ICANN Geographic Regions Drafting Group Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 18 August 2008 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Geographic Regions drafting group teleconference on 18 August 2008, at 14:00 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-geo-regions-20080818.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - Group Leader - NomCom appointee
Chuck Gomes - Registry c. Council vice chair
Philip Sheppard - CBUC
Tony Harris - ISP
Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

Absent - apologies
Ken Stubbs - Registry c.

Staff:
Rob Hoggarth
Glen de Saint Gery

Olga Cavalli: Good morning to everyone. Do we have Chuck on the line? Hi Chuck

Chuck Gomes: Hi.

Olga Cavalli: We have...

Glen DeSaintgery:(Tony Harris).

Olga Cavalli: We have (Tony). We have...

Glen DeSaintgery:(Philip).

Olga Cavalli: Hi (Philip).

Philip Sheppard: Hello.

Olga Cavalli: (Tim) and myself.

Glen DeSaintgery:(Tim Ruiz).

(Tim Ruiz):   Here.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery:And Robert Hoggarthfor staff support.

Olga Cavalli: Oh okay.

Glen DeSaintgery:And myself.

Olga Cavalli: And (Rob) and Glen. Okay. Glen could you do the roll call for the, to see who is on the call so it's recorded?

Glen DeSaintgery:Thank you (Olga). I'll do that. (Tony Harris)?

(Tony Harris):   Yes. I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery:Chuck Gomes?

Chuck Gomes: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery:Philip Sheppard?

Philip Sheppard: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Tim Ruiz)?

(Tim Ruiz):   Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Olga Cavalli?

Olga Cavalli: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: And Robert Hoggarth as staff?

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Present.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Good morning/afternoon. It's morning for me. I think it's morning for many of us or those who are in Europe it's afternoon. And I would like to thank you for the comments that you sent on the list and the principles change and some other issues that have been put by myself in the document.

I don't know if you all received it. Did you see it?

Man: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: Yeah, I mean I have the latest document.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I sent a new version yesterday which includes some other comments sent by (Chuck) and some other comments afterwards and, I think by (Tim) and by (Philip). And I proposed an agenda for the call.

But before that I would like to know when do we want to make the next meeting. As far as I know and Glen was so kind to tell me that next Monday it's a holiday in the United States and...

Glen DeSaintgery:No. Not next Monday, the first of September.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, sorry. Sorry. Sorry. I'm so sorry. I get confused. So next Monday we will do our meeting and we should think about what to do in the first of September. Just keep that in mind. And perhaps we can exchange some different dates and times to agree on a date.

Or if those in the States want to do on a holiday just, we should agree on when, meeting on the first, instead of the first of September. By the way, today is a holiday so (Tony) and myself we are in our respective homes working for the working group.

(Tony Harris):   That's true.

Olga Cavalli: That's true. Okay. One thing that I include in the, in the first part of the document that I sent it, it's some issues with, (interrelation) with the mission of our group. When we had our last call last Monday I was, in a moment I was quite confused.

And I thought that I needed to go back and to check which was the scope of the group of our, of our job. So I went to the board resolution and I also went

to an e-mail sent by (Denise Michel) afterwards asking the (unintelligible) so some input from us.

And I included them in the first part of the document. And this was not a principle but I thought it was interesting that at least for me to be clear in what we should do in the group and with a document that could come out as an output from our work.

So I propose to review that if you agree and then to review the principles that you have been sending. I have some questions about some of them. Perhaps you also have some. And then we could perhaps refine it or define a specific wording or keep on working on that and see which are our next steps.

One thing I wanted to do but I had really no time this week, I wanted to go further with the list that (Rob) prepared with ICANN and United Nations on RAR regions. And what I wanted to do is to include all the countries in it but I really had no time to do that.

And maybe I could try to do it during this week to see, to check about balance and to see if we want to say something about that and to suggest something new about regions or just discuss among ourselves about that. So do you agree with this proposed agenda?

Do you want to take something out of it, to include something new issues in it or any suggestions about it?

(Chuck):   The only comment I'd make (Olga), this is (Chuck), is...

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

(Chuck):   ...that you know I think we should minimize how much work we do that would ultimately be done by the communitywide working group. I don't think it hurts to start exploring some thoughts in that regard. But I think that the mission is fairly clear on what we need to do and...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   ...to the extent that we get that done and still want to talk about maybe some thinking that will be done by the communitywide working group I'm not opposed to that. But I think we ought to accomplish the primary mission first which I think you're intending.

                So I'm not suggesting that you're suggesting...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   ...anything different from that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any comments, any other comments about the agenda?

Man: No, sorry, except to say I agree with (Chuck). And I thought that in fact on our last call we had already agreed universally...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: ...to say yes on the first point of the mission...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: ...in terms of yes we should, we believe there should be a communitywide
                        working group and the GNSO...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: ...should be a part of it. So that's worth recording I think.

Olga Cavalli: I, I agree with you. I just want and I needed (unintelligible) at least for
                        myself...

Man: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: ...to go backwards and check the, our scope of work. One thing that (Chuck)
                        has commented that he sent to the list and I think is a relevant comment , it's
                        that I copied/pasted the word at large. It says geographic regions
                        (unintelligible) to the at large community. And I had the same doubt about
                        why at large was in capital or not.

                        And perhaps we could ask what if (unintelligible) from the sub has any
                        comment about this, this wording was sent by (Denise Michel) in an e-mail
                        sent to the GNSO to, specifically to (unintelligible) in the chart. And then it
                        was submitted to the GNSO list.

                        I think that I agree with (Chuck) that at large should not be written in caps and
                        it's talking about general ICANN community. But we should ask staff to
                        clarify this or we just take that it means about the general ICANN community.
                        What do you think?

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...sent an e-mail to (Denise) and haven't gotten a response. She's probably
                out. But I did that right after our meeting so...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay, so...

Rob Hoggarth: This is (Rob)...

Olga Cavalli: ...we, yes?

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. This is (Rob). She has been traveling and I think was scheduled for
                some vacation time as well. But I will follow up with (Denise) as well to
                provide clarification to you all on that.

(Tony Harris): I think that's...

Olga Cavalli: And (Rob)...

(Tony Harris): ...very, I think that's very important because...

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. My sense is...

(Tony Harris): ...the way we discuss this and look at it I think could differ between the
                supporting organizations and the GNSO. I think there are some different ways
                they can look at this.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. Thank you (Tony). Again this is (Rob). The way that the letter is
                written I believe particularly since it says structure to the at large community
                in general and to the value of the communitywide working group specifically.
                My sense is that that applies to at large non caps but I will confirm that with
                (Denise).

Man: And it's - and it's a real simple fix. Actually the simple fix is probably just to totally remove at large to just eliminate any possible confusion and it's just the community in general.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. That's a good point.

Man: Yeah. I sort of have, I've given this request has come anyway as a reaction to the CCSA report. (Unintelligible) at all if this was specifically the at large organization.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. My sense is that's probably a typo but (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah. I'm sure it is.

Olga Cavalli: And yes. I totally agree with you but I think that we perhaps should check with (Denise) if there is, if it's really the whole community. And I agree with (Chuck)'s comments (unintelligible) that should say structure the community in general. I like that wording perhaps more than at large.

                        It could be confused with the supporting of (unintelligible) of ICANN.

Man: I agree.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So (Chuck) just let us know when (Denise) sends some information about that.

(Chuck):   And (Rob) said he's going to follow up on that too.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So going through our list of principles what I did is I included them in the table and I put the principle and some comments that were exchanged in the list. I think, I hope I covered all of your thoughts and your suggestions. And perhaps let me know if I missed some of them.

And I included the initials of each of the proposals sent by whom, (Chuck), myself, (Philip). And I, do you want me to go one by one? I have some questions about some of them and perhaps you have some others perhaps to clarify or to change somehow the wording.

Do you think that's right to do or you want to add some new principles and then go through the whole list? Any ideas?

(Chuck):   (Olga) this is (Chuck) again.

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

(Chuck):   Maybe, I'd like to suggest a process idea. As I was reviewing the principles there are different kinds of principles that we're talking about here. Some like for example that first one that I have really has more to do with the mission of this communitywide group. And others have more to do with, with the work of the group itself in terms of examining geographical regions themselves.

And so I think it would be helpful and by the way I'm okay with the way you want to proceed, but as we do that we might group them into different areas so that that'll kind of as we go, naturally help us organize the principles that we have.

Because I don't think they're all principles for the same purpose. Some principles are for evaluating the geographic regions. Other principles are more for the mission of the community working group and there maybe other groups that we'd have as well.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments about what (Chuck) is proposing?

Philip Sheppard: (Unintelligible). I support that also just to say I think that even with our existing, what's already written I think I mean a number of them were actually paraphrases of each other. There's very little I disagree with in the principles sections.

But I think some of them are repetitive of the same ideas so we also need to consolidate when we group.

(Chuck):   Right.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with (Chuck) and also with (Philip). I was going to do that by myself but I thought it was not fair to not sharing with you which kind of different grouping I could go forward.

So I think it's a good idea. (Chuck) do you have in mind some different categories that we should group just by having a first revision of the principles or perhaps we can, we can keep on defining them as we go by through the text.

(Chuck):   Yeah, I'm okay with just going through them in order right now. But as we do that we can, we can group them. The two groups, I mentioned two groups there maybe others.

One group is, and I came up with this one because I realized that the first one I communicated really is more about the mission of this communitywide working group than it is about geographic regions themselves.

So the two categories that I automatically think of is okay, first of all the task of the communitywide working group and that, I think the first, that's one category. So in other words...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   ...it's not the (pulse) related to the functioning of that group and its mission. Second category is principles related to the review of geographic regions themselves. And I'm sure there maybe others. Those are the two that naturally fall out in my mind.

Olga Cavalli: So okay. One is task of the wide working group and related, and the second, the review of the region. Okay. And then let's go one by one perhaps and we afterwards we'll read each of them. We perhaps could specify in which category we want to group them.

I also think that there are some principles that are similar in between. And perhaps we could ask as (Philip) said, we could consolidate the text in one principle that covers both visions which could be similar.

So I will start with the first one sent by (Chuck). The order just is as they came to the list. It's not reference order or I think I put it first because I think it's more important. It's only the first come first in, that's criteria which could not be the final order of our principle list.

Okay. You want me to read the first one or just we all have it in the computer, the topic of the makeup of ICANN geographical regions must be considered in the context of the geographical region requirements imposed on all ICANN organizations.

And hence those requirements should be reviewed and possibly adjusted in conjunction with any proposed changes to the regions themselves. I would like to change the first part of it, the topic of the makeup of ICANN's geographic regions.

I, perhaps we can, I would suggest any other wording that I cannot think about now but I could perhaps, I'm not sure if I like that, makeup of ICANN geographic regions. What do you think (Chuck)?

(Chuck):   I'm flexible. I'm not terribly thrilled with my wording myself. But I was trying to come up with something that expressed the concept. So I'm open to suggestions.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Anyone has a comment to (Chuck) about this principle?

Man: I think it's a, I think it's quite a good, it's quite a good way to start because you do have to consider the current makeup of, let's say how we are currently defining the regions. And from that putting some requirements on how we make the GNSO council. So if we make any changes obviously we have to look at how that will be affected.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. It's very difficult to seriously consider geographical regions without at the same time considering the impact it's going to have. And the requirements in the ICANN bylaws for the different SOs and etc. are really critical in that regard.

So I don't think the mission that was given of you know in, for this particular communitywide working group necessarily included this. But I think it needs to be included.

Man: Yes, and I...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: ...would also add for the work of the nominating committee which I participated in for years, they, when you have an election process within the nominating committee very often you will have the situation where you have a slate of candidates.

                But for certain positions like board seats or GNSO council seats only, you can only choose candidates from certain regions because otherwise it would provide an imbalance. So that has an impact also on the way people get elected through the nominating committee.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any other comments on the first principle as suggested by (Chuck)? So...

(Chuck):   And anybody that can come up with better wording feel free. I'm not...

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) I don't like the...

(Chuck):   But I...

Olga Cavalli: ...the makeup. That's maybe a problem with the wording. But it maybe it's my English which is not so wide. Okay, we go then to the principle suggested by

(Philip). I respected the numbering you sent (Philip) and then I took out other numbering so we were not confused.

But it's not that I, I just made that change because you put different numbers up to seven. Okay. Number one sent by (Philip) ICANN regions are relevant to the GNSO with respect to creating an implementation of mechanism for diversity of GNSO council members. I personally agree with it. Any comments about it?

(Chuck): Yeah, let me make a comment. This may come up with a third (unintelligible), this is really kind of a nice intro statement. It's maybe less of a principle than a statement of why this is important to the GNSO. It would fit good into an introductory section of our response.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we could think about using it as an introduction of the document.

Philip Sheppard: This is (Philip). I mean first of all if we're thinking of categories it might also work for other people. I mean maybe the category is just one of relevance. We're stating relevance to us and...

(Chuck): Yeah. That's good.

Philip Sheppard: ...relevance, relevance to other people that exist elsewhere.

Olga Cavalli: So what are you suggesting (Philip)?

Philip Sheppard: The category for this I think should be relevance.

(Chuck): And that's good. And I think that...

Philip Sheppard: Because wheat we're saying within that is as far as the GNSO is concerned this is irrelevant. But we know there's relevance to other people of geographical regions. I mean (Tony) just gave a good example of that as well.

(Chuck): Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: We don't need to add all principles for that but this would help also perhaps the thinking of the communitywide group later.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck): That's good.

Olga Cavalli: Great. (Unintelligible). Okay, number two, application of diversity based on regions will need to be revised in the forthcoming new structure of the GNSO council. Here I have a question (Philip).

Diversity, I think in my perspective, diversity should be always be relevant for the whole ICANN issues and for the whole GNSO no matter which is the new structure. And this is when I think should we say this here or it is obvious that diversity should be always present for any kind of structure that the GNSO will end up having that that's my question.

(Chuck): But I don't think this is talking about whether diversity should be applied or not. It's just pointing out that, that with the forthcoming new structure and the GNSO this whole idea of geographic regions needs to be worked in that context. So...

Man: So the application of those regions.

(Chuck):   Yeah, right.

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: What it's doing is picking up wording from the first principle there and the
key phrase is the application of diversity based on regions will need to be
revised. It's saying a similar thing to (Chuck)'s first (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Yeah, that's right. So that's actually the two could be in the same group
although it's, this is certainly specific to the GNSO.

Philip Sheppard: It's like a subset of the general point that (Chuck) makes in the second part of
his...

(Chuck):   Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: Right. Right.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: I think it's good because as (Philip) says you're talking about the application
which gets to (Chuck)'s concern about let's say the (GTLE) registry not
having perhaps sufficient members from other regions other than Europe and
the US.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we keep it? That's a question...

(Chuck):   Oh yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...I have.

(Chuck):   It's a good one.

Olga Cavalli: Number three, the existing ICANN regions present problems of imbalance. I totally agree.

Man: I don't agree with that but so...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   Well let me make a different comment. I would say that that is less of a principle than it is a value judgment.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Man: Exactly.

Man: That's true.

Olga Cavalli: So and then it's number four and it changed to ICANN regions should improve on this imbalance I think should be together with three if we decide to keep it or modify it. It's like the same one with different parts. (Tony) you said...

Man: It could be combined with...

Olga Cavalli: ...you don't agree?

Man: ...principles.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry.

(Tony Harris):   I don't agree.

Olga Cavalli: You don't agree? Could you clarify why?

(Tony Harris):   I don't think we have in the GNSO a problem of imbalance today due to the regions. And I think possibly a safer wording would be that the existing ICANN regions or the review of the existing situation with the ICANN defined regions should be checked for possible problems of imbalance.

                     But I wouldn't state that the problem exists.

(Tim Ruiz):   What if we were to say that...

(Tony Harris):   I think it's pretty fair the way it's setup now as far as with the five regions.

((Crosstalk))

(Tim Ruiz):   ...to a single principle...

Olga Cavalli: (Tim)?

(Tim Ruiz):   ...that says that the ICANN regions should provide balance.

(Tony Harris):   That's okay.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you very well (Tim) could you repeat?

(Tim Ruiz):   That we combine the two into a single principle that just basically says that the ICANN regions however designated should provide balance.

(Tony Harris): That's fine.

(Tim Ruiz):   Or an opportunity for balance, something of that nature.

Man: Balance of what?

(Tim Ruiz):   Of representation.

(Chuck):   One way of combining them and I think they, if we just made one principle like (Tim)'s suggesting, we can say any change to ICANN regions should improve on any identified imbalance.

(Tony Harris): That would be fine if you don't want to get into the value judgment. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Could you repeat it (Chuck) please?

(Chuck):   Sure. Any change to ICANN regions should improve on any identified imbalances.

Olga Cavalli: On any identified imbalances. Well that's, that's, I think it avoids talking about the imbalance that (Tony) wants to, not to mention. And it mentions that if there is imbalance it should be improved.

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: I mean just let me interrupt here. I'm happy with deleting my three and making the changes suggested. I mean just for clarity what I was picking out

there was the fact I don't think we do have a problem with the GNSO but I recognize that in particular the current Asia-Pacific one region is sought by many in particular the CCNSOs to be an element of imbalance.

But I say for our perspective we don't need to get into that so I'm happy with the change.

(Chuck): Now (Philip) you make me think of something else though in what you've just said. And that is - is that the whole concept of imbalance probably shouldn't just be evaluated in ICANN as a whole but it maybe a different situation depending on the specific sub organization within ICANN.

So an imbalance in the CCNSO may not be the same as an imbalance in the GNSO. In fact they may not even be factors. That's kind of an important point.

(Tim Ruiz): Then does that, does that potentially (hint), this is (Tim), does that potentially hint at another principle that might be considered? And that is that a single set of region designations may not work the same for each supporting organization or advisor committee?

Man: I think it does.

(Tim Ruiz): Which makes things more complicated but...

((Crosstalk))

(Tim Ruiz): ...could be the reality of it.

Olga Cavalli: Could you repeat it (Tim)?

(Tim Ruiz):   That a single, that a single set of designated regions may not work well for all supporting organizations or maybe all organizations within ICANN.

Olga Cavalli: May not work for some supporting organizations within ICANN? A single set of designated regions may not work for some supporting organizations within ICANN? This is what you said?

(Tim Ruiz):   Right. Right.

Olga Cavalli: I'm trying to write them down so if we want to use them just I have the wording in the document. Okay.

Man: Let's focus on that just a little bit if we can (Olga) because...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Man: ...there is even a, maybe a broader issue here than just the regions themselves going back to for example the geographical region requirements for each of the organization could bury. My point was that you know an imbalance in what maybe perceived as an imbalance in the CCSO may not be an imbalance in the GNSO.

Olga Cavalli: I see.

Man: So I'm not sure we may even be able to word this a couple of different ways and include both of them, both what (Tim) said with regards to the regions themselves, you know having them identical for all organizations may not make sense.

But this whole concept of the application of geographical region requirements may need to be flexible by organization as well and I'm not sure how to word that or even if we should.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments about this?

Philip Sheppard: I think it's sufficient in a way that (Tim) expressed it. You know actually we don't need to come to conclusions here. I think we just need to...

Man: Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: ...help pave the way to the solutions for this communitywide group. And I think if those, the revised four and (Tim) the new one is, covered the point.

Man: And I'm good with that.

Olga Cavalli: So we agree on the text suggested by (Tim) this is what you're saying (Philip)?

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: A single set of designated regions may not work for some supporting organizations within ICANN?

Man: Or you could relate the same idea to get the phrasing (unintelligible) which is talking about any change to ICANN regions to improve on any identified imbalances. Bearing in mind that such changes may impact different parts of ICANN differently.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: That's saying, that's saying the same thing isn't it? If (Tim)'s happy with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. This would replace your number three and four (Philip)?

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: This is what...

Philip Sheppard: My suggestions. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry for delaying but I'm trying to write this down. Okay. Any other comments about this three and four sent by (Philip) and modified by us? Okay.

Man: I think that works.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Number four we already discussed. Number five, there is nothing sacred about the number of regions remaining at five.

Man: It's a true statement.

Olga Cavalli: True. Yeah. I have a question? Should we say this or we want to say this?

Philip Sheppard: I think it's worth stating only because...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Philip Sheppard: ...you tend to have, you know you tend to have rather fixed limiting thinking...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Philip Sheppard: ...when you address these things. If the starting point is you know how do we reshuffle the five well that might not be a good, you know maybe it's better to say let's have four, let's have six or let's have 10. You know.

Man: Yep. No, it's good.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Number six, I consider (unintelligible) making geopolitical judgments and so where regions are relevant refer to an authoritative third party wherever possible. Any comments?

Man: I like the, I mean I agree that if there is a you know an authoritative organization of geographical regions that works for ICANN it would be nice to do that instead of inventing new ones. The key issue is and (Philip) does say wherever possible, you know it may not be possible to find that.

And so I think we have to word this carefully so that we, and maybe it's just wording it to say that if there is an authoritative organization of geographic regions that fits (ICANN)'s needs it would be preferable to use that rather than making up a new one.

I think it's important to qualify that with that there may not be and so we shouldn't force fit an authoritative regional organization if it doesn't really work.

Philip Sheppard: You know I think we're pointing in the right direction. But I think there's a fundamental principle here in that ICANN is ill equipped to make geopolitical judgment. ICANN may be able to assess a geopolitical arrangement which fits

but ICANN itself is ill equipped to make those judgments in terms of you know oh this country and that country are...

Man: Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: ...partly similar so we can lump them together. What I'm trying to say is those sort of decisions should not be for ICANN but that (unintelligible).

(Tony Harris):   Yeah. I'd like to say something.

Olga Cavalli: Yes (Tony)?

(Tony Harris):   This is (Tony Harris). I think that I might be more comfortable if we said something like in determining geographic regions that are applicable to ICANN supporting all, to the ICANN structure in general existing geopolitical definitions by intergovernmental bodies or whatever you want to call them should be considered and maybe appropriate to the fit that we're looking for. Something on those lines.

But not, I wouldn't say that, make a statement that ICANN is ill equipped or not or shouldn't be doing this. I don't see the point in that.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...more than one principle here (Philip). You, the first principle maybe just that you know international organizations or other authorities should be consulted in making any geopolitical judgment.

I agree with you that ICANN is not necessarily well equipped to do that and consequently they should be consulting with a lot of work that's already been

done in these areas in terms of doing this work and that's one principle. And I think that's consistent with what you said (Tony) in that we're not making a value judgment whether ICANN should or not.

In doing this work they should you know use the expertise that's there already. And that's one principle. And then a totally separate principle has to do with whether or not there are any regions already defined that would work.

(Tony Harris):   That's true. But let's remember that ICANN was born and built as a consensus based organization. I mean everything that ICANN consists of originally was a point where it was intensive of sorts. So I think geographic regions are just one more thing which are built on consensus.

Man: And that's okay. Yeah. I'm, I don't think that contradicts with what I said. I think that's consistent.

(Tony Harris):   Yeah. No, I'm just adding to what you said not...

Man: Yeah, okay.

(Tony Harris):   ...correcting you.

Man: Okay, good.

Olga Cavalli: So we should split it into two?

Philip Sheppard: Yeah. I'm happy with that.

Olga Cavalli: Into two principles? One could be something like international organizations
                  should be consulted in making geopolitical judgments when consulted by
                  ICANN?

Man: I like the term that (Philip) used rather than just international organization.
                  The authoritative...

Olga Cavalli: Authoritative...

Man: ...third party.

Olga Cavalli: ...third party. Okay. It's more, it's more broader, right?

(Tim Ruiz):   Maybe assessment. I kind of like that word better than judgments as well.

Olga Cavalli: Should be, authoritative third parties should be consulted by ICANN in
                  making geopolitical judgments? That's, (Jeff) you didn't like judgment,
                  (Tim)?

Man: Geopolitical decisions. How about decisions?

Olga Cavalli: Decisions?

(Tim Ruiz):   Yeah. There we go.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Tim Ruiz):   Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Decisions.

Philip Sheppard: That's fine. I'm not sure about consulting or third parties. I think we're just kind of looking at third party structures and determining whether or not they fit or not.

Man: Yeah. That's a good point.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry. I didn't follow you.

Philip Sheppard: (Olga) I don't think we're stating that we need to consult third parties. We're just looking at third party structures in making a decision as to whether or not we like them.

Olga Cavalli: So which other verb could we use? Authoritative third party should be (unintelligible)?

Philip Sheppard: The geopolitical structures or authoritative third parties should be...

Man: Reviewed?

Philip Sheppard: Yeah. Reviewed in...

Olga Cavalli: Reviewed by ICANN in making geopolitical decisions?

Philip Sheppard: Okay. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay? We all agree? Yes? Reviewed, okay. And then we have another principle, but I don't have it in written, which would be the other one, which is the text of the second one. I have some comments sent by (Tony) that (reminding) geographic regions applicable to ICANN in general should be

considered and maybe (unintelligible) discovered by authoritative third parties should be reviewed by ICANN in making geopolitical decisions.

Which is the second principle that is missed from the first one that was split in two. Or we are okay with only this one?

Man: It might be okay with just the one.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: But...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: ...I don't know.

Man: I think the way it's, yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I had the feeling that you wanted to add something more.

(Tony Harris): No. It's okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we'll go to number seven where there are gray areas in such a third party regional construct the CC manager of the territory may opt into whichever region they wish subject to some underlying logic to avoid (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Whim.

Olga Cavalli: I have a question for (Philip). Do we have to talk about the CC managers
                   here? Are we, or...

Philip Sheppard: Well I was, yeah I was making assumption that we would have one regional
                   structure for ICANN, not 20. And once you have that if you're going to have
                   any, any ability to, to have flexibility within that and I'm thinking you know
                   the exceptions of you know Guadalupe being made as a good example of
                   technically a part of France and the Caribbean and there are countless others.

                   If we're going to have the ability for a region, for a territory to make a change
                   from the norm it just struck me that an ICANN relevant body needs to be
                   identified to do that. And the most natural fit struck me as being the CC
                   manager rather than any other fit for ICANN and (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: You know I agree with the principle. My question is that if we have to talk
                   about CC issues in our GNSO documents.

(Chuck):   Well and why would it have to be restricted to CC managers. Actually even in
                   the GNSO if, and I'll use registered (unintelligible). For example, if there was
                   a registry that was located in the Guadalupe you know why couldn't the same
                   principle apply if there was some underlying logic as to why it made more
                   sense for them to be represented in a, in the Latin American Caribbean instead
                   of Europe. Wouldn't that apply as well?

Philip Sheppard: Well I was assuming again (unintelligible) we haven't discussed is one of
                   simplicity which is that we would have one regional structure for ICANN as
                   we currently do.

(Chuck):   Well and that's okay. I'm accepting that.

Philip Sheppard: And therefore if you do have one you need to think of which is most likely to be the most comfortably in touch party and to avoid different optings. I mean are you suggesting that you would be happy with let's say Guadalupe, CC countries happy to be in the Caribbean area but the registry opts for Europe, would you be happy with that complexity?

(Chuck): I think it might be okay as long as there was some reasonable justification for that why it occurred because I think your parenthetical is important. You don't want it to just be a whim. So in other words there should be some reasonable basis for why that is done and as long as that is stated I don't think there has to be an evaluation procedure.

But as long as that's stated then I think that'd be okay. But I don't know. I'm open to others on this. I don't have strong feelings here.

Philip Sheppard: I think...

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?

Philip Sheppard: I think, my instinct is that it's a degree of complexity that is probably disproportional to the benefit.

Olga Cavalli: So we keep this principle?

(Tony Harris): I have a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

(Tony Harris):   I see a slight risk in defining the CC manager as territory. As the authority who may opt in and say look, I want to belong to some other region because the at large community if there are some people involved from that same territory, may say we don't agree. This is the government speaking and we have an entirely different opinion.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, you're right somehow (Tony).

Philip Sheppard: Agreed. But I think you need to decide who you'd want to do the opting. And if you're one to say at large do it then fine. But I think, I mean perhaps we don't need to have the argument here now. But we should say the ICANN needs to decide who the authoritative party would be.

(Chuck):   Or what if it, what if we were to take it a step up and just say where there are gray areas in a third party regional construct there should be a mechanism for resolving that.

Philip Sheppard: Fine.

(Chuck):   A predefined or something.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah, okay. Fine.

(Tony Harris):   Just to be on the safe side.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah, okay.

Olga Cavalli: So...

(Tony Harris):   Although I appreciate what (Philip) was trying to do here, was simplify.

Olga Cavalli: So this would read like where there are gray areas in such a third party regional construct there should be a mechanism for resolving that. That's what you said (Chuck)?

(Chuck):   That's fine.

Philip Sheppard: Yep.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So...

Philip Sheppard: It's okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...we agreed in it?

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Then there are some comments in by myself. I think that perhaps they could be put together with some other. ICANN regions are different from other regional divisions or perhaps we could use the same wording as we said before. Authoritative third party or something like that.

                   This is problematic and consistent especially in developing countries and does not stable participation and geographic diversity into the ICANN structure. Any comments?

Philip Sheppard: Could you explain what you mean (Olga)? I don't understand why developing countries in particular are an issue to do with diversity more than any other country here.

Olga Cavalli: I, let me explain what happens because I deal with that every day since many years. A developing country does not have a huge budget to send people to different meetings. And if the, a country belongs to different regions it means that for some issues they should go for some United Nations admitting them for other issues like ICANN for example, like the (unintelligible) for ICANN.

Well (unintelligible) is not related with regions really. But if the CC of the country is managed by the government which in many developing countries is the situation then they should go to different meetings which are in different regions with, under a different scope.

This is quite complicated for promoting the participation of people in developing countries because it's difficult to, really to send people to different meetings in different issues and then to coordinate it. If a country belongs to different regions then it's a problem especially if the country is a developing one that has a less budget.

That's my concern. But I'm open to your comments.

Philip Sheppard: So what you're saying is that from the low budget developing country perspective...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Philip Sheppard: ...the closer that the ICANN regions are to third party authoritative regions the better.

Olga Cavalli: The less (unintelligible), the less diversity in regions the better. That's my...

Philip Sheppard: Right.

Olga Cavalli: ...comment.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...because you don't have budgets for sending people...

Philip Sheppard: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...meetings and you don't have teams of people for going to the many different meetings. That may not be the case in some developing countries but in general at least what I have seen in some countries of Eastern Europe or Latin America it's quite confusing and complicated.

But it's only a comment. You can agree or not. And I welcome your suggestions.

(Chuck):   So are you saying then (Olga) if I try to pick up on what (Philip) said, is that in general it might be better for developing countries if the ICANN regions, let's just take the, are more similar to the UN identified regions.

Olga Cavalli: Well yeah, somehow. My point is not, that may not necessarily be good for all the developing countries. What I'm trying to say that if a developing country belongs to different regions in different issues related with ICANN and with United Nations and with other international issues then it's more complicated to participate in all of these different meetings and processes.

And that, that makes more difficult for diversity in ICANN and also in the rest of the meetings. But perhaps we, we could review it after, after, yes just...

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: How about this (Olga)? Why not say something like participation is easier when, where ICANN regions correspond to existing authoritative third party regions? Does that capture it?

Olga Cavalli: I'm trying to write it down. Correspond...

Philip Sheppard: Participation I easier when ICANN regions...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. When ICANN regions correspond...

Philip Sheppard: ...correspond to authoritative, to existing authoritative third party regions.

Man: I would agree with that if you constrain it to CCs because otherwise we're saying basically what you have stated originally (Philip) when we started the discussions, that we should follow one of the existing intergovernmental definitions of geographic regions.

Philip Sheppard: Well yeah. I mean yeah, but I mean...

Man: That's what (Olga) is saying here in a way.

Philip Sheppard: It is.

Man: And...

Philip Sheppard: But I think, and I think you know it may be that your, you know we're making some principles or maybe in this case, you know of statements of fact. And it maybe that the immediate outcome of those take you in different directions.

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: ...they could both be true.

Man: We did discuss a few minutes ago that, and I think it was a point that I maybe wrong, that (Tim) made, that the definition of geographic regions may not be an equal fit for all the supporting organizations. It may not be apt for each...

Philip Sheppard: Yeah.

Man: ...for every one. So basically that, I think this point which (Olga) is trying to make would be covered there. I feel very uncomfortable about a statement which says ICANN regions are different from other regional divisions because then what...

Olga Cavalli: You don't like that.

Man: ...we're saying you know...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: ...this is wrong and we should, we should align with the United Nations or the OAS or whoever.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: And I don't think that's a safe way to go.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Philip Sheppard: Well I don't know. I mean I think for me, I mean I'm not, you know you're not (unintelligible) if you want but I think I mean what we're saying, (Olga)'s point was basically about participation. So you know in other words if you look at the implications of regional structure and if participation is your key you may move in one direction.

But if diversity is decided to be more important you may move in another direction. But you need, it's quite useful to be aware that you know perhaps moving to improving diversity you may lose out on participation. And doing that in the knowledge of that you know those two competing objectives I see no wrong in identifying that.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony Harris):   ...how you say it (Philip) because it's, the way it's stated here is very clear. It does not favor participation in geographic diversity. I don't feel at all comfortable with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay (Tony). Do you have a suggestion (Philip), suggested text saying participation is easier when ICANN regions correspond to authoritative existing and I can write the last word?

(Tony Harris):   No. I'm not comfortable with that.

Olga Cavalli: You don't like it?

(Tony Harris):   No.

Olga Cavalli: We just, we can take it out. I mean it was only a comment. It doesn't have to be included. I don't care taking it out.

(Tony Harris):   If it's not something vital. Yeah, because yeah I think it's getting us back in the first straightjacket which I was trying to avoid from the beginning.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. We're all agreed that we delete it?

(Chuck):   Well but there, I think there are other elements...

Man: Couldn't something be...

(Chuck):   ...of things that you're saying in this, in this thing here. There are more than one statement you make in this particular section. So I'm okay with deleting that particular part but...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   ...and that's why I asked my question of you the way I did. I didn't think that you, (Olga) you intended fully what, what (Philip) was saying and because of what (Tony)'s concern there. But there are some other things you say here that maybe we should capture independent of that.

(Tony Harris):   I'm not saying delete, (Chuck) I'm not saying delete the entire comment. The second statement in relation with regions, etc., I think that's a valid point and it goes to what you were saying the other day.

(Chuck):   Right. Yeah, right.

((Crosstalk))

(Tim Ruiz): This is (Tim). Could we either add it to an earlier principle, I can't remember which one it is, but what would make it separate, (unintelligible) makes the point that both diversity and the participation may not be equally served by a single geographic structure of designation of geographic regions.

(Chuck): I think you're on a good track and it may tie in. We don't need to jump there now. But something I was trying to get at on that latest one I added. Because but I won't go there now. But I think you were on a good track there (Tim).

(Tim Ruiz): If maybe we could...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Tim Ruiz): ...get that again when we get there.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I, any suggestions on what to do with this? I have no problem in not including the, my first principle. And perhaps (Tony) if you want to suggest any other wording that we can think about it, that you feel more comfortable with?

(Tony Harris): What are we talking about now? Which of the statements?

Olga Cavalli: The one that you said that you were not comfortable with, the ICANN regions are different from other regional divisions. This is problematic and...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony Harris): I don't really have anything that I would put in place of that because I think you know it's covered elsewhere right now.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So I'll delete it okay? It's gone.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah, but I think (Olga) you can just you know, we can keep the concept in mind and when we get to...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Philip Sheppard: ...the principle that (Chuck) was referring to then you know if we can't resolve...

Olga Cavalli: I think it, perhaps we, I should, or we should think about keeping the issue but not with this wording. That's what I'm saying.

Philip Sheppard: Ah, okay.

(Chuck):   Now your second, your second sentence whether we leave it the way it is we may want to come back to it in relation, you know that some flexibility should be allowed for representatives. And I don't think we need to restrict that to the GNSO council.

                   I certainly support it for the...

Olga Cavalli: In general.

(Chuck):   ...GNSO council but it probably applies generally. And...

Olga Cavalli: So...

(Chuck):   ...we may want to come back to that once we go over some other ones.

Olga Cavalli: Oh okay.

Man: That's a good point. Sure. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Tony Harris):   And I think the third point, we haven't discussed it yet which is different regions of different concerns. I have no problem with that.

(Chuck):   That's kind of a relevance...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   ...issue right, that we...

Olga Cavalli: That's kind of a relevance that could go perhaps in the first part of the document.

(Chuck):   Yeah. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So then we go to (Tim)'s comments. The designation of ICANN regions should take into consideration desiring views, concerns and interests of the users and residents of various parts of the world.

                    The designation of regions should provide the opportunity for those diverse views to be thoroughly represented within ICANN processes. I think this principle includes reading it now, includes what I wanted to say in mine.

So I think it's a different perspective of the same problem. I don't know what you think. I agree with (Tim) in this principle. Any comments? Do we like it? We leave it?

Man: I think it's, I think it's a good statement.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, me too. Then the other one, there may not be an existing designation of regions that will satisfy this principle. However, reviewing existing designations will be helpful and may serve as a basis upon which to build.

(Chuck): So this, that part there is kind of another relevance one, right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I totally agree. And I agree with both. Perhaps this second one would go with the one about flexibility. What do you think?

Man: Yeah. It seems like it's kind of wrapped up in the earlier principles we talked about, right, for the most part? So...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I agree with (Tim). And then there is another principle sent by (Tim). No, it's, this is sent by (Chuck). Existing usage should not be inordinate, this is very difficult for my English, inordinately disenfranchised of the, sorry, for the goal of thoroughly representing user groups who are not yet active and may not be able to effectively participate in the near term.

I have some questions (Chuck) that I would like to ask you. When you say effectively participate what do you really mean? And not yet active and effectively participate. This is something that I don't really get.

(Chuck): Well let me oversimplify it just to illustrate. What I'm getting at is that we, you know the, work could be done to say hey, you know the majority of future users of the internet should be represented much more strongly.

And so let's say that you know 70% of the users of the internet are in developing parts of the world and because they make up such a big proportion of the potential users our geographic regions should reflect that and therefore you know 70% of the geographic regions should come from those parts of the world.

And therefore the rest of the world which currently makes up you know the current usage of the internet should only have 30% representation and so you basically disenfranchise those who are going to be most impacted in the near term by the policy decisions that are made.

And so what I'm getting at here, there needs to be, you can't just look at the future if in fact those, that 70% area is not yet well organized and well represented that could allow easy capture by a few people.

And so you have to keep in mind the impact on existing well represented user groups at the same time while you're trying to bring in the new. And you shouldn't ignore either one.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I understand this point.

Man: I understand what, I understand what you're trying to say (Chuck) and I think it's a good point. Perhaps the problem is the phrase, where you say be able to effectively participate because then you're saying well possibly somebody can say so if you're poor you're, you know you're not considered.

If we change that by something we said something like involved as active stakeholders it may not be able to be involved, no let's leave be able out of it, may not be involved as active stakeholders, perhaps that might cover your...

(Chuck):   I'm fine with that.

Man: ...point.

(Chuck):   Yeah. Yeah.

Man: Yeah. So you're saying really people will not be actively involved. You're not saying why, why they would be or they would they might...

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: They also need to relate it more back to each regional selection don't we somehow?

Man: Probably yeah.

(Chuck):   So...

Philip Sheppard: I mean part of what we're saying is that if existing, if ICANN regions are to be based, are to be based on current internet usage then a new mechanism will be necessary as usage changes or something like that. Is that...

(Chuck):   That's good. Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: Something like that?

Olga Cavalli: Oh. Could you repeat it...

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...(Philip)? ICANN regions are to be based on current...

Philip Sheppard: If.

Olga Cavalli: If.

Philip Sheppard: So it starts off with if, yeah.

Olga Cavalli: If.

Philip Sheppard: If ICANN regions...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah?

Philip Sheppard: ...reflect current internet usage...

Olga Cavalli: Reflect current internet...

Philip Sheppard: Usage.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: Then there will need to be regular revisions as regional usages change.

Olga Cavalli: Then there will...

Philip Sheppard: Will need to be...

Olga Cavalli: ...need to be...

Philip Sheppard: Regular...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: ...revisions of the regions as regional usages change.

Olga Cavalli: As users of the internet change?

Philip Sheppard: Yeah. As regional usage changes.

Olga Cavalli: As, yeah. If ICANN regions reflect current internet usage then there will, there will need to be regular revisions of the regions as regional usage changes. That's it. Is this the same that we wanted to say? (Unintelligible).

Man: I don't know if I'd vote for that.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...then there will need to be regular revisions. I want to recall on what (Tony) said and see how could, that what (Chuck) suggested could be rewritten. Existing users should not be inordinately disenfranchised for the goal of thoroughly representing user groups who are not yet active, who are not involved as active stakeholder. That's what you said (unintelligible)?

Man: We're not, yes. You need to leave it in (Olga).

Olga Cavalli: To effectively participate in near term. I like it. I like the...

Man: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...involved as active stakeholder instead of not...

Man: Yeah, but you need to leave the word, you need to leave the word yet I think.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Yes.

Man: I would leave that.

Philip Sheppard: So (Olga) I thought my suggestion and if I got it wrong, was attempting to capture the same idea that (Chuck) had made in that statement. It was a replacement, not an addition.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...that they are different. They are different issues.

Philip Sheppard: Well then I don't understand the first issue. My apologies. What are we saying?

(Chuck):   Okay. One of the things, I think it's a fair goal that regional diversity however we end up defining it, needs to accommodate future issues of the internet. And what I'm saying is in achieving that goal we can't just totally forget those who are users now.

                   Okay? So don't disenfranchise...

Olga Cavalli: Every, yeah.

(Chuck):   ...the existing users in an effort to enfranchise the, you know future users. They're both important goals.

Philip Sheppard: Okay. Well then ICANN regions should enfranchise both current and future users?

(Chuck):   That's, you know that's good.

Olga Cavalli: Could you repeat that (Philip)?

Philip Sheppard: ICANN regions should...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: ...enfranchise both existing and future users.

Olga Cavalli: Should enfranchise the existing...

Philip Sheppard: Both existing...

Olga Cavalli: Both.

Philip Sheppard: ...and future users.

(Chuck):   That's much simpler than what I said.

Olga Cavalli: What do you say (Tony)? You like it?

Philip Sheppard: That's a good choice for this.

(Tony Harris):   Nobody could object to that. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Should enfranchise both existing and future users. I like it.

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: ...may be possible to achieve. But (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   (Philip)'s always much better at wording things than I am.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony Harris):   (Philip) you should have been an ambassador.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Tim) sent some comments about the principles sent by (Chuck).
Perhaps you want to comment something (Tim) or you're comfortable with
this, with this wording?

(Tim Ruiz):   I'm confident, I'm fine with that wording. The only other part of my comment
that I don't know if they need to be fit in here or not is just...

Olga Cavalli: I can read them from you if you want.

(Tim Ruiz):   No, I've got them in front of me here from your document. Well maybe what
I'm thinking of is in a different, no I think I'm good with that. I think the
other, the other point I had will come later.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   But there is an element that flowed from that, from your comment and my comment in response and so forth. And it comes back to what (Philip) alternatively suggested. This whole idea of it being dynamic and needing you know ongoing review is a good principle but it's something separate.

Man: Are we looking at the comments on the side...

(Chuck):   Yeah.

Man: ...on the side bar here also?

(Chuck):   Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Yes.

Man: Because I think (Tim)'s made a couple of very good points here.

Olga Cavalli: This, yes, this is why I wanted to point that he made relevant comments on the list and I didn't want to avoid commenting on them.

(Chuck):   Well the first comment I think we captured didn't we (Tim)?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...what I was going to say.

(Tim Ruiz):   Right.

(Chuck):   But this whole idea that (Philip) was getting at that as the whole dynamics of the internet change this concept of we don't want to lock geographical region things in without some review on an ongoing basis I think makes sense. Isn't that a good principle?

(Tim Ruiz):   Yeah I, I would think so. I think that you know just, this is where you know it seems to make sense to review them today. I don't you know, another three years down the road or so I mean I think it might be worth looking at again as things change.

Man: I think it's, yeah I think it's a very good point since we'll probably all be speaking Chinese in five years.

(Tim Ruiz):   That's very likely.

Olga Cavalli: So we should, which text we should include as another principle?

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: ...regions should be reviewed with appropriate regularity. How about that?

Olga Cavalli: Oh. Could you repeat that (Philip)?

Philip Sheppard: ICANN regions should be reviewed with appropriate regularity.

Man: (Or)...

Olga Cavalli: With appropriate...

Philip Sheppard: Yeah. Regularity.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Philip Sheppard: And we'll leave appropriate to be determined by the communitywide group.

Man: Yeah. That's a good point.

Olga Cavalli: And the last part of the sentence, could you repeat it?

Philip Sheppard: With appropriate regularity.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. But then you said something you want to add it to the sentence?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we have two sentences, two principles. ICANN regions should enfranchise both existing and future users. And then ICANN should be, ICANN regions, regions should be reviewed with appropriate regularity. We like that? Okay.

And then we have a principle sent by (Tim) which I like. And then there were some exchanges of opinions with the list between and just I would like to clarify it to you (Philip). (Tim) said sufficient outreach should be undertaken to understand as fully as possible the varying views, concerns and interests of users and residents around the world.

And I think that (Philip) writes a very interesting issue that it, for doing a huge task of investigating which are the needs and views. It maybe extremely expensive and costly. What I really wanted to say and what I tried to express in the list is that I see outreach as a vision in the long term.

As far as I see ICANN outreach activities at least in some areas, some regions of the world like Latin America, is mainly focused on (unintelligible) of these activities. And then, there I see that there is some witness in communicating of the relevance of all the issues related with ICANN actions to the whole community.

And then I see outreach as a vision and as a long term process not as a study made which could be, I'm sure it will be very expensive and it will say what we all know that there are some different visions or opinions and diversity that should be reflected.

This is what I wanted to express. And (Philip) I don't know if you, if you understand my point.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...this statement.

Philip Sheppard: I agree with it completely. But I...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Philip Sheppard: ...don't quite see the relevance to determining regions. That was my only concern.

Olga Cavalli: This is why I'm asking (Tim)...

(Tim Ruiz):   (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: ...wording.

(Tim Ruiz):   Yeah, this is (Tim). I, you know the only, yeah I have no objections as this doesn't really fit. But it maybe, it could be combined with the principle we just did with reviewing the regions you know at appropriate intervals.

                    You know and then stating to that end ICANN should continue outreach to understand this goal if possible...

Olga Cavalli: Oh I like that.

(Tim Ruiz):   ...in terms of interest (unintelligible) around the world.

Philip Sheppard: Yep. That makes sense.

Olga Cavalli: I like it. Could you repeat it please (Tim), so I can write it down?

(Tim Ruiz):   Right after, I can't remember exactly how we worded this, that principle. But right after the principle or as a second sentence to the principle...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Tim Ruiz):   ...that as...

Olga Cavalli: ICANN regions should be reviewed with appropriate regularity.

(Tim Ruiz):   And then, and to that end ICANN should continue with outreach to understand as fully as possible the varying views, concerns and interests (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Outreach, sorry, continue its outreach...

(Tim Ruiz):   Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...to...

(Tim Ruiz):   To understand...

Olga Cavalli: ...understanding...

Philip Sheppard: That is to say a phrase you've got there already (Olga).

Olga Cavalli: Sorry?

Philip Sheppard: I think (Tim) is suggesting the same phrase you've got there already.

(Tim Ruiz):   Yeah. So at the to understand then just the rest of my sentence there.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. To understand, to fully as possible the varying views, okay.

Man: That works.

Olga Cavalli: So I copy it. Okay. We like it. Are we okay with that?

(Chuck):   It's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Perfect. Do we need to go through the comments sent by (Tim) or by (Philip) or I think we are okay with this wording, right?

Philip Sheppard: Yeah. I mean I don't, I don't necessarily need to say this in principle. I was just making the point for our own purposes really in understanding how we are at.

Olga Cavalli: Right. So we go to our last principle.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony Harris):   I'm sorry. This is (Tony Harris). I have to leave the call. I'm traveling in a while. So if you'll excuse me please?

Olga Cavalli: Okay (Tony). Have a good trip. I'll see you...

(Tony Harris):   Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: ...tomorrow.

(Chuck):   Thanks (Tony).

(Tony Harris):   So we'll see you tomorrow. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Olga Cavalli: Bye (Tony). I'm sorry. I think that there was someone saying something to me and I didn't hear. No?

(Tim Ruiz):   Oh it was just, it was just (Tim). I was just acknowledging (Philip)'s point that we didn't really need to discuss that doing this kind of outreach is a part of this, right now is a part of this redefining regions would be just a little bit part of capabilities or the scope of what's practical. I was just agreeing with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we have our (unintelligible) here. Principle in, at least in my document. The value of any (interviewer) selected from a geographic region is proportional to the degree to which that person represents interest of that region. This was sent by (Chuck).

And then there are some comments sent by, there is something, some other comments sent by (Tim) that I included in the last moment yesterday night that I think that perhaps they should be another principle.

He says any geographic requirement on consideration in selecting counselors or on the GNSO in selecting board members should be measured by citizenship only. And this please (Tim) could you clarify this to me because I don't understand exactly what you mean by citizenship?

(Tim Ruiz):   Well in other words you know (Chuck)'s principle I think is good. I agree with that. But what I was trying to get to is that trying to impose principles on the GNSO council, on the constituencies first in selecting counselors or on the council in selecting board members that they have to select a board member that has a, has some degree of, that can show some degree of representing the interest of a region that they're from I think is too much to ask.

And that if there is a geographic diversity required by, required, the counselors selected or of the board members selected by the GNSO that it should only relate to the citizenship because that's really all we can practically get to.

And so to go deeper than that in trying to determine, you know to try to find representatives for the counselor or that we select for the board that truly represent the interests of the regions wherefrom in some way I think is beyond our abilities.

And I mean my personal feeling is that having any sort of requirement on either is irrelevant and that, you know it's more of a nominating committee kind of thing. But I can understand you know wanting to at least have some kind of diversity as citizenship but it shouldn't go any further than that. Does that make, I don't know if that, I've cleared it up or made it more complicated. But...

Philip Sheppard: I mean I think, I mean from a practical perspective I think I probably agree with it. I mean your, I think the current test in the bylaws is citizenship if I remember correctly.

(Tim Ruiz):   I think so. Right.

Philip Sheppard: And it's, it is probably the, you know the only practical way you can do that. I mean whatever system you have if it's purely residence in a regional purely citizenship they can be abused and we can have you know if you take a look at it from the council's perspective, a citizenship, you could have a Japanese, a Brit and a US person who were Washington based lobbyist and they'd qualify for diversity.

But you know hey if you have it purely regions you could have three New York born people in three different countries of the world. So it doesn't help you either. So and I think you've got to choose one or the other. And I think I agree with (Tim) that citizenship is probably the simplest to define and the

most likely to be the best test for diversity which is the objective we're seeking.

(Chuck): And I don't disagree with that. In fact (Tim)'s thoughts made me think and of course forgive me for going into the GNSO specifically now with regard to the proposed new structure. But it made me think that the (Nom Com) seats that we're recommending on the GNSO council could be an effective way of getting some geographic diversity in cases were some of us like the registries for example, have difficulty in some regions.

And I also agree that in the case of a (Nom Com) nominee they could look a little more closely at selecting people that would you know have a reasonable chance of representing that particular community and their interests and so forth than we can do in our individual constituencies.

So I think (Tim)'s onto something here that maybe useful. It maybe a separate principle or a sub principle or something.

Olga Cavalli: I think that it should go as a separate principle. This is what I thought when I read it as a comment. Could we, and I have a question about, could you write it as a principle (Tim) and send it to me or we can try to figure out something right now? What do you think?

(Tim Ruiz): Well wouldn't just the first sentence there...

Olga Cavalli: Any geographic requirements and considerations in selecting counselors in the GNSO and selecting board members should be measured by citizenship only. There?

(Tim Ruiz): Yeah. Is that, I'm not sure how else I might reword it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Tim Ruiz):   But I'm open to other ideas. But...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I can include the sentence and perhaps we could refine it afterwards and exchange some comments. And I have a question (Chuck) about the...

(Tim Ruiz):   As long as, this is (Tim) can I just, again...

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

(Tim Ruiz):   ...I just want to interject that that isn't, and I don't intend that to oppose (Chuck)'s principle. What I intended was that I think (Chuck)'s principle is good and it applies but should not apply to the GNSO selecting counselors or board members.

                 But I just want to make that clear.

(Chuck):   And in this case it's a case I think where it is useful to be specific and make reference to the GNSO. In other cases I've kind of said well maybe we should broaden that but I think you're right (Tim), that in this particular case it's good to be specific.

                 With regard to the GNSO the citizenship requirements probably make sense except maybe for nominating committee selections.

(Tim Ruiz):   Right. Right.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So I will include it as a principle. (Chuck) I have a question about your principle which I agree. My only concern is you say the value of any individual selected from a geographic region is proportional to the degree of, to which that person represents interests of that region.

Who would say which interests this person represents? I mean it's a business person and it's a community person, it's a wide community person, it's a government, you see my point?

(Chuck):   Yeah. And that's why (Tim) got me thinking that in the nominating, the nominating committee would do that in the case of nominating committee representatives. So the answer to your question in the case of the nominating committee or with regard to the nominating committee that's the answer.

In the case of the individual constituencies that are selecting representatives they would be the ones that do that. The point is, is that just selecting and I agree that the only, probably that the best practical way to do this is based on citizenship.

But as, if my principle is considered I'm not suggesting some rigid mechanisms where we check representativeness. But it is a good principle to follow in terms of selecting representatives that hey, to the extent that we have the ability within our constituencies you know we should look a little bit beyond just citizenship even though that's going to be the primary criterion that we use.

You know to the extent that we can select people that are good representatives of the interests of that region the ultimate goal of geographic diversity is better met.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   My, a very, I think this is a very idealistic principle but one that's good to keep in mind. It's very easy to comply with the letter of geographic diversity without accomplishing the goals of geographic diversity. But it is ideal and I'm not suggesting a rigid mechanism for enforcing it.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah. I agree with the objective here. I mean in fact the statement has phrase at the moment the value of etc. to my mind is (unintelligible) principle a more statement of truth. And how we turn that into a principle in terms of application we may need to...

(Chuck):   Yeah.

Philip Sheppard: ...think about it.

(Chuck):   Yeah. Exactly. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: So you're suggesting a different wording (Philip)?

Philip Sheppard: Well yeah. I think, I've just written what (Chuck) is saying to my mind is a statement of fact. And what we need to do is to think how we want to apply that fact, if we're going to say and therefore you know I mean you know we're either going to say something you know very loose like, you know we hope that good selections will be made, bearing in mind that.

                  Or we want to make it more rigid. I'm not quite sure where we want to go with it. I think we need to...

(Chuck):   We need to think about it a little bit further.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah. When you turn it into...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Philip Sheppard: ...something as, that makes it an outcome rather than just a statement of the state of the world.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, great. We've got to the end of the document. What I will do now is to prepare a new document with the principles that we agreed on. About the grouping in categories what would you think would be the next step to follow? Do you want to do that now?

In fact I have a very, I have a document that I would like to work on because I have different things that I have been reading and I would like to work in a cleaner version that I should work on. So I'm not sure if I could follow this document.

So saying in which category each principle goes into unless you have been following off of the changes in the text.

Philip Sheppard: Well (Olga) have a go at that. I think before when we started off we, I think identified what three board groups, the principles, function the new group, the review of regions that had to do with change of regions and the third was relevance.

Have a go and see if they fit and then we can all make comments. And then you know if we need to move something around or suggest a fourth category we can do that when we see the list.

(Chuck):   Now (Rob), a question for (Rob). (Rob) as, you're still on I assume.

Rob Hoggarth: I am.

(Chuck):   Yeah. And to the extent that (Olga) would like assistance in terms of doing this I think you're available as staff support as well. Is that correct?

Rob Hoggarth: That is correct. Available, happy and willing.

Man: Well there you go.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Just say the word (Olga) at any point.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: What I would like to do now is to work on a new document with all the principles that we have agreed and the new text and maybe send it to the list. And perhaps (Rob) you could help me at, what I could do if you all agree with (Rob) we could go through a first division into categories.

                  And then review it with you and the list but if only all of you of course agree in this idea.

(Chuck):   I think it'd be fine if you and (Rob) work together in the next couple of days to pull something together. And then you can send something out to the list. I'm okay with that.

Philip Sheppard: Yep. I agree completely. It sounds like a great idea.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And then we could meet next Monday with a cleaner document and with the grouping in different categories. And maybe we can review that document through the call. And I have a question. Which is, which is the outcome of our working group?

It's a document, it's principles with an introduction, how do you see the final document structure?

Philip Sheppard: Remarkably short, clear and concise.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Chuck):   And it's probably going to have you know the three sections that, with the principles or statements within each one. Yeah, I think it is going to be short and direct. It will start off by answering the primary question.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck):   And then add the additional information.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay. So we will me and (Rob) will be drafting this document. We will send it to the list in two or three days and we will meet next Monday at the same time. Okay?

Philip Sheppard: Okay.

(Chuck):   Sounds good.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thank you.

END