ICANN Brussels Meeting
Breakfast GNSO Wrap-Up
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 24 June at 08:00 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.

Chuck Gomes: Okay I think that that's the bell for 8:30. So continue to get food and eat.

So let me start off by again thanking everyone on the council for...

Man: I've got to get the recording going.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Man: Waiting for the operator right now. So he - it sounds like he's starting.

Chuck Gomes: Right back there I think. Please start the recording.

Coordinator: Thank you. I will go ahead and get that started. One moment.

Man: Thank you.

Coordinator: Okay this is the operator. I have started the recording and please begin when you're ready.

Chuck Gomes: Okay I'll - want to welcome everyone here for our GNSO Council Follow-up meeting. Please continue to get up and get some food if you like - coffee whatever. I'm sorry the coffee isn't up to standards of Belgium.

The - but again, let me thank everybody for all that you've done over the last - since Saturday morning. We've had very long days, tons of meetings. And I'll report that to the board on Friday morning.

And I know this is an extremely tiring week. But, you know, we get a lot of work done. There's things that are progressing quite nicely. There's decisions that we've made and so forth. And everybody on the council and in the GNSO as a whole is a part of that. So I appreciate that very much.

One little reminder I want to give everybody, especially with regard to the two houses and the stakeholder groups, I hope that you're starting to think about chair and vice-chair election because come Cartagena we will have to have certainly a new chair as I'm termed out this year. Yes, I'm - well it's not a chair term, it's my council term for the registries. This will be the end of my fourth year. And so two terms is all that I'm allowed.

So please be working on that. I know the registries and registrars are trying to finalize our process for those things in the next couple months I hope.

And - but I just wanted to remind everybody to be thinking about that so that the houses can report their elections as needed come - by Cartagena because at the end of the Cartagena meeting we make switches okay?

So now in some cases there are candidates - there are current counselors who's term expires but they're eligible for another term. So I think what that means then if - especially if they're possible candidates for chair or vice chair, make sure you know whether they're going to be re-elected in advance of the other process.

So, just some timing things here, that we don't need to talk about it here because it's really, for the most part, up to the houses and then their two stakeholders groups to deal with that. But I wanted to alert everybody to that.

Now as I said earlier, where we'll start off today is just to critique our public meeting that we held yesterday. And feel free to say anything - good, bad - whatever you feel like saying.

Hopefully, you know, as we do this following each meeting we can learn things that'll help us do it better in the future. Feel free to critique the way I handle the meeting. I'm perfectly comfortable with that. In fact I welcome that.

And, you know, the idea is to learn and get better. And so let me open it up right now to any comments, questions, suggestions that you might have on that meeting. Stefan?

Stefan van Gelder: Just a question. Is there - will - do people on the council want me and Glen to continue working on the agendas we have done for these two meetings for the next one?

Chuck Gomes: Any -- yes, Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible) first is the question of Stefan. I would appreciate that. So I was very comfortable in advance. We've got a very, very comprehensive agenda and very early, very early stage and to see what was going on so that they could intervene and say okay and communicate our need to you. And you also covered that. I very much appreciate that. Thank you very much.

And with regards to the meeting yesterday, from my point of view I felt very comfortable. So just the way, how it quite worked, how it was organized, how it was managed.

The only critique I have is coffee. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: I think that a lot of people that will second that one. By the way, I was informed, I think Glen's the one that informed me of this probably on Saturday that they were (pressing) the coffee and so forth to the vendor area (with the

intention of) forcing people to go buy the booth, which I understand that I guess from a point of view of all those who went to the expense of setting up their booth but it certainly isn't very practical for us meeting in all different locations of a huge facility that - by the time you go down to that area and get back you've used your break time in many cases. So thanks Wolf.

And I agree with you. I - of course I wouldn't have been able to spend the time on the schedule that Stefan and Glen spent. And they did a good job of interacting with us in doing that. So that's for that.

Anybody else want to comment on yesterday's council meeting?

Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: First on the technology, I hope we can find either a way to make Adobe work better with all operating systems or alternatives that allow participation from the Linux based systems even when others are using Adobe because - and I'm sorry that the problem only came up in aid and upgrades. It must have been days before this meeting because my browser kept crashing out of the system. And so, I thank Marika for helping to keep me connected through that.

I also wonder whether we can somehow condense some of the procedural discussions. It felt as though we had a very long meeting for issues on which we could have come to a crisper consensus more quickly.

And I'm not sure whether that's - just means enforcing time limits and assuming that we've been able to hold most of the conversation on the list in advance or making sure we're all familiar with procedural rules and ways to close off debate when it seems that we're repeating ourselves but to help us think through that.

Chuck Gomes: It's a good point. I was thinking up until the break a lot of the stuff we did had to be - and maybe even after the break too had to be terribly uninteresting to people in the audience.

You know, the council -- this is quite a few years ago now -- the council used to design the agenda so that we avoided a lot of those things and kept it simpler, more tuned in to the - to the fact that there was an audience out there.

I guess one of the problems we have to deal with -- and this is a challenge I think that we need to work on is -- in testing it is that, you know, our workload right now is so intense that we need to use this meeting to continue moving forward. And there were some critical things we had to decide yesterday. And we had to do that.

And some of those are - different members of the council had and we had to work through those. To the extent maybe that some of those could be worked through in advance, let me share what happened because most of you here wouldn't have been aware of this.

But in the Nairobi meeting, and let me ask the question (Christine) are you on?

(Christine):   Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Good, thanks. I thought she was coming on and I wanted to make sure. But also there were a subset of us in Reston, Virginia at the Hyatt Regency there in a conference room in the middle of the night when the council meeting was going on. And it was quite fascinating because we weren't up on Sage and visible and so forth. We had the freedom to walk around the room and whisper in each other's ears.

And I think Jeff Neuman who wasn't on the council but who was there as well, he was Skyping with Mary. And (Christina) and I and Tim and who else was there on the council, Caroline.

And we were all discussing things. We weren't in the public eye so we were able to kind of negotiate. And I forget what the difficult issue that was on the agenda that we were all working on and you were working on here. VI. It was VI. Well interesting, VI, okay.

And so - and it was emotion I think that we had to work through. That was great. I wish we could do that kind of thing in the public meeting because we were able to work together and so forth. That's kind of tough to do in the public setting like we have but I found that to be really effective. I don't know if anybody else that was there wants to comment on that.

Mary?

Mary Wong: Well I wasn't at Nairobi (West), although great pictures by the way.

But actually having been at the Nairobi meeting on the days or whatever, I want to agree, I thought that was really one of the more effective ways we worked as a council and as representatives of each of our respective stakeholder groups.

And I remember thinking at the time on stage how nice it would be if our stakeholder group members could actually see how it is that we work through all these various channels - public, semi-public and so forth because then they might understand what it is that we tried to do as a council.

I don't have any constructive suggestion but certainly from Nairobi (East) it seemed pretty effective as well.

Chuck Gomes: Tim?

Tim Ruiz: You know, I was wondering if when we were sitting there on Wednesday if on the - part of our working sessions on Saturday and Sunday shouldn't be a preparatory, more preparatory for that meeting.

But we can do that kind of interaction and get things honed down so that when we're in front of the public eye we can just - we have this motion all set, we're ready to go and all that haggling is, well it sounds negative. All the positive negotiation that we do to get to agreement can be done, you know, during the preparatory meeting.

I mean and that - and I don't suggest that be closed either. I think, you know, that that could be opened. People could see how they work together. That'd be excellent idea.

Chuck Gomes: Things are coming out of this. You know, some of us have criticized the board over the years, their working session in preparation for their board meeting on Friday.

But in essence at least part of what they're trying to accomplish is what we're talking about right here and there is some value for it.

Now key difference being that our working session would be open, yes. So that's really good. I think we may be on to something there. Like if we could have worked through a couple of the key motions where we had some differences, some amendments and done that beforehand and in an open session, that's a good idea.

What do you think about that idea Wendy? Does that sound like it might be one thing we could do?

Wendy Seltzer: Yes. And I think that the interaction is a good thing. And maybe we can - I think that long table was a particularly unfortunate setup because we couldn't

see one another to - even though we were all together in person it was in some ways worse than the phone calls because we didn't have other ways of signaling.

So sure using the supplier meetings, perhaps using the chat more ritually, either the chat that's part of Adobe Connect or a Jabber or IRC chat to be able to exchange some coordinating messages in a side channel.

Chuck Gomes: Both. Okay, Rosemary?

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh, thanks Chuck. And the other side of the coin to that was that I felt it was a little bit of a letdown when the working teams came to give their report.

And because we talked about those in the meetings on Saturday and Sunday, I felt it was a big - a bit of a letdown. So if we change our approach and do some of that stuff on Saturday Sunday and make those more of a discussion interaction session that might work for those folks as well.

Chuck Gomes: Wendy, would you be willing to take the lead with a couple other volunteers and just kind of capture some of this stuff and come back with some recommendations for our Cartagena meeting? (Christina)?

(Christina): I think it's an excellent idea. My only hesitation is that to some extent we need to be able to build in for discussion that occurs on Tuesday.

So I think we should certainly try and do more of that on the weekend, but I think we would have to do so with the understanding that to a large extent it'll be subject to our consultations with our respective constituencies and stakeholder groups.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, because I think most of us used Tuesday on Constituency Day to, you know, finalize where we're at and get the input we need from our stakeholder group and constituency members. Good point. Thank you.

So Wendy would you be willing to kind of - I'm not - we're not looking for something major, just some simple ideas that we can then evaluate, you know, a few meetings from now and then try and implement them in Cartagena?

Wendy Seltzer: Sure and anyone else who's interested in joining that effort just let me know. Thanks Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Tim. Anybody else would like to joint that, just a little group could come back with some recommendations for improving it in Cartagena? Okay, Stefan, go ahead.

Stefan van Gelder: Someone yesterday wrote up -- I forget who it was -- the reading out of the motions and the time that that takes up. I wonder we shouldn't look at that as well.

In a sense it's useful for when we have our phone conferences because people who just listen to the MP3 afterwards, if they haven't been able to read the motion, then they have that motion in front of them.

But it's also true that it takes up a lot of time, especially during our live meetings here. So I wonder if we shouldn't read it at that as well.

Chuck Gomes: Good idea. And one thing that would really facilitate that is having the motions up on the screen so the audience can see it. We all had or most of us had the Adobe Connect working for us. But the audience, you know, did have that.

Now there are links that if they were online they could of - and I tried to mention that to people. But one thing that I think would make it a lot easier too and then we probably wouldn't need to read them and (unintelligible) are

up there so they could be seen. So that's another idea that Wendy and Tim - anybody else want to join them in doing - it's okay if it's just two.

But if someone else wants to and Glen why don't you send a message out to the list because we didn't take roll call. But I think probably there - you know, there may be - work with Wendy and Tim on that and Wendy will take the lead, that would be good to just send a message out. Anyone else want to comment on this?

Liz Gasster: I just have a quick question Chuck. It's Liz. The real-time, I mean having the motions up for the community to see so they wouldn't be able to see the real-time edits.

Marika Konings: We could of course project the Adobe Connect screen. The only thing it would mean if you have slides that it's a lot of back and forth for the tech guys that they need to switch.

But for example what could be done is projecting one we get to the motions projecting the Adobe Connect screen of the council. But they also see the live editing on that screen. That could be an option. It just means that there might be a bit of a delay in getting slides back up and forth but that may...

Chuck Gomes: Now...

Marika Konings: ...be an option.

Chuck Gomes: Now I don't recall whether the board, you actually see the live editing. But the board in their meeting on Friday, they make edits and then they - they post them and so forth. So anyway, another thing that we can work on?

Marika Konings: In the board meeting what they do - do they just project the word screen I think? It's either Dan Halloran or (John Jeffries) that sits behind the screen and they project their screen. That's the word document. And there are

sometimes indeed they do some live editing and see the Word document in there.

But I think (maybe) for us is we're using as well Adobe Connect room for other things, it might the easiest just to project that on the screen so people can see that.

Chuck Gomes: The - now you can't show redline though on Adobe Connect can you?

Marika Konings: That's correct. That's...

Chuck Gomes: And to me -- and maybe I'm alone on this, I don't know -- it's really nice to see exactly what was changed, deleted and added clearly.

So and - and again, let's work through the logistics on this.

Marika Konings: Because the challenge is that if you have people participating remotely they won't be able to see that. Because you cannot do redline at Adobe Connect. So use them basically either or so you can just use the word and show that on the screen for those in the room or those remote won't be able to see that or you use the Adobe Connect so people remotely can actually see it as well.

But indeed you have the limitation there that you cannot do redline. You can use caps for example to distinguish between, you know, old language and new language. But it's not as easy as, you know, red lines.

Chuck Gomes: Are there other software tools that provide more options than Adobe Connect? I have no idea so it's a...

Marika Konings: I've been looking into those but it's not obvious where you then - you know, you have live editing tools but then you don't for example, have the raising hands or chatting or at least, you know, from - we've done a bit of research on that. There doesn't seem to be an ideal tool that suits all purposes.

So one other thing is that we can we really haven't touched that much for example and its sometimes, you know, doesn't work always because it depends of course, Adobe uses bandwidth as well, for example that I could share my screen.

So I would be editing in Word or you show that in Adobe Connect. I think that's something that, you know, we need to see that we can make that practically work. And hopefully that doesn't, you know, affect too many people that are long bandwidth options or, you know, that (won't) see the screen.

So maybe we need to do a bit of testing with that and that might be an option to explore.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Now let me - we have a few people that have joined us here this morning as observers. And I want to pause a second. If any of you, we would be interested in hearing your perspective if you were in the council meeting yesterday in terms of what you thought and what would help you as an observer in that meeting.

If any of you would like to share any thoughts on that regard we've got a mic here. And we'd, you know, I'd love to hear your observations. Yes, please?

Woman: (Well) I love being in the back of the room not actually having to do anything sitting at the front of the table.

I couldn't agree more with Wendy on the construction of the table. It was terrible. When you were sitting in the back of the room you had this long line of people not able to see each other and engage with each other and as Wendy said, signal to each other.

And it looked awful. Just pushing the middle table back and swinging it around to make it sort of a semi-U would have made a huge difference.

Beyond silliness logistical things like that does, no one's in the room listening to you. That's a terrible thing because it even means that it's boring which I don't think it is or it's being run in the wrong way which I don't think it is.

But where is the audience? Where are the stakeholders, not to mean the stakeholder groups, but where is the people that are affected by the decisions? So to me there's a big job of work to do engaging people in the room. And it's unfortunate that it's such a big room and it looks so awful when it's so empty at a time of the day when there's nobody listening.

So that's a significant problem. And all of the issues that were being discussed yesterday were terribly important. And I find them immensely engaging and wish to be - and continue to be part of it.

But unless you have people in the room engaging with you, then the decision-making process might as well just happen around here. It might as well and then just announce the decisions later on.

(I don't know if) you have (terribly) open meetings and everybody's able to participate and (unintelligible). That's a great improvement, shutting up the peanut gallery in the back of the room.

And it used to be anyone could speak and anyone could sit at the table. That's a big improvement because it makes it more efficient.

But the biggest issue for me is sitting in the room and just speaking to no one except yourself.

Chuck Gomes: Anyone else?

Alex Gakaru: This is Alex, just two quick comments. One of them is there was a moment when - where somebody requested for minutes of the meetings you had.

And I think the reaction that we got from the (unintelligible) or the session was it will look very good to the audience because as I told you, you can't get in (unintelligible).

So maybe next time you could press the spot a bit better so that you can feel like you (unintelligible) words maybe you can see you offline and you can be asked what happened because everybody's worried about lobbying for a position or the other.

The second thing I want to make is a general organization which contributes perhaps to the point that I just did mention. The events, the organizations have been back to back not ten minutes or five minutes (inter) right in-between.

But when one ends the next one is meant to start in the (sev) room. So it doesn't - it didn't give us room to move from one room to the other. And that may have contributed to the people not making it to one room or session leaving going to the other.

So maybe in the organization would be necessary future sessions be organized in five minutes at least in-between. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So what your - that last comment had to do then with the different meetings, not so much the council meeting yesterday. Yeah, got it. Sorry about that with my comment there.

We were running out of time and the person who asked the question knew there were no minutes. So it was a loaded question. I probably should have handled it better. But I thank you for that input. Stefan?

Stefan van Gelder: Thanks Chuck. Just to Liz's point about the low participation level in the room during our meeting yesterday. I think we have to bear in mind that those

- this has been an extremely busy week. And the main agenda, there are several sessions running concurrently.

That was the case yesterday for us. I know there was a session on DNS set that people want to go to. I think there was a new gTLD session.

So that was part of the problem there I think, yes. And these meetings in general, not just the GNSO agenda, are getting so full that it is hard to get that.

So not disagreeing with the fact that an empty room looks bad, but I think that may be the reason for it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stefan. (Bill)?

(Bill): Empty room does look bad. But on the other hand it may be related to another factor which is what we had on the agenda to do.

Anybody who would have looked at that agenda would have said geez, they're doing a whole bunch of procedural types of things. There isn't a lot of really juicy substantive stuff going on.

When we've had in my time here both in meetings where we were discussing things like vertical integration and so on, the room was quite full.

So it's simply, I mean if you're - if what we're really concerned about is to ensure that the performance of aspects of the open meeting are optimized, then I guess we have to like consider do we want to hold some things for the open meeting that we might have been working on otherwise and try and structure our work in full so that, you know, we've got this crescendo of decisions on important things happening then rather than a bunch of sort of, you know, how will workings be organized and things like that which people are not going to be quite as excited by (is) natural to me.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Bill). Tim?

Tim Ruiz: And I think too another factor is just the culture that seems to have kind of grown around ICANN meetings because in the evenings, you know, a lot of networking and dinners are late and people don't get back to their rooms quite often till early in the morning.

                 And so 8 o'clock in the morning starting any meeting I think is going to get, you know, a lot less attendance than it would otherwise.

                 I don't know if there's anything you can do about that. But I think that's just a fact that, you know, we have to deal with as well.

Chuck Gomes: Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: I would like just to emphasize that the - you know, working group report seems to be repetitive with - to me. I don't know because there are -these reports aren't being made to the GAC to the other constituencies, to the constituency stakeholder groups to us before and (unintelligible).

                 So and many of these are open to the (beyond). And so people can - keeps receiving the same message many times. And I think an overall arrangement of the workgroup report not to be - not to really so repeated in so many instances right, don't know if it would be (better).

Chuck Gomes: Good. Terry?

Terry Davis: Yes Chuck, I guess I was going to agree with (Bill). Our meeting was (unintelligible) session.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Terry. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yes just sitting here listening to this discussion I'm just wondering even this - or another way to see it isn't this kind of good in a way that it is - a lot of the actual debate should be taking place in the working group.

And if things of substance are discussed so much then we have the other side of the problem Jeff who will definitely come up and say this discussion should not be happening at the council. So just (showing) that perspective as well.

Chuck Gomes: Don't want the council communicating. Stefan?

Stefan van Gelder: I don't know who it was that made the point that 8 o'clock is too early. I want to second that. And this meeting is normally held at - I think we normally do it at 12:00 don't we Chuck or something?

But the agenda this time just apologize to you all which is planning the agenda just - it became impossible to find another slot for this meeting. So that's just another example of how busy we are.

I think we will be extremely busy this week. And if we can, we will, you know, going forward, move this session back to its 12 o'clock slot.

Chuck Gomes: And just a little insight information here. Stefan was lobbying for canceling this meeting last night. Anybody else on our public meeting? Yes (Bill)?

(Bill):   Just a completely uninformed question. Has the council always met Wednesday morning for 4 hours? Is it impossible to hedging doing it in the afternoon and organizing some of the - don't normally know what the constraints are.

Chuck Gomes: That's a legitimate question. And what I would suggest is that Stefan and Glen, we need to bring this up really early. We can't wait till the staff has started working on scheduling.

But I would suggest in the next couple months Jeff raise that question with them with regard to the council meeting.

Good question. I mean I don't know. I mean obviously it's always difficult scheduling regardless of the time of day. But if some of the sessions that we know are going to generate more interest, our schedules early in the morning.

You might not have that problem. But good, good question. Anyone else? Anyone else from the - behind me here that wants to say anything?

Not crazy about these long narrow rooms, but every facility we go to is always different. Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Regard to the topics, they may be more of interest or less of interest to the (content) to the audience. I - (I've) got the impression and I compare meetings, public meetings, country meetings in the public ICANN meetings and our normal sessions every three weeks we have. Those sessions are getting you to (unintelligible) well to be more involved in the preparation for those - I mean for those public meetings.

It means that more effort is given to all these work which has to be done to be moved here at those meetings rather than in our (we) try weekly session we have.

So I wonder whether it's - it would be possible not also to be so well organized for our council calls. That means that we could move those more managerial work during those sessions (through journals) of public.

And then post or do our efforts more (unintelligible) our efforts more on topics which may be of more interested for the public during the public meetings.

And what I mean (again) that the organization work should be more done during our council calls which are not so publicly visited and other topics which may be more interested for the public could be then extensively discussed here in those sessions here like in the meetings.

Chuck Gomes: Not seeing any other hands and there's - and you'll let me know if (Christina) wants to - yes, (David)?

(David): Just a comment because I know the board had said the other day that we were the masters of our own destiny and their own workload.

And certainly and coming to a Sunday morning meeting starting at 8 o'clock is radical in many ways because there's not many places where you have 8 o'clock meetings on a Sunday morning.

And I just got a question - well not (being) a question, a thought. But the fact is the 6 o'clock swap's still free throughout the week. So we need to be careful because the agenda gets bigger and bigger maybe we'll find ourselves at 6:00 am meetings.

Chuck Gomes: Okay let's take a few minutes and see if there are any comments on the overall schedule for the week. Does anybody have anything you'd like to share or ask in regard to that? (Bill)?

(Bill): I don't know if this is the moment for it or not, but it's not about what we've done this week but it's looking forward to Cartagena.

As I've said to you before, I think it would be sensible if we could find a way to schedule some chuck of time to have a discussion of the council's role and how people (understand it), having an hour at some point in Cartagena.

The other thing I was going to suggest, I don't know if everybody was in the GAC meeting. But some of us were fairly floored by the GAC's turnaround on morality and public order.

After years of saying that we didn't see that there was an international legal principal here that interpreted by (unintelligible). GAC turnaround and say, you know, geez, we just read the DAG and we find there's this (thing there) that we didn't - don't think works. It was kind of interesting given their prior position.

And it just strikes me as something that just is - I would think that this is something that maybe it might make sense for them really to sort of cross community working groups to try to address and it would make sense for council to be much involved in that.

I think that this is (unintelligible) fairly quickly. (Unintelligible) hoping that what they have in mind. So it's just a suggestion that these are two items we might think about.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Bill). If I only had some hope that the GAC would participate. It's so hard. Yes, it's so hard to get them involved.

Caroline?

Caroline Greer: This is your first point though, a conversation on, you know, role of (concert) and (unintelligible). I think we should have that conversation sooner rather than later and, you know, perhaps even finding the conclusions, you know, not that I think it's going to be that serious of a workload or a project and just clarifying it in Cartagena but at least having had the (unintelligible).

Folks who are petitioned I don't know what to expect is (unintelligible). I'm also wondering about the board GNSO dinner on Sunday. I mean personally I

thought it worked quite well. And Dennis Jennings had a couple of suggestions as well. You know, (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Did we refer Dennis to Jeff? Terry?

Terry Davis: If I realized it generated some controversy. But I found it very helpful to have the session with the board.

Chuck Gomes: Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yes but, you know, I even talked to Jeff a little bit later. Just seeing -- and I don't know if he was even here this morning -- but it just seemed to me that maybe it wasn't so much that we had the session it's just that the way it occurred raised questions about what went on and, you know, whether the discussions were appropriate and that kind of thing.

That might be something we can give some thought to is - because I know it creates a dilemma otherwise. But I think that was - that was probably generated more questions than the fact that we had it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and of course as I promised I communicated with the co-chairs or the Working Group, (supplied) detail and let them ask questions.

And I encouraged all the Working Group members on the council that were in the meeting also to feel free to share anything that you wanted to on that.

If I had to do it over again, one thing I would do different is I would have invited the co-chairs to that meeting. I actually suggested that and I got a strong reaction from a couple counselors.

And in hindsight I said, you know, I should have held my ground on that just to have them there if nothing else just to observe would have made a big difference I think. I don't know, could be wrong on that.

But your point's well taken. It was kind of a novel idea that was dynamic. It came up. The only way to make it happen in a in person meeting on this topic was this week as you all know. So I don't need to explain that to you. Stefan.

Stefan van Gelder: As one of the strong reactors I want to come out of the closet. But the reason why at the time I thought it wasn't a good idea was that I didn't see this session while we were discussing it as a VI session solely. It become one, but the idea was - I think it was Caroline was talking about communication. And that was the idea behind it.

I think we all found - we were all in agreement before the dinner that it was a useful thing to have when the question was put to us by (Peter), should we continue.

And I think we came out of that dinner with the certainty in our heads that it is a useful thing to do. And Dennis then suggested that, you know, we may also - that there's that social event. But what about the communications event that we could also have? And that's what we were trying to do.

So it turned out to be a VI session. That may have been unfortunate because it's the topic of the day and it's slightly controversial. But I think the idea behind that is to continue just increasing the communication between us and the board maybe.

I don't know if the board's okay with that but I think there's a will in this room to do that.

Chuck Gomes: By the way Stefan and Glen, keep in mind Dennis's suggestion as we're planning for Cartagena meeting that's a very good idea.

And obviously you already captured (Bill)'s suggestion to have a time. And I'm not sure an hour would be enough. We may need a couple hours open to the community to talk about the role of the council.

By then we should be finalized - hopefully will have finalized the Working Group's implementation recommendations and the PDP implementation recommendations and so forth. So those are important items.

By the way, I did tell Mikey and Roberto that as soon as I can find time I will try to respond in more detail with regard to what happened in that meeting. I just have been buried literally this week.

And so if they want me to I'll ask again before I raise it if they'd rather or not me even bring it up again I will.

I did email Ron Andruff and say if he wanted to talk one on one I'd be helpful to him. He was one of the people that commented, but more than happy to do that. I just, you know, didn't see any light of the day. And as soon as I respond, what I anticipate is a whole string of questions that are going to go on for a while. So I just didn't have the time to commit to that right then. Stefan?

Stefan van Gelder: Yes (Clarence) just reminded me that a point came up when we were organizing the dinner and communicate - as you know we sent out - we reached out to board members asking them if they had topics.

First of all I think congratulations to Chuck because we changed the format very last minute. I think it worked very well. So congratulations there, the format this time being that, you know, we had set tables with topics on those tables and people could go to the tables and determine their own topics which is not something that we've done before. And that may have helped make those dinners more interesting.

But one of the suggestions that was made by one board member before when we're organizing it before this meeting was that we had these dinners without staff.

Now I don't know the history behind that. I think that was something that had come up beforehand. Chuck you may have been able to help on that.

But it is something that's worthwhile discussing. Just for planning purposes it makes a lot of difference because the budgets are getting tighter. And if you don't have staff you have less people so it's cheaper.

But we may also want to discuss whether, you know, the interaction with the staff and the board at those meetings is useful or not. I don't know.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yes, you know, I kind of raised that issue, not that I think that staff should not be involved. I (unintelligible). My only concern was that it seemed like at some of the dinners because of the number of counselors and staff together there wasn't an opportunity to interact with as many of the board members at the dinner, right, because the tables were, you know, 3/4 staff and council. And you might have one or two board members.

And I was much - at least at our table it was great. We had three board members. So that was very good. Just what I just want to make sure is that the council has sufficient opportunity to interact with the board (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Tim. Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Well we had a lovely dinner but no board members interested in working (newer) model. Lovely dinner by the way Wolf right with Liz and Ken and others.

So comment maybe we have to consider that so the next time list of issues or Wolf, I don't know if you have any other thing to add.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible) the table was nice (really so). But we ended up with, not with a board member, but this is special advisor to the Chairman, to the ICANN CEO.

So he was not aware of anything of our topic, you know. So but, okay, he tries to convince him that the (topic) also to communicate to us. Okay, anyway so that's - by (unintelligible) that means okay for the preparation of such dinners it would be nice or it would be good I would say if in advance of the board members would be allocated to those topics (really see) okay, is there - is it of interest to the board or is it not?

Chuck Gomes: Well of course we tried that. And I think three board members responded to what (Bruce) distributed and what I sent out. So maybe we just need to start that a lot earlier. I don't know. Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Maybe if the topics were presented to the board they could exclude some if there is not interest from them.

Chuck Gomes: So not only ask for their preferences but ask for...

Jaime Wagner: Yes, present them the options and feel free to exclude any that there is no interest.

Chuck Gomes: (David)?

(David):   That was on the table. It was (unintelligible) average I think is - I already mentioned already but was the idea of having a council board meeting first for now where we do for an hour and (unintelligible) then follow-up straight up with the social and have a natural tendency together with whatever subject they were discussing I want to carry on or not (indication).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Caroline?

Caroline Greer: (Unintelligible) there is no board members in the Working Group
                  (unintelligible) prioritize that project so highly. And I think yes, getting the
                  subjects in advance and, you know, maybe even hear of a random selection
                  of counselors and board members, you know, pre-allocation and that if we
                  dated the subjects, 400 in advance we could also (unintelligible) but we
                  (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Good, Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer: I like (David)'s suggestion a lot. And some of the board members at our table
                  were commenting and somewhat questioning why it is that the council
                  doesn't have a formal meeting with the board at these meetings when it's
                  troops are on to all of the constituencies and stakeholder groups and other
                  SOs that may be not every meeting but once a year at least we might have a
                  formal meeting. And then that might flow quite nicely into social drinks or
                  dinner.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, jumping back to the VI topic, I think everyone here knows that. But that
                  was actually a suggestion from a board member. So if anybody asks and
                  wonders. Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Well we ended up having a formal meeting with the board here yes, semi-
                  formal. It was a semi-formal.

                  And I think I strongly agree with (David) and Wendy.

Chuck Gomes: Is there anyone, like Wendy volunteered on our - to work with Tim on, you
                  know, some ideas for our public meeting and so forth. Is there anybody that
                  would like to take the lead maybe in developing working with somebody else
                  on the council to focus on the board, the interaction with the board whether

it's one meeting or two or one that's split into two parts or whatever? Anybody want to take a lead on that?

Okay, Terry? Anybody - who would - okay (David)? Okay, anybody else? I mean two's good. I'm not pushing for more but okay thanks, appreciate that. Jaime? Jaime, Zahid? Stefan? Stefan's not here is he?

Did you want - Zahid, did you want to join them? Okay, thanks. This is the day always where I start to - you know, you start to relax a little bit and then it hits you. All of us know that I think.

So we're running out of time. So to me this is invaluable time because great critique has happened.

Let me just real quickly open it back up to the people behind me. Is there anyone that wants to add anything? All right, thanks. Thanks for coming. Oh you sure may Liz. Thanks for reminding me.

Liz Gasster: Oh thanks. This is a little mundane. Oh I'm sorry, (Bill)?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: Sure. Okay, just want to briefly mention right now ICANN uses the social text wiki. And we're going to be moving away from that to a new wiki that is called (Confluence). It's by Atlassian, A-T-L-A-S-S-I-A-N.

There's some reasons why we did that. There's some benefits in terms of better editing, stronger security. It costs less. It has stronger version control which might be useful and some other capabilities that are nice.

It's going to be phased out - phased in a sort of phased approach over a six month period where the existing wiki will remain up and workable. And there'll

be a migration of data. And then at some point we'll begin operating in the new space with both of the wikis operational for about a three month period.

I know that the communities of wikis varies or, you know, the wiki pages varies dramatically. So for some of you this just may be of no consequence really.

But for others there may be training that you'll be interested in taking. And we'll provide more information on that. And also probably for working group chairs and for other working group participants to the degree that working groups correctly use the wiki.

So I just wanted to mention that quickly. There will be more information coming about opportunities for training. I've been using it without training and just by myself. It's sort of functional. So I don't think it's really daunting unless you do a lot of complex stuff but just wanted to mention it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Liz. (Bill)?

(Bill):   I don't want to sound like a broken record but I - probably I didn't frame my comment before about the morality public order in the right format. So you replied that it's hard to get tax people involved so let me try again.

Tax people I've talked had ALAC plans to (coordinate) a group to talk about morality and public order.

So I told them NCSG is happy to work with them on this. But let me refrain, I think it would be more appropriate if it was council that was expressing a willingness to work with them on this.

So I guess what I'm asking is since there are people in the other two groupings who is - (unintelligible) who intends to do something about this,

would the council like to join or can we have an expression of council interest to participate?

Chuck Gomes: Anybody have a problem with us expressing our interest as a council? You need to go back to your stakeholder groups and...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Bill): Well we have - were you in the GAC meeting? You should read Milton's blog. Actually he's quite good at this.

But the - in a rather interestingly heated and packed room GAC meeting the other day, the GAC with the United States curiously in the lead and quite intensively said basically they don't like the morality and public order section of the DAG and they wanted out.

And of course some board members said gee, that's nice that you don't like it. Could you give us some idea of what maybe you like instead? And they said no, that's not our job. We're not going to - the GAC doesn't have to tell you what it ought to be. We just tell you what it shouldn't be.

And so given that that's the case, there is then a curious limbo situation where you've got the GAC saying that here to, heretofore highly controversial and problematic section of the DAG has to be replaced with something.

So therefore there are people who have an interest in this trying to think out, think through what if anything something might be.

Should it be simply that we have nothing there and the other provisions of the DAG that deal with community objections or whatever else would be sufficient or do we have to have some other kind of provision?

And it's entirely possible that if left to their own devices, government should come up with something that's (fresh) than what we have.

So in any event it seems to me that people are going to be having this conversation, it would be sensible for the council or if the council doesn't want to, stakeholder groups participating in an effort to try to brainstorm a bit about what the alternatives might be.

Chuck Gomes: So the ALAC and the GAC have agreed to work together on this. And the...

(Bill):   There are people in the GAC and there are people in the...

Chuck Gomes: My mistake.

(Bill):   ...(unintelligible) who are saying let's do a (thing). I don't know that it's percolated up to the level of the GAC formally calling for that. But I was told by one GAC member that they thought it would be in the communiqué...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Bill):   ...a call for creation of a cross community group.

Chuck Gomes: So why don't we approach it the say way? Who in the - on the council or in your group -- it doesn't have to be counselors -- restricted to counselors -- would like to participate on that?

So we've got - let's get these names captured. Okay, so Caroline and Zahid and Jaime and Olga and (Bill).

And again, if we could put a message out on this Glen to anybody else from the stakeholder groups - Mary. Okay.

So and we're out of time. We need to turn this room over. But - so and if anybody else wants to. So we've got some definite - and from a variety of - a good variety of stakeholder groups that - that's excellent. Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Thank you. Now just to clarify because we haven't cleared any of this with RSGs. These would be individual capacities yes? And this is not sort of a policy decision or anything from the council per se? Just wondering?

Chuck Gomes: Sounds like we're going down a dangerous path doesn't it?

Zahid Jamil: I know. And we get asked about (cheaper) meetings so...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And don't hesitate to refer people to me on that meeting. It really was my doing in response to some stuff that happened. I can - I will be happy to handle questions and so forth.

Thanks again. We do need to close so that the - this next meeting can start. And it's - it is the (Pedner) PDP Working Group here. So we need to quickly get out of their way and let them take over. And I think we've even left some breakfast for them if they want it.

So thanks guys. Thanks for everything this week and for this great interaction right here -- much appreciated.

Woman: NCSG counselors will you please check your email too from emails from me?

END