-finder.com was an Egyptian. And I know that he hired a lawyer from the United States to follow-up on this.

So I think that there might actually be documentation that exists and is ready so...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Andre Philip: ...if I could get him to get - to send me some of that stuff.

Avri Doria: That'd be great.

Andre Philip: And maybe put him in touch with some of the people on NCSG. Konstantinos would also like to be in touch with them. And then we can see what he have and then see what we can do to build on that.

Avri Doria: Yes Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: Yeah. And thanks and I - this is where working NCUC and work outside blends nicely because this is the sort of thing that I do over at chillingeffects.org where we documented some of the United States based domain takedowns.

And I'm certainly happy to contribute resources to the effort. And also help to bring that into the debate.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. So that can almost be seen as sort of a little project we've got going.

On the IANA issue Brenden that you brought up. Yeah, like okay so great idea, now what?

What do you suggest? Is this something where we get a pirate patent and just start writing? Is this something - I mean how do we take a next step on that?

And I am just taking a next step on the domain takedowns and regulatory regimes, etcetera.

So what would be a next step that you would recommend for this IANA issue?

I mean other than to say we should do something. How do we do it?

Oh Milton. Milton's Brenden's rescue.

Milton Mueller: Well I was suggesting there is a notice - request for comments out from the NTIA which controls the IANA contract.

And they've set a specific set of questions.

So we could respond to that even though it won't be in time for March 31st deadline, we could develop our own response to that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Milton Mueller: And, you know, and some other timeline and then start shopping it around in time for the Singapore Meeting also liaise with other groups. I guess the ISOC and those kinds of people would be interested to know whether we support what they're pushing for or not.

Avri Doria: Or not, okay.

Milton Mueller: If not why not. So I think that would be the way to do that.

Avri Doria: And also the receiver of things at NTIA might be able to receive something even after a deadline and read it for interest.

                    Yeah Brenden and then Mary.

Brenden Kuerbis: Yeah. I'll just add in conversations with people I know that NTIA is always trying to figure out better ways to interface with civil society.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Brenden Kuerbis: They've really struggled with that over the long term so...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Milton Mueller: Who is?

Brenden Kuerbis: NTIA.

Milton Mueller: Oh okay.

Avri Doria: Yeah, they are.

Milton Mueller: Well...

Avri Doria: And they've basically said, you know, call them when we need to so
                    we can call them.

                    Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: So I think Milton I sent you a little message on this but I suggested that
                    one of the topics for the public forum on Thursday because - actually
                    backtrack. ICANN has told us actually (Peter) through ICANN Staff has
                    told us that we're actually doing - we did a public forum yesterday and
                    they're doing one tomorrow on the new GTLD and the GAC thing that
                    they want to use the Thursday time for other topic if possible.

                    So Milton suggested the IANA contract could be one topic that will be
                    of interest not just to us but the whole community. So maybe some of
                    the things could be brought up there as well.

                    But secondly, so (Bruce) has just sent an email to the council list
                    saying that not only has today's remainder of the Board GAC Meeting
                    been cancelled, sorry for the inconvenience but that - I was really quite
                    sure that I put that bit in there so but if it (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: We're channeling (Bruce).

Mary Wong: No (Bruce) is usually actually extremely nice and polite and this is not an impolite message. But he also goes onto say we will be listening to further GNSO constituency and public input tomorrow before we finalize our position.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Mary Wong: I'm not quite sure what that means. And I don't think they put anything, I'll get - but I think it indicates that we have another chance so.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Mary Wong: It goes back to an earlier item I know. But it was kind of (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: No. I think that's good and...

Mary Wong: And...

Avri Doria: ...I will predict that they'll ask specific questions. So I think, you know, all of you will get up and give your positions.

             Yes (unintelligible).

Woman: And not to do any kind of ICANN numerology here but finalize is a nice word for those of us who are hoping that something will actually happen at this meeting.

Avri Doria: Finalize is really a powerful word. Isn't it?

Okay, so on the IANA basically it seems like it almost maybe worth starting one - you know you guys have started using the pirate pad quite successfully as a tool for collecting comments and perhaps or the wiki. I'll set up - what I'll basically do on each of these three is I will give them a wiki slot from which they can start building whatever it is they want to cover it.

And over the next couple days I'll make sure that everyone's got permissions to do that. And it's just going to take me a little while to track everything down and get permissions set up.

But and I did say three things. So there was the, you know, the Amber's project and get that set up on that. We've got the IANA which is basically start coming up with answers to the five questions.

Hopefully like Amber's coordinating one thing, Brenden are you willing to coordinate sort of the IANA effort?

And then it becomes one of the things that I'll ask about, you know, when we have periodic meetings and stuff on one of these things.

Now the third thing was the sort of ICANN internal on disability access of web sites and meeting rooms. I'm not sure what we would have done if somebody in a wheelchair wanted to come to this meeting. Maybe there's an elevator that would have gotten them here.

But I tend to doubt it. Like I say my ex-partner partner is wheelchair type person so I'm not sure how that would have worked but anyway.

So I don't know. Do we want to take that on? And if so, who's volunteering to sort of work on, you know, I guess the first thing is just to notify ICANN that, you know, there's - I forget the address of it. But there's this test you can put your web site through and it'll tell you everything that's wrong with it in terms of disability access.

I've run various web sites through it before. I don't remember what the address is but can find it.

Yes.

Amber Sterling: Since ICANN is a U.S. corporation I know my company struggles with this, keeping up with the technology and making sure we're accessible.

There are proposed changes to the web site requirements coming up in the next few months.

Debbie you might - do you remember the timeline off the top of your head?

No. But they're impendingly soon and however fast they operate.

And so it might be worth - I can look into when that's going to be released. I need to know that for my own job. And it might be worth scheduling our requests once the new requirements come out if they are going to come out in the next month or two just so they don't have to do work twice.

But yes, we think this is a very important issue. And I think it will be really great for us to bring it to their attention because I imagine this is another one overtaken by new GTLDs.

Avri Doria: Oh yes. Well that would be great. And then in fact if perhaps on our wiki site we could start documenting both on a national and an international basis what the standards are, some of these tests that can be run. I don't know if some of us could - I know I have some of that because at the IGF a couple years ago, you know, we got approached by the Disability Groups who said you're not accessible. You're not this.

So we went through a whole bunch. So I probably still have some of the older international information on these things available.

But yes.

Woman: Yeah. I know some people in IGF who work very hard to make sure that the meetings and facilities are accessible.

And I think this hotel is reasonably accessible which is good. The web site isn't. And maybe there's a way to look at having - ensuring that the whole ICANN communications policy as you said incorporates accessibility.

So it's not only the web site, it's the fund meetings, the online meetings and the (unintelligible). And there are a number of resources online. Certainly the content accessibility guidelines through W3C are the internationally recognized guidelines.

And they have now got a Version 2 where a lot of multimedia is incorporated as well to ensure that that is accessible.

I'm not sure about the situation in the U.S. where the U.S. governments are requiring, you know, government funded organizations to ensure that their web sites are accessible.

Amber Sterling: But it would be a requirement for all organizations is my understanding. If you had a web presence your due diligence is to meet. That's my understanding so huge process.

Woman: That was the case with the previous version so I think it's just a matter of the timing for the second version of the accessibility guidelines.

Avri Doria: Thank you. David.

David Cake: I just wanted to alert some inactive working members of NCUC are actually experts on this and would probably be willing to through in a bit of time to help us put something together so.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Amber Sterling: (Bill), Avri, sorry, this is Amber. I keep forgetting to say my name. If we wanted to also request that an ADA provision be built into all of their meeting arrangements per your thought so perhaps this hotel.

From my perspective the hotel is fully...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Amber Sterling: I've seen elevators. But we could ask that they make sure that that is in their agreement provisions. That is language that I already have because that's my day job.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Well thanks. Yeah, you're right. I just looked at one room. And I don't really know what the rules are so. Okay, thanks.

Okay, so that's at least three things that we've started working on that are - or will start working on that aren't being just driven by what's happening in the GNSO at the moment so that's really good.

Anything more on this one before I move to the fundraising financing issue?

Okay, on the fundraising financing and it's something that has probably suffered from a very serious lack of leadership.

Yes Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. I need to head out to go to...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...see someone right now. I just want to say it's been great meeting all of you today.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And I look forward to working with you a lot more in the future. Thanks a lot.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Thanks.

Okay, on the fundraising as I was saying, it's been the orphan child in terms of doing this reorganization, restructuring that charters and meetings and policy stuff has always taken a precedent. Part of it is my fault. It's just the last thing that I ever get to.

We have within our charter a Finance Committee that I think has one or two - supposed to have one or two members of each of the stakeholder - I mean each of the constituencies. Plus anyone else who's really got the skills to do fundraising and to figure out budgets. It's actually a finance, but we don't have a budget.

NCUC I guess has some money so it has some budget. I don't know if you guys have money or stuff. We don't have dues to be in NCSG. We never have.

One thought that did come up in the past was the notion of voluntary contributions. You know and I don't know how far that would go, how well that would work. We see how well that works in the ccNSO in terms of sovereign. Oh, you know, it's a peer pressure sort of thing.

Other than that fundraising means going to people that got bags of money that give them away. To do that and I already talked to a couple of the ccTLDs at one point and said, yeah, we might be interested.

But what they would want then was a proposal and a prospectus and glossy pictures and stuff. Somebody would need to do that.

Yes Amber.

Amber Sterling: I guess I have a couple introductory questions before we get into that.

Would we put any limitations on who we'd accept money from?

Would there be conflicts of interest from accepting money from some organizations or some types of organizations members?

And then do we want to worry our pretty little heads about that or do we just want to say hey, if you want to hand me money I am more than happy to take it?

Avri Doria: I would bet and I don't think we've talked about it, but I would bet we would care. Somehow or other that would just be my suspicion that we should care and that we would actually have to care. I mean one of the requirements under ICANN is since and this is a sort of funny issue since the NCSG is an ICANN organization as it were and certainly they're going to tell us what fiduciary rules we have to follow so they don't get bounced back in terms of us doing bad things.

You know I think we would have to be fairly careful. And I think that may be ICANN constraints on it. I don't know. But there certainly could be our own constraints on it.

Amber Sterling: And then my next question is do we want to - does the Stakeholder Group truly need money and or should we just leave it up to the constituencies to find out for themselves which is the current model? And well for the NCUC at least it doesn't seem to work. And the other two of us haven't attempted.

Do we want the Stakeholder Group to have funds?

And if so how much are we talking about?

Avri Doria: Yeah, right. That could also be another good way to do it where the constituencies would get funding. And then perhaps, you know, for what little bit the Stakeholder Group may or may not need. For example if the Stakeholder Group needed to check secretariat services that the constituencies could be a way to provide that to the Stakeholder Group.

And the Stakeholder Group which is more of an organizational issue than the degree issue that that - as I said the Stakeholder Group needs a Financial Committee just to deal with the issue.

But how it gets done I think those are things that, you know, are really good conversation topics.

And I have no idea what makes sense.

Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: I probably have a bit more time on my hands to do a bit more (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And you volunteered before so this time I'm actually going to put you on the list.

Mary Wong: Yeah so well it sounds to me that we need to do a bit of, you know, fact gathering, figure out the context to see what we would spend money on if we had it and where it might ideally come from while answering all of these questions.

And so I kind of put my hand up to...

Avri Doria: Okay, great.

Mary Wong: ...work on that.

Avri Doria: I know the kinds of things that we've - and Alex you're already on the list so but I'll get to you.

I think among the things that if we did have money for example it might be good to have a secretariat type of service that helped the NCSG.

Is bringing people to meetings just a constituency issue or can a Stakeholder Group participate in helping people come to meetings?

In terms of outreach is there an SG outreach that brings people into the Stakeholder Group and then they find which constituencies?

So there's all - and I'm saying. These are all discussions we had. I don't have a prevailing point of view on it. But I think they're all great discussions.

Yes Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yes. Thank you. I wanted to suggest - mention about where to get money from. I think in the various WAC Teams and WAC Groups I think we wanted declare there are issues in our officials and organization.

Is it DOI? Is it called DOI where you state where there's any...?

Avri Doria: The statement of interest.

Alex Gakuru: The statement of interest.

Avri Doria: And declaration of interest. But they've been combined to just the statement of interest. Yeah.

Alex Gakuru: Statement of Interest. So if you for example are an organization that has an interest in the output of our policy so then some organizations obviously be introduced by the country.

And I think that's in the book. I think would also influence which organization we can and we cannot receive money from.

Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. Yes (Didi).

(Didi Hallock): It seems important that we try to diversify more and I would think that that would be something we want to spend some money on to ensure that there's representation regionally.

And I don't - you know also the types of organizations. But I don't know. I mean I think it's really kind of a - it's part of the finding ourselves.

But it seems to me that it's a bit dangerous if we only have - if the only representatives are ones who can afford to come or whose governments will pay them to come or whose corporation will pay them to come.

And I think it's a huge question. But I think it's something that we should wrestle with.

Avri Doria: Okay, hank you. So yes Maria. Please.

Maria Farrell: Does anybody else want to work on this or will I just go and drop this to (unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: There's already a small committee because there's already - Amber's on it. Alex is on it.

Amber Sterling: Who knew?

Avri Doria: Huh?

Amber Sterling: Who knew?

Avri Doria: Who knew? You've got a subscription welcome to. I think you were put on it when, you know, as one of the chair of one of the constituencies. Alex was put on it as one of the chairs.

But if you want to replace yourself with someone else please tell me. What I do is I automatically put the chairs on and then if they want somebody else, they can put somebody else.

Amber Sterling: To be kind. I don't think anyone else wants it.

Avri Doria: I'm sure. Konstantinos is on it. Maria is on it at the moment. And I just added you. And Milton is on it as he's the Treasurer of NCUC so and as an executive chair so he's actually one of the few with money so he's definitely on it.

And so that's who's on it at the moment, obviously if people from other. But that seems a group to go with to start with. If you can do an outreach to others who have the knowledge and the wherewithal, I said I was on it too, right, but I'm useless.

But, you know, it's just see how we're going to go. But there's now a group with six names on it so that's probably a good place to start.

Anything else on the fundraising?

And the idea I'd really like people to think about though is would members be willing to pay a voluntary. I don't see us putting in a required membership. Other Stakeholder Groups have one and the registries, they have a really big one, and the registrars are substantive also.

But I just don't see that being a direction we'd want to go to. But that's the kind of thing that the Finance Committee can look at. You know then the membership would have to accept it.

But it's certainly something they - what I'm saying is I'm not trying to limit what that committee can propose, perhaps thinking about the organization that may force itself limitation. But, you know, it's certainly not limited.

Anything else on that one?

Yes Mary.

Mary Wong: This may in line of point but when you talk about getting voluntary contributions from people, it struck my mind.

And as you said I think one of the things that the committee will be looking at is not just how and whether there's money but what should that money be spent on.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Mary Wong: (Didi) asked about travel and things like that. I think one of the things that the committee should be looking at at least for recommending is that to the extent that we fund folks for travel to meetings whether it's the database public meetings or work group meetings or whatever it is, that there are some guidelines as to who attends what sessions because in the past we've had sessions where we probably could have done with more NCSG members and to the extent we know that a

certain number who are at a certain meeting especially if they are funded by constituencies of Stakeholder Group I think that those kinds of guidelines would be very helpful.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. Anything else on this topic?

Amber Sterling: Does anyone have any thoughts on broaching a conflict of interest?

And are there any immediate types of organizations that jump to mind that are immediately on the OP list?

Woman: You know I wouldn't of thought there was - we had a really - I thought the meeting on Friday was wonderful. It was really very interesting and useful for me especially.

And but I was showing the papers to - a printout to a friend. And he said, My God you let Google fund it? What - how - you know who decided that?

And I could not answer that question.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah. I - Google owns my life. I don't worry about Google. Every bit of information I've got is in their hands already so.

Yes.

Woman: A second issue I think is whether we accept restricted grants or demand unrestricted.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Woman: And which - and if we accept restricted as I imagine what sorts of restrictions would be permissible?

Avri Doria: Yep, thanks. That's a good question.

   So was that kind of like raising a hand and wanting to say something?

   Please go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Amber Sterling: I guess I'll say it. I don't know how smart it is. There could also be an argument if it's completely unrestricted and we just accept money from whomever that the lack of conflicts would come into effect that we don't care. You're just handing us money.

   And so I mean that could be a benefit which would if that was policy and that was written for our Stakeholder Group that would be an explanation as to why Google could donate funds. That I'm sorry, I wasn't able to attend. But that sounds like a really wonderful event and I'm glad whomever sponsored it, I'm glad it was put on because it was put on for very good reasons.

   And so perhaps if there's just a policy stated for the group and that could be a workaround in order to get funding where funding comes. That could be another potential solution.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Alex. Oh no sorry. It wasn't Alex. I was just used to Alex being there, sorry.

Lynn Goodendorf: Lynn Goodendorf, ICANN Fellow. While I think that's a good idea but I'm worried about the appearance of compromise even if someone should get funds with no strings attached. If let's say it's a stakeholder and the group should make a decision in whatever direction we wouldn't want the appearance that we may have made a decision either way because we have some interest.

So I think the appearance of compromise is also something we could look into.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Yes.

Man: Just I am (unintelligible) about this issue of funding and people afraid that because getting may be (unintelligible) sooner that some organization can influence the policy of the NCSG. Because I think if they want really to influence the policy in the ICANN, they can have lawyers and some lobbyist, that they can work better and do better than just try to influence the NCSG works by funding some small different (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Is that a hand?

Man: Yes, okay. I think this one of those things which is going to be much easier to do it reactively rather than proactively. Let's just have the NCSG exec have to vote to accept any given donation and trust to flag anything that they think is going to be problematic.

Avri Doria: And especially since the membership has the ability to decide that the Executive Committee is out of its mind and over turn their decision by vote.

Man: Yes absolutely. I'm not really trying to work out all the potential problems. Let's wait till we get one. Because I don't think we're going to get anything that's - if we get things at all it's probably going to be from relatively uncontroversial sources like safety or something which obviously is all right.

                Someone that - I can suggest sources that are really not very - you know I don't think we're going to get the - general problem for free speech organizations is the porn industry. I don't think they're going to try - go try and get money to NCSG. They'd probably head further down, but more specific down channels and all.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Yes (Didi).

(Didi Hallock): But I'm just telling you that there are people who definitely have a problem with Google funding and noncommercial. These are constituencies.

Avri Doria: Yeah. No, I understand that. Is there anybody in the NCSG that is upset about Google having helped pay for the meeting?

                And we could chat.

                But I understand. And I think it's terrible when all these private corporations give money to help people.

Amber Sterling: This is Amber. Just to sum up, I think if these policies were written down and documented.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Amber Sterling: And they could be - I think that would go a long way. And at least it would show the people looking in that we did think about it and then if we publicly stated who funded what and how much.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Amber Sterling: Or there are ways. But at least you could point to something. And so it would have the transparency that I think at the very least would have helped mollify, you know, the Google concern.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes Debbie.

Debra Hughes: I just want to say maybe this group could come up with a set of recommendations for the EC, you know, take a look at and then we could bring it back.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Debra Hughes: And then (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: No. That's what I was hoping. I was hoping that they would take the content of this conversation and do something good with it.

Yes sir, (Pete), then David and Maria was your hand up? No, okay. Well she can pass.

(Pete):   Just a question, how are we expecting - how much fund (unintelligible)...?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I have no idea.

(Pete):   ...because I thought we were going to talk about guidelines and policy for making (unintelligible) too much over income management control complexities.

Just (in order) to organize an event, Google is - mainly is different for some or different for others. I know that Google for example is I'd say financing some place about freedom of expression, about human rights, etcetera.

So policy, I'm not fond of Google but I don't see why we are focusing on that issue.

As Stakeholder Group needs some finances to help some members to attend an activity and the meetings of ICANN so we can really participate in the different sessions.

So let's try to find some resources to do that. Do not focus on this policy to avoid some conflict of interest. Let's trust each other. That's all.

Avri Doria: Thank you. David.

David Cake: I think doing like a - even a very small policy development process, the hypothetical money that might not exist and the sort of - is probably not the best use of our limited resources. I think transparency is a very good point but transparency can be done retroactively when it happens. If someone offers us money the Exec can explain the rationale in accepting it.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Although I'm not sure we need to hold the policy development classes. I think if somebody came up with five bullet points that were guidelines that's, you know, somewhere softer.

                   Yes, Amber.

Amber Sterling: I already have one good one we can draw on. I don't know about Maria. But I can't imagine a thing longer than three paragraphs.

Avri Doria: Right. So yeah, that's what I was thinking of.

                   Any other issues on Stakeholder Group budgets and fundraising?

                   I'm just feeling good that there's somebody taking responsibility for it. I must say I'm quite excited about that.

                   And I know I should have called on you earlier because you kept saying you were willing and then I just never chased you.

Oh okay. So in which case we're at the any other business part, not that we haven't taken tangents all the way along through - all along the meeting to see if there was any other business. But is there?

He's not here. I don't know but (Bill) did? Was (Bill) here at the beginning? I don't remember seeing him.

No other business? Yes.

Man: Just really briefly. The Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team is properly gearing up for a lot of work this week and will be asking for community thoughts on anything to do with those topics.

I'd really appreciate some comments from the noncommercial area. Sorry. Yeah, think about it.

If you have anything interesting to say about security, stability or resiliency, we'd love to hear it.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you and...

Man: Specifically I'd love to hear it.

Avri Doria: Huh? Anything else? You got something? Yes sir.

Man: Yes. Can you join as much as you can work as much - working group as you can. That's all.

Avri Doria: Right. Yes, definitely encourage people to get involved in the working groups.

Also I don't know if we have anyone here who isn't a member. It's an open meeting so of course they're in. And I'd like to encourage them to become members either individually or the organization. No pressure on you as it's open. The meetings are open and such.

But that doesn't mean that people who come to meetings and have ideas and put projects on our project list aren't welcome to become members.

Yes.

No.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Okay, then don't. I really shouldn't call people before their hands are up. But people have gotten very subtle in this meeting.

There's been the and there's the and then there's the.

And so I've been reading people's personal signs for hands almost up so I apologize if I read you too quickly.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: And then I made it longer by asking you how it was going.

So is there any other business?

If there isn't thank you all and see you next time.

Woman: Yes. Is everyone going to the 5:30 cabs over to CNET for the public
            voice ALAC (unintelligible).

                              END