

Travel Drafting Team Teleconference

TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday, October 23, 2008 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Travel Drafting Team teleconference on Thursday 23, October 2008, at 16:00 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/gns0/gns0-travel-dt-20081023.mp3>
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - NCA group leader.
Zahid Jamil - CBUC
Greg Ruth - ISPCPC
Ken Stubbs - Registry
Robin Gross - NCUC

Absent - apologies

Edmon Chung - Registry - absent apologies

Tim Ruiz - Registrar - absent apologies Avri Doria - GNSO Chair - absent apologies Chuck Gomes - GNSO vice chair - absent apologies

Absent

Cyril Chua - IPC

Staff:

Glen de Saint G ery - GNSO Secretariat

Man: We're now recording.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Olga, we have (Olga), yourself - who is leader (Greg Ruth), ISP, (Robin Gross) in CUC, (Ken Stubbs) in Registry and that's all for the moment.

Woman: Okay.

Woman: And I have apologies from (Edmond Chung), who is traveling.

Woman: Yeah - and also (unintelligible)...

Woman: And (Avri) cannot because she's also traveling - thanks.

Woman: Going to be in the call. So thank you everybody for being in the call. I sent an email just today that we finished our last call last week with something that we talk about on - when we were on the call. You were supposed to send some input for me to start the drafting and document. I was wondering if someone sent something because I didn't receive any text. And take into consideration that we have to have something drafted and agreed by November 1.

What I did after this week, I had taken some notes during our call. And I just put them in a small email I sent yesterday to the list. It's not meant - this to be agreed principles or concepts. It's just some notes I've been taking during my - during the call, just please don't think that I am trying to say this is truth or agreed text.

And also, I don't know if you saw it, (Avery) sent after the email I sent yesterday a very interesting email making some points in relation especially about the size of the constituencies and the amount of constituencies after the GNSO will change in its structure.

So I've - what you think - how should we proceed? Should we perhaps review this small notes I have been taking and the concepts sent by (Avery) or you want to propose some ideas that I could write as you

mentioned. And how would you like to proceed? I would like to know how do you want to work with this call?

Man: (Olga)?

(Olga): Yes - who's there.

(Ken Stubbs): Yeah, it's (Ken Stubbs). I have a couple of responses...

(Olga): Oh, (Ken) - yes. Okay, before you start - sorry - I would like to make a comment. I remember that during your - our call, you had to leave a little bit early. And what we liked very much in our last call was somehow a summary of some issues to take into consideration when we talked. And I asked in the first email I sent to the list after I call, if you could perhaps summarize them and that would also helpful for our work. And now I hear you.

(Ken Stubbs): Thank you. I apologize - I got the email but I've been somewhat distracted. We've had illness issues in the family and it's been just to say the least a bit of a distraction. I'll try to get something summarized so in the next day or so.

I have some comments with respect to the comments that (Avery) made.

(Olga): Yes.

(Ken Stubbs): First of all, they talk about constituencies of different sizes. I think for all intents and purposes, regardless of the size of the constituency - and let me use those in an example, okay? First of all, you have to

stretch to determine exactly what constitutes size - I'll give you an example.

In the business constituencies - and if I'm incorrect here I know somebody will speak up. Many of the organizations that are members of the constituency have significant numbers in members. And I'm thinking, for instance, the US Chamber of Commerce, International Chamber of Commerce - a lot of the trade groups and various groups there. Do you count those members or do you count the memberships - number one.

Number two, the - I think that ICANN over the years - over the last ten years - has acknowledged the concept of a constituency system. I think if we add new constituencies in the future, ICANN needs to be prepared to fund the travel for the new constituencies - this should be a budget item for ICANN.

And that that should be done a pro rate basis according to the constituencies. Also, with respect to one constituency that has a large number of members getting a good proportionate amount of funding - I think we're much better off with the concept of funding each one of the constituencies on an equal basis.

In other words, I don't really think the number of members - if ICANN acknowledges the existence of or the addition of a new constituency, that that's the benchmark right there. And I would doubt very much whether any new constituency would have a different representation on the council than the other constituencies. I can't see - and I don't see - the idea of restructuring the council to account for these as well.

I do believe that the funding should be to the constituencies and not to the various houses - you have a bicameral system that we're setting up. But each one of those houses consists of constituencies and the concepts that's in place now called for constituency representation on the council - not house representation.

And if I'm wrong, again, please correct me. So I'm inclined to say to (Avery) that that's just a budget item and whatever the existing constituencies are getting and if ICANN acknowledges or recognizes the new constituency, they have to agree to fund it on that basis.

And I think I pretty well covered the allocation as well. I think you'll run into real problems if you start funding constituencies on a disproportionate basis, you know.

(Robin): Hi, this is (Robin). Can I (unintelligible) too?

(Olga): Sure, (Robin), go ahead.

(Robin): Yeah, I share (Ken)'s sentiments about that. But I wanted to make one clarification. We're talking about constituencies but I think what we really mean are stakeholder groups as we are transforming into the new GNSO. We're moving into four stakeholder groups. So I think - or at least from my perspective - what we're saying is the four stakeholder groups are the ones who received the funds. And then there are various constituencies within those stakeholder groups.

And so, you know, it's going to be up to each stakeholder group to proportion those between the different constituencies within the

stakeholder group. That's my perspective and I just - I'm wondering if that's what others are thinking?

Man: I think we're all on the same page there, (Robin), because our constituency consists of various types of members. By that I mean, you have the generics and then you also have the specialty TLDs. So I'm inclined to agree with you there. I think maybe we need to get (Avery) off of the idea of using the word constituency and moving towards the description of stakeholder groups.

(Robin): Yeah, I think for clarity's sake we should do that because we're moving into a system where we will have both constituencies and stakeholder groups. And so it's not, you know, we just need to be clear about which entity we're speaking about.

Man: It might be a good idea on any summary that we give back to the council that we are consistent in our wording. Otherwise, they're going to have the same issues (unintelligible) that we are here.

(Olga): Thank you, (Robin). I have a question. So we should talk about the stakeholder groups, not talk about, you know, a document about constituencies - that's what you're saying?

(Robin): Yeah, that's what I'm saying because we're - this is a policy that isn't going to go into place until sometime in 2009 presumably. And so that's, you know, we're going to be in the new GNSO where we're divided into four stakeholder groups at that point with constituencies within the stakeholder groups.

So I think it makes more sense to replace the language that we've been using now as constituency with stakeholder groups.

(Greg): Well - this is (Greg). I guess I'm - I don't see it quite that way. As (Ken) said, if you're a constituency, you're a constituency because the board or ICANN or whoever decided that you are a separate voice. Whereas the stakeholder groups, I think, are kind of artificial. I mean, they're just groupings of constituencies for the sake of convenience.

So one could make a case for actually talking about constituencies - individual constituencies instead of stakeholder groups getting support.

Woman: I have...

(Robin): I haven't heard before that there would be constituencies outside of the four stakeholder groups.

(Greg): Oh no - I'm not saying there will be. But I'm just saying, the entity that you have to deal with is a constituency, not a stakeholder group.

(Robin): All right.

(Greg): Because a constituency is recognized as a separate - I mean, this takes this idea of stakeholder group as just a pure artificiality as far as I'm concerned. You have some odd combinations that go into stakeholder groups or be called stakeholder groups simply because they have to be - people have to be stuck in one of four groups.

But if it really is a separate constituency, in other words, a whole - a constituency really is a stakeholder community, okay? In the normal

sense of the word, stakeholder. And that the recognize that the constituency, they're a separate voice and they should have a separate voice and be funded as such.

But I, you know, I don't want to monopolize - I don't want to impose my will on anybody.

(Olga): Someone else wants to...?

Zahid: This is Zahid. I'd like to chime in at some point.

(Olga): All right, Zahid, you're done (Greg), or you want to add something else?

(Greg): I'm done.

(Olga): Okay. Zahid, you want to say something. I think (unintelligible) point initially about the whole dealing with (Avery)'s point (unintelligible) emails. I think we need to make sure that the payments are - the budget is actually allocated to the constituency. I completely agree with that.

And I think that in case there are going to be any new constituencies and ICANN needs to take account of that in the future process and allow appropriate funding. So I think that point can be dealt with that and your average point. However, with the stakeholder group issue that just raised by (Robin), I think that it might be new language at the moment and it may create confusion, maybe we could stick with the constituencies.

And there's another practical reason why I think that that language should be used because at the moment, the way we all considering how it's going to be necessarily handled, will be that each constituency will decide who's going to be represented as counselors from their position or their other representatives will be coming to these meetings whether they're working group meeting or the council meetings.

So I think from an administrative point of view, it would be that the constituencies (unintelligible). So I would agree with the last comment that we should use that language. What we could do is in the drafting process actually and at what currently are the constituencies. And if supposing the language changes or they're given a new terminology, that could be taken into account subsequently so that at the moment we should stick with the current terminology -that's what my view is.

(Ken Stubbs): (Olga), this is (Ken Stubbs). Can you put me in the queue please?

(Olga): Okay - sure, (Ken), go ahead.

(Ken Stubbs): Yeah, we have the advantage of some expertise on the - attached to the working group with Glen. Glen, I'm going to ask you a question because I know you've been working to some extent on the restructuring of the GNSO. Correct me if I'm wrong, they're talking about bringing the possibility of additional interest groups supplying to ICANN for recognition within the GNSO. Aren't they discussing those, using the term constituencies?

In other words, if the domainers want to establish a constituency, they would apply to ICANN for recognition - am I correct there?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes - and I think (Robin)'s explanation that she gave was also very correct. There are constituencies in the stakeholder groups.

(Ken Stubbs): Yeah.

Glen DeSaintgery: And there could be even more registry constituencies for example.

(Ken Stubbs): Right. I think from a practical standpoint, what we may have a potential problem for political unrest. And that is if we make a decision that (unintelligible) should be allocated to a stakeholder group, I can see a significant amount of flack going on within the stakeholder group as to who we give what out of that.

Now maybe I should just say, well that's tough, that's their problem and not ours. at the same point in time, it would be nice if we could work out a system where we could get some sort of buy in from the very beginning so that we don't run into an issue like that because I, you know, it's just to a me an additional irritant for contention.

I think that maybe we need to take a closer look at exactly what ICANN's trying to accomplish or what we're trying to accomplish by restructuring the GNSO. I think we're trying to provide flexibility in the future for addition of constituencies who may be a member of one stakeholder group or another stakeholder group.

But I think ultimately - and please correct me if I'm wrong - maybe I'm just missing something in the restructuring. Any new interest group that's recognized by ICANN - and I'm going to use the domainerships because it's easy to identify them. If they recognize them, they're recognizing them as a constituency and I'm believe it was my

understanding as a constituency they would be entitled to membership in the newly reformed council.

Is so, this funding is supposed to be essentially to fund participation primarily - and I use the word primarily because I think most people assume that participation is essentially by member - for members of the council, even though a constituency may elect to fund someone other than the counselor.

So I think would be - I think we'd be better off to budget this on the basis of a per constituency basis and I think ICANN has to realize that if they recognize a new constituency and if in fact that constituency's entitled to representation on the council, then ICANN is going to have to provide funding for any future constituencies that are recognized. I don't think that they should dilute these existing fundings.

(Olga): Thank you, (Ken). Someone else want to comment? I would like to make a comment.

(Robin): This is (Robin). Can I get in the queue after you?

(Olga): Yeah - and I would like to ask you, (Robin), a question. I think you comment about stakeholder is really important. But I have the same doubt that (Ken) rised. Are there going to be new constituencies if approved by ICANN and there are going to be part of each of this four stakeholder groups? But should we think about dealing with constituencies for our document or should we think about stakeholder groups?

And as you mentioned the stakeholder concept, perhaps you can clarify this maybe to me or to the rest of us. So go ahead, (Robin).

(Robin): Like I said, it's my understanding that the GNSO is being basically divided into four stakeholder groups and every constituency whether in existence now or yet to be created, fit within one...

(Olga): Hello?

Man: Hello?

(Olga): Hello? I hear music. Hello?

(Robin): Okay. Yeah, I have no idea what that was.

(Olga): There's no music on the line.

(Robin): It happens often when I speak, you know. Anyways, so it's my understanding that any constituency whether in existence now or yet to be created fits within one of these four stakeholder group. And that's why I think it's important that we stick to the language of stakeholder group instead of constituency in this context because of the transformation.

I also think - it seems like we have a - we haven't reached agreement of understanding as to what this GNSO restructuring is about because we're hearing, you know, different ideas of what's happening on this call. So I mean, it's not going to be up to the travel funding call to decide the restructuring of the GNSO.

So I think we need to get clarification on this point because I think it's really important. And if it is in fact all constituencies are being put in one of the four stakeholder groups, then I think it's important that the funds be divided among the four stakeholder groups and then stakeholder groups, through their own internal machinations, allocate how those funds are used.

So I just want to...

Man: I agree with (Robin) in terms of getting clarification. Because I'm only speaking personally right now. and I want to make it absolutely clear that this is only my personal observation and that is that if each one of the constituencies is entitled to representation on the council - and let's assume that the ISPs, the IP and the business constituency was here equally into the same amount of representation on the council as the registry, so the registrars.

It would seem to me that you would be diluting the funding for that specific half of the stakeholder groups by doing it on that basis. And I just frankly don't think that that's really fair because you are dividing a pot of money on one side between three members of the registry constituency. And on the other side between nine members of that group and the only thing I think it creates is just more dissension and frustration.

I'd rather have a situation so that the funds are divided on the basis of representation on the council and then they can decide what they want to do with them. To me it's a little bit more equitable. But I do think that until we find out exactly how ICANN's planning on funding this in the future, are they going to fund it on a per stakeholder basis or per

constituency basis. Because if they're going to fund it on a per stakeholder basis, (Robin), as you add more constituencies to the stakeholders, you will not get anymore funds because by our definition we're dividing it up between the four stakeholder groups. That's just food for thought. I really...

Man: This is - I would like to say something - oh, sorry.

(Olga): Okay.

(Ken Stubbs): Thanks for hearing me out, guys. I'm sorry if I ramble too much.

(Olga): That's great, (Ken). Zahid and someone else want to talk after Zahid?

(Greg): I'll get in the queue - this is (Greg).

(Olga): Okay, Zahid - I hear music. Hello?

Man: Hi there - it's happening when I talk to you, (Robin).

(Olga): Okay, no problem. It's (Greg) and back to myself and someone else want to talk (unintelligible)? Okay, Zahid, go ahead.

Zahid: Yes, I agree with (Ken) here because if I think what will happen is the money will be divided up and then a greater portion would be available to the (unintelligible) constituencies and there would be a lesser amount available for say, the BCO (unintelligible) and ISPC.

And I think that's why I completely agree that it would probably not be so fair in one respect. The other think I'd like to mention is that I think it

- I completely agree with the point that it's - the travel and funding is for representation on the council. Now the moment - my understanding - and I just want to get verification on this is it's not the stakeholder groups who have representation of counselors but it'd probably be the constituencies still.

If that changes, then I can understand why the stakeholder groups should get the funding rather than the constituencies. But if the representation in the new restructuring is based on constituencies electing their councils (unintelligible) so then it should be the constituencies basically getting to divide the shares up.

That's why - that's how I see it. But am I wrong? Is it the stakeholder groups eventually who are going to be electing counselors onto the council? And this is just a question for anybody who has the answer to this - thank you.

(Robin): It's my understanding that it will be the stakeholder group which is why I was going into the direction of saying we should fund the stakeholder groups predominately.

But again, this is...

Zahid: This is good because - sorry.

(Robin): That this group is going to be able to, you know, decide. So we just need to get clarification of what this decision is, you know, is to help us as we figure out our plans.

Zahid: I agree with that and I think we need to get clarification on that and if - it all depends on who basically gets to decide the representation of the council really.

(Ken Stubbs): Yeah, can I...

Man: Wait.

(Olga): Could we follow the queue please because if we - we have very few (unintelligible).

(Ken Stubbs): All right, I'm sorry then. Please put me in the queue.

(Olga): Thank you - thank you, (Ken). And Zahid, you're done or you want to say something else?

Zahid: No, I'm done.

(Olga): Okay, (Greg), go ahead please.

(Greg): I guess I agree with Zahid and (Ken) that if you allocate funds on an equal basis to stakeholder groups, you run the risk of diluting the funding for the constituencies. It's clear to me - I don't know - I don't have the answer to (Robin)'s question exactly. But it's clear that the basic units of representation in the GNSO is the constituency.

The ICANN Corporation has recently, I think, released a new constituency petition and charter guideline or something like that. Meaning that if you want to be a new constituency, you have to justify why you should be a new constituency and you have to explain who,

you know, who you're membership is and all of that. The bar is not low. Not just anybody can become a constituency.

On the other hand, if a constituency really does have an identity, then that identity has to be represented and the constituency (unintelligible) are the individual units of different stakeholder representation within the GNSO. They may not have seats on the - none of the constituencies may get seats on the council but I think as members of the GNSO, the support organizations, they are equal and should get equal support.

(Olga): Thank you, (Greg). I would like to make a comment. I also think that maybe I'm wrong but my understanding of the (unintelligible) and the council is by constituency. But I also agree that we should ask for clarification to understand really if the stakeholder groups are receiving this funding or the constituencies.

I also understand that if there will be some stakeholder groups with more constituencies than the other ones, then each stakeholder should deal with this portion of the (unintelligible) to traveling. And I would like to ask you if - how could we ask for clarification, who would be - the board or GNSO or (Denise) - who should give us this clarification and how should we ask for it? And now I have (Ken) in the queue.

(Ken Stubbs): Okay, first of all, I'm going to ask for a clarification. I know that Zahid said that the funding is for counselors. But I think you have to put - insert in that sentence as it stands right now, funding is primarily for counselors. But you have the option of not necessarily funding a counselor if you want. And that may even become more relevant if the model for the stakeholder groups is as such, where hypothetically you

could have a stakeholder group that has three representatives on the council - well, I'm going to lower it.

You have a stakeholder group that has two representatives on the council. And if so, you may have three constituencies within that stakeholder group and it would appear that one of those constituencies may very well not have representation directly on the council but is represented by the stakeholder rep.

So I think we need to get the clarification. I think the best person to go for clarification - and I would request that we get the clarification in writing - a good, clear - because it gives us guidelines to work from there. And that would be from (Denise) because (Denise) is responsible for managing that process that - unless I'm incorrect - (Denise) is responsible for managing the process and we'll move the GNSO restructuring forward, so she can take it from there.

She can go to (John Jeffries) but I think if we let (Denise) coordinate it and task it to her, it will probably get done faster and most effectively.

(Olga): Thank you, (Ken). Someone else want to come in on the queue?

(Greg): This is (Greg). I just want to agree with (Ken) that it's probably (Denise).

(Olga): Yeah, I think it's (Denise). Glen, what do you think? Is (Denise) the person to maybe ask for clarification about this issue?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, definitely.

(Olga): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: And I would also put (Avery) in check on the copy as (unintelligible).

Man: I think what we need though, we need - and no reflection because I think (Avery) and (Chuck) may very well have opinions about it. But all (Avery) and (Chuck) have at this point in time are opinions. We're operating under guidelines that have been - how do I put it - more pretty well imposed by the board on the GNSO for restructuring.

(Denise) is the vehicle for that process. So I think we need to make it very clear, I don't want to get into a three-way discussion about what this means. I need to know - and frankly, I don't plan on going any further making recommendations until we get this clarification because I'm afraid that any recommendations that we make - even if they're draft recommendations - may very well end up being taken by one of the interest groups in the wrong way. And I'm trying to keep politics out of this.

I just wanted it to be as fair as possible and (unintelligible) we, you know, the initial guidelines we talked about.

(Robin): This is (Robin). I support what (Ken) just said.

(Olga): I support what (Ken) said and I think that perhaps we should write something. My question now, is our clarification requests from the GNSO to (Denise). Do we need to draft something and then have it presented to the council or just draft something with the opinion and input of (Avery) and (Chuck)? How do you think we should proceed?

Man: My feeling is that we should draft a request for (Denise) and give it to (Avery) to forward it to (Denise). If (Avery) decides that there is something in there that is either confusing or requires additional clarification, that would be fine.

We were in effect -this was created by the council. (Avery) may want to get that before the council. I would hate to get it before the council at this point and time because I think he's going to get into a long political discussion of what the intent is. And if that's the case, then we just - I don't know what the hell we'll do - it could go on four or five council meetings.

But I do think we're better off with starting at the top because (Denise) is the one who's taking that through from the board to the GNSO.

(Olga): Thank you, (Ken). (Robin), you wanted to say something? Please (Robin), go ahead.

(Robin): No, I don't think I'm in the queue.

(Olga): Oh, sorry. I misunderstood you. Is someone else wanting to say something and I misunderstood it was (Robin)?

Man: This is Zahid. I'd like to say something.

(Olga): Okay, Zahid, go ahead.

Zahid: Yeah, I was just wondering, I mean, since (unintelligible) is coming up pretty quick now, I'm just wondering is it possible for us to have a small

meeting or I don't know if there's enough time in (unintelligible) to get these clarifications from the staff on this issue.

(Olga): Can I say something or does someone else want to talk? I think it's a very good idea but I also think - I would like to support what (Ken) said about having something - or I think it was (Greg) or (Ken) - something in written - just both ways. Maybe face-to-face and something more - which is clearly stated (unintelligible). I don't know, what you think?

Man: I don't have a problem with having a meeting in Cairo. I would hope that we could do it at a time where it would be practical for everyone and I think we need to have a limit on participants. I think it should only be members of the working group and the people who are attached to this thing. This is not supposed to be a political football that gets kicked around in Cairo at this point in time.

Zahid: I support that - this is Zahid - I support that - yeah.

(Olga): Okay, so we should - how should we proceed? We should ask maybe (Denise) to set up a date and a time in Cairo, fitting our agenda -our general agenda to discuss this among our group? And of course, having (Chuck) and (Avery) in the meeting?

Man: Well I think we offer them the opportunity of participating in the meeting. I think in the case of (Denise), it has to be one she can attend because if we have to formally go through some process to get responses from (Denise) every time, it's going to delay inordinately.

If we have a face-to-face meeting with (Denise) included and if there's a question and a clarification needed, she's in a position to give it to us

in real time and it will save us time and effort. But I think if we do this the right way with (Denise), we should be in a position to come out of any meeting in Cairo with the opportunity to present some sort of set of guidelines probably within two weeks. And that would be (unintelligible) the council for them too. That would give them enough time to deal with this move forward.

(Olga): So we can - you proposing that we make a phone call or conference call with (Denise) before the Cairo meeting - that's what you said?

Man: No. I'm proposing that maybe you call (Denise)...

(Olga): Okay.

Man: Let (Denise) know that we would like to meet with her in Cairo...

(Olga): Okay.

Man: And prior to meeting with her in Cairo, we need the clarification on the issues that we've discussed here. And I think Glen has a very good handle on exactly what the clarifications are that we need. And ask (Denise) if she could give us something in writing - just an email to the group and just ask her to be there to be able to respond. Because if we don't get this thing clarified and move out of Cairo with clarification, it's going to start to create some more problems because you've got Mexico City coming up next. And I don't think the council wants to go through what they went through the last time. It's just not much fun.

(Olga): Some other comments about this procedure to get clarification?

(Greg): This is (Greg). I think we need - agree that we need to get clarification and as soon as possible. I'm wondering how - whether that needs to stop work completely on our efforts or whether we're - since we're agreed on other things, we can do some partial work in the meantime?

(Olga): What do others think? I think (Greg) raises a good point. Should we wait for clarification and know exactly if it's stakeholder groups of constituencies or perhaps we could work in parallel with some other issues that have already been discussed and agreed among the group? What do you think?

Zahid: This is Zahid.

(Olga): Yeah.

Zahid: I think we should work in parallel to meeting up to Cairo and get a clarification on it subsequently.

(Olga): Yeah, I agree with that idea also. What do the others think - (Ken) or (Robin)?

(Ken Stubbs): I'm okay with that.

(Olga): Okay.

(Robin): Yeah, I'm okay with that too because there are a few other issues that are somewhat independent of this such as transparency issues, reporting issues, things like that that it won't matter which, you know, that answer won't necessarily matter for deciding those issues. So maybe those other issues we could work on between now and then.

(Olga): Okay. So I would like to make a short to-do list for us for the next week. (Ken) proposed that I could contact (Denise). Do we all agree in that?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

(Olga): Okay, should I contact her by email, with a certain document that we prepare among us previously? Perhaps I could draft something about this - after this meeting and we agree among us and I tell it to (Denise).

Man: That's fine with me. I don't care which way you do it. I think you have the spirit of what our concerns are with request to clarification, if you want to - I think the most important thing is to get it done. We're starting to get up against timelines and many people will be traveling towards the end of next week.

(Olga): I know.

Man: And if we don't get this done soon, it's just going to get dragged out. And I'd rather have - one, I'd rather have a meeting date and time set up. And number two, I'd like to have that clarification before we start traveling. It's just, you know...

(Olga): I have the comments about this idea that I mentioned. What I could prepare - now that I have all this comment in my mind fresh and absolute and with the time - I can draft something and send it maybe in one hour or two (unintelligible) draft words to the list. And if we like

that, we send it - I send it to (Denise) as a request for clarification from the group. Do you think that's fine?

Man: Sure.

Man: Yeah.

(Olga): Great. (Robin), you like it?

(Robin): Sounds good.

(Olga): Okay. And about the parallel work that we agreed to do (unintelligible). Hello? Hello?

(Robin): We've got Foreigner joining us on our call this morning.

(Olga): And how about prior work that we want to do in the last call, we were going to put some comments together that I was going to draft in a document. Perhaps we could - you could send them to me and I could start to put them in one document all together.

Man: Okay.

(Olga): You agree? Okay, so we have two things to do. I will draft something now and I will send it to you and see if you like it or make other changes that you think that are needed. And I also - (Avery) and (Chuck) will be copied because they are on the list. And then we send it to (Denise) and I receive your comments and paragraphs so I start drafting a document. And when - are we having another call before we travel to Cairo or we meet face-to-face in Cairo in the free moment that

we have there? We won't have much free time but we will manage.
What do you think?

(Robin): Well maybe we could work via the email list over the next week. I think a call may be a little bit tough with travel schedules.

(Olga): I totally agree with (Robin). What do others think?

(Greg): Sounds good to me - this is (Greg).

(Olga): Okay. So we - (Ken) and Zahid, are you okay with this idea?

Zahid: Yeah, that's fine.

(Olga): Okay, so we will work on the list, through these two things that we are doing - so the request for clarification and the parallel documents that we will prepare. And perhaps through (Denise) we can try to find a date and a time to maybe joining (Denise) or perhaps we can meet before and exchange some idea. Okay?

Man: Okay.

(Olga): Great. So we are done for the day or you want to say something else or some other clarification or comment?

Man: You have a - you had a list of things - bullet points or, you know, points that you thought we reached and agreement on in the last call. Can you just - do you have that list with you? Can you read them off?

(Olga): Oh yes, I do. Please, don't think that something we agreed on. I just note that I made during the call the thing that I had been doing today and just something to - some food for thought for today. But it's not that we agreed on it. You want me to read them?

Man: Sure.

(Olga): First one - this is (unintelligible) to participate in meetings when (unintelligible) for attending them.

Man: Okay.

(Olga): The second one is, should there be a - a question - should there be guidelines for using funds or/and attending meetings? This was in relation with preparing a report after the meeting or being present in say, 80% of the meetings that are in face-to-face and during that week.

The third one is, should it be some feedback after the meetings or this brings a lot of work to the council members? Is this related with the previous one? Then we have another one -constituencies should be free to allocate in a transparent process a certain amount of funds assigned to them.

In our previous call, we had no - we didn't discuss about stakeholder groups. We just focused on constituencies as far as I remember - maybe I'm wrong. But correct me if I'm wrong.

The other one is, there should be flexibility for constituencies in using the funds so they could decides - (unintelligible) further reduction. There should be a normal amount assigned per constituency. The

GNSO council should not get involved as a council in how these funds are used once they are assigned to constituencies.

Should there be a contingency budget? What happens with other required face-to-face meetings like, for example, (unintelligible) or other meetings that could rise. And also, (Avery) sent some comments - do you want me to read them, (Greg)?

(Greg): Just one thing comes to mind first. As far as the other meetings - like out of ICANN meeting schedule like we've had before with certain working groups and so forth. My understanding was that there was, in the past, there has been a budget for that. It was (Denise)'s budget, she allocated it as she saw to fit to progress our work.

Maybe we should ask her about that too.

(Olga): Okay.

(Greg): You know, I don't know. Does other people think that's worth asking her about, the contingency?

(Olga): I think it's a good idea for us to ask her - yeah.

Zahid: I agree.

(Olga): Okay. (Ken), what do you think? (Robin), do you think we can ask (Denise) about this?

(Robin): Sounds fine.

(Olga): Okay. Okay, I can write that in the questions that I will write in a while.

(Greg): Just so you're clear, that's really a separable issue, I think.

(Olga): You think it's a separate issue from our clarification?

(Greg): Yeah.

(Olga): You're right. So you think that we should include it in our request for clarification now or perhaps we could talk to her when we meet her or in a separate moment?

(Greg): That's a good question. I don't know. Anybody else?

(Olga): I think that if we put it together now, we make some confusion. I think it's very important that we get the clarification about stakeholder and constituency.

(Greg): Okay.

(Olga): But that's my opinion. I don't know, what do others think? Perhaps we could talk with her about this when we meet her?

(Greg): Yeah, we could.

(Olga): Okay, any other comments? No - we're done?

(Greg): Yeah.

(Olga): Okay, thank you everybody. You will receive some drafting made by myself in a while. I'll start - I'll get something to lunch now and then I'll make it and we keep on working in other issues on the list. And we keep in touch online. Thank you everybody.

(Greg): Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you, (Olga).

(Olga): You're welcome - bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END