

**GNSO Council Special Travel Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION**

Thursday 28 August 2008 12:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast GNSO Council Special Travel Teleconference on 28 August 2008, 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-special-travel-council-20080828.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Results of Travel Policy meeting and motion

<http://gnso.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg05391.html>

Present:

Avri Doria – GNSO Chair – NCA
Chuck Gomes – Registry constituency, vice chair
Olga Cavalli - NCA
Philip Sheppard – CBUC
Kristina Rosette – IPC
Tony Holmes – ISP
Tony Harris – ISP
Greg Ruth – ISP
Norbert Klein – NCUC
Tim Ruiz – Registrar C.

Staff:

Olof Nordling
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Géry

Avri: ...came from me. And which me did it come from? It came from me at

Norbert: Thank you very much.

Avri: Thank you. I realize mail from me comes from many different addresses. It can be confusing. Okay, the recording has started so we can proceed. Glen, could you just do a role of who's here so that we know at least who's here to start with at this meeting. So as I say, this is not a quorum, not a voting meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Do a role call.

Glen DeSaintgery: We have (Olga)?

(Olga): Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: Avri.

Avri: Yep.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Chuck Gomes

(Chuck): Yeah.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Kristina)?

Kristina Rosette: Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Norbert)?

(Norbert): I'm here.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Greg Ruth)?

(Greg Ruth): Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Enrique)?

(Enrique): Here.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Tom Keller, Jordi) Iparraguirre, Edmond Chung, (Tony Harris, Robin Gross, Carlos Souza, And Jon Bing. So we have got each person. And sorry, we've got (Marika Konings, Olof Nordling and myself

Avri: Okay, thank you. So...

Man: And it looks like ((Tony) Holmes) may have dropped off temporarily. Is that right?

Avri: No, the team is muted but not (unintelligible).

Chuck Oh, muted I see. Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Someone from that registrar constituency.

Avri: Thank you, I'm glad to have them on further constituency. As I say, I did not plan this as a voting meeting given its interim status, but I did want to have a chance to talk through the list we were proposing to

make any trade off that we feel we need to make. And I sent out an email with an agenda.

There were only two items on the agenda, allocation of travel slots for Cairo and then a second item if there was time and if there was the inclination to talk about it at all is a discussion of next step, if any, in responding to the staff's determined travel policy for the GNSO.

So the information - I sent out an email basically propose - suggesting a method of coming up with our list, which was in following the policy that each of the constituencies would send to the counsel list to me, whatever. A list containing 0 to 3 names. That in that list the first name from each of the constituencies would have an automatic seat - I mean an automatic travel slot leaving possibly for - possibly more had any constituency not decided to put in, a suggestion.

But leaving four if each one did. We did get at least one name from each constituency which gives us six names in the default travel spot, and that's (Mike Rosenbach) toward the BC, (Uta Decker) for the IPC. (Tony Harris) for the ISPC, (Robin Gross) for NPC.

(Clark Walton) for the registrar's and (Carolyn Hoover) for the registries. That left four spots and five names. For the business constituency is (Ahid Jamil) and Philip Sheppard. For the IPC, (Christine Rosette), for the ISPC, (Greg Ruth) to the NCUC, (Norbert Kline).

Now an extra detail came thru, which was that (Uda Decker) and (Greg Ruth) can get partial support, travel, plus hotel for some of the nights but not all of the nights. And expenses I guess for the some of the days

but not all of the days because of their non-com status and the support they get through non-com.

I haven't received final confirmation yet, but there are some funds. There's been there - the funding is - and Glen can give a better confirmation on this. It seems that there are funds left over in a budget from the DNSO day. And that these funds would be adequate to cover additional nights, hotel, if we were to put the two people who have non-com support and were to cover that.

Now I've asked for verification that these funds can be used this way. These funds have been around for a while, they haven't been used I think since I've been Chair and there's sort of been a discussion as to what should happen with them, and I think once we finish our structural re-org, we need to take a look at exactly what happened.

These things have just been sitting in a budget forever. So it means that we do have the ability if (Uta Decker) and (Greg Ruth) took the partial support from non-com to cover to extra nights in the hotel, but I still need confirmation of that time. So, we've also - one of the questions that was spending is whether we could split support between two people.

And someone take flight and someone take hotel expenses. We've been told quite definitively that that is not a permissible option. And so therefore, one has a complete - now that doesn't mean that one has to take both flight and hotel, I believe. And that would just leave the rest of the money in the budget. But it does mean that we can't give one person one and one person the other.

So I think I've said, and so in my note I included everything I've just said plus this is specifically for anybody that didn't have to be in front of a computer. And I include the excerpts, the pertinent excerpts from the email with the request at the bottom of that message.

So I guess I open the floor. I open the floor with a question on whether - since this is significant in terms of the IPC and the (Uta Decker) as the first name on the slot is occupying the automatic slot. But if she were to say she would go with the non-com and that, then (Christina) could be moved into that slot. But that hasn't happened yet because I've gone with the procedure I suggested.

I guess I'd like to open it to other people that want to comment, want to suggest what we should do. In some sense it looks like everyone can be covered. But we need to discuss it.

Kristina Rosette: Avri, can you put me in?

Man: ...and.

Avri: Who's - this is?

Kristina Rosette: (Christina).

Avri: (Christina), sorry. You were so faint I couldn't hear you. (Christina), who else?

(Norbert): (Norbert).

Avri: (Norbert). Anyone else want to be in the initial queue?

(Chuck): (Chuck).

Avri: (Chuck), anyone else?

Philip Sheppard: (Philip).

Avri: (Philip), anyone else? I'd like to get started queue. Okay, (Christina).

Kristina Rosette: Two questions, first I understand that you can't have members of the constituency sharing the packet with one getting air and one getting hotel. But how exactly would it work if someone (unintelligible) support but only needs the hotel? I mean I understood that you suggested that might be an option. And I wanted get it very clear.

Avri: Right, yeah, no. I - as far as I can tell, I'd have to confirm this. But from you would just speak to the travel agent and say I just need the travel support. The hotel support, now we can confirm this afterwards if that's what we decide. Just use the travel support.

Don't need a ticket. And then the budget remains.

Kristina Rosette: That, I mean that would certainly help me, because I really truly only need partial support because I'm not comfortable asking for more than that. The other question I had is that the very helpful memo that (Doug Brent) circulated indicated that (unintelligible) travel support would have in attendance for all of the meetings, deemed necessary by their FO.

And my question for everyone is, are we considering the Saturday meeting, notwithstanding the (unintelligible) day, or the day before the

meeting officially starts. Are we considered - there tends for those to be a prerequisite for travel funding.

Avri: Interesting question. I hadn't given it any thought.

Kristina Rosette: The reason I ask is that I need to be in D.C. Until early evening on Friday night because that's the earliest I can get the Cairo status.

Man: Yeah, can I express an opinion there, Avri?

Avri: Sure.

Man: I think it would be fair for the FO to make that decision and I mean that the fact that someone has a conflict in their regular life that interferes with the other two I think should also be fine. I mean we all run into those kinds of situations.

Avri: Yep. He was reasonable. I mean...

(Tim): I've got - this is (Tim), I'd like to express an opinion on that too.

Avri: Okay.

(Tim): And I mean if - I don't agree. I mean if we're going to fund people's travel to an ICANN meeting, then, you know, we should focus those funds based on need. Although I think we're scheming out the (unintelligible). But at least to make sure that we fund people who can be there for the entire meeting, and those working meetings on Saturday and Sunday are important.

And if, you know, we're going to fund somebody to be there, let's make sure they can be there for the whole thing. So, why we would give funding for someone who's going to be there for part of the time?

Man: This is for the part of this other question which is concerning an auspice (sic) on equity. If somebody's a member of counsel, and we're saying they would be required to be to a pre-meeting of counsel, say on a Saturday, would that also apply to people who are not members of counsel and say, observers who would actually not need it, that meeting as well.

I think we need to be clear when we're making a just sort of policy where we go...

Avri: That would seem actually reasonable that all counsel meeting and all FO meetings would be all FO meetings whether somebody was on counsel or not. Obviously if the meeting was closed to them that would be an issue, but we don't have closed meetings. So I would think that all would be all for everyone.

Man: Okay, I...

Avri: That seems to me, reasonable. But, you know, obviously we have to talk. I'll go back to the queue now.

Man: Sure.

Avri: (Christina) had you finished with your points?

Kristina Rosette: Yes.

Avri: Okay, thank you. (Norbert).

(Norbert): And I just wanted to ask, you said there are these left-over funds that you might need. What was your (unintelligible) of the (unintelligible). They have to be concerned. Do you know when the conformation did happen?

Avri: Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry, I didn't get your confirmation out.

Avri: The question on whether the old DNFO funds budget can be used to cover...

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh, no there's no - there is no limit that has been put on that.

Avri: So, in other words, I can use those for that purpose, because as far as I understand, those have been designated as something that the Chair of the GNSO can apply as needed?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Avri: So, in other words, ICANN said yes, that is something. And I won't get feedback later that I could not do that?

Glen DeSaintgery: Well that is in the resolution that was made.

Avri: Okay, thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Which ICANN - which would you like me to send that to concert right now?

Avri: That would probably be good.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Avri: Thank you. So I guess (Norbert) the answer is it looks like we have that confirmation that I can use those funds that way.

Man: That helps us today. Thank you.

Avri: Thank you. (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Yeah, and I was just - the question I sent to the list just before we started with regard to if the two non-com members are funded for the whole meeting venue, they - then they would count against the ten for the counsel. But it sounds like you have come up with a...

Avri: Right.

(Chuck): ...at least that we now have an alternative for that, so.

Avri: Yes that they would have a completely separate (unintelligible) for funding which would be non-com, plus this, this, this, this, that.

(Chuck): So I guess my question becomes kind of irrelevant then, even though Glen I guess I understood you that I was correct in my assumption?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, because I think the question to (Denise) (unintelligible), and she answered yes, (Chuck).

(Chuck): Thanks.

Man: But that's not what the policy says is posted.

Avri: Well they're not being funded under that policy.

(Chuck): Well, if you look at the chart, and it lists the FO, GNSO, it says number of non-count appointees, three additional support to the meeting - half your meeting counsel's guiding from the chair that's ten - total supported travelers is actually 13, which includes the three-man count appointee.

Avri: Now, there's a difference between the non-com -

(Chuck): Well according to that they're included in that policy.

Avri: The confusion here I believe is between non-com appointees and members of the nominating committee. So, (Uta) and (Greg) are members of the nominating committee.

(Chuck): Oh, okay.

Avri: And are being funded to attend part of the meeting, and they have this special meeting on the weekend after by ICANN as nominating committee participants. And what was missing is that that support only began, I forget what day it begins, but it begins - it doesn't start, even on the sun - the Monday.

(Chuck): Starts on Thursday.

Avri: It starts on the Thursday. So we would need to make up for the expenses funding for the Saturday through Wednesday. As that is not covered by the nominating committee because the nominating committee does not require people to actually watch an ICANN meeting, it merely requires them to choose non-com appointees.

But doesn't require them to actually participate in the meeting.

(Chuck): Got it.

Avri: Which is interesting in itself, but that's a different conversation. Okay, so at the moment what I guess - and this is a question for the IPC, is I have (Uta Decker), in - as she's occupying the top slot in the IPC slot. And I'm wondering now how we handle that, because without the IPC saying, you know, she's not the number one in the front. She's the number two, and therefore please put (Christina) in or, you know, she's not on the list anymore because she's taking the non-com. I have to work with the constituency list.

Woman: If you're - well, if you're asking whether the IPC would like to have (Uta) as the non-non-com covered portion of her travel funded by these additional legacy funds?

Avri: Yep, yes we would.

Woman: Whether that moves me up on the list I think is irrelevant because it's their requirement for travel funding is that I have to be in Cairo at 9 a.m. Saturday morning. I cannot do that. I cannot be in Cairo before 7 p.m. And I should also note that, you know, according to the ICANN web site, the meeting doesn't technically start until Sunday.

Avri: Yep.

Woman: So in that case, you know, depending upon how the counsel goes, the IPC would not use any of its travel slots, and we would just reserve or hope that statements have been made from the fact that we would be able to get additional slots next go around with (unintelligible).

Avri: Okay...yeah. It seems, I mean I agree that people should try and be at all of the meetings and I think a rule - I think I guess I agree with (Chuck) that we need to have certain bits of flexibility, but obviously its something we would need to vote on in the counsel.

Woman: Right, and this is a unique situation. I mean for me at least it's going to take about 24 hours in travel time. So, you know, if this meeting were located somewhere else, in Paris, wouldn't be a problem.

Avri: I understand. Okay, well let's go back. (Chuck), I had you on the list.

(Chuck): You've - you already went.

Avri: Oh, no I already went through (Philip). Did I get to you?

Philip Sheppard: I'm (unintelligible).

Avri: Okay, sorry.

Philip Sheppard: Yes, just to - well a couple of observations and a question. One in terms of the DNFO funding - I don't have any (unintelligible) where, but the origin of that funding with fees voluntarily paid by constituencies in

order to fund their activities before we go to budget from ICANN. And I think the philosophy behind reserving that money was to use it for things that we thought were going to be in the interest of policy making.

Perhaps the start is something like that when that money wasn't forthcoming from ICANN, it's (unintelligible) over there. Revolution (unintelligible) will be posting on that, so it's not - we need to be very clear that that is money that has come from constituencies, not from ICANN or historically.

The second question I have is I'm slightly confused as to this overlap between counselors and nominating committee members. I thought it should be any to do one or the other, or at least a transitional move.

Avri: No, no again, it's two different categories. And we confuse because we call them non-com. There are non-com appointees of which (Olga), (John) and I are non-com appointees.

Philip Sheppard: Sure.

Avri: There are nominating committee members.

Philip Sheppard: Yes, but...

Avri: (unintelligible) appointees and (Greg) and (Uta) are committee members.

Philip Sheppard: Yes, but I understood that to be a committee member of nominating committee, you are ineligible to be a member of a body that the committee appointeth to.

Avri: No. In fact, nominating committee - there are BC members, in fact there's two BC members on the nominating committee. And there's one from each constituency.

Philip Sheppard: No, no, no. Not - but you can't be - not if you're (unintelligible) member of the constituency.

Avri: And you can be on the nominating committee. You just can't be appointed by the nominating committee.

Philip Sheppard: I don't know. I just saw that in Section 8 of the by-laws under that. All right so then like person who's served on the (unintelligible) committee in any capacity should be eligible for selection, for any means depending on your position on the Board or any other ICANN body having membership positions, the nominating committee's responsible for filling.

Man: That's a fact.

Philip Sheppard: (Unintelligible) inclusion of ICANN on your meeting, du, du, du. (Unintelligible).

Man: Yeah, but doesn't present them - sir, I'm missing what you're saying (Philip) because in other words they couldn't be appointed to the Board. They couldn't be appointed as a non-com rep on the counsel. But that doesn't prevent them serving on the non-com and being in a constituency.

Philip Sheppard: We went through this process with a former counselor...

Man: ...and it was (unintelligible) before.

Avri: Who wanted to run for Board.

Philip Sheppard: Oh, okay. (Unintelligible) additional.

Man: It gets folks to go (unintelligible).

Avri: I mean there may be a different issue in there, but it's certainly not an issue for us. You know, if there is some question about eligibility to serve on a non-com, that's certainly - on a nominating committee, that's certainly not an issue that we can deal with in any sense.

Philip Sheppard: No. Sure. Okay. All right; and my third point, was really what I think we need to have a clear rule also, I think in terms of the beginning and the end of an ICANN meeting. And I think regardless of circumstances in front of us, I think we get into trouble if we try to have something that is different to the official start and finish of the meetings, however the dates that they designated.

It just leads - it will just lead in the future to arbitrariness. And my recommendation would be that eligibility criteria that we have to set then should be determined by the official start and finish time of these meetings. Or these official start time that (unintelligible).

Man: Can I respond to that Avri?

Avri: Sure.

Philip Sheppard: Sure.

Man: I disagree with that, while at the same time, being consistent with what I said earlier, that I think we need to have some flexibility there for exceptions. It's not arbitrary to say that from the GNSO's perspective the commitment should involve any meetings we have prior to the start of official meetings.

That's not arbitrary at all. It's very clear, it's very specific. At the same time, like I said before, I'm okay with having flexibility. In fact, I support having flexibility for exceptional situations in that regard.

Avri: And I don't know if it matters, but I'd like to add one comment is, and especially when someone is only taking partial support, it might make it easier to just be flexible. I - queue's open, or (Philip) had you finished?

Philip Sheppard: I'm finished, yeah.

Avri: Yeah, queue's open for people to discuss it further. Okay, what I'd like to recommend and get people to respond to is that we need to put (Christina) in the IPC slot that we define that, you know, being at the meeting includes being there at all sessions, but flexibility for missing a day.

And that (Greg Ruth), and (Uta) get the other funding and that everyone else that's on this list would therefore be part of the ten. So in other words, we would have a list of travelers that would be (Mike Rosenbach), Kristina Rosette, (Tony Harris), (Robin Gross), (Clark Walton), (Carolyn Hoover), (Becky Gumeal), Philip Sheppard and (Norbert Kline).

Yeah, I said (Christina) at the top of the list, I'm putting it together with (Uta Decker) and (Greg Ruth) getting non-com committee support plus

the supplemental funding from the DNFO budget. I understand (Philip) what you're saying about that. And that's one of the reasons why even though I've sort of been - Glen has made me aware of this budget.

I've never really known what to do with it. This does strike me as being insupportive of constituencies and what I really think we need to do once we get to - into the restructuring and into the talking about how we do things as one of the standing committees to actually think about this budget and what we do and do we just use it.

Do we subdivide it, do we try to build on it for things, etc. It sort of sat there for a long time. This strikes me once before when we couldn't find funding for someone to come, we looked at using it and then found the funding somewhere else, so didn't need to.

But it's one of the reasons I've sort of - it's been there, but I haven't really known what to do with it in this case, using it for that supplemental funding seems to me to be reasonable. But certainly when I wrote this up, I would mention that as going in and counsel, you know, would have a chance to say no, we think that's a bad idea.

But that would be part of the package that I would certainly recommend. So I'd like to ask people to comment on going that way with it.

(Greg Ruth): Now this is (Greg) and...

Avri: Yeah.

(Greg Ruth) ...pretend I'm like in the queue.

Avri: Okay, I've got (Greg), I've got (Tim). Anyone else?

Philip Sheppard: (Philip), just point information.

Avri: Okay, (Philip). Okay, (Greg)?

(Greg Ruth): I'm happy with this kind of resolution for this specific case, the Cairo meeting. Obviously in the future we'll have to figure out what we really want to do. But now and a point of clarification, is this supplemental funding at this - can be used at the discretion of the counsel, however the counsel wants to use this money?

Avri: Actually I think it's actually at the discretion of the counsel Chair.

(Greg Ruth): Okay. But it's not...

Avri: I think it's (unintelligible).

(Greg Ruth): ...something where ICANN can say, oh no, no, no. You can't use it for that.

Avri: That's what I was confirming. Because I'm never totally secure that ICANN will let me do what I think we should be allowed to do. So that was what I was trying to confirm.

(Greg Ruth): Right.

Avri: Glen has confirmed that. Obviously after this meeting, if that's what, you know, we sort of have a general agreement to do, a rough consensus has it where to do, that's what I would write up as the

proposal. Then I would ask to be verified. We would therefore have a week for, you know, any screening that might happen about that.

But I, you know, I trust that Glen has, you know. And that's what the policy says. So I think we should be okay.

(Greg Ruth): So we'll know by - we...

Avri: We'll certainly tell you.

(Greg Ruth): ...but you will be putting it out by September 4?

Avri: Yeah. I mean I believe we already do know, but yes, there's obviously always a chance for someone to, you know, come with a bigger stick.

(Greg Ruth): Okay, well given that likelihood, I would speak in favor of the plan you suggested.

Avri: Good thing. (Tim)?

(Tim): Well clearly, I'm not (unintelligible). Well I mean, basically the plan you're suggesting then funds all with the entire counsel membership with a business constituency and two from the ISPC and two from the IPC. But you know, I don't - I can't believe in my wildest dreams that there's a real need to fund all three of the DC or even two of the IPC or the ISPC.

I mean if we're still going to go down that road. I would at least request that we go back to the NCUC, make sure that they know what's going on here, and give them an opportunity to fund their third counselor...

Avri: They already...

(Greg Ruth): ...in lieu of somebody else.

Avri: Okay, just a point, they already listed that their counselor was covered in that message that was sent.

(Greg Ruth): Right, but...

Avri: And...

(Greg Ruth): ...they may decide to use this funding instead. Clearly and, you know, and that's a pretty sad state of affairs, if the NCUC can say well, we can cover one of ours, but the (unintelligible) can't cover anybody? I mean that's really this is just getting a little bit ridiculous from my point of view, the way we're using these funds.

And I don't think there's any need that we have to use all these funds. And if everybody's got at least one counselor supported or attending, then I don't see the need to fund everybody else.

(Chuck): Please add me to the queue Avri.

Avri: Okay. Okay, (Philip)?

Philip Sheppard: Thanks. I'll make my point of information in the response. The point is, I don't know if anybody's seen it, but Glen's forwarded out that resolution on the old DNFO funds. And I think what we had agreed back in 2003 was to authorize a counsel Chair for expenditure up to \$1,000 U.S. I think that was just seen as something in terms of practicality for something that might come up.

The implication is beyond that, we need to make a decision of the accounts for the terms of use of those funds.

Avri: Well I was planning to put it in the package that I was going to ask the counsel to verify.

Philip Sheppard: Oh, and I just know (unintelligible). I mean, I think - I mean to me the point of this funding is to maximize people who participate in policy development. And therefore I think I - you know, I support the proposal you made. People have indicated the level of support they would like in that particular objective.

And if we can accommodate by - with everybody juggling with non-com, everybody's request. That's strikes me as a great (unintelligible).

Avri: Thank you. (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Yeah, well I - the (unintelligible) constituency has been very clear with regard to travel subsidization all along that we believe - I think of course we just - providing travel support on a basis where there is a legitimate need. I certainly agree with (Tim) that it's not clear that there is a legitimate need in several cases, because in most cases it wasn't - no statement of need was even made.

I specifically communicated with regard to the person that the registration go forward, that there was a definite need that the person couldn't attend if the funds weren't (unintelligible). And I did that intentionally because we do believe that this sort of activity should be based on a - primarily on a need basis.

We also believe that they should be active in the meetings and but the primary thing is need. So if the registries certainly aren't in favor of supporting travel expenses for people who don't have a legitimate need. Last, I want to say that I think it creates a problem when we use what are essentially registrant funds to support travel of people who are lobbying for a particular interest.

And I'm totally supportive of them being able to lobby for their interests. I have no objection to that at all. Where I have concerns is where we're using general registrar fees - registrant fees, excuse me, to subsidize those organizations. I think it creates a situation that's awkward and even creates some conflicts that would be better to avoid, except in cases where there's a legitimate need.

Avri: Before I want to create any queue I want to put myself in it. Anyone else want to be in the queue? Okay...

Woman: Avri?

Avri: Yeah? Was that (Olga) or was (Chris)? Yeah.

(Tony Harris): Avri?

Avri: Yeah?

(Tony Harris): Yeah, (Tony Harris), just put me in the queue please.

Avri: Okay, so I have myself, I have (Olga), I believe and (Tony).

(Olga): And no, and (Olga) wants to be in the queue but it was not the first one that said me.

Avri: Oh, was that...? I'm sorry.

Kristina Rosette: That was me, Avri, (Christina).

Avri: Oh, I'm crying. So I have (Christina), and then I have (Tony) and then I have (Olga). Apologies.

(Tim): And (Tim).

Avri: And (Tim). Okay. I wanted to first in terms of this particular exercise for Cairo, and I was really hoping that we could sort of separate all of the discussions about whether it's just for need, you know. Is it just counsel members? Is it people who are important to a registry? Is it, you know, our registrants who, you know, or is money devised from registrant fees usable by people who lobby for particular registrant interests, etc.

And leave all of those really tough questions for the new counsel that's sort of comes through and is looking at things in the new light of, you know, redefine the portionalities, restructured by com, or whatever it is that the Board is deciding at the moment is our fate.

And so therefore that's why I sort of suggested a neutral process that we would go through where within the constraints given by the staff creative pool that every constituency would rank up to 3, from 0 to 3. And without sort of any prejudice of deciding, is this person or that person appropriate?

As I said, just for the Cairo that we would come out. Now in terms of making a decision, have we gotten to the point of having decide between someone who is needy and someone who perhaps doesn't appear as needy, then we may have gotten it. Since we've got a formula that allows us to cover everyone that we put on the list during this exercise, that I admit is not perfect, but is something to try and resolve things before getting into the weighty issues.

I'm hoping we could lead sort of set the weighty issues aside and just go with something that works.

(Tim): I'm sorry Avri, but that wasn't clear that that was what was going to be the outcome here. And I'm sorry to just but in, this is (Tim).

Avri: But...

(Tim): But if we (unintelligible), you know, well if we only get ten names we're just going to fund everybody. You know, we might put a few more names on the list. That wasn't clear that that was going to be the outcome.

Avri: But okay - I apologize for that. I caught that in the various notes of the various questions that people asked me, and in fact I had talked about the whole thing that in the best of all cases we will only have ten names and we will be able to fund everyone.
I think I said that quite explicitly in the suggestion that I was putting forward to try and find a solution. It was only if we had more. So yes, I was hoping that, you know, and my particular hope, I was hoping that it would be need-based. But there is no decision.

And if we try to resolve all of these hard issues before Cairo, we won't have a list. So (Christina)? (Christina)?

Kristina Rosette: Sorry. I'm going to have to - well I just wanted to note that I would be very appreciative if this is in fact the formula that works. I'll just make it abundantly clear that I will not accept full support. I cannot and I will not do it. If the decision is that there can be no partial support, I can note (Tim) that the (unintelligible) matter, count - task (unintelligible) and task me you really only have one.

If decision's made then I will accept that by - but I will respect it. And I will also note that I tried to be very forth coming about the restrictions on my attendance; again, renders me ineligible for any travel support (unintelligible). Back to you.

Avri: (Tony)?

(Tony Harris): Yes, I just wanted - well actually Avri said whether according to was what I was thinking. And I rather interpreted that this particular meeting is sort of an interim situation, and then with - there would be more in depth consideration and discussions on how to move forward and forth. And I think really this - the decision of what's to be done in this case seems to solve everybody's problem.

And we can then look to the future afterwards.

Avri: Thank you. (Olga)?

(Olga): Yes, and so different kind of question. As a non-com appointee, I understand that we have travel support. What I would like to understand, if the support will be the same or the procedure for the

travel support would be the same as before or if we'd have change, and if it has change how it will be from now on?

Avri: I - we'll have to get into that separately and, you know, we'll talk. I believe that it is the same as everyone else's is what's being said other than it's automatic.

(Olga): Okay.

(Tony Harris): Avri, could you add me to the queue please, (Tony).

Avri: Okay, (Tony). Okay. So (Olga), on any of those issues, we'll have to work them out with that. But I believe that, except for Chair and who happens to be non-com, it's the same process though it's the same right of status before. It's the same.

I have tried to get clarification on the issue of per diem versus direct coverage for a hotel. But again, that's not an issue for this meeting.

(Olga): Okay.

Avri: We'll have to send this off outside.

(Olga): Okay, thank you.

Avri: (Tim)?

(Tim): Yeah I would just like to restate my request that we - before any decision is made that the NCUC has an opportunity to fund all three of their counselors from this fund. And I don't see any difference in that

than funding all of the VC or two of all of the other commercial user's constituencies. Certainly, you know, if the NCUC can come up with the funds to try to possibly fund one counselor, I can't see any reason why the commercial users couldn't do the same thing.

And if they can't, then maybe they need to relook at discussion of their constituencies and how they're funding. But at the very least, if we're going to move forward with this as it is, then I would like to be sure that the NCUC knows that they have the opportunity to fund all three of their counselors to their (unintelligible).

Avri: The trouble - okay, if I can interject, the problem I have with that is everyone was given the same exact question. And...

(Tim): Not everyone had the same exact understanding and that's what cleared it.

Avri: That's never taken anything that everyone has the same exact understanding. I can't think of a single situation in the world where everyone has the same understanding. However, everyone was presented with the same (unintelligible)...

(Tim): Avri, don't even stick to the by-laws when we're doing a PDP. So it's ridiculous now to say that they're some rule being imposed here that I can't be...

Avri: I'm basically trying to solve an issue...

(Tim): ...now flexible.

Avri: ...and open - reopening it up at this point when we've managed to cover everyone that's there is really just a formula for how do we exclude someone. So I personally have a problem with real payment. You know, it's...

(Tim): No, it's not a matter of excluding; it's a matter of including.

Avri: But we can't include (unintelligible).

(Tim): I just want to look at this.

Avri: Okay, (Tony)?

(Tony Harris): Yes, just on that last point, I certainly don't think it's advisable to open this up again. And I just wanted to add my support for those who have spoken in the terms of moving forward on the basis we've discussed earlier for Cairo. And then taking a fresh look at it and looking at the other issues after that.

So with that, I just thought that we'd move forward on that basis and apologies, I'll have to leave the call now. Thanks.

Avri: Okay, thank you.

(Chuck): Avri, please add me to the queue, it's (Chuck).

Avri: Okay, (Chuck). And I'd also like to ask (Norbert) back to the queue as the NCUC person that's on the call. I apologize for putting you on the spot, but I'd like to get your opinion on whether we need to reopen this, as NCUC has made its own statement. But (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Yeah, the - I - one of the things, the challenges that I will have obviously is to take this back to the registry constituency before September 4, and make sure that I vote the way that the constituency wants me to vote, okay? And two requests on that regard. The first one, Avri be very - it would be very helpful to have your - I don't know if it's in the form of emotion or not.

Your proposal...

Avri: Yeah, it would be emotion.

(Chuck): Okay, so it'd be very helpful to have that as soon as possible.

Avri: Oh, I don't need to have (unintelligible) till it's a week ahead.

(Chuck): Okay, very good. Secondly, I know in advance that it would be very helpful for me getting the support of the registries for this package, for this interim solution if - in cases where it hasn't been already stated in the request on the counsel list that need, you know, a statement of need. In other words someone couldn't attend the meeting without some travel support would be made.

Now I'm not asking that in cases where it's already been made. And there are several of those. But there are also several of those where it was just request for funding. And I know based on the registry's position that if that statement was made.

And I'm not looking for any audit of that, I'm just looking for a statement that there is a legitimate need for the funding that that would facilitate registry constituency members supporting this concept.

(Tim): So, (Chuck) this is (Tim). So by need if you - if someone says well, I can't go unless I'm funded, that's sufficient?

(Chuck): Yes, that would be sufficient. I don't think we want to get into an audit situation that we - I'm okay with self declaration...

Avri: Right, right.

(Chuck): That there's a need.

Avri: With privacy concerns of who would have to look at whose financial information on what objective basis to determine that they had need is a vicious head offish that I don't think we would want to (unintelligible).

(Chuck): No, and I'm not suggesting that at all.

Avri: And I think - I mean as I requested, people should include their reason for the request, whether it was need, you know, whether it's extraordinary circumstance. I think, you know, in terms of, you know, while (Philip) hasn't said anything in this meeting on this one, sort of answering the question of if these people aren't counsel members or working group members, in what respect is there a GNSO need for the person to be there would probably be a good thing to include also.

If we're going to start collecting information so that we can get a more discriminatory view as opposed to, here's a process we followed it, we

got a number of names that we could accommodate. And that if we've gotten more names, just of as a point of reference, if we end up by reopening things and end up with more names, then we have to start looking at how we exclude somebody from the list.

And it then becomes more of a problematical discussion and as I'd looked at, if we have a problematical discussion, the only thing we can do is then do random collection by lot, which is less fortunate. At the moment, we do have a finite list that (unintelligible) handles.

And from what I can tell, there's sort of a rough consensus, certainly not, and you know, certainly not complete consensus for putting that as a motion for the counsel. I've heard, you know, one voice against and one voice. And please include enough information so that, you know, I have a basis for voting.

(Chuck): And Avri one more thing there, one of the things that the registers also were very clear on in their - in the constituency statement in this regard is just that transparency was really important. And I tried to be as transparent as possible. And others have done so as well in their request for funding. And I think that's a very important principal.

Avri: Yeah, and I believe that we've run this whole process as open as possible too, with, you know, the call being recorded with everything being done online on an open list. So I do believe that the process has continued in a very transparent way. And certainly, you know, the requests have been almost all written with reason.

You know, some of them have indicated that there's a financial need, some of them have indicated that there's another reason within the

constraints of the policy that's (unintelligible) by the staff. Those are both equally valid.

(Chuck): And then one last point is just that I do believe in the case of, at least in this interim procedure, that the six slots, one for each constituency, should primarily be evaluated by the constituencies themselves. Some of them may not have the same criteria that the registries apply. And I understand that.

But I do believe that it's appropriate for that being a constituency decision. The seats beyond that I think are of a different nature.

Avri: All right. And but that's just...

Man: Avri?

Avri: Yes?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri: (Unintelligible) yes, ask your question, thank you.

Man: The line here is going up and down. I didn't catch it correctly. Can you please repeat your question?

Avri: Okay, (Kim Ruiz) had basically asked that we go back to the NCUC who put forward two names and indicated that the third counsel member had his own funding. And basically had asked that - basically go back to the NCUC and say, hey, you know, are you sure you only wanted these three - I mean these two. You know, because look at the

list that we've got before us maybe you would like to, you know, suggest some other names so at least all counsel members would be covered.

And so and I basically was asking you whether, you know, for your feelings on that move, on (unintelligible) need.

Man: Our discussion has been going on very much in the context that there are so many questions being raised also today about, for example, (unintelligible) on the relationship to other fund that we really focusing our discussion on the title regions, hoping that we can come up with an intensive discussion on the policy at a different stage.

But for the present time, your is our particular situation requesting that the two counsel members can get a support while the third counsel member gets (unintelligible).

Avri: Thank you. So it's 8:57, well 57 minutes on the hour now. Let me not say what time it is. I'd wanted to do this only an hour. I believe that we have a rough consensus with one dissenting view. I will mention the dissenting view in the note that I sent, and I'm sure Kim has, you know, amplify and correct me where I say it inaccurately or too coarsely.

If indeed I've done that, and I know it's quite possible that I did. And had second item I had had which is how we proceed with commenting on the policy and then a dynamite. (Unintelligible), which is how do we proceed for the future, given the existence of this current policy are topics that I will move to a future time.

I think that, you know, I do have them on the agenda for September 4. I do invite anyone that wants to start a drafting team on writing a response to do so. And I think any individuals and any constituencies that want to write more particular responses that contain elements that all of the counsel might not agree to also consider their - taking their responses.

In closing, did anyone else want to add anything? Okay, well I appreciate everyone's attendance and everyone's participation. I will get the write up of this out and the motion. And obviously, like all motions in our policies, it will - I mean in our work, it will be editable and modifiable and discussible.

Thank you everyone.

Man: Thanks Avri.

END