

**Interview with Rita Rodin, candidate for the position of ICANN Board Director,  
seat number 14  
28 February 2008**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council and constituency interview with Rita Rodin, candidate for the position of ICANN Board director seat #14, on 28 February 2008.

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-council-20080228%20.mp3>

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

Attendees :

Rita Rodin ICANN Board

Chuck Gomes, GNSO Council vice chair, Mike Rodenbaugh CBUC, Robin Gross NCUC, Kristina Rosette IPC, Jordi Iparraguirre gTLD Registry, Jon Bing Nominating Committee appointee, Alan Greenberg ALAC Liaison

ICANN staff:

Liz Gasster, Robert Hoggarth, Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: Thank you. I'd like to inform all participants that today's call is being recorded. If there are any objections, you may disconnect.

You may go ahead, sir.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much.

Well first of all...

Rita Rodin: Chuck, you wouldn't mind if I hang up, would you?

Chuck Gomes: What's that?

Rita Rodin: You wouldn't mind if I hang up?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I would. I know you, I know this - you'll enjoy this as much as we do because you like good dialogue.

But I want to start off just by especially welcoming Rita to this session and there's certainly no need to be disappointed by the limited participation. Quite a few people had conflicts but the participation and the discussion and the submittal of advanced questions I think was very good. And I suspect a lot of people are going to be listening to the recording as soon as they can.

I want to thank all of you who submitted questions as well as each of you participating on the call.

The first thing I want us to do is describe briefly, have Glenn remind us of the voting process that's going to happen here I think starting tomorrow.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, I will do that, Chuck. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: I can.

Glen Desaintgery: The voting starts tomorrow Friday at 15:00 UCT and it will end the following Friday on 7th of March at 15:00 UCT. As we all know there's only one candidate, Rita.

The voting will be by secret ballot and the same procedure that we've used for the GNSO chair will be used in this vote. Please check your spam filters as well and return the ballots as soon as possible. That does speed up the process.

All council members are eligible to vote but not liaisons. There are 27 votes in all and the majority of all council votes should be attained, that is 14 or more.

In exceptional cases, you may vote by phone if you - would be on holiday or not have Internet connectivity or whatever. And there will be a separate mailing list to manage the elections going forward. This is usually the procedure for votes that is, for the Board director votes.

Now, anything to do with the election should be sent to this list. You will all have notification that you are subscribed to the list ,that is, the council members and the liaisons, myself but not the other staff.

And the messages on this list are treated as confidential until the end of the election, but may be disclosed to General Counsel in order to obtain advice about how to handle procedural problems that might arise.

The council list should be kept open for policy development work.

The results of the election will be announced as they usually are. That is, you will find your secret code, your confidential code with the way that you voted. And each Council member should check that the vote has been correctly recorded.

The results of the vote will be confirmed at the Council meeting on the 27th of March. And then pursuant to the bylaws, the Council should give notice of its selection to a General Counsel not later than April 2. So we will be in good time.

Chuck Gomes: Any question?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Very helpful.

Very quickly, I want to outline the process we're going to use this morning. You probably looked at that but I'll still go through it very quickly.

First of all, I jotted down three purposes of the interview. Obviously, we want to interact with Rita regarding her current and future role on the board in preparation for our vote. But I think it's equally important that we want to allow counselors to not only learn about how Rita functions in the role of director, but also to understand her responsibilities in that role according to the ICANN bylaws. So we'll kind of start out a little bit on that direction.

And then also, we want to allow Rita to better understand our concerns and issues related to policy development processes and including the roles of the board's role in that regard.

I will give Rita an opportunity to make some introductory comments when we get started.

And as far as procedures and guidelines, I am going to coordinate the process and we'll manage the queue from my site. If anybody finds out I'm not doing that correctly, please speak up, okay?

The questions submitted in advance are going to be asked first in the order listed as I sent out, unless for some reason we decide differently. Then I'll give Rita an opportunity to respond and she - Rita, you're welcome to ask clarifying questions.

And then follow-up questions by anyone on the call will be allowed - including Rita, you can ask follow-up questions or make follow-up comments as well.

The - so the only thing I ask there is that they stay on topic. There will be a general opportunity for new questions later on. So any follow-up - new follow-up questions you have though on the same topic are welcomed and encouraged.

The person who submitted the question will be allowed to ask it if he or she is present. In other cases, I'll read their questions.

Keep in mind that this is not a time to do policy development work nor a time to advocate personal or constituency provisions regarding policy issues.

Because there's only one candidate, I think this should be viewed more as a two-way learning session for Rita and the Council than a political debate. Hopefully, the discussion will help us all improve in our ability to work together constructively to develop policy going forward.

Now any questions that were not submitted in advance may be asked during the discussion as long as they stay on topic. And there will be opportunity after we discussed all the advanced questions for questions on new topics. So please hold those till the end unless they're related to something we're talking about.

In the case of advanced questions, the name of the person who asked the question, you know I listed the name right at the beginning of the question and the document I sent out.

And I think in all but one case, the advanced questions are printed with no systemic changes. And in that particular case, I put the original text there so that you could see that. Unfortunately, that person is on this call so that will make that one easy.

Any questions or comments on the process?

Okay, then let's get started. And, Rita, I'll turn it over to you for any introductory things you'd like to say or ask.

Rita Rodin: Thanks, Chuck, and thanks everyone for giving me the opportunity to chat with you all on this call today.

I've had some individual discussions with the registry and registrar constituencies and the BC. So it's good to kind of bring that all together now and have a call with all you folks in sort of a General Council level.

I think the one thing I'd like to say is - and what I'd like to do going forward is really (appreciate) and improve the communication that

(unintelligible) have with the Council in a little bit more of formal way perhaps.

You know, coming back last year, back in the ICANN community, it was an interesting re-incarnation to see what issues had progressed and thinking what issues hadn't.

And I think it's important sometimes when people engage in discussions and make different ideas and different things that go around, and, Chuck, says sometimes the topic can get a little bit lost.

So actually, I'd like us to think about ways that we can continue to improve the communication between you all and the (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) to now talk a little bit about my views on that fiduciary obligations that board members have, but one of the things that we did very recently was Chuck, Avri and I would have some calls and then when we've joined the board, the four of us would have some conversation so that Bruce and I really understood the position of the Council and how we could understand that and help clarify that into our discussion.

And I personally thought that that was really helpful and because it's a little bit difficult sometimes to glean just from the Council meetings and some staff briefing really what the Council is speaking and what some of the touch points are.

So I'm looking forward to continuing that and also thinking through with what some of you always to help improve that.

You know, we have the GNSO improvement proposal out there and, well I think that those of us on the committee hope we're going to see kind of GNSO Version 2.0. And (unintelligible) and definitely how that can be executed (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Much appreciated, Rita.

So let's get right into the questions.

The first one I checked was kind of a health update question for Rita. For those that don't know, she stayed very reactive throughout this long recovery process she's been in, and even in the New Delhi meeting as much as what was possible with the communication problems that we had there.

But Adrian asked, he says, "Rita, you have been ill and away from occasional phone calls in recent ICANN meetings. Do you expect this to continue?"

Rita Rodin: I appreciate the question. I have been doing my best to stay on topic and in some ways I think not working as well may actually participate a little bit more at least in some of the board committees and the like.

But I'm really hopeful that I'm going to be at the board retreat in Riga April. And if I can't come to Paris, this is just going to be a real problem. But I do not intend to miss any more meetings (unintelligible) typically possible.

I've had some - I fractured my heels -- both of my heels and back and I'm running a lab about the health community (unintelligible) in the

body and apparently is they - unlike knee replacement or hip replacement or just standard broken bone, so it's a - my recovery is going a slower than I would have liked but purposely on track for getting me up and around and (unintelligible) in the next couple of months.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Any follow-up questions or comments?

Okay. Then based on the - some of the discussion on our Council list that I saw, I threw in this next question myself.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And as a director, is it accurate to say that your first responsibility is a fiduciary responsibility to ICANN the Corporation? And what does that mean and how does that translate into the concept of representing the GNSO?

Rita Rodin: I think that's a great question and it's actually something that at our Board retreat in Sophia last October as I've just joined the board, it was when that I asked John to talk about a little bit because I was surprised that a lot of directors hadn't been briefed on that and didn't seem to understand their role as a director versus their role in a constituency or just as an individual

So I don't want to opine on this. It's really John Jeffrey that - my understanding is that in fact, once you're a director, you have to be sure the responsibility to the organization as a whole.

But I think that's always what I have tried to employ irrespective of, any of the legal ramifications. And a board member, I think it's important to take a holistic view of all the issues that basically (unintelligible).

The GNSO certainly has a myriad of different perspectives, issues and ideas.

So I think it's important to understand all of those and try to incorporate all of those points of view when being a director and speaking really the best possible outcome for the (corporate).

Chuck Gomes: Now, Rita, how does that then translate into - as you could tell by some of the questions that were asked, there are some people that think you're actually there representing the GNSO and I think there are some truth to that, but how does that all fit together with the fiduciary responsibility?

Rita Rodin: Well, I do think that as a GNSO rep, it's important to understand where the GNSO is coming from. I think that's a role that Bruce and I need to play. And to the extent we participate in conference calls we get some insight. But I think it's understanding the issues that you are facing and being able to answer questions or help clarify and also helping issues to the (foray). I know even just with the fast track ccTLD IDN working group, you know, we had conversations about that.

And it was helpful for me to hear directly from you all what some of your concerns were. I was able to talk that through with folks on the executive committee to understand what you all are looking for and how we could try to help and resolve some issues.

So I look at it as not a - I'll say all GNSO all the time advocate. But it is me understanding it and (Bruce) understanding where is that they're coming from and trying to help the board through this and subsequent discussions on some of these issues and try to make some progress.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Any follow-up questions or comments that anyone would like to raise?

Okay. Then I'll go to Avri's question. And I'll just read it. My question relates to the improvements casting the GNSO Council as a management body instead of a legislating body.

One of the concerns that I wrote of in the public commentary has not really been alleviated by the last report. This concerns the distinction between policy management as an administrating function and policy management as a policy function.

If I read the current proposal correctly, the Council must pass on recommendations from working groups as long as they followed the to-be developed process correctly even if, in the consensus view of the Council, the recommendation is really a bad idea.

I think this relegates the GNSO council to a purely administrative body and not a policy body. At the very least, I believe the Council should be able to reject the policy recommendation if there is a super majority against it, same also as applied to the board vis-à-vis a GNSO Council super majority PDP decision. I would like to know your position regarding my concern.

And before I let Rita respond to that, this is really a good question for Rita in a special sense, and that is that she is not only a board member but she is on the board governance committee and she was on the Board Governance Committee working group that worked on the GNSO improvement recommendations.

Rita, it's all yours.

Rita Rodin: Thanks, Chuck.

So I have a look through with the help of some of the working group members, the language because I possibly couldn't explain what's in the report (unintelligible) - I'm going to - I think I may leave that out.

But I'm curious to know from you on the phone, I think one of the things that the working group is really hoping to achieve was to get a kind of idea of GNSO Version 2.0. And this relates to, you know, everything from effective policy to – Norbert's question about compensating council members. And I think that, I mean you all are super busy, you have day jobs and what we at least were trying to respond to in this GNSO improvement working group the it's a notion of not having the kind of WhoIS (ReDoc). In other words, it's a lot of really hard work and not really being able to get to some sort of inclusion that every can agree to.

I think the flipside to that was the ccTLD report (unintelligible) a great job and do a lot of work in trying to come to some consensus.

So I think if we look at those (unintelligible), you know, how do we tie a hard wire, if you will, that type of more successful process within the GNSO improvement document.

So the problem that we came up with was let's move to sort of management as opposed to legislative. And this is really a choice of words because they know that we're trying to move away from weighted voting. It was (unintelligible) that we're kind of (unintelligible) and the Council speaks purely administrative.

But one point that I have to you all is this in fact we have business in the working group where the GNSO is actively in selecting and appointing chairs and vice chairs and making sure this was robust representations within each working group to express the view of each of the constituencies.

I'm not sure how we think we then come to a recognition and (requisite) that would "a bad idea" That was the bad result in my view. I'm curious - again, as we take the premise that the GNSO is going to select the chair, this is going to be very strict kind of policy and process acquiring to-be-followed (unintelligible) and the terms will be to, you know, what the specific issues are and how they will be discussed, if in fact then we have that coupled with robustconstituency participation).

How do we think we're going to get a bad recognition that the Council thinks it's a bad idea?

Chuck Gomes: Let me take the queue on that. Who would like to be on that queue?

Jon Bing: Jon Bing.

Chuck Gomes: John, okay. Who else?

(Allan): (Allan).

Chuck Gomes: (Allan), good.

Anyone else?

Okay. Glenn, you can jump in later if you - just let me know.

Jon, go ahead.

Jon Bing: Yes. I don't greatly understand how this works compared to a delegation to the working group. I can see a working group being stepped up and launched in to where can you probably use the results which then is performed.

But from the experience of participating very modestly working group, that (unintelligible) with some put into especially at telephone conferences, the differences in language skills and so on all may contribute to the balance in the working group to work for all the different - from balancing the concept.

So it depends really on that do you want to have dedication to the working group or whether you want the working group tube for the council to reach consensus opinion.

Chuck Gomes: Rita, would you like to respond to that?

Rita Rodin: I mean I think that's what we're trying to say. I think Jon is saying is that it's different to say you guys did come up with the result to enable us to have a debate versus you come up with a result that we (unintelligible). Is that right, Jon that you're distinction?

Jon Bing: Well, part of (unintelligible) with and about if you're bound to pass it on, you really have no authority. And you have a delegation rather than the working group.

Rita Rodin: Right.

So, let me just read in what in the report that I think we'll clarify this and, again, I'm getting this from some of the drafter of this language that they're saying that Section 5.2 because I knew we have something in here. And it talks about when a working group completes these words, going to present its report and conclusion including any minority views to the Council for review. The Council (unintelligible) to ensure that the Working Group follow the appropriate procedures, and I'm paraphrasing here a little bit, and achieve its goal and act consistently with its mandate including with respect to outreach, exclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency.

The Council should also verify the level of agreement in the working group. And this is I think the important language, and forwarding the working group's report to the board. The Council should indicate the extent to which it believed that the Working Group has fulfilled its mandate and the Council may forward a minority of its own if appropriate.

Man: Yup.

Rita Rodin: The Council should not reopen the substance to the policy issue which would undermine a rationale for an efficiency of the process. At the same time the Council will have the option of sending an issue back to the working group for reconsideration if they see the majority believes that the report omitted critical facts or did not actually request the working group's deliberation.

So, again there were - there was not any intention of having the Council nearly be a conduit to which the reporting pass it on. But there also was this language we did not have intended to have Working Group work, have a chair that's going to be (unintelligible) sophisticated and well verse in issues, have, you know, just for the sake of argument six-month process and then, kind of have the Council starts deliberating at square one.

So that was - those were the two tensions that we were trying to deal with in this language

Jon Bing: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Does that makes sense Jon?

Jon Bing: Completely I'm afraid. I find that one of risks of having a democratic process is of course that it takes time and that if there's disagreement in the organization, it has to work itself out. And if there is sufficient strongly disagreement within the Council and the Working Group then certainly it's something that should concern you principles of a consensus.

Rita Rodin: Well, and I think that's why, Jon, again, from my perspective as board member, what I don't want to have happened is very (driven) and earnest people working and have their efforts be viewed as not counting. That's one (unintelligible).

So, if we're going to have in effect of Council in my view that can create from policy from the bottom up (unintelligible) that's going to be able to reviewed by the board and executed. And I think that's what we all want a decision to (unintelligible).

I think that we need to have robust discussion in the Working Group. And that's what we we're trying reviewed here is make sure that Working Group had outreach, have representative from each constituency that discuss things in a very substantive way. And in the report, if there wasn't accordance for consensus, that's typically also why we included including minority views.

Jon Bing: Yeah, but that minority views...

Rita Rodin: What do we think Council needs to see is what the thought and what the deliberation was. And what we're trying to do is push some of the deliberation to this working group to more effective enable the Council to have a debate.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Jon.

Jon Bing: Yeah, well, I won't prolong this more, but in my (unintelligible) make more sense if it on this - if it has been the concept passing the report on to the Council with its own recommendation, so that there always was a recommendation from the Council which could (debate, prolong

) or whatever this Council thought. And it could be in agreement or in a position or making new (emphasis) with respect to that report. And that's would be a normal procedure in my opinion. And it wouldn't delay things but would make the Council be clearly in control of the process

Chuck Gomes: Now, Rita, that doesn't to me sounds too much different in what you said.

Rita Rodin: I would agree, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So I think that we're on the same page there. Okay?

(Allan)?

(Allan): Yeah.

Two things. First, answer Rita's question of how would it be possible for Working Group to come up with something that the Council in disagrees with strongly. I think part of the answer to that in my mind is the description of how the Working Group will be constituted, how they will work, how the chairman will be - the chair will be in strong control and make sure that the group is not shanghaied hard by particularly interest. I think that's for idealistic.

Some Working Groups and some chairs are excellent and manage to do it, some are so far from it that it's hard to imagine we're going to legislate that these are going to all work well. And I think that's part of the concern...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Allan): ...of how - and just how do we make sure that these Working Groups really meet the idealistic description that's in the report.

Chuck Gomes: Now, I let Rita respond.

(Allan): Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: But I want to say that it's seems to me that the large part of that responsibility is going to be in our hands in the design of the Working Groups. You know, we're probably not going to be perfect, so, you know, to be so idealistic to think that we're going to get at perfect and won't have problem situation that's naïve, but at the same time, we will have the opportunity in the next few months to try and do everything we can based on our experience and we've got a lot of good experience of both good and bad to design a process that will hopefully maximize the chances of success and minimized those chances of failure that you're talking about, (Allan).

Rita, you want to respond?

Rita Rodin: I appreciate that, Chuck, and that's exactly how I feel.

You know, I think that try for perfection and anything you don't really get much more than (an interaction). And I think that it's very easy within the ICANN structure to prefer an action I think we've been that. It's very easy for people in a Working Group to (unintelligible) and never agree and that's what some people primary done here in the Course 1. And if, you know, if that's what people want to view, there's

nothing that even working group can revise bylaws even kind of procedures (unintelligible).

So, you know, I don't have any response to you kind of people not acting in good (stage). What I do think is that like Chuck said, there's a situation where we're trying to constitute these working groups and have people come to them with the intention of trying to resolve issues. And that's really what the (hold is).

Chuck Gomes: You know, I think the recommendations did have some recommendations with regard to giving the chairs some authority to manage the (unintelligible) people that may be involved so that it's not possible for just that one or two people hold up to show.

Alan greenberg As I said it's a theory and it's like a theory I support. The question is how do you really make it happen given that we're - given with a wide range of people with different experiences and different intentions.

Rita Rodin: Well, and again, I would (unintelligible) in regards to what Chuck said which is it's my responsibility at some point, you know, the board cannot micromanage individuals. And I do think this is (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: Uh-huh.

Rita Rodin: ...really bring everyone in and say look we have to - we can either work here together everyone or not, you know, (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, (Allan).

(Allan): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I want to...

(Allan): I've got a follow-up for Avri...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, go ahead,

(Allan): As you mentioned there's the possibility and probably the likely possibility in a lot of cases of minority reports with Working Groups. It seems reasonably clear from the discussions I've had that the board doesn't really - won't have to arbitrate between the minority reports. And that would put it on the Council to try to resolve those.

Do you see as a Council responsibility or do you see minority reports from Working Groups being passed on to the board essentially with or without comment but be passed on?

Rita Rodin: I am an advocate of more information is better. And I guess - most of you probably know, but I'm an attorney is what I do is mostly deal work and sort of doing a lot of trademark work. But now I do mostly deals, and so it's both, you know, in a buy and sell context, but also joint ventures and a lot of licensing. And so, what is involved in that oftentimes is cleaning the table where people will want to get some things done, but they're far apart.

And what I have to do with them is listen to both sides and in many cases figure out, you know, how do we get beyond what (unintelligible). And so, I actually would like having one information and having a difficult questions asked. I mean that's one of my thing, is to try to help people come together when you don't think it's possible.

So, for me and I can't say for all board members honest, but from my perspective, if the Council can come together and say this minority is really sort of one (unintelligible) person who is not really expressing (unintelligible) constituency, you know, again, I'm not going to micromanage how the council wants to present its information to the board. That's you're all dealing with.

But as board member, I'd like to know what different positions are because if there is in fact -- just to take an example, but if there's an issue that really would affect trademark owner, and every other constituency says X but there is this wonderful minority, but if you look at the issue, that's where we have a big impact in trademark owners. I want to know what their view is even if there's only minority view.

Conversely, if there's something that's really going to affect the individual users, and everybody except the individual users have something to say, I want to know the individual users have to say, because that's exactly important in terms of issues. So it's not that kind of cookie cutter one size fits all here, but I as board member thinks that more information and when I say that I mean more information that's actually real formal information, the form of this report (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Isn't accurate to say that when - just because the minority report is passed on to the board doesn't mean that we're asking the board to resolve that minority opinion? Or does that...

((Crosstalk))

Rita Rodin: I don't think it is, Chuck. I think it's more than FYI. That's how I view it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Now, it's different situation if we give the board something has to got a simple majority support and there's apparently significant difference of opinion on the simple majority recommendation. That's kind of a different situation and for us to do that to the board, that phrases may be even more of the questions that you're asking, (Allan).

(Allan): And that was exactly the kind. I wasn't talking about the, you know, the (IPC) has a strong view on our individual users. But if there's a real mixed report from Working Group, I know talking (Roberto) if he gave their clear impression that the board doesn't want to stuck in their lap to try essentially revisit the whole issue and decide which way to go. And if not then, then Council has a responsibility.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Rita Rodin: That's right. That is right.

And again, you know, it's - I always - (unintelligible), you know, everybody wants bottom up except when they want (unintelligible)

developed in a review. You know, (unintelligible) can't have it both ways, but yeah the board doesn't want to be doing that...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Rita Rodin: ...and seems as like imposing, here's what we're going to do and here's the better position.

(Allan): Which means there are going to be times when Council become the policy making policy recommending body when the Working Group can't come to - reason to closure on?

Rita Rodin: I think that's right and I think that one of the things that will be helpful for you all to participate in this kind of implementation of this new GNSO improvement. I think that was very important because again, you know, while the people on the Working Groups to GNSO improvement certainly have varying amount of experience with the GNSO and ICANN. In general, we're not on the Council and so, I think it's very important to have you all participate in this implementation as much as possible to give the kind of reality checklist if you will.

(Allan): Okay, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And this thing, this issue - this kind of issue where there's not a real strong majority on a recommendation, just probably another illustration where the Council policy management role is more than what people suspect because that's at the point or maybe we decide not to pass it on to the board to go back to the Working Group or to take some otherwise methods to try and see if we can't come up with a position and sometimes we might make a decision that there frankly has not

consensus. So, we just let market (forces) work if it's not an emergency situation or something like that.

One other thought I wanted to drill in and before I do that I want to welcome Rob Hoggarth to the call. Welcome Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: And I think also that when we're talking about the Council managing the policy development process, I don't view it and Rita I'll let you respond to this to see if you think I'm on target, I don't see it, you know, your formal Working Group, your point of chair and maybe a vice chair and you give him terms of reference and they go out and do the work and then, until they're done and then the Council gets involve.

I see the Council involved not in a micromanagement role, but in an over-site role probably by having one or two council members on the Working Group and regularly getting feedback, so that if we see things that are happening that we think are contrary to what's supposed to be happening, we deal with those during the Working Group process not after it's done.

Is that a correct perception?

Rita Rodin: Is that for me, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Rita Rodin: Absolutely. I mean as I said at the outset of this discussion, right, it's our intent that a lot of the Working Group will either be with counselors

or with the constituency reps that have views that their counselor shares. If that's not the case, I think this whole model doesn't work.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: y I ask you question then, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Jon.

Jon Bing: Jon asking questions.

How do you find the authority to intervene of the Working Group as this launched?

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure - run that by me again, Jon please?

Jon Bing: Yes, how do you find this authority to intervene? Let's say we disagree and the Working Group said, "All right, you disagree, but this is our view."

Chuck Gomes: Well, and I don't know if I'm grasping the full extent of your question, but if the - just about premise on the facts that we've set up some fairly well defined procedures for Working Groups.

Jon Bing: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And if we're observing some things that are going on in the Working Group and that - those procedures are going to be the basis for the Council intervening to try and set things on the right track.

Jon Bing: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So, that get what you're asking?

Jon Bing: Indeed. Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

Okay. Then let's go on to the next question. And this one is from Adrian. How can we better progress outstanding issues for example domain tasting, transfers, GNSO reform, et cetera, with the board?

Rita?

Rita Rodin: I think that's good. One of the things that's really important and I've used this word in a number of different even is kind of priority. I think that oftentimes, you know, people head into an ICANN board meeting and then, there's certain issues that are meant to be address in a lot of times other things start flying around and people have discussions and things come up and sometimes we can get off topic.

I do think that, you know, I don't know how you all particularly prioritize on your agenda, we're have kind of a clear view of, you know, for calendar year `08, we're going to do X (amount of) priorities., but I'm a big fan of priority and sort of a plan for executions.

So, I think it's important for the Council to understand, you know, what are the issues that we really care about and what do we think need to happen. Clearly, at this juncture, you know, I am well aware as is the board that IDN and ccTLDs are very important to people. And I think

those are two huge issues that involve a lot of different viewpoints from all different constituencies involved, obviously BCs and the GAC, et cetera.

So, I think that those are two big things that I at least would like to see get some progress in that very short-term. But I do think that for example if you look at the new gTLDs, one of the things that came out of majority meeting was that GAC is going to go back and talk to GNSO about some issues that the board I think needed additional classifications where they had questions on.

I think (unintelligible) Council can quickly address those, deal around those, come up with decisions and get back to staff quickly that it can be passing the board. I think that's all helpful.

So again, from my perspective, I think it's about clarity, communicating the priority and try to help execute that priority.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

And any follow-up questions or comments on that?

Okay. Going to another question from Adrian, how can we better communicate through you to the board to get them to understand this is issues and their important?

Rita Rodin: I can't tell that it's kind of similar to the question before that, right? I think it's again it's having formal discussion that (Bruce) and I can understand where you all are coming from. And the extent in which those letters - I thought it was great. Chuck the way you guys did a

letter about the Working Group on IDN, I think that's really helpful too. But we have discussion before that went out, so I understood what that was and I could help communicate what that was to the board and help people understand where you guys are coming from, so...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And especially since it generated some controversy.

Rita Rodin: Yeah, yeah.

Rita Rodin: But I think it's helpful for us to kind of understand whether you're comfortable with them (unintelligible) coming from so we can help aid in board discussion. So again, it's about kind of regular communication.

Chuck Gomes: Any follow-up or comments on that?

Okay, going to Question Number 6 and (Mike), I'll turn it over to you.

(Mike): Thanks Chuck.

Hey, Rita. Same question I asked in our BC meeting the other day. Basically in light of the discussion on the domain case and working group list, how do you describe the registry constituency role in consensus and development.

Rita Rodin: And as I said, I guess to the BC, so I think this is probably coming out of some of the comments from New Delhi, I know that (Jeff) and the

registry constituency is a little bit unhappy (unintelligible) at how some of its domain tasting issues have been calculated.

But this, I think, is a broader question of this notion of consensus policy and the - and I'm sure all of you have heard of this notion of the (picket fence). And this is clearly an area where as a board member I don't think it's appropriate for me to say what is right and what is wrong. It's really a matter of general counsel and I've had discussions with John Jeffrey on this issue of what is this kind of consensus picket fence

So, John is sort of the - that's pushing that need to really definitively comment on this, but my understanding of consensus policy had always been that as a registry, your - as (unintelligible) say to me, get in a piece of the public trust, you know, getting endowed with a monopoly to run a registry.

And with that responsibility comes with some obligation. And the way that we look at some of those obligations has been consensus policies which - there's specific language in the registry contract and I think that they've been modified a little bit since I've looked at them last, but it's about this acknowledgment that there's certain areas that's maybe so important and so critical to the ICANN community that the registries should in fact call them. One of those, you know, the kind of classic consensus policy is the UDRP.

And so, I think, again, that the registries are very important in terms of discussing consensus policies because the registries are running a business. And without their ability to run their business, their not going to be (unintelligible) to, you know, continue to participate. But there is then a balance with that - of that there are - of the notion that there are

certain policies that the community needs to, you know, broad cross section of a community (unintelligible) very vital to protecting the interest of the community. And so, those policies are meant to be informed and adhered to by the registry.

Chuck Gomes: (Mike), do you have a follow-up on that?

(Mike): No, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Anyone else?

(Mike) and I have had quite a bit of dialogue via email on this. I would like to share some things I shared with him that are - that I don't think were shared on the broader list. But contrary to what some people's assumptions and maybe (Jeff) even implied it in some of his communications on the list -- on the domain testing list -- it - I'm not aware of the registry constituency position taking a position on this particular issue of the registries involvement and consensus policy development.

The way I read it in the .com and .net agreements is just that, you know, there's language there that says the registries need to be involved in the consensus development process and that's my own personal reading of...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck And so, I do, you know, again, I don't think there's a registry constituency position on the particular issue that's been debated on the (DT) list recently. So, I just wanted to point that out.

And so, whether that will be or whether we could even reach position, I don't know. And really, like - Rita said these kind of things are really general-counsel type issues in terms of how they apply. And I know (Mike) (unintelligible) that - I think address that.

Chuck Gomes: Anything else on that one?

Thanks, (Mike).

(Robin), you're up next on Question Number 7.

(Robin): Great.

Okay, my question has to do with freedom of expression and new top-level domains. Rita, in your view, should ICANN institute a one size fits all policy prohibiting domain names that are considered immoral or contrary to public order in any part of the world? How should ICANN take into account the different legal and social systems at the local level to develop a global policy for introducing new top-level domains?

Rita Rodin: (Robin), I should say this is my favorite question. I really think it's great and it's - frankly, those of you who know me a little bit know that I like to talk substance a lot more than process. In some way, this is one of the things that I really would like to have a robust discussion at the board level on.

But I had a discussion with John Jeffrey, during the Delhi meeting and (Robin) because I think their question is a great one and I personally - and again (unintelligible), you know, I don't think anything that I

personally believe necessarily matters, but I personally do not like to note things as a one size fits all. I think we heard quite directly during the .xxx celebrations that we set out as a part of - when I was on the board that, you know, different parts of the world and any lesser traveled know that different parts of the world is still different. And I'm sure many people think that everyone in America is immoral and contrary to public order. And, you know, conversely, I don't feel comfortable with a bunch of people and I don't know who these people would be in some sense. Everything else - what is going to be called immoral.

There's a (unintelligible). Some judge basically said, you know, I don't know what - pornographic, I can't define what that is, but I'll know when I see it. And that kind of a standard - (unintelligible) a little bit uncomfortable. It's going to impose different things and, you know, I don't wear a (berka) but some people do and it's important to respect both of the ideals and ideology.

So, I don't really love that. That's always been one of the recommendations (unintelligible) report that's bothered me. And just so you all know, I had discussion with John Jeffrey during the Delhi meetings. He's been assuming that's kind of one of my personal issues. And I asked him, "So, how is that coming?" Because, you know, the board had asked us to kind of get the implementation report to the board by January and we're still kind of waiting eagerly to hear that so we can start acting. And, apparently, that hired a bunch of different law firms around the world to kind of try to standardize that specific recommendation. And, not surprisingly, it's tough. And I think that can be very difficult to execute.

So, my understanding -- and again, this is informal-- I know we all had problems with the, you know, dialing in, it was driving me nuts in any - all the boards meetings and the boards, you know, have - getting up at 3 in the morning and getting dropped every 20 minutes because there were 35 different phone wires and they were taking pictures and sending it to me, but it's very frustrating because we're participating robustly, but I think this is one of the things, (Robin), that you're going to give (unintelligible) as I said from (unintelligible) some more guidance in the counsel as to what you all really thought about when you were recommending them.

Chuck Gomes: Any follow-up, (Robin)?

(Robin): No. That's helpful.

Chuck Gomes: Anyone else?

Rita Rodin: Now, what do you guys think about that? I've heard from (Peter). Are you guys all in agreement with that or is that kind of way out there?

Chuck Gomes: I'll take a queue. Anybody want to comment?

I'll jump in, Rita. You know, I think we knew what this recommendation is as well with a couple others that we were giving task - the staff a huge and very challenging task with regard to implementation.

Obviously, we had some competing views within the GNSO and within the community at large with regard to this type of issue. And I think we're all going to be very interested in seeing what's the final recommendations with regard to implementation on this one as well as

a few others come back to us and whether it's possible to do something in this area or nothing, or what.

It's going to be quite interesting to see but I - and Rita, you weren't able to participate in the Saturday session when (Kurt) gave us the overview of the implementation process. But at the end, I told him I was very impressed with the caliber of work they had done and were still doing with regard to all this. And so, I'm quite confident that they're doing a very thorough job. Now, whether they can come back with ways to implement all of our recommendations remains to be seen, but that's what we've asked him to, you know, to tell us. And then we'll have to go back and - maybe on some of them and regroup.

Rita Rodin: Thanks (Chuck).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Yup.

All right, (Robin), how about Question Number 8.

(Robin): Okay. This one has to do with ICANN and human rights. So, could ICANN build more protections for human rights into its governance structure by incorporating guarantees found in the universal declaration of human right, for example, into its corporate bylaws?

Basically, my question is, how can we ensure protection for fundamental values in an entity that is a legal corporation?

Rita Rodin: (Can you) help me understand what you're specifically referring to that? It's kind of within the basic human rights of people to get domain (unintelligible) apply this to ICANN in general?

(Robin): Well, I think that it is a fact that ICANN is sort of fulfilling a quasi governmental - and certainly a policy role here. It means the same kind of basic values that we expect from governments or legal institutions, we should also expect from ICANN. And so, how do we try to make sure that ICANN is fair and that ICANN makes sure that basic human rights - when they are actually invoke or respect it in the processes.

Man: What...

((Crosstalk))

(Robin): For example, freedom of speech, privacy rights, a lot of times the policies that we deal with impact both of those issues. So, my question is, how do we make sure that we're able to continue to protect privacy rights. We're able to continue to protect freedom of expression right.

In a place that is a corporation and ultimately governed by corporate bylaws and, you know, states statutory rules about corporation, how do we build in those other kinds of protections into this kind of s structure, a governance structure.

Rita Rodin: But I think - you know what, I remember attending a conference two years ago where the board talking about (unintelligible) within ICANN structure and someone in the audience said well (unintelligible) is actually - it's very simply American idea and we don't even recognize the concept in our country. And I've only thought of that since then because I do think that the (unintelligible) doesn't come from an American background, do try to impose very different (unintelligible) on everything within ICANN.

But, I think, (Robin), that, you know, if you look at (unintelligible) and privacy, those two are issues that are quite vigorously discussed within ICANNs community, I'm not sure that you don't mean to a charter those types of views. I'm not sure that's necessarily appropriate or needed because I'm sure that there'd be a laundry list of other things people would want to do. But I do think that the work that certainly your constituency does and others view I think is what needs to be really done. And I think that the outreach that I'm always hoping happens with some of the At-Large and non-commercial I going to continue in this thing. I think frankly I'm very encouraged by what's happening with At-Large and getting more representation of individual users in a really sort of substantial (and best) level.

I think that's the effective way to do it because certainly, you know, rooming in how we can best go in to a charter, but frankly, I think that that's the better bank to the bucket, real robust individual participation and making sure that this stay at the (fort runner) of the basis.

Chuck Gomes: And if I can jump in. And, (Robin) - and you're welcome to respond. Too - I think we have to keep ICANNs mission and view in a lot of this now clearly with regard to privacy, for example, that have come in to play with regard to Whois. And it seems to be a very appropriate way for - to come in for.

But, an awful lot of the human rights issues that you're talking about come into play more not necessarily exclusively with content on the Internet than it does with the parameters that ICANN coordinates in its role. Again, understanding that even flexion of a TLD string, you know, can be some sort of an expression there.

So, don't you think that we have to - in dealing with this, ICANNs mission is really relatively limited and so, how much of it really does relate to human rights because they don't get into the content area if you accept that assumption.

Any other comments on that?

Okay.

The next question comes from Tim Ruiz who couldn't join us in this call. And the first one he asks is, "The ICANN staff recently submitted to the Council of synthesis on single-character names at the second-level. One of the option methods that state as having been suggested is manage to qualify options for those with prior rights. While the synthesis only makes this single mention of prior rights, it is likely to become a much bigger issue. What is your view or position regarding prior rights claims to single-character names at the second-level?"

Rita Rodin: I haven't seen this - the report (unintelligible). I'm assuming what they're talking about is that's kind of a shoutout if you will to - the issue that's already been around forever which is trademark owners saying that they have some sort of a preexisting right to domain names. And so, I'm assuming what they're talking about is they'll be an option that to extent to which maybe, there's going to be some sort of a sunrise or people have a trademark negotiation for a single-letter trademark, they'll be able to come forward. But I have no idea that this really (in fact you're) referring to.

Chuck Gomes: I just looked at this report actually - and the last half-hour before this meeting started and even had a little chat with (Patrick Jones) who wrote the report. It's important for us, first of all, to understand that that is just a synthesis of the ideas that were put forward by people that commented during the public comment period. It's very important for us to recognize that ICANN staff is not recommending anything specific be done with regard to prior rights, but that was one idea that was put forward in the comment period and so it was included in the synthesis. And more works are going to be done on this.

So, I'm sure - and this is a particular area for those of you that are familiar with some of the work that was proposed by Overstock on, you know, and, you know, probably two years ago at least now when they put forward some ideas and one of their suggestions was that there should be preference for those who have some rights in a single letter name above others. And comments in the public comment period also said -- and this is in the synthesis -- there were those who thought they - anybody should have a chance to get a single letter name whether they have intellectual property rights or not.

So, these are issues that were - I'm sure we're going to grapple with as we grapple with this particular issue of allocation of single character names.

Rita Rodin: And, Chuck, if I could just jump in here. You know, my view on that is, everyone can certainly have a view on, you know, I think that there should be anybody that should be able to apply. But the reality is that, if something has a trademark right and they're setup before the UDRP existed which is why we made the UDRP, I guess to some extent, there may be course that will - even if we did open it up to everyone

and somebody got a single letter domain name but a court thought that somebody had prior rights to it, they would have to give it up.

So again, I think this is kind of thing where while theoretical debate may be fun and interesting for people to have, I think sometimes in all of ICANN issues, we do need to kind of understand what the legal framework is and be realistic and practical about what the system may do.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Any other questions or comments on that question?

Okay. Going to Question Number 10, also from Tim. "There's likely to be ongoing policy work regarding the allocation of IDN ccTLDs. Any resulting policy will have significant impact on both the gTLD and ccTLD communities. In your view, is this an example of a need for a cross SO policy development process?"

And the second question, "In your view, is the cross SO process reasonable consider given the evolving nature of the Internet?"

Rita Rodin: Well, my answer to, is this an example of a need for a cross SO policy development process, a resounding absolutely in my view. Yes, a 100%. At (Unintelligible)

I'm not quite sure I got the last - is it cross SO process reasonable given the evolving nature of the Internet. I think the Internet is evolving and becoming more global as a general world. But I don't understand that last part of the question. But, yes, I think that, absolutely, this, you know, again it's new fast-track IDN Working Group with the GNSO representation. I think I said this on the record in LA, but I think the

extent to which you can all talk about - get out issues in the table, try to understand where it is coming from. That's going to go a long way and giving some sort of policy that can be easily implemented.

Chuck Gomes: And I don't know that I can translate Tim's second question any better. If anybody else have a thought, maybe what is getting at there?

Now, possibly - and I have no idea whether this is what Tim is getting at or not, but maybe the question could be asked, "Is it really realistic considering that the ccNSO has it's own PDP and the GNSO has its own and they're not necessarily identical and obviously they're working in very different environments, is it really realistic to consider some sort of a cross SO PDP?"

And I have no idea whether that's where it was getting at.

Rita Rodin: Yeah. And I think you guys are probably in a better position to answer that based on their interaction. But, again, maybe I'm too idealistic, but I'd like to think that people are working towards a common goal even if they come to a table with different points of view they can manage each side and understand each other and how to...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody else have a thought on that?

(Allan): The way I read the question was - the second one was asked if the answer to the first one was no. If a cross SO policy development process is not appropriate for this particular case, is it something we should be considering in general.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, (Alan).

Rita Rodin: I go, yes, with both. So the answer to one is, yes. Definitely in this particular issue and I would love to see more cross supporting organization policies and interaction up.

Alan I think the following question is does that mean we need bylaw changes or does that simply mean that we need to support the organizations which cooperate with each other and place nice?

Rita Rodin: And you know my view on that, Alan. We're all big kids in a playtime. So I'd like to think we didn't have - we won't have to regulate to do that, but I leave that to you guys.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. Number 11 comes from Norbert and hopefully each of you - and this was one of the last thing that came in and had a chance to read the background that Norbert gave, it's was fairly lengthy I did include it down below on the document I sent out and its background that I think most of us are familiar with anyway, but it is there for your reference.

And then what I did is I try to pull out from there some questions that Norbert raised. He says I would appreciate getting some comments regarding what you think should be done on the ICANN board level about the issue of travel cost support for the GNSO counsel members with your active initiative I would hope.

And then the second one is I also would appreciate to know how you would assist ICANN use of travel resources more wisely. Maybe we're going to take one of those at a time.

Taking the first one about what you think (Rita) should be done on the board level with regard to the travel cost of GNSO counsel membership.

Rita Rodin: My view is - again, when I found out actually that council members were not supportive in terms of at a minimum travel to the board meeting, and I guess Chuck, you wrote us a little bit of a clarification there. So members, Council members are supported in some specific travel but not to ICANN (unintelligible). Is that correct?

Chuck Gomez: Right. Right. Except for - and except - the first time it happened to an ICANN general meeting was in Delhi that I'm aware of.

Rita Rodin: Yeah. And my view on that is really unabashedly I don't understand why. I need to understand why we haven't instituted a method where council member supply key meetings. I think - certainly think can be done with the Internet with teleconferences and I think you all have done an amazing job of doing significant work remotely. But everyone knows that this is really important because if we look at the GNSO as the way that council - the policy was named in this case, I don't understand how we don't then support financial in other way.

And you guys come in the meeting. I know that there has been discussions and acceptance (unintelligible) in having better staff support for you all getting additional resources teleconferencing et cetera. And I hope there's been, at least in their views some part of us in here that I think this last piece about funding (unintelligible) is absolutely critical. And I have 1000% of support of it and frankly, (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomez: The question came up in New Delhi and probably you weren't able to hear because of the technical problems, but in the discussion, the workshop that occurred on this a member of the business constituency raised the issue of the fact that most if not all counselors are actually and I don't think the term lobbyist was used but basically lobbying for particular view points that either their constituency or them personally are interested in, how do you balance the idea, I mean you have the idea that most of the overwhelming majority of ICANN financial resources come from registrants and so...

Rita Rodin: Comes from what was that? Sorry, what was that last part, they come from?

Chuck Gomez: Come from registrants.

Rita Rodin: Uh-huh.

Chuck Gomez: Okay, the fees that are paid through registries and registrars and so is it right to have registrants basically paying these fees for particular interest groups being able to, you know, lobby for their points of view with the policies development process, that question was raised in the discussion there and probably one that you weren't able to year.

What do you think about that? I thought it was an interesting point that's raised, how do you balance the need to encourage participation and facilitated even on a cost point of view with this idea that obviously people are -- really they're representing particular view points and maybe even lobbying for the interest of those entities.

Rita Rodin: Well, again, I had not heard that (for things of that), Chuck. And again I think that you can kind of twist anything to be unfair. Everything that ICANN does in all of it (unintelligible) ICANN or coming out of I think what their registrant obtained. The whole budget they were supporting staff applying and looking for a venue and applying for different countries to look further different agendas as well as (unintelligible).

So well, I think that's certainly an interesting again to (unintelligible) question, I think that again if you look at the GNSO as a critical piece of ICANN and the way that ICANN policy is going to get developed is by having different constituencies with different point of view come to the table, discuss them, advocate them and then this (unintelligible) try to compromise to come up with the final position. That's what ICANN is supposed to do and how it works. And therefore in my view that should be funded out of he budget.

Chuck Gomez: And then another item that was discussed there was, okay if we look at GNSO improvements and the recommendations to the working group model where working groups become even more important then -- so does the same thinking apply to working group participation when in-person meetings are needed?

Rita Rodin: That's a great question. I have not really thought about that. I think we could certainly (Doug) and other kind of more in the budget (unintelligible). But I would love this start taking small baby steps first and see how that works out. This again my gut reaction to them.

Chuck Gomez: Anybody else want to comment on that first question from Norbert before we go to a second question?

The second question relates to what he observed in terms of the funding for the Delhi meetings was, you know, not good cost efficiency in terms of the airline rates and so forth that were obtain and so his question it was with that context was - I also would appreciate to know how you would assist ICANN use of travel resources more wisely.

Rita Rodin: I think that's a great question as well. You know, I'll tell you all that I was not that (unintelligible) Delhi and a number of (unintelligible) in my view inexcusable. And at one point I (unintelligible) I can't believe that \$61 million can't get me into, you know, a board call. I think it's the second one I participated in remotely

The second meeting that I participated in remotely I am overwhelmed to say the least of the capabilities that we have. And, you know, one of the things that I think is an issue for me at least is sometimes within - you have to appreciate all the hard work that everybody in ICANN (unintelligible) from, staff and management side through the board to all of you that spend money, spend your time flying on the world to help make this positive work and I think it's great.

But I also think that there's a real need now to kind of step it up and I think we need to have a list of the things that should really be kind of an auto pilot and they're not and I don't really understand why that is. But I'd like to see a travel policy that makes sense to everyone and that is really just a plug and play. And I think that is something that's hopefully can happen sooner than later.

But I think this kind of being - it's like sort of acceptable is to just kind of I'm okay with (unintelligible) and some of the area that is not

(unintelligible). I'd really like to see an improvement in a lot of the travel and remote participation facilities.

Chuck Gomez: And in fairness to Doug Brent he did communicate even before New Delhi, but again in New Delhi that that goal is to develop a comprehensive travel policy so apparently work is going on, on that.

Rita Rodin: Yeah, absolutely. This is my main issue for the board. Board members have definitely been talking about this for a while, and I think that the (unintelligible) and working very diligently to do this. I know that, you know, (unintelligible) and I have this question about Delhi overruns and affordable and, you know, there's absolutely things that are going to happen particularly given the places that, you know, need to help is always - you know, if you look, you know, what's going on (unintelligible), you know, who could have foreseen that? And now people are scrambling once again to figure out what we're going to do with those.

Then secondly it's variables and things that are going to come up and that's why I think it's even more important to have some sort of a general plug and play that should be able to run as smoothly as possible and free people to deal with something a one-off thing (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomez: Thank you. Any other comments or questions on this?

Okay. Then we go to question Number 12 which is again from (Adrian). He says that I would like to see a regular monthly report from our representative on board issues and where she stands on them potentially with time allotted on calls and in meetings. And then I added

the question associated whether is that possible and are you willing to do that?

Rita Rodin: You know, I wasn't sure if (Adrian) wants me to write a book report to him (unintelligible) or what.

But, you know, certainly I tried by best to be on the call, and essentially I'm not really excited (unintelligible) are kind of statements to kind of chime in. I think certainly that it's something that I'd like to keep me doing it is that I'm sure (Bruce) would like to continue to do.

I'm not really talking about a regular monthly written report which I think given a lot (minor) commitment would be a little bit micromanage people really. I think that is something that is necessarily which (Mike) can certainly address that, but I wasn't sure where he's looking for (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomez: Okay. Did some or the rest of you have thoughts on that regard?

Okay. Well, just encourage (Adrian) to clarify his position to you and on the counsel so that -- to make sure he gets an answer there.

His next question was and the last one of the advance questions as, I would like to see a representative present at our counsel base at ICANN meetings where board commitments permits, is that possible?

Man: I think that was present.

Chuck Gomez: What did I say?

Man: You said present.

Chuck Gomez: Oh, yeah. Thank you. Thank you (Allan), I appreciate that.

And so - in other words he is asking - he is saying that he'd like to have you and (Bruce) at our - I'm assuming he means the GNSO open counsel meeting that we usually have on Wednesdays assuming that they stay the same in the meeting and maybe even present at those meetings, so is that something that's possible and how do you feel about that?

Rita Rodin: Yeah, I think that's very good. And I think (Bruce) and I tried as much as we can to be there. We have - I think that usually happens on - I was (unintelligible) Wednesday meeting too, Chuck And that usually happens on all favorite constituency (jobs)?

Chuck Gomez: No, it happens on the next day.

Rita Rodin: Oh, it does. Okay.

Chuck Gomez: Yeah.

Rita Rodin: Because I know that sometimes we have other things that are - we don't control our schedule and, you know, I (unintelligible) this now and then with this GNSO improvement it's kind of busy and we don't control our schedule, (Diane) kind of give us a print out of where we're supposed to be and what time.

But I know that personally, you know, the board is now if you all know are trying different formats with constituency day. And I think most

board members like the notion of kind of traveling to different constituencies and getting a broad cross section of work that they're concerned with. I'm kind of torn on that because I would like to be able to (unintelligible) GNSO meetings. We think that work - having more communication and having more effective understanding between the GNSO and (Bruce) and I, I think we kind of need to be present at those meetings. So I'm definitely in support of that. And I think the question is just trying to figure out where the rest of the board stands. I know that some board members want to have people more rotating in and out of different things. But I certainly at the expense to which my schedule permits always try to be at the Council meeting.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. Any other - any follow up questions or discussions on that?

Okay, we've now come to the point where I'll open it up for any new questions that anybody wants to raise or even comment and really you're welcome to participate in that as well.

Okay, and by the way I want to welcome (Kristina) and (Jordi) to the call and sorry they couldn't be with us on the whole call, we're just coming to the end right now and (Cristina) and (Jordi) if you have a question you'd like to ask even if it relates to one of the topics we already discuss well let you know if it's too much repeating but feel free to bring that up now.

(Jordi): Thank you Chuck, that's okay on my side.

Chuck Gomez: Okay.

(Jordi): (Unintelligible). Thanks.

Chuck Gomez: (Jordi).

(Kristina): Rita, this is(Kristina. The only question I have, and again I was caught on the call, so I apologize for joining late, as there's been a lot of talk in a lot of quarters about trying to make attendance at the meetings easier for everyone, not only the counselor but also members of constituencies, members of the advisory committees et cetera.

And then in connection with that, one idea that seems to be getting a lot of attraction or at least I keep hearing about it from different people, is the idea of selecting within each of the various regions, one or two cities to act as meeting hubs with the idea being that these are the two cities in this region that meeting will be held at you will know that when it's every other meeting in this region will be at the cities we can plan accordingly, we'll have overtime enough of the relationship with the, you know, prominent hotel that we can negotiate good rates that are - and I was just wondering what your thoughts were on that whole idea of hub cities.

Rita Rodin: It's one of those things Kristina where sometimes it's like I'm in, you know, ICANN (unintelligible) because even (Crawford) as we all know (unintelligible) a lot of work over the past, at least ICANN around the board a have this idea of hub cities. And apparently (unintelligible) developed and things that (unintelligible) came out of that. And what were told was that there wasn't really (unintelligible) for that.

So it's more something amusing but not really. To me that another thing that's getting more (unintelligible) why does that sold in the first place.

But even as it may, you know, I certainly am in favor of using attendance (easier). My understanding of why hub cities wasn't something that people thought was a good thing was that by having ICANN travel to different cities, it allows a broader participation of folks that couldn't in fact travel.

So if we are just selecting three cities or so that really then isolate many of other potential participants that would want to come to these meeting so when we're in, you know, I don't know, some type of trailer or Wellington or Ghana or, you know, wherever, it's allowing some of those local participants who really can't fly anywhere to come and participate and learn a little what ICANN is about.

So I sort of see both sides of it. I don't know if you were on sort part of this call about, you know, funding the GNSO council members...

(Kristina) I was.

Rita Rodin: ...travel. You know, I think it's kind of I see both sides and I - and again I'm somewhat (dismayed) because I thought that (Susan) had couple of idea about idea of hubs out there out there and that the community didn't like it. So I don't know what to tell you on that really.

I think everyone is certainly open to making attendance easier and more robust but also balancing the notion of kind of, you know, be as inclusive and get to different parts of the world. (Unintelligible).

(Kristina): All right. Thank you.

Chuck Gomez: Rita, it's interesting because I certainly (unintelligible) with what (Susan) was advocating there and she did it in some, you know, of the public ICANN meetings ways back. But I never really did hear opposition to that idea so maybe I just missed it and I think the idea was to have a, if you have three meetings a year you have a couple at (hub) cities and you still allow for at least one meeting a year to be at a non-hub city to facilitate the other thing.

But anyway, I'll be curious if you ever get any information with regard to how that opposition was determined. I certainly wasn't privy to the opposition to that idea.

I do understand that the interest in getting -- allowing easier involvement for people in remote areas where they probably wouldn't be able to come event to a hub city and I think that's legitimate but I think as I recall (Susan)'s of the ideas was to kind balance the two so that you will have some improvement.

So if you get any insight in that as to how they determine that there was a lot of opposition to that, I'd be curious.

Rita Rodin: Okay, we'll do.

Chuck Gomez: Anyone else have a question or a comment before we adjourn this meeting?

Okay. Well, again Rita thank you very much for the time you devoted to this, I think it's has been very informative and hopefully we'll have more of this in the future and not just wait for election time.

The - and also thanks to each of you that participated on the call as well as those of you that submitted questions in advance and now for the rest of the counsel who couldn't attend they'll listen to the recording.

Thanks a lot and have a good rest of the day.

Man: Okay.

Man: Thanks, Chuck.

Rita Rodin: So thanks everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Rita Rodin: For my part, I'm really encouraged and I really appreciate everybody submitting questions and participating on the call. It's great for me again to hear what's on your mind. And I would second Chuck's (unintelligible). I hope if we actually do this more often and we'll hopefully be able to think of ways to actually execute on that. Again, I think sometimes we have great ideas and then we never, you know, use the next step and figure out how we're going to do those. But I'm certainly open to having more calls with you all with the (debrief) so that we can actually really understand what's on your mind and try to help as best we can.

Chuck Gomez: Okay. Thanks everybody.

Meeting adjourned.

Man: Okay.

Man: Bye.

END