Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 10 December 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT) meeting on Thursday 10 December 2009, at 15:00 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-ppsc-20091210.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#dec
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair
David Maher – Registry Stakeholder Group
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group
Tatiana Khramtsova – Registrar Stakeholder Group
Paul Diaz - Registrar Stakeholder Group
Alex Gakuru - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group
Wolf Knoben – ISCPC
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group
Marilyn Cade – Individual
Robin Gross - NCUC

ICANN Staff:
Liz Gasster
Margie Milam
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:
Marika Konings

Coordinator: The recording has now started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on

today's PPSC PDP call on Thursday the 10th of December.

We have Jeff Neuman, Tatiana Khramtsova, Avri Doria, Marilyn Cade, James Bladel, Alan Greenberg, Alex Gakuru, from staff we have Liz Gasster, Glen de Saint Gery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White, and we have apologies from Marika Konings.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their name when speaking. Thank you very much. Over to you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Gisella. This is a Jeff Neuman, chair of the PDP work team on December 10, 2009. I want to welcome everyone to the meeting. Just a brief announcement. Today's meeting will just be limited to an hour. Some of us have other commitments at 11:00 Eastern Time that we need to get to, so we'll keep it to an hour. I think the agenda really is to discuss for a little bit of time the request or the face-to-face, and I kind of want to keep that time limited, because I really want to get back to doing some more on stage four work that we've been making some really good progress on.

With that said, just a little bit of an update. As most of you know, there was a paper that was sent around that we talked about in the last call on the rationale for a face-to-face that was approved by those, at least by a rough consensus of the group. I sent that to the full PPSC, as we discussed on the last call on the 5th of December.

There were some additional comments on the list, as everyone has seen, not from necessarily PPSC members. Some of them actually are either no longer active or just have not responded. But there have been some emails from Avri and Marilyn and others, Liz Williams and ICANN staff that addressed some of the - rather than addressing really the rationale for the meeting, most of them addressed things on logistics and number of persons funded, locations, things like that.

Mike Rodenbaugh did have some question on the need for a face-to-face meeting, and he posted the list that I tried to clarify whether those are - it sounded like from at least the first series of emails they were more geared

toward prioritization of GNSO council work and other work that is going on, but he did update it, after I asked him some questions of the value of face-to-face in general.

And Avri has clarified, as well, and she is on the call. Avri has clarified some comments on the face-to-face meeting and the value of a face-to-face.

And I kind of want to separate the two issues of the value of face-to-face from the logistics of the face-to-face. I want to settle on the answer to the first question before we get to the second question. Because if I've misread the consensus of the group, which was that the group feels like there is value to a face-to-face meeting, then there is no really no sense in talking about the logistics, number of people, etc.

So does anyone on this call have any comments on whether they believe I'm incorrect in assuming that there is a consensus that we believe that there will be value to a face-to-face meeting of this work team?

Avri Doria: This is Avri, may I speak?

Jeff Neuman: Absolutely. And by the way, if you're able to, we do have an Adobe, I don't know if you're in front of a computer or not, but...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...it would be great to join, but yes, Avri, go on.

Avri Doria: Okay. First of all, I don't believe that you can separate the issues that way. As I've said in the answer, and this is an answer that I've confirmed with other members of the NCSG, the other councilors a and the other members of the executive committee, is there may be some positive value to this meeting if it is done in a fair and properly distributed way. In other words, if the logistics are indeed correct.

There could be negative value to this meeting, if they are done incorrectly. Of course there is a value to the meeting, it's just whether it's positive or negative is really the question. And there is just as much chance for it to be negative as positive.

So that being the case, and no I do not believe that you have consensus for there being a positive value for the meeting.

Jeff Neuman: So just can I raise a couple of questions? According to the NCSG - so assuming that there is - if we can't (unintelligible), obviously Alex is one of your reps that was with (intent), who would be the other NCSG rep?

Avri Doria: Again, there hasn't been a discussion on who do we send if there are more, as I said in my reply to you, you know the way to do it fairly maybe, that there is only one rep per stakeholder group. That may indeed be the right answer. That is as much parity as the possibility of two from each or three from each.

We have not discussed who else we would send, because the issue is not about names, it is about the principle of parity in doing it. If there are more seats available, then the NCSG will talk about whom, find out, I guess first thing would be find out if any of the new council members that were appointed by the board would be ones, or whether they wanted to look at someone else. These are people who are just now getting involved in all of our (unintelligible). So that's something we haven't talked about yet.

Jeff Neuman: So let me ask another question. And by the way, if anyone wants to jump in, just raise or your hand or let me know?

Marilyn Cade: Jeff, I can't raise my hand, I'm not on line anymore, and can I get in the queue.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Let me ask one more question and then I'll get Marilyn and then James whose hands are raised.

Avri, is your - what do you believe is the rationale for a face-to-face meeting. I guess, let me just ask the general question.

Avri Doria: I believe the rationale for a face-to-face meeting is to solve those hard issues with face-to-face discussion. I think any of the simple issues can be dealt with easily in telephone calls and on email. It's just if there are hard issues that take a lot of concentrated conversation, those are the kinds of things that warrant face-to-face. And when you're discussing the hard issues is when you need to have, you know, complete representation.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, let me go to Marilyn and then James and then Alan. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, thanks, Jeff. I guess I've got a comment on two things, and that is one, I think it's important to have the meeting. I don't know how we stumbled into using the word value, so I'm going to ignore that word for a minute. We need to advance this work further and complete it, and develop the enhanced PDP that has been outstanding. I'm just going to note that calls for improving changing the PDP took place long before the last board-governed review, but actually came out of a review that the council undertook.

So I think the, you know, we ought to be able to address the question of representation and balance, assume we're going to solve those issues and put together a two day meeting, regardless of when we're doing it, and get people together, make sure we have extra remote participation capability, as well, and structure the work and advance the work.

I think failing to do so leaves the policy council, and I understand some of you have probably a sense that you have more affinity to the policy council, because you've recently been on it or you're on it now, but at least the policy council hamstring - hamstrung. They're moving ahead without the tools that

the community and the board said they needed. And that they are put in a position of continuing to make decisions on the fly and they are basically - it's an unfair position to the stakeholder community, it's not fair to the councilors and we're fulfilling our responsibility to the board.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks, Marilyn. James?

James Bladel: Good morning, Jeff. Thanks. This is James, and I just wanted to get back to your initial point, which is I do see these as two separate issues. From the perspective that there is nothing that would be accomplished in a face-to-face meeting that couldn't be accomplished through traditional remote participated meetings, then the logistics or the administrative of who goes and who's sponsored really just kind of becomes somewhat irrelevant in my position. So, I just wanted to put that out there, that I feel they are separate issues. If we can address one and that's determined that there is no consensus for a meeting, I think that kind of takes the other one off the table.

Jeff Neuman: Right, and James, I understand there was an objection from the registrars at the council level in terms of priorities. But putting that aside, because I don't believe, again, this is my personal view and you guys can let me know, I don't believe it's our job on this work team to talk or even think about what the council priorities are, our job is to prioritize, I mean our job is to move, put a priority on the work of this group and then move this work forward, and if we believe that there is value or that we need a face-to-face meeting, then we should request it.

It is the job of our councilors to think about the big picture and to make a decision about, if they choose, on funding and some other items.

So just to help clarify your views, James, I'm sorry, so your view as a work team member, do you have a position on that?

James Bladel: As far as the council priorities, the overall big picture, I'm probably not going to wade into that.

Jeff Neuman: Right, I'm sorry, I meant are you in favor of the face-to-face meeting, as a member of this work team?

James Bladel: No.

Jeff Neuman: You're not?

James Bladel: No, no.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Can you explain that?

James Bladel: I think the - you know, I think we laid out some of those concerns earlier, and I'm going to rehash them from memory then, I would beg a little bit of indulgence that I might not get them in the right order or I might miss some, but...

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

James Bladel: ...you know, it has to do with essentially the number of PDPs that are currently ongoing. I think it is somewhat of a dangerous precedent if we start requesting or requiring face-to-face meetings as part of PDPs.

                  Secondly, I think that just, you know, as evidence, our discussion of participation is that it's limiting. Okay? It picks a region, it picks a group of folks and it says that we're going to go forward with this roster and it doesn't really, you know, keep the door open as well as a meeting where everyone is remote.

And finally, I think in general don't necessarily believe that this is a good use of either staff or travel resources. So, I probably left some things out, but that's I think the crux of the objection.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I just think we also need to along the way think about why we got into this position on the debate on the number of people and participation, and, you know, some people have made comments about, no one really cared about participation until travel was involved. And I don't think for a moment there is anyone involved in this that is just yearning for a trip to D.C. for two days or wherever it ends up being.

So it's not the travel and such, but there is something which is causing people to want to participate in this when we have not had really good participation from some groups in the past. And I think we need to think about why and what we can do to get that ongoing participation, when it's only boring teleconferences.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Thanks, Jeff. I just wanted to follow-up on a point you made a few moments ago about when you have opportunity to present before the council, the debate that appears to be going on the list and undoubtedly will come up on the council about the prioritization of this work. Whereas I personally feel that the work of this particular work team is extremely high priority, the council can't keep going forward until it has the rules that it's going to operate under, as they apply to their own operations, and importantly to any future policy work.

If there is a substantial debate at the council level about prioritization that is one of the agenda items, I would ask that you as a representative of this group listen and potentially weigh in, if the majority of the council feels, as

Mike Rodenbaugh does, that this is not a high priority, then I would challenge then why in the world did they constitute this group and do we need to keep banging our heads and move forward.

I fully expect that they know that it is important, and I don't believe that Mike speaks for a majority, but I'm just asking, please, since you've been invited to be on that call to listen in to what they have to say. And if you're finding that a substantial number of councilors even take Mike's view, then challenge them to ask, what is the purpose of having this group if they are not prioritizing? Why did they create it in the first place?

I think there is a disconnect in Mike's reasoning here, and maybe it just needs to be teased out at the council level, but it's very important for all of us if the councilors don't feel that the work we're doing is all that important, and I underscore this, but if that's the case then, then what are we doing here week after week?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think so. I agree with you that it's going to be important to make those points. One other point that's important that I don't think Mike understood is that the work was deemed important by the board. Right? It's the board governance committee that made recommendations to the GNSO to deal with this. So if the priorities weren't really set by the council, the council did create the steering committee and the steering committee did create the work teams, and the council obviously approved of those and approved of the charters.

The work was deemed important by the board. So I'm not sure, you know, obviously the council can always send back a message to the board saying that we don't find it important, but, you know, one of the things that we do need to reiterate is that this is not necessarily work that the council just dreamed up and said, you know, let's create a steering committee and work teams on. It was something that was kind of lead to them by the board.

Which by the way is an issue in any PDP, right? If you think about it, we'd spend some time talking about it in stage one and probably stage two, which is when a board wants a PDP or wants work done, there is no real discretion by the council to say no to that. The council can create the mechanism by which that work is done, but there is no discretion of the council to say no. At least that's the way it's set up now and that's kind of what, you know, we all kind of agreed with in stages one and two.

Now granted this is not a PDP, but it's indicative of what would happen in the future if the board wants a PDP. So all of that needs to be pointed out.

I think the budget issue is interesting, because it's technically not coming out of the council budget but it would be coming out of a separate budget that was set by ICANN on GNSO improvements as opposed to work. So, the argument Mike makes and others make of a council about this would take away from money for other council activities is not exactly correct, although it would take away from money spent on other GNSO improvement activity, whatever that might be in the future.

So I see Wolf has got a comment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Now I wanted to make a comment after Alex Gakuru.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me to Wolf and then I'll go to (Alex). Wolf, are you on mute, maybe? Okay, let me, we still can't hear Wolf so let me go to Alex. I'm sorry, you there Wolf?

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Can you hear me.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, we can hear you now.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, what to say, so I was wondering so sometimes getting back to the roots in this question will be, the question of value of such a meeting again and again. For me, this was only the question, you know, when I saw over the different meetings we've had on the telephone conference and the proposals we made. So there were proposals made to some extent.

I then I was also thinking how could that be improved, you know, that's the basic question, you know? And I think really it could be improved at a certain stage by holding a face-to-face meeting, concentrating really on the issues. And that was my thinking about that and why I support such a meeting. And I think in that way, the other question of could that be valuable from the point right now? But if we come to that point that we feel okay, let's do it and let's make argument from that meeting, really. Then therefore, we have to talk about these conditions of the meeting that has to take part here and so that's my opinion.

And on the other hand with regards to prioritization, I pointed out in the written notice as well, that we are not talking about really there are other things other than holding a meeting that we don't talk about, other items are less important or not that much important, because there is not yet a face-to-face meeting for other items.

I can really follow what Paul is saying with regards to the question of priority, because the council has to be faced with a discussion about prioritization of council work. The council has to talk about prioritization of this work, in this sense has to make the (unintelligible) of things, which doesn't in the end, okay, things are really not important or real important; it is just to organize that work. And from that point of view it came to my mind really these items, the PDP development or the new PDP, what we are doing is kind of basic things for our future, kind of, I would compare a kind of infrastructure items we are doing.

So except the infrastructure for the work, it basically falls to work we have to do in the future, and therefore this is kind of important and I would really ask

for and would support to have an effort in a face-to-face meeting as soon as possible.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks. Okay, Alex?

Alex Gakuru: Yeah, thank you Jeff and everybody on the call. My view on the mandate of the task to this by the board is what made me support the face-to-face meeting from a standpoint or rate of it. And the reason for doing this is just still standby is the fact that all positive development in the future shall be based on some of the recommendations that we shall arrive at through consensus.

I also, unless this new policy development foundation is still not a widely accepted foundation. So we do need to make sure that the environment that to govern how we make policies and all ICANN policies in the future is indeed founded on that environment where we actually are agreeing on how to meet to create consensus.

So therefore, I found the face-to-face meeting from the mandate changes and have mandates coming straight from the broad, like mentioned of this earlier, that is one that may require that maybe we meet. Because I do know when people meet sometimes that things change, they actually are discussing things more closely in the sense of arriving at a point of view. I'm not saying everybody now must always meet to agree on everything, but I saw there is a very - have both originated mandates which is on the site, and that is why I support this maybe.

What I would like us to do, and us, all of us, find out what these issues are that are stopping us from a - because they're different, it's not a one thing there. I think the key question to me has been and is a historical reason, and not of parity. We need to look at these issues, hash them out and then so that we can process with the serious work that we are doing from our different perspectives, and I think that is probably the parity.

And I sense, this is my personal feeling, I sense a lot of consensus again on this meeting, I'm on the fence, I'm not saying it is a consensus, if we have a good issue, an issue of parity and we say okay we'll go and then relax. We don't try to make it a big new (hash). That's my fear for now, and then we probably could go to each board and their recommendations.

Thank you for giving me the chance to recommend.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, Alex. And I do agree in your statement that the work we're doing is really setting the basis for the future policy developments that the council or the community does. I mean it's very important.

All right. So again, I need to judge the level of consensus. If I submit a request to the council. I know it's already been on the council list. I think Mike has cc'd people on the council, probably before it was ready to go to the council - definitely before it was ready to go to the council, I think Mike kind of took his discussions to the council level. Which I'm going to ask on this call and I'll ask on the email list, that until something is ready to go to the council, I'm not sure people should be cc'ing the council and bothering them with these requests until it actually gets there.

I understand Mike's passion and people have passion to get this issue discussed by as many people as possible, but in this case I think created a little bit of confusion to actually put it on the council list. Because, after all, only certain people can comment on the council list. I can't even submit any comments to the council list and most of us can't. Only councilors can. So have Mike take the emails going back and forth and then having some of them go on the council list but others not being able to respond, I don't think creates the complete picture, nor do I necessarily think the council should be bothered until they need to be, right?

So with that, let me go through and see if I can get kind of a feeling of the group. I think I understand the noncommercial stakeholder group where as Avri and Alex have said that they, please I'm just trying to paraphrase so I can get a consensus, that they believe there would be value to the meeting if done with the caveats that have been mentioned.

The registrars do not favor a face-to-face for the reasons they have mentioned. Alan, do you want to, I'm just kind of going down the Adobe list.

Alan Greenberg: I support the meeting.

Jeff Neuman: Let's see, David Maher are you on? Okay, I see him on Adobe, but I'm not sure if he's on.

David Maher: I'm on, I was on mute, sorry. And I agree.

Jeff Neuman: With supporting the meeting?

David Marher: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Avri, was there anything you wanted to add?

Avri Doria: No, not really. But basically yes, it's a question on what its value will be, but that if it's not organized with parity then we don't support it. Only support if it's organized with parity.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. All right. Sorry, I'm just writing it down. So if I go down the list. James and Paul, did you want to add anything. I think you guys have pretty much...

James Bladel: No I think hopefully my view is very clear.

Paul Diaz: I just support James.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Robin is on the Adobe, but are you on the call, as well.

Robin Gross: Hi, yes, I just joined.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I think Avri and Alex have done a good job representing the noncommercial view. So I'll skip you at the moment. Wolf, it seems like you are in support?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. The business constituency is a tough one, because you have Liz Williams saying one thing and Mike saying another. I'm not sure who their primary rep is, and I've sent a note trying to seek clarification on that.

Marilyn Cade: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: So I'm going to have to go off in a minute, so I'm just going to express my, I apologize about jumping the queue. I'm going to express my support for a face-to-face meeting. And I'm also going to comment I am here as an individual, not representing the business constituency, but I can say as a business constituency member that the constituency has not had a discussion about formal opinion. Just so you know I appreciate the fact that you've sent an inquiry as to chairs, so that the representatives can bring - the formal representatives can bring that topic back to the BC.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. There's no one I think from the ICC on this call, but I did see a note from (Brian) earlier that said they were in support of the meeting. I'll go back and double check it. I don't know if Liz or anyone else can recall what his note said?

Woman: Brian did send me a note saying he supported the meeting.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Woman: And also, he talked about location in D.C., you know, free of charge with sort of reduced catering.

Jeff Neuman: Reduced catering.

Woman: Well he said it was very - the term he used very modest or something.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Woman: Not less food, less cost. It could be a disaster.

Jeff Neuman: So I think the way it sounds, if I'm reading this correct, it sounds like there is just kind of going through this list, it sounds like there is strong support for meeting, whether it rises to a level of consensus I need to figure out the business constituency view, although it sounds like - I mean with the right parameters, you would add the non-commercials in there.

                 So what I've asked Avri to do and what she has done is she spelled out the noncommercial view. The plan is to put together a new cover note to send to the council, you know, reiterating some of the points that were in this call today, and also taking some of the stuff from Avri's email to make sure that gets across to the council.

                 They are planning on bringing it up on their agenda a week from today on the 17th. I believe I'm going to be asked to come to the meeting or at least listen to the meeting, answer any questions and kind of present this proposal. I will do my best to present this. I'm sure all will communicate with your council reps to keep me honest and to weigh in obviously on council priorities and things.

So we'll bring up the request. I'm not sure what, if anything, the council will do with it. Frankly, this is a first, so I'm not even sure what the role is of the council. I'm assuming if the council says no way, then I'm assuming there is not going to be any push back by staff or anyone to actually insist on the meeting. On the other hand, if there is no affirmative vote and the council just says, okay, we've had this discussion. At this point I think the plan is still to go forward with the meeting.

We'll see what happens after the council meeting. I know time is running short. I know there are some visa issues that may need to be figured out if it's in the United States.

One point I did want to raise, Avri, and then I do really want to spend a little bit of time on stage four, is just to reiterate that the discussion we had on the last call as to why the United States D.C. was chosen, really has to do it seemed, really had to do with cost as opposed to anything else. It was not to send a message that we don't believe we're international. Again, it was done with an eye towards we need to move forward on progress with the group, it really wasn't done because we felt like we needed to do outreach for this meet. We really felt like we just needed to bring together the people that were in this group that had been participating or that had a commitment to this, and it really wasn't done with an eye towards, you know, your normal outreach trying to get new people and fresh faces from around the world.

I see that Alan has a comment.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...that given the environment we're working in, maybe cost should not be the only issue.

Woman: And here.

Alan Greenberg: That's not our decision necessarily, but it may be important that it not be the main decision point that is used to decide where meetings are held.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And then let me get to - was that Marilyn also that I heard?

Marilyn Cade: I just came back. Sorry for dropping off, we'll try to be here the next 15 minutes.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, okay, thanks. I have Wolf, then Avri and then Robin.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, just to say the intention is for the council to come up with a motion on the issue, on the question of face-to-face, so normally as a motion is about, asking for acceptance of the office is a request as it is. And in this respect I am asking you, do we intend to modify the request in light of the discussion we right now we had? So I would encourage, as I could see probably for Avri, she was only finding a conditional yes if there is parity. So is it intended to modify the request and probably discussion, we should find the procedure for that?

Jeff Neuman: Okay, let me go to the other people that have raised their hands.

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah, thanks. I think first of all, if you get to any use of the word consensus you have a medium to rough consensus at best. I think Wolf did identify an issue, which is that since the conditional is on doing correctly, which is not only the parity issue, but perhaps geographic consideration, that the plan as intent would not have NCSG's support. And finally, but you weren't asking about the plan when you asked that question. You were asking purely might there be positive value in a meeting.

If you're talking about the plan as it exists, then no, that doesn't have support. And finally, on the geographical issue, I certainly did not mean to say that Washington D.C. was intentionally picked to show the world that we do not care about international. What I would say is, yes, I understand that

Washington D.C. is financially expeditious and it's really easy for the people, the North Americans that live clustered around D.C., but given the affirmation of commitment to be a more international friendly body, that those commitments that have been made. And that's one of the reasons why I keep pointing out also the 9.1 and especially 9.1B, that there have been deals with, you know, policy making and the policy development process, is that those commitments have been made that is a new dimension on all of our discussions, and that we cannot continue the discussion on new PDPs without taking all the affirmation commitment into account.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, okay. So Avri, let me, because what it sounds like, and then I'll address this to you and then Robin's got her hand up too. Unfortunately, what it sounds like to me, and maybe this is too narrow of a view, but what you're almost saying is that there could never be another meeting in the United States, because of the affirmation of commitments. So that's probably not what you're saying, so help me as chair to determine or figure out what would be the appropriate - given the composition of this group and given the goals that we would like to achieve at this meeting, where would be an acceptable meeting and why would that location be better than Washington?

Avri Doria: Okay, I haven't given much thought really. What pops into my mind is Amsterdam Airport. But basically some place that people from more locations in the world can get to with only hub hop. So perhaps Dulles counts as one of those and Washington D.C. in its relation to Dulles. I'm certainly not saying, no more U.S. meetings can ever be held or they will pardon me because of the visa issues with the U.S. think that is something that perhaps should be considered. But I'm just saying that an automatic decision that we're meeting in Washington D.C. because it's cheapest is not. We also have to look at the fact of the people who might come to this but don't get free seats and have to pay their own way, is Washington D.C. really the cheapest. Would Amsterdam be cheaper? Would Kuala Lumpur, I don't know. I mean I'm not one of those that's pricing things for people living around the world. If we had many people coming from Australia, you know, to this meeting or from Asia to

this meeting or from Africa to this meeting, who had to pay their own way or their companies had to pay their way, because we don't need to just invite the people that can pay. But I'm assuming that other people would care enough to come anyway.

Jeff Neuman: So I think...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I don't know the answer, but Washington D.C. is quick and easy and cheap for the people in Washington D.C. and vicinity North Americans, then cool.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I think, just - then I do want to go to Robin. I think Washington D.C. was chosen because again the group, which is meeting regularly, when we looked at the composition of those that would not need funding, I think we actually did look at that. And so when we looked for example at the registry, registrar, the ITC, the business, some individuals, we did determine that there just happened to be a number of people located very close to D.C. that could get there, even if they weren't the funded ones. That may be different with the noncommercial, but certainly with some of the other stakeholder groups, that is something we thought about.

                 For example, if James were to be funded from the registrars, because he's in Iowa, and as he says, it's two hops from everywhere, you know, if he were to be the one funded, you know, Paul would be able to come, because Paul is pretty close, you know, he's in the D.C. area. If Marilyn could come, because she's in the D.C. area, so there were kind of, we did look at the composition of the group, so it wasn't just this haphazard D.C. is easy, let's do it there. Let me go to Robin, because she's got her hand up.

Robin Gross: Thanks. I just want to imply that, and I certainly don't think that the choice of holding the meeting in D.C. was in any way trying to exclude other participants; I never thought that was the intent. But what I think is we need to

think about the locations of what happens when we select meetings in different locations. And unfortunately, always having meetings or frequently having meetings in the United States is an extremely burdensome activity for people in developing countries. It's a real pain to get a visa, it takes a long time, and there is enormous expense.

So I think that, you know, it's not just about let's stick it to the people in developing countries, ah-ha, I don't think that's at all what anyone is trying to say here, what I'm saying is let's think about the implications about the location of our meeting. Because even though we don't intend to exclude others, we may in fact be exclusionary of people in developing countries, and what happens is we have a situation where it's just a perpetuation of the existing participants because it's easy for them to participate, so they make it easy for them to participate, which then continues to make it more difficult for people outside of the existing small country of people who are planning.

So I think we need to make sure that we open it up to newer people and take that into consideration. I know some folks just said, well, this work team is special and we need to just think about this and not think about these broader issues.

But I disagree. I think we can't remove this work team from the rest of the work that the GNSO is doing, and we have to hold the same kinds of standards to this work team that we hold all the other work teams, meaning making sure that all the views are represented in the dialogue.

I for one do not understand this argument that, oh no, this is just existing participants to finish up the work, so we don't need the noncommercial viewpoint there. I don't understand that viewpoint. To me that goes completely against everything that the GNSO is supposed to be about, representing particularly interests and can support that our interest be represented there, and we also think it's important that it's up to the community itself to decide who represents us at these meetings. It's not up to

ICANN staff. It's up to the noncommercial stakeholders to decide who represents noncommercial stakeholders. It's up to the registry to decide who represents registries, etc., etc.

So these are two points that we're going to play really hard on going forward.

Jeff Neuman: Just to clarify though. Any noncommercial can join this work team at any time. I'm assuming you're not just doing outreach face-to-face, I am assuming you're hopefully doing outreach to get more people to join the work, right?

Robin Gross: Well I think we've done that. I think you've seen it - I think you've seen that.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I mean I know, and analysis is part of the group so I'm glad, I'm glad you're part of this group. I think that's very beneficial for us all to get your viewpoint. Okay, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Two points. We just spent a lot of time talking about how to pick a location, and maybe I missed it, I think I've participated in all the calls though. This was not an issue we really discussed. The staff went away and did an assessment of where the best place would probably be. It may well be the staff needs to use a different algorithm for determining this. But I think it's important for those who weren't at earlier meetings, this was not a major subject of discussion of this particular group, not when I was around.

The other issue I want to mention is cost is not the only factor but also travel time. For me, I can probably get to Amsterdam for a lower price than I can PPSC to D.C., despite the distance and you know the time of the flight. But one takes a day or day and a half worth of travel and the other takes a couple of hours. And that also has to be part of the overall equation in determining what the best location is so to speak. I don't know how to do that, but I just want to go put on the table that it is one of the issues.

If you make a two day meeting into a four day meeting, you're going to reduce the number of people who participate. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Okay, anybody else with comments on this subject? Robin your hand's up, but I think that's left over from the last comments. Okay. Thanks.

So I guess there are still some logistic things, and again, we'll present all these view points to the council. I've got to be honest with everything - with all the discussions coming up, I'm not sure that this is going to happen, but we're going to bring it up, and I don't want to withdraw the request from council, because I think it's actually a really good discussion for them to have.

Whether or not we go forward with this face-to-face, I think they need to have the discussion, and so I don't want to just withdraw having them not have to go through the exercise of discussing it. And even if January 18th and 19th do not happen, I do think a face-to-face of this group will have some value. So even if it's later on or at another time that everyone can make it in another location that everyone can make it.

So does anyone disagree with that? I have a feeling if I withdraw it or say that there is too much dissension within the group, the council won't discuss it and we won't make any progress on this issue.

Okay, so like I said, I'm going to take Avri's comments, make sure they get reflected in the draft email, make sure the discussion we have today and those in support, those not in support are reflected in the notes council, and they'll have a discussion. James, sorry, you have your hand up.

James Bladel: Yeah, real quickly Jeff, I'm sorry to interrupt, but Avri made a point about this that if this has to go forward we could, you know, have a marathon phone call, and I think that's probably a good idea. In fact, rather than looking into funding travel, maybe ICANN could look into putting together a WebEx or something like that?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think that's right. I think we can do something, even if it's on those same days. I think that's right. I'll talk to staff after this call to see what could be done with that. I think some of the current technologies may not be the greatest that we've had. I find Adobe okay, but it's not like WebEx where you can actually do some real time editing or people could see changes. So we do need to find something better than Adobe to have that type of meeting.

With that said, I only have five minutes left, but I do want to cover a couple of things. On the one sense, you know, I know it seems like there has been a lot of discussion on the list of this subject. There has also been a bunch of discussion on the confidentiality of board reports, which I'm very happy to see that we're having some substantive discussions, and it's obviously an area that people are passionate about.

If I can get that same level of passion on the surveys, stage four survey will be up until the site is extended until the end of the week. So, you know, hopefully people can finish it by Friday so that we can submit the results around to the group on Monday. Again, surveys are only informal, they are just to try to help guide the discussion on the rest of stage four, and to help include in the report. They are not indication of consensus. So please, please respond to those like you've been responding to the messages on this face-to-face.

We also have stage one and two reports that have had zero comments, and it's quite likely they are quite substantial. They've been out there for a couple of months - well stage one has been out there for a few months, stage two has been out there for about a month now. So please comment on those. After all, that is the ultimate work product. The stage three report will be joined hopefully by the latest on Monday, so you will have stages one, two and three reports out there to review.

And we do have another call that is scheduled for the 17th, which the time has been moved. Hopefully you've all seen that, because the council is meeting at this time or conflicts at this time, so we moved the council meeting to, I know what time it is East Coast U.S. time, it's something like 1:30 East Coast U.S. time, so that's 3-1/2 hours after the normal meeting time. So please look at that.

I've seen the discussion on the chat about if we do have marathon call sessions, the 18th may not be the best date, but if we do have to do that we will send around Doodles to block out a couple of marathon sessions to talk about it.

So does anyone have questions? Comments? Great. Please do those surveys and respond to the report. Thank you very much and I will talk to you all on the...

Woman: Jeff, one thing on the survey, just because we have people it's with, I just want to ask people if they think - well two things. One, for those of you that have not filled it out yet, we can keep it open through the weekend if you think you might get to it in the next couple of days. I think like Alan and James, you've typically done them and I don't think we have survey responses from you. And, Alex, I wanted to ask you, because it looks like you responded twice to the survey but didn't finish either, and so an order for yours is to appear in the survey result. You want to make sure - I know it's kind of long, but you want to go through and kind of finish it in one sitting. And I also wondered if maybe you had difficulty with it and that's why you did it twice?

Alex Gakuru: Yes, yes, I can quickly respond to that. Yes I had on three occasions that I was using that link, one of them would (unintelligible), and then I was forced to restart it. And then the other one the (unintelligible) I think about three days ago is when I did it in one session. For some reason, I don't know if all the information got through. The other option I do have all the questions and

submit them on a document typed out, because I still have the response to sites, and I could send it as...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Well Marika would help you. She wasn't able to join this call, but she wanted me to bring it up and I'll have her reach out to you directly and figure out if there's a -we just want to make sure to capture your comments. So very good.

Alex Gakuru: There was a tech - it was a technical problem with the audio, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: ...where I am too.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...this is Jeff, I've also asked Marika to look into seeing whether this software or other software could be used where you could actually save your results midway and then could return back to it. I think that would help. Because these are very long.

                So I think having Marika reach out to Alex is a good idea, and possibly just sending a document with all the questions where he could submit something separate would also help.

Alex Gakuru: Okay, thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

James Bladel: This is a James. Just for the record, that was turned in last night, so you should have it now.

Woman: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you everyone. I'll talk to you guys next week.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Man: Thanks, Jeff.

Woman: Bye.

                         END