

ICANN Geographic Regions Drafting Group Teleconference

TRANSCRIPTION

Monday 11 August 2008 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the ICANN Geographic Regions drafting group teleconference on 11 August 2008, at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-geo-regions-20080811.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Participants present:

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

Staff:

Rob Hoggarth
Patrick Jones
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

(Olga): Okay, I took the weekend for reviewing all the documents and all the comments on the list. And we ask and you requested to have a comparison between the different regions and the different allocations of countries and sub-regions.

That could be an interesting goal to have available. (Rob) do you know if we are able to have this someday in the near future?

(Rob): Oh yes, I am sorry. I circulated something to the list probably about 45 minutes ago after I got (Phillip's) okay. So if folks do not have that, they should be having it on their servers soon.

(Olga): Okay.

(Chuck): I do not see it yet but I will watch for it.

(Olga): No me neither.

(Rob): Okay.

(Olga): Okay. I have been reviewing all the documents, especially the document issued by the working group from the system. So on your (raffick) regions and I also remember to be as involved in that when I was that representative for Argentina last year or the year before.

One thing that I think it is relevant to define is which is important for the GNSO, because I think regions are important especially for GNSO and for countries, but which is the relevance for the GNSO.

And I think that in the list we already have some ideas. I think we all check (Phillip) and myself agreed that the geographical diversity that we need for our council members should be our main issue for taking in consideration.

Do you think there is something else about geographic regions about and the GNSO?

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

Woman: Here.

(Chuck): As I think I communicated on the list, one of my biggest concerns is one...

(Olga): Hello?

(Chuck): ...that may not be considered...

(Olga): Hello, I cannot hear you.

(Chuck): Cannot hear me. Can anybody else hear me?

(Tony Harris): I can hear you (Chuck).

(Chuck): Okay, you cannot hear me (Olga)?

(Olga): No.

(Chuck): Hmm.

Woman: (Olga's) line is very faint.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Phillip): You are coming through fine for me (Chuck) as well (Phillip) here.

(Olga): Hello. Hello, I lost the connection for, so I did not hear you (Chuck). I am sorry.

(Chuck): Can you hear me now?

(Olga): Our - now I am hearing you, but before just, you started to talk and I lost you.

(Chuck): Okay, let me try starting over. As I think I communicated on the list, one of the concerns that I think is really important to us and it may even become more important with the GNSO voting structure that we recommended, that is the geographical diversity requirements that are in the Bylaws for the GNSO.

(Olga): Exactly.

(Chuck): The registries in particular in the past have had a real challenging time filling geographical diversity requirements because there frankly were no registries in several regions of the world.

And that has forced us to, you know, stretch the requirements and find somebody, whether they were particularly willing to serve or had the time or whatever, or qualified, and I think that is not a desirable outcome.

Now, my first concern in that regard is I am not sure that particular issue was intended by the CCNSO or even the Board in terms of the scope for this particular effort.

And so while I think it is one that I definitely should be addressed, we may have to address the issue of whether it is in scope and make

either recommend that it be considered in scope or take some of their avenue in terms of dealing with this issue.

((Crosstalk))

(Olga): Okay so...

(Chuck): Now let me qualify all of that too by saying that the registries are all for the geographical diversity and we think that should be continued, but we think that more flexibility more along the lines of what is required at the Board level would be better for the council as a whole, rather than applying it individually by constituency.

Now, you know, we are going to have to think through that if we pursue that because I understand there are some complications with that, but some increased flexibility I think would be really helpful.

And I will leave it at that for right now. We can talk more about that later.

(Tony Harris): And I have a question, (Tony Harris).

Woman: Yes.

(Tony Harris): Yes. I am just getting a little confused here about the actual objective of this working group. Are we looking at geographical diversity all across ICANN or just related to the GNSO?

(Olga): I think that we have to present a (genital) position or ideas. I do not know what the group thinks, but thinking about geographic regions

about ICANN could be something - some outcome that we perhaps we can address also in our document. But I think that we have to talk about GNSO. I do not what you think about.

(Tony Harris): That was my understanding, but if we are thinking about how the Board should look with geographical diversity that would be something else I think.

(Olga): Yes, that was something that was going to ask you (Chuck) in your last part of your comment that you mentioned the Board and I think that (Tony) question is going the same direction.

Could you please clarify your last part of your comment.

(Chuck): Sure. And that is why I - it is not clear to me that one of my biggest concerns was intended to be part of the scope of this group. So that is exactly (Tony) why I made that clear.

I am not sure that they intended a, so first of all let me back up a step and say that my understanding is our task is to mainly comment on whether we think a joint ICANN working group to focus on this issue is a good idea.

I think that is probably a relatively simple exercise. But, depending - what I am saying is that I would like to make sure, if possible, that the scope includes geographic diversity requirements that are in the Bylaws as well as the definition of the geographic regions, which I think was the main intent of the suggestion.

(Tony Harris): But I, it looks like then we are not really quite clear on what our mission is. And getting to your comment on the problems the registry constituency had to fulfill the requirement for geographical diversity, I think you have an excellent point there.

And it may not have been the only constituency with that problem. So, definitely some flexibility should be built into the Bylaws on that account. Perhaps there should be a fallback provision saying that if within the constituency there is not the means to fulfill this, then you should be able to proceed otherwise.

(Chuck): Yes, and I think there probably are several ways it could be approached, but more flexibility I think would be really helpful. I pointed this out in the GNSO structure working group that for example, if you - let us say, and I will use (Phillip) I will use the commercial stakeholder group side in the new structure, and let us say, let us just use the number five representatives on the council, and if each one of those had to be from a different geographic region because the Bylaws currently read that no two can be from the same geographical region, you are then forced to find somebody from every geographical region even if no one is available.

And, you know, maybe that is not a problem for the business constituency and that is great, but that is the kind of situation that forces us to not necessarily have the most qualified people in - on the council, and I think some balance there would be very helpful.

(Tony Harris): Well (Chuck) looking back at...

(Chuck): Now...

(Tony Harris): ...I am sorry, I would just like to respond to that. Looking back at the - when ICANN began to function as an entity, I think basically the concern was if you do not get geographical diversity in the councils and the Board, it is difficult sometimes to stimulate participation from some of the regions such as Latin American, Africa, not so much Asia because you have Australia and New Zealand. But it gets pretty much something dominated by the central countries.

(Chuck): Yes, and we do not want that (Tony). And so I think we have to be very careful how we approach something like this so there is some balance there. But at the Board level, the way it is handled is at a much higher level.

You know, you have to have at least one from every geographic region and there cannot be more than five in any one geographic region. I am not suggesting that same model works for the GNSO. It obviously would have to be tweaked.

That is a lot more flexibility than opposing it at the constituency level where you have a small number of reps and they all have to be at different geographical regions.

((Crosstalk))

(Phillip): (Phillip) here, just a couple of comments if I may.

(Tim): (Tim), can I - (you) have a question if I may. Just in regard to what (Chuck) was recommending earlier, because the actual resolution of

the CCNSO is to plan a community-wide working group to study the regions that had been assigned by ICANN.

And then the Board's resolution was to sort of to get together comments from the various supporting organizations and advisory committees on that resolution.

So what you are saying (Chuck) is that our comment back in regards to the working group on the regions should also include a comment that it is not just the re - if the regions are going to be studied, then the way those regional requirements apply to the Board in other parts of ICANN should also be looked at.

(Chuck): Yes (Ken) or (Ken), (Tim). That is where I am going.

(Tim): Okay. And I would agree with that.

(Tony Harris): Yes me too.

(Olga): I could barely hear you (Tim). Could you repeat the last part of your comment?

(Tim): Just that I agree with (Chuck) that if the community-wide working group is established to study ICANN's geographic regions and whether they should be reconfigured, that as a part of that they should also look at how that would affect the regional requirements in regards to like the Board and other parts of ICANN.

(Olga): Okay. I also agree with that. I also have noticed that there are some countries, especially developing countries, that they do not know in

which region they belong to, and there are some difficulties for their participation.

And sometimes, and I did mention activities, IGF activities overlap or not with ICANN activities and these countries want to get involved and they do not know what to do.

So having geographic diversity and representation from this (corner) of the world could be difficult for these people if they are really eager to participate. And I think this is quite well addressed in the document that the CCNSO produced.

So coming back to our objective, what I have noticed, and I think that the comment made by (Chuck) is relevant, the problems with for example registry constituency is out of having diversity in their representation from people from all over the world.

Is this happening in other constituencies? Perhaps some others could bring some more ideas like (Chuck) did?

Man: With the ISPs we do not have that problem.

(Olga): Because there are ISPs all over the world?

Man: Well, we do not have much participation from Africa but we have good Asian participation and Latin America and of course Europe and the U.S.

(Olga): Business constituency (Phillip)?

(Phillip): Yes, I mean, we would probably have less problem than others to find people, but I do not think that is the central issue. I think we should, on this call, now focus on the scope of what we want to cover, which I think is simply giving commentary back to the Board in the context of the CCSO report, which itself does not reach any conclusion, but just makes an analysis.

Focus indeed on the regions as a mechanism for diversity and comment if we think the existing regional structure is good for that, or bad for that. And by all means, make some comments that in any future council structure clearly with a new structure the application of that needs to be looked at afresh. And I think that is a fairly obvious statement to make that I am sure we will agree upon.

(Chuck): Now is it fair to say that all of us would support the formation of a community-wide working group focus on the issue whatever the scope is?

(Phillip): Yes, yes.

(Olga): Yes, yes.

(Chuck): That is what I assumed too.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: (One) decision on this call.

(Chuck): So that is really the very simple answer to one of the key questions being asked.

Man: Uh-huh.

(Olga): Okay. There are some - (already) in ICANN there are some divisions in relation with regions which are the RIRs regions made by (ose) and for numberings and IP addresses and also there are liaisons assigned to certain regions. Do you think that these regions are useful? Do you think that - I think that the RIRs and the liaison, at least from the Latin American and (Gillian Bersecky) and perhaps (Tony) you can say something about it.

The region is quite well related with the local RIR. And so a big change in that could bring not perhaps a good FX in the region. And...

(Tony Harris): Well, oh I am sorry.

(Olga): Yes.

(Tony Harris): The RIRs had a very classical problem which came up with LACNIC was put together four years ago, which was - what happens with a Caribbean Islands...

(Olga): Yes.

(Tony Harris): ...because since LACNIC was a very Latin American centric community, there was some islands in the Caribbean that said I want to belong to RIPE and others wanted to belong to ARIN for example.

(Olga): Um-hmm.

(Tony Harris): So that - it did not automatically fall into a geographic region like, you know, your island is here so you belong to LACNIC. That just did not happen.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: So then does that mean that LACNIC and the ICANN Latin America Caribbean region indeed have differences.

Man: When LACNIC was formed that problem did come up and to my knowledge it is still that way. There are some islands who do not belong to LACNIC as an RIR.

Man: Uh-huh, yes.

(Olga): Okay, so we have RARs with difficulties. I know that some regions like in Eastern Europe and others have similar problems like the Caribbean, but these regions have been established in some years and seem to be working. Caribbean countries are working with LACNIC quite well as far as I know. (Tony).

(Tony Harris): What, yes, they are not enemies, but I am not - I do not know the current status, but it used to be that, for instance the French speaking Caribbean Islands prefer to belong to RIPE. And the English speaking, some English speaking islands wanted to be an ARIN such as the U.S. Virgin Islands for example.

(Olga): Okay. And I have been also reviewing the United Nations division which ranks the Americas all together, but there are some regions by the way the economy commissions of the United Nations is divided into sub-regions.

The Latin American and Caribbean economy commission is based in (San Paolo de Chebay) and handles Caribbean and the whole Latin America. Something quite similar to what LACNIC area is established now.

And the same happens with other economic commissions of the United Nations. Not the big division in between America so the United Nations make for the whole continent that I think is quite broad to bring all the continents together.

Man: I think Africa has a similar problem with the Northern African, some of the Northern African French-speaking countries, I believe, prefer to be within RIPE.

(Olga): So do we have a special reserval approach for the GSNO region scope or ideas or...

Man: (Olga), (Phillip) there, can I bring you back...

(Olga): Yes.

Man: ...to a question I raised on the list...

(Olga): Yes.

Man: ...which is I think one that is quite fundamental really. Do we believe that ICANN should essentially allocate countries by, you know, its own mechanism to suit its own needs, to regions, however many regions it may be, or do we believe that for our purposes of diversity, it is better to avoid such geopolitical debate and instead rely on an existing (exhaustive) system.

And I think we need to ask ourselves that question first, because that will take us in one or two different directions before we pursue, you know, the problems with any one grouping. And I think there is nothing that I have seen so far that is a perfect grouping, and we just need to look at ideas of which may be the best.

So don't we need to answer that question first, ourselves as a group, before we go much further?

(Olga): I think it is a very good question. And from my prospective, I think that ICANN should not allocate, but it happens. It is already allocated. And some regions are working in between the ICANN structure somehow good or bad with some unclear definitions for some countries, but the fact is that these regions are already working somehow with some allocation, and...

((Crosstalk))

(Olga): I am just...

(Phillip): (Olga), let us be clear, the ICANN regions exist because they were in the original 1998 Bylaws of ICANN which were written, you know, by a set of American lawyers. And that is why those regions exist.

(Olga): Okay.

(Phillip): The Board then took a decision to say use the U.N. system of allocation but within the straightjacket of the ICANN Bylaws. And that is what has happened. And the problems that have come out of that part of history is, while identified in the CCSO report, and I think our job is to say well either with the best situation we have got, so we stick with it, or to say maybe there is something better that can be achieved.

(Olga): Yes.

(Phillip): But I do not, I mean, I think simply saying that they have been working okay, I am not sure I agree with. I think they have been working because there has been nothing else to work with.

(Olga): No, no, I did not say they are working okay. I think that they are there.

(Phillip): Exactly, yes.

(Olga): (Unintelligible) are existing. And...

(Phillip): Yes, but I mean a by, you know, a bylaw can be changed, you know, at the drop of a hat if the Board decides.

(Chuck): (Olga), if I could...

(Olga): Yes.

(Chuck): ...make a suggestion, I think it would be helpful if each of us responded to (Phillip's) question with regard to the general approach (unintelligible).

(Olga): Yes.

(Chuck): Can I start that?

(Olga): Sure.

(Chuck): You know I have mixed feelings here. I like the idea of tying it to some already internationally recognized geographical region division if that is possible to do in a practical way, but it is just like the current application of the geographic regions was force fed to the ICANN Bylaws and certain American lawyers (you) force fitting an existing one.

If it does not adequately meet the needs of the GNS, excuse me, of ICANN, I do not think it is necessarily a good idea just to say we are tying it to some existing regional division.

(Phillip): You know, I would only suggest change if we believe that would lead to improvement.

(Chuck): Right, yes. That is a good way to approach it.

(Olga): Okay, someone else want to comment on (Phillip) question?

(Tony Harris): Yes, I will comment if you want. (Tony Harris). I actually agree with what (Chuck) just said (Phillip) because I think from a surgical perspective, you are - the idea of well let us - there is something already established in the world, let us just say we should do the same thing.

It may not be a good fit exactly for the complicated ICANN environment. And I think perhaps if we considered flexibility as (Chuck) suggested earlier in - with say constituencies and situations where you just do not have the people to fill...

((Crosstalk))

(Olga): (Unintelligible).

(Tony Harris): ...geographical...

(Olga): (Unintelligible).

(Tony Harris): ...diversity seats, well perhaps that same flexibility could apply to some country which says well I do not feel comfortable being lodged within this geographical area, and I would sooner be in another one. There may be some way that that could be addressed also.

(Olga): (Phillip) you wanted to comment something?

(Phillip): Yes, I think, I - to me there is a separation in the choice of regions and in the application of ICANN's diversity requirements. I mean, we ought to keep that separate in our minds at this point.

(Tony Harris): That is true. Yes, that is true.

(Olga): Okay. I just want to make a comment. When I said that the regions exist, I did not mean to be - to say that they are - that this is good. I just wanted to say that there are some things going on. And if there is a change, then there will be some consequences that perhaps better for the - and it is for the good.

But, if there is a change, something may happen. That is - I am not saying that it is perfect and I personally think that it should not be very much diverse from other world divisions in order not to duplicate efforts especially for developing countries.

Someone else would like to comment on (Phillip) questions about ICANN allocating regions or using existing allocations all over the world?

Okay. So, I have a question (Chuck) about flexibility. I totally agree with you that registry constituency has the difficulties in finding people especially because most of the (PVT) happens in some few countries.

How can flexibility be addressed without being confusing, without being not clear for different countries? Say for example a country wants to be participate in one region or in the other one. How can we say let us go for flexibility but with some kind of order?

(Chuck): Well I think, first of all, I think it does have to be, you know, clear and non-confusing, but I think that is something that could be accomplished. Kind of flexibility I was thinking of, and whether or not

this is the right way to approach it or not, I want to hear from a lot of other people on that.

But for example, what if the geographic diversity requirements were imposed at the council level rather than at the constituency level? Now, there are some complications in that regard with regard to implementation and I am fully aware of those.

But all of a sudden then you maintain the geographical diversity on the entire council and maybe even use non-com reps to help us make sure that stays in place if that is possible, while at the same time, not being so rigid at the individual constituency level that constituencies get put into a bind where they have to compromise and use the citizenship issue to meet the requirements.

I mean, frankly, up until we had (dot) Asia, you know, what the registries had to do was to find somebody who had a citizenship in another region...

(Olga): Right.

(Chuck): ...regardless of whether they were really representative of that region or even living in it. And that is what we did. You know...

(Olga): Yes.

(Chuck): ...I am not sure that met the full intention of geographic diversity. And I think that we do not want to force those kinds of situations, while at the same time we do want to encourage geographic diversity.

(Tim): Can I ask a question...

(Olga): (Unintelligible) sure.

(Tim): ...just to understand that more fully. So (Chuck) are you saying then that the constituencies would not be required to appoint counselors based on geographic region and that wherever it diversified, the nominated members, the nominating committee members would be the ones to fill that in, or I am not quite understanding.

(Chuck): Well, I do not know that I have the answer (Tim), but let us take for example, let us say the contract at (Fardi's) had three reps on the new council once that happened okay, each, three reps each. Rather than requiring that all three be from different geographical regions, the, maybe no more than two could be from the same region.

Or, and again, I am not sure that is the answer, but that is, you know, kind of the thinking so that you are actually able to select the three most effective people and not just go by everyone has to be from a different region.

And it becomes maybe even more or less (unintelligible) if you have four or five reps on the council where it becomes maybe more critical.

(Phillip): (Chuck) isn't the problem your - you file (unintelligible) historically the registry is going to improve over time anyway with...

(Chuck): Yes, yes.

(Phillip): ...you know, I suspect that, you know, if the existing structure of geographic diversity has been a problem - continues to be a problem, it will be a spectacular failure of expansion of UTLD. So I think that failure of diversity would be small in comparison to the other.

(Tony Harris): But all going well, there will be a Mexico member in the registry constituency.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Yes, and...

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): ...that will really, I actually do think it should improve, but I also think it will take a quite a bit of time for that to happen. And one of the things we have experienced as new registries have been added, that so many of them are so tied up with building their business model, that it is very difficult for them to devote someone who could spend the time, for example, that is required on the council.

So I think that that should happen. I suspect that it is going to take several years though before that really, really has full impact.

(Olga): Okay, I agree with (Chuck) that it will take some time for diversity to be reflected in the participation in the different constituencies.

So going back to (Phillip) questions, do we have some conclusion about believing that I can last allocate countries into regions or we

should use or rely on existing divisions made like let us say for example United Nations. Do we think that is feasible, useful?

I, and I will give you my personal opinion. I think that the - some changes in flexibility could be added to the regions that are allocated in ICANN right now. I think that is easier and not that conflictive. But it is only my thought. What do you think?

(Tony Harris): (Olga) I will go if you want. (Tony Harris). I think that, I mean the whole concept of ICANN as an entity was put together without any effort to emulate or copy existing models and it is almost logical that geographical distribution or diversity should also have been tweaked accordingly to make it useful to the ICANN mission objective.

So I think I agree with (Olga) flexibility should be added, but I am not comfortable with saying well doesn't our United Nations model and we should adhere to that strictly.

(Olga): No, no.

(Tony Harris): For example, for example.

(Olga): Oh, no. I find difficulty saying in trying to (adhere) to United Nations scheme. I mean, I think that it will bring a lot of changes and I am not sure if this will be good for the working and constituencies and in supporting organizations that it may bring a lot of changes apart from the part that we can add some flexibility.

That is my thought and this is when I say okay we have some regions already defined in ICANN and let us see if we can - I am not saying

that they are necessarily good, but they are somehow working. That is my opinion.

(Phillip): (Olga) maybe worth pointing out some that (Rob's) email now with this quite useful chart has now come through on setting on my email so probably on others too, which is just a chart that shows you the United Nation's region, the RIRs and the ICANN regions sort of side by side with a little description as to some of the differences there which is quite useful to see.

(Olga): I do not...

(Phillip): I mean for me I think the key issues I think that when we, you know, we highlighted one of these on the list and the CCs have highlighted another, I am going to go the following, the problem with United Nations categorization is the Americas and it lumps them all together and that seems to be perhaps inappropriate for the diversities that we want to achieve that is currently solved by the ICANN model and it is also solved by the RIRs model.

The failure of your current ICANN model in particular as is the RIRs model is the Asian Pacific region where the area of the greatest population and greatest growth is rather underrepresented I suspect if you do the figures on population or countries compared to the other regions.

And I think that is where there has been political pressure in particular. And I think also it was, you know, I think, somebody on this (store) perhaps discussions I have seen also made the point about the United Nations categorization with Asia splitting oh Asia Pacific has been

(Asian Asiana) actually means Oceania was a bit of a strange area, although it is large geographically, it is rather small on population.

So it also has some problems I think in terms of fit. So those things are highlighted on that chart though in broad terms is quite useful to think about it in that way.

(Tim): This is (Tim). I would like to comment too. Let us - I am not as, you know, well versed in some of this as some of you are, but it just seems from my perspective that the concerns of different constituents in different parts of the world would be - that the needs and the interest of these various regions are going to be different from others.

And to make sure that those interests and those needs are fairly represented within the ICANN space. So those might not fit necessarily well within the U.N. structure because they were not created with that idea in mind.

And, you know, if you look at just for example Internet users, you know, actually Oceania, Australia actually has more Internet users than all of Africa, or you know, some of the European sections that the U.N. has put out in the Western Northern or whatever, like the Middle East for example.

So, but I am not suggesting that we go by, you know, population, I am just saying that Oceania, Australia as a region, you know, it does have a significant number of users in comparison to some of the other regions that might seem large, but when you look at it as, you know, what are the interests and concerns of the Internet users and, you know, how they might want to participate in ICANN, you know, it is

going to be significant in Oceania, Australia as much (goes) anywhere else and their needs and interests might be different than some other regions.

So that would be my concern about having things folded up too tightly like the U.N. has it without getting into the subcategories, and maybe the way ICANN has it is not exactly right either, but I do not think that you can just take like the U.N. or some other international body and say well, you know, the geographically regions that they define will work, because within ICANN context, we have to look at it within, you know, what is the purpose, why would these constituents in these various parts will want to participate.

And to make sure that the reasons are defined in a way that a diverse set of interests and the concerns specific to those users are going to be represented somewhere, somehow within ICANN.

That does not really get us to an answer, but I guess I am saying that I do not think that there is necessarily one set of regions that have been defined by the U.N. or anyone else that would necessarily work directly one for one within ICANN.

(Chuck): Yes, all...

Man: I agree with that very much.

(Chuck): ...yes, all that is that...

(Olga): I agree with him too.

(Chuck): (Olga) could I raise a process issue for this group?

(Olga): Sure.

(Chuck): And see if my thinking is correct or not. And it seems to me that it is not the task of this group or even the GNSO at this stage in time to actually agree on exactly how geographic regions should be improved, but rather first of all, and we have already accomplished one objective, we are all in agreement that we support the formation of an ICANN working group, community-wide working group to focus on this issue.

And it is that group then that would ultimately work this problem and we would be a part of that.

(Olga): Okay.

(Chuck): But the - I do not - I am not saying we should stop there. So I think, and I have heard several people mention some principles, (Phillip) did it, (Tim) even in what he just said actually was sharing some things that could be very much built around some principles that we could include into help guide that community-wide working group when it is formed.

So whereas I do think it is very helpful for us to talk about these - the U.N. model, the ICANN model, the IRR model and so forth, and we should spend time on that, ultimately, we do not, in this group or even at the GNSO council level, have to actually decide now. That will be done in another group. And to whatever we can do to make sure that that happens in a constructive and successful way is I think where we should focus our attention in this particular group.

(Olga): I agree with you (Chuck) and I also agree with (Tim) about not our United Nations division is perfect. I think that, I totally agree with you.

So I would like - I think very useful what you mentioned about flexibility and we should be saying something about it, especially about the GNSO council. What do you think?

(Phillip): (Olga), (Phillip) here, let me agree with what (Chuck) had just said in the first part of what he said.

(Olga): Um-hmm.

(Phillip): And it may be very useful to him perhaps if, you know, you as Chair are going to put pen to paper, then perhaps, you know, fleshing out an (appointive), agreement was already got on this call.

Secondly, perhaps suggesting some principles going forward as to how we think these things should happen based on, you know, what you have seen on the list and discussion on this call, and that would be a useful thing then for us to act to or list on our next call and just in terms of going forward, because I think it is right, we do not need to make the decision in terms of how it should look, but we could describe the path to go down in terms of how things should look, if indeed there is going to be any change.

(Olga): Okay.

(Chuck): So in other words, each of us could, between now and our next call, be in a ca - translate some of the things we have said on this call into some principle. Some of them were already really stated as principles.

And you begin to form a list of principles, but then we can decide whether we all support them or not and then put those forward along with the support for the formation of an ICANN community working group.

(Tony Harris): Sure it can be mentioned as consensus was also evident on these issues, and mention them.

(Olga): Okay, I suggest the following. Why don't you send me - I can concentrate if you agree on the comments and the principles and I can draft a document and send it to the list and something else that we should agree is how often or when are we going to have our next call, which date is convenient, or frequency if we need many if we need few meetings, what do you think?

(Phillip): It depends (Olga) I think on what we think the scope of our work is. I mean for me I would be satisfied with a short report which says yes there should be some ICANN wide body and we want to be part of it.

And two, here is a set of agreed principles that should relate to any consideration of regional structures and diversity. End of story, you know...

(Olga): Okay.

(Phillip): ...and I think the rest can be done for later.

(Olga): Other comments about this idea?

(Chuck): Well (Olga) I do not know that we are quite ready to start drafting. I think the next step, and I am okay with you trying to draft something now, but the next step if we could selectively, you know, all put forward some principles, and then in our next meeting, if we could discuss those, refine them and decide whether there is a strong agreement for those principles, once we have done that exercise, then we may be getting closer to actually being able to draft something.

(Olga): Yes of course (Chuck). Forgive me if I - my English is sometime limited. I just wanted to say that I could draft a document putting all these ideas together, not more than that and send it to the list and then we discuss it in our next meeting.

And I was asking to the group when and how often do you think that we should have our next conference call?

Man: Well if this time works for everyone, can we just have a tentative schedule for this time every week? Does that make sense? And then we will kind of play it by ear as far as how many we need.

Man: That works for me.

Man: Me too, I have no problem.

(Olga): It is once a week, I cannot hear you very, very...

(Phillip): Yes, same time once a week was the proposal.

(Olga): No problem. So you think it is a good idea that you send to the list or some principles that I can put them all together or someone else want to do that, that I have, just a suggestion that I can do it, but I am open to any suggestions. Do you...

Man: That is fine.

(Olga): Okay. Okay.

Man: Sure.

(Olga): So we agree in meeting on next Monday the same time? And also were sharing these principles through the list and I will put them together and of course I will send it to the list as soon as I have it done. And we discuss about these principles the next call.

Man: Sounds fine.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Olga): Okay? Okay. So we have things to do and thank you all for meeting and let us exchange some ideas on the list and we talk on next Monday.

(Chuck): Thanks everybody.

Man: Great, yes.

Man: Okay, thank you.

Man: Thanks (Olga).

Man: Thanks (Olga).

Man: Good-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

END