ICANN
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
GNSO Meeting with ICANN Board
Sunday 12 March 2017 at 13:00 CET
Note: 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 recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

(James): Okay, let's get started with our next session, if we could ask councilors and visiting board members to make their way to the table and get seated. And I will be awaiting my traditional thumbs-up starting gun from the back of the room, and there it is. Thank you.

Okay. Thanks, everyone. I hope you enjoyed your lunch or maybe present tense, are enjoying your lunch, and while we get started into our next session, which is a joint session with the ICANN board, we'd like to welcome -- if we could ask folks to take their seats please. Thank you. So if we could welcome our colleagues from the ICANN Board, and joining us at the table.

Do we need to maybe just go around the horn with some introductions here? Because we've had some change over both on the Council and on the Board since our last discussion. It might be helpful to -- for those who don't already know each other.

So let's mix things up a little bit and start down here with Paul. Paul, go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Hi, there. Paul McGrady, IPC.

Keith Drazek: Keith Drazek, registry stakeholder group.

Woman 1:   (Unintelligible) NCA, NCA.

Carlos Gutierrez: Carlos Gutierrez, GNSO liaison to (Guy).

Rafik Dammak: Rafik Dammak, NCAG.

Marilia Maciel: Maria Maciel, NCSG.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria, alternate councilor for NCSG.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin, NCSG.

Stefania Milan: Stefanie Milan, NCSG.

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle (unintelligible).

Ben Fuller: Ben Fuller, CCNSO liaison.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, ISPCP consistency.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris, ISPCP consistency.

(James):   (Unintelligible), ICANN board.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin, registry stakeholder group.

Man 1:   (Unintelligible), ICANN staff.

James Bladel: James Bladel, registrar stakeholder group.

Markus Kummer: Markus Kummer, ICANN board.

Heather Forrest: Heather Forrest, IPC.

Becky Burr: Becky Burr, Board.

Chris Disspain: Chris Disspain, ICANN board.

Mike Silber: Mike Silber.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ICANN Board.

Julf Helsingius: Julf Helsingius, NCA.

Valerie Tan: Valerie Tan, NCA.

Darcy Southwell: Darcy Southwell, registrar stakeholder group.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, registrar stakeholder group.

Jonne Soininen: Jonne Soininen, NV IETF liaison to the Board.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, registry stakeholder group.

Lousewies van der Laan: Lousewies van der Laan, ICANN Board.

Philip Corwin: Philip Corwin, BC Council.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi, BC Council.

George Sadowsky: George Sadowsky, ICANN Board.

Cherine Chalaby: Cherine Chalaby, ICANN Board.

Rafael Ibarra: Rafael Ibarra, ICANN Board.

Khaled Koubaa: Khaled Koubaa, ICANN Board.

Steve Crocker: Steve Crocker, ICANN Board.

(James):   Thank you and welcome once again. So in preparation for this session, the Board sent us two questions. We'd like to address those first and then we'd like to then pivot to the questions that we prepared for the Board. And we have identified a couple of speakers for specific points, but then we'd like to kick off as much of an organic and spontaneous discussion as possible.

So the first question coming from the Board was asking what degree our membership is participating in CCWG accountability Work Stream 2, and what can the Board or ICANN do to facilitate participation and completion of this work? For this question, the first speaker will -- from the GNSO -- will be Paul McGrady and we have a few items of discussion that he'll raise. Paul?

Paul McGrady: Thank you, this is -- and James, you might have to help me remember what the other items are, but -- because I'm still adjusting. Paul McGrady, from the IPC, as I mentioned. One of the things that I think the Board can do especially in relationship to Work Stream 2 and jurisdiction is it could signal clearly that if it believes this to be the case that ICANN's formation jurisdiction is not up for grabs, that ICANN doesn't intend to reform outside of California and in a different jurisdiction, and that we should be focusing on other aspects of the jurisdictional discussion.

We have gone round, and round, and round and whenever we try to settle it, it comes back again with people on that particular team reintroducing that topic. And so I don't know, maybe the Board could speak to that and that might help us to set that issue aside and finish up the work on jurisdiction.

Man 2: I think before I respond directly to that, I want to pass along that (Akanori) and Ron are -- Ron da Silva are obligated to be in ASO day so they send their apologies and so we hope that we're well represented even without them here. We've been watching this dialogue on the jurisdiction it's one of those somewhat thorny issues in that it seems perfectly clear from where we're sitting. It was all thrashed out pretty thoroughly pre-transition and very strong statements were made and so it's puzzling sort of sharing the same issue that you're raising, why it keeps coming up.

The challenge, frankly, is would we make it better or worse if we tried to say something. The question what's driving it and if we sort of react exactly as you're suggesting and simply try to make a declarative statement, would that only make it worse in the sense of it would look like resistance and be taken as a signal to redouble efforts to make it a cause, as opposed to settling it. You see what I'm saying? There are, I guess, some other kind of jurisdiction issues like where contracts are made and so forth.

It's puzzling. Perhaps there'd be a better thing for me to be saying this, but what we've done so far is just relax, and wait, and see what comes and if it dies off that's fine and if it doesn't then we'll deal with it when it bubbles up. And we empathize maybe sympathize even with the sort of disparate points of view that are being expressed there and some of you obviously want to get on with the more practical aspects of what you can do and others want to sort of relitigate something that we think is completely settled.

(James): That actually is very helpful. Avri, you're next.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Avri Doria speaking and a member of that jurisdiction subgroup. And perhaps one of those that helps contribute to the confusion. The way I see it happening is there are people in that group, who for various reasons, see some problems in the jurisdiction as its set. Now, many of us have said

upfront and we're not at all talking about moving it. But we see problems with it.

For example, the one that I constantly harp on with my problem with the jurisdiction is that I worry, especially given some of the current circumstances that ICANN will at some point be limited from doing business with various countries in that in we have an administration who could well say, sorry you cannot traffic anymore with country X because country X is our enemy.

And so we start talking about things like limited immunities, waivers, exceptions. And often when we start into those conversations, we get an immediate, oh no, no, no, no, no, we cannot move out of the United States. No other country would be better. And the point is that's not the point.

The point is yes, we accept that this is this jurisdiction we're in and many of us have absolutely no desire to try and recalculate everything of our accountability that has to do with being a California corporation and relying on its extended accountability, availability. But still there's a concern that the U.S. government can say sorry, you may not function freely as the international organization you think you are in terms of doing business.

So looking for protections, looking for an effort to try and keep us from being limited at some point remains one of the jurisdictional issues that -- and we end up sort of aligned and together in a group with all of those that sort of say there's a problem with the jurisdiction.

(James): I appreciate you explaining that. I don't want to take this further. Becky, do you want to say anything on this?

Becky Burr: So I just want to say, the internet is global. In order to coordinate the DNS, it has to be done on a global level and ICANN must be able to operate globally. I think everybody in this convention center shares that. There may in fact be things that -- options, different ways, tools that ICANN could use to provide

greater assurance that it will be able to operate globally. I think that's something that the staff -- the organization actually should look at and I think that that -- I don't think we have the tools and the jurisdiction working groups to do that.

So I just don't want to leave this with the impression that your point about the need to operate globally is not taken, because it is.

(James): Any other speakers on the question of jurisdiction or indeed anything related to Work Stream 2? Phil?

Philip Corwin: Thank you, (James). Phil Corwin for the record. I've been a very active participant in the Work Stream 2 group on jurisdiction. I would note that the only valid criticism I've ever heard of ICANN's U.S. jurisdiction is the corporation is something that's existed since its beginning, which is subject to monetary controls by the Office of Foreign Asset Controls and the Department of Treasury, for which waivers can and have been granted but it hasn't prevented ICANN since its inception from operating globally and increasing participation from every nation of the world.

There have been some working group members who have wanted to relitigate the entire question of U.S. incorporation. There's one wants no jurisdiction of any nationality, some kind of international law status. I think the rapporteurs have been very generous in giving this discussion extended time, but it's clear that there is no consensus at all for changing U.S. corporate jurisdiction and it's probably time for the working group to move on to the important jurisdictional questions having to do with contracts and other arrangements for these corporations. Thank you.

(James): Thanks Phil. Julf?

Julf Helsingius: Thank you, Julf Helsingius speaking. I would just like to address this of what kind of Board do we to facilitate with a very simple practical theme. I'm

participating in a bunch of workgroups in two groups and there was a face-to-face for Work Stream 2 groups this Friday. I didn't participate because while I was totally prepared to pay for an extra night's stay in a hotel from my own pocket, I just couldn't get myself to really fight ICANN travel to justify I needed to fly in one day early. It was just one step too far.

So maybe, I understand this is a review of the travel policy coming up. It might be a good idea to sort of keep that in mind.

Paul McGrady: I'll make a brief comment. So we've been hearing -- I've certainly been hearing various complaints and there probably is something to look at. I think there's probably two separate things that may not be aligned properly, perhaps. One is the scheduling of the meetings and for that, what I've been told is that all of us, not the Board really, but everybody has actually participated in the schedule set up. And so the decisions about when to schedule meetings and so forth actually went through a community process. I'm channeling Johan words as much as anything. I hope I'm getting it right. The different question is whether or not the travel policies have been aligned with the results of that, and I'll just leave that hanging there.

Julf Helsingius: I guess I want take the opportunity because several of you were there, to thank you for inviting me for that face-to-face on Friday. We can have a face-to-face if you want to, but thank you very much for the opportunity for me to come. It started to become a tradition now and I'm looking forward to doing it again. Thank you.

(James): Thanks Steve and Johan. If I could weigh in a little bit on the scheduling thing. I've noticed a couple of trends and first off, I should say that the process for developing the Copenhagen schedule, while far from perfect, was miles better than what we went through Hyderabad. But from my perspective, one thing I'm noticing is that we have more groups asking for longer sessions and requiring that they be unconflicted.

And as long as those proliferate, we're going to have scheduling problems and I think it's because we're seeing more and more -- a larger and more diverse community is looking to get different things out of ICANN face-to-face meetings and I think it's just going to be a challenge related to the scarcity of the days and times that we're all in the same city, not to mention the scarcity of rooms and translators and staff.

So it is a challenge. It's not going away and it is increasing, not necessarily associated with Work Stream 2 but that's certainly part of it.

(Steve):   The only response I can make is we went through this long process to set up the new meeting schedule, what used to be called ABC and now we're giving them names to these -- what's the name of this one? Community Forum and we have Policy coming up next, and what's the next one? Just AGM. Maybe we've got some competing forces here, as you said, general tendency to have more meetings, more people, more issues is not really quite aligned with the revision that was made a couple of years ago. Well, that's a community problem so I'll just toss it back to you.

(James):   Thank you. Any other speakers on this particular topic or we can move onto the next question, which is what are the top priorities policy or advice issues for top priorities for your group and that one is flagged by me. We have three.

Obviously, first and foremost with the GNSO are our focus is on our policy development work, including our active PDPs on subsequent rounds of new DLTDs, review of rights protection mechanisms, the next generation RDS, and the implementation of policy work that's already been conclude, including the privacy proxy services, accreditation services, which we heard an update from -- in our morning session.

And some of the outstanding implementation relating to the Whois transition. Of course, we are still having discussions about the back and force facilitated

discussions with the GAC on IGO and Red Cross names and identifiers and what the appropriate protections are for those, and that's something that's ongoing here this afternoon as well.

So aside from that, and all of the challenges associated with supporting that work and ensuring that the volunteer community is supported and managing those processes, we also have a lot of internal housekeeping associated with implementing our new bylaws, our post-transition bylaws.

We have a group that's working now to effectively rewrite the GNSO operating manual to make sure that we are now conforming as one of the participating community organizations in this new structure. We also are encountering a common problem or common task is to staff review teams and CSC, and EC, and various liaison roles.

We're finding that we have more and more positions and sometimes than we have bodies available to fill them. So in order to conduct that in a fair and equitable and efficient manner we're creating a standing committee from the GNSO to evaluate our candidates in a predictable and consistent manner.

So those are kind of the big tasks that are in front of us, but of course, we take our queues from our communities. So the meeting on Wednesday or in April, we could certainly have a new work effort dropped onto our table and we'd have to adapt and take that in stride. But that's currently what's on our plate and what we're looking forward to as we kick off 2017 in this first meeting of 2017.

(Steve):   A lot of stuff there. Let me ask Becky to respond on the PDPs and Cherine on the board priorities.

Becky Burr: If I could just -- I want to just respond to (James). I'd be curious as you're rewriting the manual to what kinds of things are coming across. All of the groups here are, including the Board, are thinking about what do we have to

do to come into New Orleans with a new bylaw. So it would be interesting if you could share what the insights are from that process.

(James): So it's underway. It's just getting started and probably oversold it a little bit by saying rewriting the manual, but let's just say reviewing the GNSO and the bylaws and then the operating procedures to make sure it conforms with the new - and a perfect example is right now, I am the representative from the GNSO to the empowered community on an interim basis, because we are looking to understand exactly how the GNSO will participate in the empowered community, how it will inform its representative, how it will table issues, raise issues, initiate a petition and all those new functions that are now available to us.

Well, those are -- that is a lever of power that is new and we have to write instructions on how -- if and when and how that will ever be pulled.

So it's like that and then that of course flows through all of the different organizations, including the council. And then Chris, did you have or -- Steve put you both in the queue here. Oh, Cherine. I'm sorry.

Becky Burr: So I think what Steve was saying is that Cherine is going to answer your question about the board's priorities and I'm going to talk about that. But I just -- before we close off on that, I think there's a sort of general question, is there something you -- that the Board can do to help on this process?

(James): Yes, and I'll defer to Heather here on this one.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Becky. Perfect opening. Heather Forrest, I didn't know. In fact, there is something that you can do to help us, you the Board, and in terms of this question what policy issues are top priorities for your group, one of the things I suppose that might strike you from the long list that (James) just read out of various PDPs and implementation review teams that are in place is we have a very board scope of work happening right now. Quite a few PDPs. I

think the thing, with that in mind, the thing that we as a perennial measure are doing when we meet face-to-face is remind people of the role of the PDP, the role of the PDP in the bylaws.

We are perpetually faced with questions as to the role of cross-community working groups and how that feeds into the policy development process, or whether it feeds into the policy development process. And we remind folks at every opportunity that we have that the bylaws charges the GNSO with managing the policy development process in relation to GTLDs.

And to the extent that you can help us to remind the community of that fact is very helpful. I think one of the things we're very (unintelligible) to is a concern about CCWG good and PDP bad and that doesn't help us in that we can't fulfill our mandate that's given to us under the bylaws if we don't have the community participating in PDPs because there's somehow a perception that PDPs are bad.

So anything that you can do to help us with that perennial education campaign would be very helpful. Thank you.

(James): Thanks, Heather and I think that's also a preview of those last questions that we're going to get into as well. One other thing, you've asked how the Board can help and I don't know if this is just something maybe to make you aware of, but we've issued two requests at the council level for the fiscal 2018 budget to include a facilitated council meeting that would be intersessional between the AGM and the -- what are we calling Meeting A now -- community forum. I liked tall, grande, venti better, but that was easier to keep track.

But sometime in the early part of each year, beginning next year for the council, some of us will be here and some of us won't to tee up their work for the beginning of the year. And the second thing that we requested in the budget is we note that with all those PDPS that I rattled off and we had

discussions, some of those leaders have dedicated significant amount of their time as volunteers to one or more of these PDPS.

Some of them are here as sponsored or travel supported participants and some are not. And I think one of the things that we've requested is that the GNSO Council have the ability, with one or two of discretionary funded travel slots so that if we have a PDP leader that we want to see them attend an ICANN meeting and they're not receiving any support from any other organization or group, that we can play that card and pull that out as needed, when necessary to help fill that gap and make sure that we have a proper attendance from our PDP leadership so that we can continue to move the work forward.

I think we get a lot more -- we see a lot more progress in one day of face-to-face over several weeks of telecons. That's just kind of the nature of the beast. So sorry to jump the queue there but we have -- I think Chris, Cherine, what's the order here? Chris, do you want to…

Chris Disspain: I had a comment but it doesn't matter, you handled it.

(James): Sorry. Cherine, go ahead.

Cherine Chalaby: Okay, so I really want to respond to your question what are the priorities for the Board in 2017. Is that okay, James?

(James): Yes, I think -- do we have any other speakers to the two questions from the Board for our priorities? Or we can pivot then to the third question.

Chris Disspain: Sorry, (James), yes I do have a comment on that.

(James): Okay, back to Chris.

Chris Disspain: Before Cherine wants to move onto something else. I just wanted to pick up on what you said about the PDP and it sort of melds a bit into CCWGs, not quite, but more specifically about PDPs. I have a concern that -- a very specific concern that one of the upcoming reviews, the Whois review or idea, whatever we're calling it this week, could end up actually impinging on an existing -- on a PDP. You've got a current PDP running on IDS stuff. There's also a whole league of other work going on, on Whois stuff in other areas.

And yet, we appear to be about to launch a review of IDS, of Whois, et cetera. And I'm very concerned to ensure that that review is limited enough in scope that it does not end up impinging on the work that's being done in the policy development process. And I've seen some indications from comments that I've looked at that have given me concern that it may be that there will be some people who would like to have topics discussed in the review that are actually already covered by other work that's going on.

So I just wanted to raise that and flag that because it was relevant to what you were saying about the primacy of PDPs and how important they are.

(James):   Credit where it's due, that was Heather's construction. But it's a fair point, Chris, and it is something that we are keenly aware of. We did discuss as a Council and as a group previously the limitation or efforts to constrain the scope of the RDS to reviewing the previous review team.

I think one of the challenges that we've identified is that these review teams are self-organizing and they have their mandate as described in the bylaws. So what we can do in those cases is highlight this concern, this overlap or contention for the same topic and make them aware and make recommendations. They are going to obviously do somewhat what they want to do.

But Chris, to your point, we are in the process of identifying what our GNSO slate of members will look like for that RDS working group and I'm sure that is

a concern that we will be communicating to them coming from the GNSO is that these other communities are not going to be necessarily aware of or watching out for the PDP. It falls to the GNSO delegation to kind of monitor that to raise that when they give their reports back to the Council. But it is something that we are also very aware of and I know we've had some discussion of those concerns.

Donna I think is next. Sorry, I haven't turned my head this way in a while.

Donna Austin: Thanks, (James). Donna Austin. I guess to some extent, (James) have covered our (unintelligible), how do we deal with -- when we -- when somebody identifies that there is a crossover between what's going on in the PDP and perhaps what's going on in a review team working group or some other effort that's actually going on. So how do we resolve that? What's the decision process that we go to, to kick it out of one and back into another, and where it fits.

So I think maybe that's a conversation we need to have because I think we're going to see more and more of that stuff happen. Within subsequent procedures of PDP working group, we're looking at -- Jeff and Avri who are managing that PDP effort -- we're aware of a number of efforts that are going on in the community that are discussing geographic names. So what we're aiming to do in between now and Johannesburg, or I shouldn't say we but Avri, and Jeff, and the PDP working group is actually get all the different groups together in one group and under the banner of the PDP is try to get an understanding of where everybody's positions are.

And then to the extent that it's possible, deal with those issues under the PDP. Because at the moment, there's a CCWG going on. The GAC has got its own working group on geographic names as well and it will be discussed in a PDP working group. So we've identified a potential problem there and we've got a solution going forward. Well, we're going to give it -- we'll give it a go anyway.

But I think it's important to understand when we see these in a section start to happen and sometimes identifies that it is a problem, who's responsible for sorting out that problem. So I think that's something we need to deal with moving forward.

(James): Thanks, Donna. No other speakers on this topic. We can pivot to the Board question then, if we're ready to move on. Okay, so as you note that we had two questions here, the first one being what are your priorities for a Board for 2017? What do you see as being in the immediate future and your role overseeing the organization?

Steve Crocker: Cherine please.

Cherine Chalaby: Thank you, Steve. So before I share with you the board priorities for 2017, I wanted to give you some context and the context is that over the last few years, the Board always had an overriding priority in any given year on which it focuses attention.

So giving you a couple of examples, the last two or three years, the transition and accountability reforms dominated the board agenda and prior to that, the new GTLD program to primacy. So this year is different. This year for the first time in many years, the Board doesn't have a single overriding priority. Instead, we have an opportunity to consolidate and work on many initiatives that have been put on the back burner over the last few years.

So with that context in mind, I want to share with you those initiatives and those areas of focus in 2017. And for ease of discussion, I grouped them into three clusters, okay. So the first cluster is relationship with the community and we have five areas of focus or initiative underneath this cluster.

First is improving the board transparency so that the community will know at all times what the board is doing and how decisions are taken. To be a bit

more specific, we are working on improving the quality, transparency, and access to documentation regarding board meetings and resolutions. We're also piloting this year an initiative to make some of our sessions open so that the public and the community can dial in and listen in.

So I'll give you an example. Yesterday, the community listened into a live debate and discussion the Board had on the adoption of a new anti-harassment policy and this morning the Board reviewed the FY 2018 rough budget was also an open session. So that's the first initiative under relationship with the community. The second initiative is improved collegiality and trust.

I think this is not something for only FY 2017 but also for the next years to come and that is the Board has to ensure that the community powers, the new ones are implemented in a cooperative manner and we recognize that the implementation of the bylaws over the next few years will have some -- perhaps some areas of differences and we have to work together with the community in a collegial and trusting manner in resolving those areas of differences.

The third areas of focus is really, we want to increase our engagement with the community between the ICANN public meetings. What we don't want to is to have a period of silence between one ICANN public meeting and another. And we want to be more present in the community and engage more with the community.

So let me give you some example. In 2017, the board members have attended several regional meetings, for example, for -- at IRRs, and we also stated a new initiative of inviting the leaders of various stakeholder groups to join us at our board retreats between the public meetings and discuss what are top of their mind. So I give you an example. Axel Polack, the managing director of (RIPE) NCC joined us when we had a retreat in Europe and more

recently, Tripti Sinha and Brad Verd, the co-chairs of RSSAC, met with the Board at the Los Angeles retreat.

So the Board is keen to pursue this initiative as time and geography permits and we'd like to engage more and more with the community and the stakeholders in between the ICANN public meetings. The force initiative and focus under the community relationship is to -- an increase in diversity and the Board really is keen and encourages more diversity across all level of the organization and the community.

And yesterday, we reviewed with Johan and Sally various diversity initiatives undertaken by -- facilitated by ICANN org. And not only have we looked at those diversity industries but also how to measure and report on their effectiveness. And maybe if Sally is here, she can respond to those if you have questions on that later on.

And then the fifth priority under this cluster is the efficient use of resources, and particularly, the pool of dedicated volunteers. That is not an easy problem to solve, but we are area that there is stretched resources in relation to the volunteers and we'd like to do whatever is possible to promote an environment where we make better use of those resources.

So those are five priorities under the first area, which relate to relationship with the community. The next area we termed it effectiveness and efficiency. So we have three priorities I'd like to share with you there. One, in relation to the board's own effectiveness and efficiency in how it conducts its workshop and how it conducts its affairs. As you probably know, we meet six times a year. We have workshops that last about three days in every one of our those. And for -- it's been quite a while now, we've been meaning to make those meetings much more efficient -- the topic much more condensed, the material better.

And this year, we've had the opportunity -- we had time to look into this and we've now restructured all of our workshop into match the areas of responsibilities that we believe we do. So we created a model called a five block model and those five blocks are oversight over policy development and cross community initiatives. The second one is oversight of ICANN org. The third one is strategic and forward thinking. The fourth is governance and fiduciary responsibility, and the fifth is community engagement and external relationships.

And any topic that doesn't fit within that, we question very hard whether we should be looking at it and also, we need to look at the priorities and the timing of the issues coming up to the Board. So that's the first areas of focus under effectiveness and efficiency. The next one is improved financial discipline and I think this is across the board and the board really wants to ensure that ICANN becomes more financially disciplined overall and that decisions to start project reviews, community initiative is not only based on needs and priorities, but also on affordability.

So this year, for example, the SOs and ACs have been very supportive and approved the introduction of a new cost control mechanism known as PCSD, to support the leaders of cross-community initiative.

And I have to say the WS2 accountability coleaders are a very, very good example of adopting these and successfully adopting those cost control mechanism. The board is also concerned about the depletion in the reserve fund as a result of financing the transition and other initiative over the last few years. And we are planning to engage with the community on this issue at -- hopefully in 2017.

The third area of focus under effectiveness and efficiency is to do with the reviews. I think in 2017, there are approximately 11 organization and special reviews in the pipeline and the Board wants to ensure that these reviews are effective. We've received a lot of questions from various stakeholder groups

and that's on the agenda of almost every stakeholder group, so I'm not going to labor about this, and we will address this topic in the different constituencies.

And then the third and final area of focus, our (unintelligible) goal operational excellence and there are six priorities I'd like to sort of share with you -- six areas of focus. The first one is support our new CEO. And really, our job and our responsibility is to create an environment for (Goran) to succeed. And one of the area we're looking at, for example, is the process by which the goals of the CEO has been set in the past, and we feel that it requires improvement and require a manner with which the CEO goals are aligned with the Board priorities.

The next area of focus under this is related to the FY 2018 budget, and the Board wants to ensure that the community is fully engaged in the development of the FY 2018 budget and that there is sufficient time allocated for public comments, and that the final budget that the board approves in June is accepted by the community. Going to be a good success if the community did not veto the power. That will be a good measure of success there.

The third priority, and I only have two more after this and then we can take questions -- is progressing some policy issues. So we -- the board wishes to see progress, for example, on the IGO protections, on the new GTLD reviews, on auction proceeds, on RDS, on WESO accountability (unintelligible). So there are top of the agenda policies and issues that really we would like to see progress on those.

And then we'd like to see progress on technical issues, three in particular, the robustness of vulnerability in the DNS software. The next one is the pressure on the root server system and the last one is the rollout of the key signing key.

The next priority under this cluster and the last one is the oversight of PTI and the board wants to ensure the financial stability of PTI and that the structure that we jointly created through bylaw is coherent. So for example, on the financial side, you would've noticed that the PTI budget was prepared and approved by the PTI board on a timely basis. And the ICANN board is also discussing with the ICANN CEO the feasibility of planning three years ahead so that creates most stability in the system.

On the organizational and structural side, we've had various discussion with the PTI board and the PTI chair and I think those discussions were very constructive. And finally, we need to support the NomCom and we have recently provided a report to the NomCom outlining some guidance on the important skill for board members. So there's a lot of -- there's about 14 almost areas of focus. All of them are our priority. None of them come really one before the other. I hope this is helpful and gives you a good round of the board's areas of focus.

(James):   Thanks, Cherine, for that comprehensive response, very helpful. I'm hoping that we can get that in slide form, something, so we can see the three clusters and understand. Because I'm sure that while I was hearing them, they all sounded good but it would be good to see -- because I've already forgotten maybe the first six. So it was a lot to take in. It was very good.

Man 3:   We have a team working on a tattoo and we're only questioning what fonts we should use.

(James):   We'll need a new tattoo every year as the priorities evolve. But thank you, that was good. So questions from the table discussion? And by the way, we should note that this is open to questions from the audience as well if you'd like to join the discussion. This isn't limited to just the councilors. Okay, trying to get to the sequence here. Let's go Rafik, and Michele, and Donna, and Avri. Okay, we've got a combination of actual hands and hinds in the room. So I'm losing the sequence here.

So we'll go Rafik, Donna, Avri, and Michele. How's that? And Wolf-Ulrich. Okay. Okay, just a moment. Everybody's just kind of shouting names now so let me just capture them. So Rafik, Michele, Donna, Avri, Wolf-Ulrich, and Chuck. And now Phil. Okay. Okay. Let's start then with Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, (James). Rafik speaking. Just to -- I mean thanks for the update and hearing about folks on diversity, but just wondering, we have in the Work Stream 2 subgroup working on diversity and it's supposed to deliver recommendations one. So how your focus will be kind of you coordinate or organize around that work in the subgroup within Work Stream 2. I don't think we need kind of several parallel effort. Even it's I understand the goodwill behind that, but how we organize and try to be effective at the end in term of recommendation coming from the community to improve the diversity within ICANN.

Cherine Chalaby: The Board doesn't have its own initiative on this. My comment was that we are observing what's happening in the WS2, but we also know that ICANN org has -- is coming up with some initiative in terms of collecting because data apparently is not something that is relatively available. And we felt very encouraged about some of the activities that the board -- that the ICANN org has taken. So (Goran), do you want to comment forever?

Goran Marby: I don't think it's an issue here. I think it's how we use words sometimes. What we're doing is outreach. To be able to do that outreach, which is according to the ICANN strategic plan, we're trying to figure out where are the -- what things do we need to fill. We actually think that some of the work you're doing in that group is very good because it's helped us define what is diversity, how do we see diversity, and where do we need to go.

So we're sort of doing what we're supposed to do according to strategic plan and you will help us to fill in some of the gaps we already see. So see it as -- we do it -- I don't want to use the word business as usual, but one of the

discussions we all would have and we also have with the community is what kind of -- how should we attract the right people, at the right place, at the right time, and what do we need. So I think we're totally in sync in that.

Cherine Chalaby: (Elizabeth), do you want to add any comment on the diversity? No. Okay.

(Elizabeth): Well, it depends on how much we want to go in depth because I think the working group -- the work is progressing. The questionnaire is going on and I think it's just something that it would be wonderful if we could get more people of, say, a more diverse group of people involved in the diversity activity because that's the aim after all. And I think that the more people that can get involved, the better it would be. So could I ask everyone to join?

Cherine Chalaby: About the data collection and so on. We are discussing already with the ICANN staff and we raised some not concern but just two comments, because the data is collected in a different space. It's not consistent. It's not standardized and so on. So there is just -- I want to highlight to avoid kind of duplication of the work and there is something already kind of handed by the community. So just to be liasing, synchronizing, coordinating all on this just to ensure that we -- the whole thing is just to avoid the duplication of effort and so on.

(James): Thank you. Next up is Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. I wanted to go and ask for a little bit more explanation on what it means for a board activity, a board concern to be see progress in a policy area. For example, in the one that I am heavily involved in, the new GTLD subsequent procedures, does it mean, for example, we've got an exhortation from the board of hurry along, hurry along, we're waiting for you.

Is that what see progress means? Or does it perhaps go to things like the need we've expressed for a block of time for the whole community to be able

to come together and discuss things, and sort of clear a way for us on solving some of the problems we see when we come to you for help.

So I'm really curious to understand what the board means when they say it's our intention to see progress. Thanks.

Cherine Chalaby: It's more to the latter, which means help as much as possible, facilitate as much as possible, so that the community can progress on resolving issues. So for example -- and I think we decided not to touch upon it -- for example, is there is an impasse between two stakeholders, we try and do our best to find a way of moving that impasse rather than actually forcing a timeframe or forcing a projection on that.

Anybody else would like to add, contribute?

Goran Marby: It's a very good question. From my perspective, and I'm talking not in a personal capacity but as CEO, is that the word we're looking for is facilitation, to make sure that I have to understand together with my people, together with the board how we can best facilitate a discussion and draw the lien so we don't interact in the discussion.

And I think that is moving line that we always kind of learn (unintelligible) because it's not a (unintelligible). And one of the things we talk about is how do we help you when you ask us for facts. What are facts so it's not alternative fact? And how do we provide the right information.

And to be able to do that, funny enough, we can't do things overnight. We often need to plan and understand where you need information. And many times -- several of you I think have talked about the open data initiative, for instance, so we can provide information in a better way. And that is kind of where we're coming from in this, at least that's where I'm coming from. I know that's what Cherine is talking about as well. Thank you.

(James):   Thank you. Next ups is Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, (James). Michele for the record. My question is pretty simple or complicated. It depends how you want to slice it. You said one thing that I think is important that part of your role is to ensure (Goran's) success or to help with (Goran's) success. So the obvious question for me is how do you measure his success? Chris, if you want to make these comments, turn on the mic.

Cherine Chalaby: Michele, my wife is Irish like you, so I understand whether this is a good or a bad question. I can assure you that I get it all the time. I get it all the time. Look, our success, the board, the CEO is really measured by our relationship with the community and how we serve the community. That's what we're here for, not for anything else. So in setting our priorities, like we -- areas of focus this year. We're really focusing on the things that we believe are important from a community perspective and we work towards those, and we want our CEO to work with us and be aligned with us on the same priorities.

And so we will set the goals for the CEO and then we have a compensation committee and I'm going to refer to George, if he wanted to, because he's chair of the compensation committee, that then reviews the performance of the CEO against these objectives and make a discussion on behalf of the Board whether these objectives have been measured or not. But the real primary way of achieving success is that you, the community, is satisfied with the work we're doing. It's as simple as that. I don't see any other reason for our existence except this.

George, I don't know if you want to add?

George Sadowsky: Cherine is correct, the compensation committee is required to evaluate the CEO performance and in discussions with our CEO, he has made clear that the that his performance depends upon the organization's performance, that is his job to make sure that the organization meets its goals and so we're

engaging in some fairly comprehensive discussions about what are the goals of the organization for this period, and short-term, long-term. And if he helps the organization meet them then he's done his job well.

(James): Not going to touch this one. Okay, thank you for that exchange. I think next we have Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, (James). Donna Austin. Cherine, thank you for sharing the priorities and I think it's really helpful for us to understand what's on your plate for the 12 months. And one of the reasons that the council is looking to have a session in January next year, and hopefully we'll get the budget to do that, is that we don't get an opportunity to set out priorities for the 12 months.

And I think in terms of you want to increase engagement with the community intersessionally and the efficient use of resources, one of the things that strikes me with these meetings is that they're a little bit of a hindrance to getting work done and to some extent, they're a lost opportunity.

A lot of discussion about people unhappy with the way that we do the scheduling or the way the scheduling is done. What we don't do is think about the meetings in terms of we have an opportunity to meet for 16 days during the year, if we just look at -- if we just add up the days. And we don't look at the scheduling in terms of what are the priorities to the 12 months and what do we need to get done by X, Y, Zed. And then work out for this meeting, well, what do we need to close off by the end of the first quarter. We've got a policy meeting in the middle of the year and then the last one.

So if we can think about how we get more out of these meetings, and I think if we think of them in terms of what's coming -- what do we know is coming down the pipe in the next 12 months and can we usefully do at these meetings, use it for face-to-face opportunities to get work done.

I think we've fallen into a cadence over the years and we believe -- and I'll just say this is a personal view. We haven't discussed it in the council, but we've fallen into a cadence and an expectation that this is the way it's going to roll. But I think there's an opportunity here for us to rethink it as a community. Because I think we have to step up with it now that we're standing our own two feet.

So let's think about how we can do this differently and how we can use the time together that we know we have throughout the year to get -- I sometimes feel we're not as productive as we could be. So let's try to work together to use that time more productively. Thanks, Cherine.

Cherine Chalaby: Thank you. I'm very sympathizing with what you're saying but I don't know if I have any concrete proposal at this stage.

Man 4: I have a suggestion, Cherine. So Donna, I agree with you and one of the things that the board is currently doing and Cherine kind of touched on it in his list, is to itself work on the best way it can use its time in its retreats and work on a series of measures -- of steps to take to make sure that what we're doing is actually the most sensible thing to do at the time that we're doing it.

I can see a merit in considering having the GNSO put a calendar together and the board put a calendar together, and the CCs put a calendar together of the stuff that has to be, the stuff that's set in stone dates and actually trying to bring those all together and see if we can therefore usefully prioritize sessions when we're all together when we need to be. That's an exercise we might want to think about piloting or trying with maybe one or two calendars and see where we get to. Okay, thanks.

(James): Okay, so just resetting the queue, I have -- I'd like to go with Chuck next at the microphone and then following that, I have Wolf-Ulrich. I have Phil, you were in the queue and then lowered your hand. Okay, so you are in the queue. Then Erika, and then Keith put a question in the chat, and we also

have a question from Steve Metalitz, who I believe is in the room or remote. But then we have to -- I put myself in the queue so that we can move on then to the last question. So we'll start up with Chuck. I'd just ask each of the speakers to end responses -- to be as brief as possible so we can finish on time.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes, and I'm kind of here as a member of the budget committee and in response to Cherine's mention of the community power to veto the budget, because I think it's really important that we as the GNSO realize that with that power comes a heavier responsibility than we've had in the past to participate actively in the budget development process, which is underway.

In fact, there's a budget group meeting tomorrow and (Xiave) didn't put me up to this, okay, but I want to compliment that the Council and various constituencies and stakeholder groups in the GNSO because over the last few years I've seen an increased participation in that. It used to be that the GNSO, except for just a couple of us, was almost missing in that process. It's encouraging to see several groups -- stakeholder groups and constituencies starting to get more active.

And I want to strongly encourage that because it would be irresponsible on our part, if we get to the end and there's something we don't like me and we want to participate in a veto process, if we haven't contributed significantly to the preparation of that budget. Again, I compliment the efforts that have been made. I'm just saying we have a responsibility there and let me say that over the last few years there have been significant improvements in the process and it's actually been kind of stable for a couple years. So it's not as hard to do that as it may have been in the past.

So I encourage all of us as stakeholder groups, as constituencies, as individuals even to take that responsibility and now is the time to take it because the process is just underway. So I like the fact that one of your priorities is to avoid the veto, and that's a good measurement. But we need

to do our homework, participate in the process leading up to that time when we would make that decision.

Cherine Chalaby: Asha, do you want to make a comment?

Asha Hemrajani: Sure. Thank you, Cherine and Chuck, thank you very much for those comments. I can't tell you how much I appreciate them. We've had this engagement with the community for a while now and you have been one of our anchors and I'm very appreciative of that. So I agree with you on the point you made about having wider participation from the members of the community because with this veto power comes responsibility, as you very quite rightly pointed out.

So very, very appreciative of the fact that A, we should -- that you brought this up and that we should encourage more participation. And I also want to clarify that we are going to have two sessions on the budget and financial responsibility this week. And I would really hope as many people as possible in this group, the audience here today, can participate. Thank you.

(James): Thank you, Asha. And because it's on topic, I'm just going to read Steve's comment from the chat and then we'll move onto the next speaker. He says non-veto by the community seems like a rather low bar for measuring success of revised budget process.

I thought the budget veto power was intended to be an extraordinary measure but I applaud the effort to provide greater opportunities for community input on realistic timelines. That has often not been the case in the past and thanks also to Cherine for the comprehensive presentation of board priorities. So that's from Steve Metalitz. So next up is Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, James. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Cherine, thank you. You were referring to effectiveness and efficiency and in this in context, you mentioned the reviews where you would like to put an eye on. My question is so the

reviews when it comes to the community reviews. So unusually in SOAC level. So piece by piece, one is after the other and one (unintelligible) after the other in a certain cycle.

As we are more and more phased and engaged in all the cross-community activities more and more, and we also look beyond our own SOs and our groups. But my question is whether the board sees a necessity once to keep that scope of reviews to a higher level, not just on the SOACs but from an organizational, from the entire organization where that would be necessary to do that, whether there is a discussion already started in the board or not, that's my question. Thanks.

Cherine Chalaby: Rinalia?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Thank you, Rinalia Abdul Rahim speaking. Wolf-Ulrich, thank you for the question. I chair the board committee on organizational effectiveness that oversees organizational reviews and the topic of the holistic review of ICANN as a whole is an item in the committee's work plan. But in terms of status of the work, we've just been discussing it.

We have not taken any action on it. We would like to see more feedback from the community in terms of whether or not this is something that is desired. And we also believe that we should wait for a period of stability before we proceed with such a review because we have just come through -- ICANN has just come through a transition and we also need to see the impact of the new bylaws on ICANN.

So there are some more variables. Also, and this is my personal view, before we proceed with a holistic review of ICANN, we should at least try to finish one full cycle, the review of the individual SOs and ACs so that we have data to work with, so that we know what is working within the specific supporting organization and advisory committee, and what is not working. Thank you.

(James):   Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich and Rinalia. Next is Erika.

Erika Mann: Thanks so much. Cherine and to board colleague, I wonder if the listening to what you presented, I wonder if there isn't a topic missing and this is through something we all have term policy debate. And this is the -- (James), you want to say something?

(James):   Sorry, no. Please continue.

Erika Mann: You did some sign so I wasn't sure.

(James):   It wasn't in your direction.

Erika Mann: I wonder if the topic about the domain name marketplace is not totally missing in our debate. When I just looked again at the strategic plan, and when you look at the we are in the phase of understanding the transition, implementing the transition.

                We are in the practically have to -- starting the debate about a new GTLD, how is it going to shape out, is it around or whatever, is it going to be. Which means when you look at it, the next strategic plan, this one runs until 2020. The next one will be coming up in 2021. You talk about financial constraints, et cetera, et cetera. Everything relates to, more or less, how the market will shape out and this will have an impact on our policies.

                So what are you planning to do with regard to this. It's not a topic -- it's my very personal topic. It's not something which reflects current debates in the GNSO.

George Sadowsky: Erika, George Sadowsky here for the record. It is important. There's no question. Those of you who listened into our open session this morning, and I hope many of you did, were treated to a fairly lengthy sub session on how we see the domain name marketplace evolving. In addition, there's the

CCRT report, which came out I think just either yesterday or the day before, which we believe is a major building block in understanding how we should proceed with respect to additional rounds of new names.

So there's no question it's important and we try to forecast this as best we can not only for the long-term but for the short-term in terms of our revenue for the next year or two. Thank you.

Cherine Chalaby: This is really, Erika, you put your point on a very critical element, particularly in our financial planning because if I refer just to the budget, if there's one line which is not fully in our control it is the top line where the funding is, because that depends on the evolution of the marketplace. So this is one we need to spend a lot of -- and today, our discussion in the open session on the budget was dominated by this point. I don't know if (Ram) is here. He's not here unfortunately. He led the discussion, would have been quite helpful.

But we do take your point. It's a very, very important point and it's, as I said, it's the one area in our budget that we have really no control. We can control cost. We can control initiative. We can control priorities. What we can't control is what's happening in the marketplace. That's critical.

Asha Hemrajani: Yes, and I just wanted to -- so this is Asha Hemrajani for the record. Erika, I agree with what -- that you brought this up. It's very important and I want to add to what Cherine just mentioned, Cherine and George mentioned. So we had a session this morning on the budget. We talked about our assumptions for the funding.

We're going to have two more sessions this week with the community on the budget. We still have an opportunity to refine the numbers. Would love your input on our assumptions for our forecast for the revenue or funding as we call it, for FY 2018. Just to get your perspective and other's perspective on how the funding should grow for this coming fiscal year. Thank you.

(James):   Thank you. Okay, next I have Phil, but I also note that Keith has asked a question in the chat that I missed, so I will go to him next. And then Rafik, I know you got back in the queue but we need to move onto the next topic. So we'll then pivot to the last question. So next up is Phil.

Philip Corwin: Thank you, (James.). Phil Corwin for the record. Cherine, you had noted that one of the priorities for the board is some successful resolution of the IGO issues. So I want to speak briefly, make four short points in regard to that in my capacity as co-chair of the working group that's been addressing access to secure the rights processes for IGOs. And I note that my co-chair, Petter Rindforth, of the intellectual property constituency is in the audience and hales from the same nation as the new CEO.

One, the IGO issues must be -- I think the board knows it, but just to reiterate, must be bifurcated into the longstanding disagreement on permanent protections of IGO names and acronyms in new TLDs, which have been subject of disagreement between council and the GAC for several years now and the curative rights access, which is the subject of an ongoing -- of the ongoing PDP that we co-chair. So they're in two different buckets.

Second, I want to again thank ICANN for the very modest financial support it gave our working group to hire an expert on international law to give us very expert legal advice on the scope of jurisdictional immunity for IGOs and domain name disputes. Without that expert input, we could not have reached fact-based recommendations and also want to note that I'm not going to note what ICANN paid for that 25 page memo, but it was a very small fraction of what other attorneys have been paid. We made our contribution to budget-cutting with that.

Third, the working group has extended the comment period on our initial report and recommendations by 30 days until March 30. That was done at the request of the GAC so that GAC members would have additional time and could base their comments on further discussions at this meeting. And

last, we will be participating -- I will be participating as will Petter and other members of council in the facilitated discussion from 6:30 to 8:30 pm tonight that will be looking at IGO issues.

And we hope while we can't negotiate anything on the stuff that's the subject of the open PDP right now, certainly on the permanent projections maybe there will be a way forward identified as there was yesterday for some of the Red Cross issues. So thank you very much.

(James):   Thanks, Phil. Keith, did you want to raise your question then?

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks very much, (James). Keith Drazek for the transcript. First, thanks to Cherine and to the board for sharing what is a clearly a very thoughtful list of priorities for the year ahead. I think it was very complete, and I think it sounded really good. I had one question specifically around the improving collegiality and trust cluster.

                  You referenced the implementation of bylaws as a possible area of disagreement or friction and that should come as no surprise. I think as you're implementing and -- getting into an implementation phase around anything, there's always going to be differences of opinion and different perspectives. I'm just wondering if there were any specific bylaw implementations that the board has identified that could be that area of friction or if it's just a general observation that there could be that friction. Thanks.

Cherine Chalaby: I wasn't referring to any specific bylaw areas. I was really referring to more of an attitude, more of a way of the board conducting itself in the future in a collegial and (unintelligible) manner, and that we were really ought to think that we are all on the same side was one common objective. And that's really what I was referring to, rather than a specific area. Thank you.

(James):   So I put myself in the queue as kind of a backstop to pivot to the next question, but I note that we have Rafik and Paul that wanted to make some closing statements. But gentlemen, if you promise me you can be brief, then we'll go to that. So I'll give you a minute each. Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. It will be really quick. Okay, so for the making the board meeting open and trying -- start to try that, but maybe one comment and maybe to inform people beforehand. I think many discovered that yesterday and so maybe you didn't get attendance that you were expecting. And just about the topic that you discussed yesterday, which I think is about anti-harassment. Just a question -- how did you take in consideration the comments made by the community and the policy? I'm not sure, did you approve the new policy or just discussing about it?

Cherine Chalaby: I think anybody would like to answer or I will take this. So let me tell, you yesterday we had a discussion at the board level on our readiness to pass a resolution next Thursday at the public board meeting. And the facts were presented to us, including comments from the community and how these have been incorporated and taken into account. And at the end, we took a straw poll among all of the board members and unanimously everybody said that they would be ready to vote on and move forward with the resolution next Thursday.

So there were two parts to the resolution -- one part, which is the policy itself and the second part is how complaints -- what's the process for complaints to be lodged, and there was discussion around that and we did some amendment to the resolution, which you probably heard of if you participated. In terms of informing people, I think you make a good point. We need to make this announcement early enough so people -- everybody in the community has time to adjust their schedule and attend those sessions. So this is a good point and thank you for it.

(James):   Thank you. Paul?

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady. I just want to go back to the topic that Phil was speaking on, and I hope that the gentleman from Washington DC will let me do this. But I wanted to point out that I don't think that we -- that there is a conflict between the Council and the GAC. I think there are differences in the outcomes from the GNSO process and the GAC process, and I think we're all struggling with the mechanism about how to harmonize those.

But I think whatever tension there is, is procedural. I don't think that we're in a faceoff or a standoff or anything like that at all. And I just wanted to convey that just as maybe a softening note. Thanks.

(James):   Thanks, Paul. It's an important point. So that brings us to the end of this question. We still have one more. I'm looking around the table. Oh, Becky, go ahead.

Becky Burr: Thanks. Becky Burr speaking. Clearly, the ICANN bylaws call for policy to be made through the bottom up process, by the policy development bodies, the GNSO and ENSO. That is very clear. The board adopted the CCWG on CCWG framework and that really tried to make a clear distinction. We owe a lot to many people in the audience. Chuck participated very much in that work. Made a very clear distinction about the need to avoid using CCWGs for policy development. That would in fact violate our bylaws and everybody is aware of that.

I think part of -- we're learning from experience and I think we're learning a lot from current experience in markets and elaborate on that, that we clearly need to think carefully and pay more attention to the processes that are there and the formal process when we see what -- when we run up against a snag, as I like to say, sort of making things up as we go along is not usually has a bad end at ICANN.

Having said that, we clearly need to have sort of that we need to have the input from the various advisory committees come in, in a timely fashion. And for that, I think this goes back to the structural issues of what's our workload, are we trying to do too much at once, is that making it impossible for the GAC, for example, to provide that in and put in a timely fashion.

And I think that one of the real issues that we have to look at in addition to just having real discipline about the PDP process is looking at our priorities, and our workload, and really ensuring that we do everything possible, first of all, to encourage the advisory committees to -- and other groups to participate in the PDP process initially so that we are having real time input into that. And then to the extent that we're getting -- that the GNSO is getting formal advice facilitate the ability to get that delivered in a timely fashion.

So I think there's a discipline issue that we are well aware of and I think there's a great deal of commitment to make sure that we exercise that discipline. And there is a kind of structural issue of how do we make it possible for all the parts of the community to work together effectively.

Marcus, do you want to?

Markus Germann: Yes, if I may, and offer a brief reaction to hear this comment on CCWG good and PDP bad. I think it's also the result of I would almost say the euphoria of the successful transition. The community learned to work together in the CCWG and some maybe think now that's the answer to all the problems. So we maybe have to recenter it and bring the church back in the middle of the village, as you say in French, and say for that we have to PDP. But then make sure also the people are aware the working groups are actually open and invite the rest of the community to participate.

This was an issue that was debated at length at the recent intercessional of the NCPH in Reykjavik and the complaint was, well, we have open working groups but nobody buys in. So that is a challenge and I think as Becky

suggested, we need to build in phase where we really bring in the other communities to comment early. We used to have a tradition where every part of the committee work in their silo and they we see what is the end result and that's where we are with the IGO and the cross issue.

But I'm very encouraged with the facilitation process we had and was it (unintelligible) today and we look forward to this evening. But let's improve on going forward and let's make sure we have an intermediate phase and we bring in the other communities earlier.

And let's face it, the GAC has also learned to interact with the community in the transition process, which was never the case before. When I first joined ICANN meetings. There was the GAC behind closed doors. And last year, the doors are open when they actually finalized their contribution to the transition.

So it's a process and I think we can work on that. Thanks.

(James):   Thanks Becky and Markus for launching on this question and I think Heather teed it up very nicely earlier in the discussion. So no, it was appropriate then. It's appropriate now and it kind of is an undercurrent for everything that we do. I put myself in the queue to speak to this point because I think I too am concerned that we see whether it's an excitement about the CCWG as a vehicle for getting work done or whether it's a frustration with the PDP. We see these efforts to find a way around the GNSO and yet to create policy.

Aside from the procedural problems with doing that, I mean the PDP is open. Some of these groups are limited in who can participate or who has a vote if it becomes contentious. The PDP has a process. Sometimes the CCWGs are, well, let's just say they're kind of going with whatever works in that particular moment. They're following a rough framework, but they are given a broader latitude to operate.

But setting all of that aside, at the end of the day to make a policy work, you need to be able to enforce it upon contracted parties and there's only one mechanism to do that, and that's through the PDP. There's only one mechanism to make sure that whatever comes out of this process is -- survives a challenge. And as a contracted party, certainly, we're going to challenge anything that we feel is both untenable and/or inappropriate or came at us from the wrong process. And so I think it's keeping those considerations in mind.

Now, that brings me to another point is that PDPs are, even if we are asking the board, encourage the PDP as the legitimate mechanism for creating policy and discourage alternative policy development, if that's the right term. But at the same time, be wary of requests or efforts to launch board initiated PDPs. I think that we have one example of that, which is working out well so far, the RDS PDP. We received an update earlier but I can tell you as being on council when that first started, we weren't quite sure what to do with that when that came over to us. It was a PDP but it kind of came at us -- it kind of came out through the indoor, so to speak, and we weren't really sure how to organize that in the workflow.

So that's a concern I think from my perspective is that a CCWG, or GAC advice, or review team will recommend to the board, go start a PDP on this, oh, and by the way, here's what the outcome should be and make it match this. So I think we need to be very, very careful about prescribing that and around process. So that's my -- there, I'll lower my hand and next up, we have a queue starting with, is it Paul, Marilia, okay, and So Chris. So I think it was Marilia first, unless Chris, did you want to respond to this one and then Marilia next? Okay. Marilia and Stephanie.

Chris Disspain: I just wanted to sort of echo what you said and sort of add to it a little bit. So from a CCTLD perspective, the CCNSO is the only place where the CCTLD policy gets made. And in my mind, it's always been a case of saying, well, if it's CCTLD policy, it gets made in the CCNSO and there's a bylaw provision

that says that they have to involve other parts of the community and then there's the GAC and so on. And ditto for the GNSO in respect to its policy making.

It is feasible that there could be policies that don't -- and the ASO does the addressing. I must not forget the ASO. So there are -- it is feasible that they could be policies that don't fit within these, like a review of ICANN or bylaw changes and that would then be what would effectively be a CCWG. That would be, in my view, the only basis upon which a CCWG could ever take any actual policy. And I think what we've done is we've kind of got used to using the word CCWG and we're talking about the CCWG that we're having -- that's still going on now in the CWG -- CCWG that did the transition IANNA stuff.

In fact, there have been a number of cross-community working groups in the past that have done stuff and it's not necessarily policy, but they have done stuff. So I'm with you 100%. It's very important to make sure that policy happens in the SOs. In fact, the bylaws say it's only the SOs that can set those particular policies. Thanks.

(James): Exactly, Chris. Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Thank you, James. Actually, my question was related to the final question that we have in front of us. So would you like me to give the floor to Stephanie or go ahead and? So my question is actually related to the stewardship role that the community and the board has.

I think that one of the things that are related to the stewardship role is to look at the future of the organization and try to understand what this future reserve so I can interface with a lot of technological innovations that we have had lately in the scenario, in the (unintelligible) system in which I can operate. And one of the keys that we have been discussing here, of course, is the next

round of new TLDs and let's launch the next round and make it better than it was before.

However, in this scenario of innovation, one thing that I am personally missing very much is to think how this scenario of connected objects and people will effect TLDs in the future if there will be any impact or not. Because I think that this is key and it's deeply related to ICANN's mission in the future, to ICANN's financial sustainability in the future. The points that we have been touching upon. So of course, the DNS as a system will continue to exist and underlie the infrastructure that we have. But the marketability of TLDs may be very different, may be the way that we interact with the things around us is not through rating them through DNS that we actually type. Maybe the way that we interact with this object will be much more natural.

So what is the future of this business and this organization in this scenario? So this is something that I'm not proposing us to start anything very heavy. I know that we all have very much work in our place, but I think that it could be interesting if we set aside some resources, some efforts to sort of put together a task force that could think about the future and explore options for the future.

And maybe brainstorm what this future could look like, because I think that it effects not only ICANN as an organization and its operations, but also effects internet users. If we think that they will access internet in a different manner and there will be much more walled gardens that will be much more points of control, I think that the internet users of the world should be aware as well what this kind of technological changes (unintelligible) their lives.

So maybe this is a public role that ICANN should have as well to kick start this discussion, of course not necessarily alone, but with ISOC and other technological organizations. Thanks.

Man 4: Thank you very much. What you're talking about is essentially important and what I'm trying to do right now to get with (David Condon) at once is trying to find those things. So for instance, I was in Barcelona a couple of weeks ago for the GSO (unintelligible) because we know that the next billion users using internet will be on mobile. And everything is going to be Wi-Fi or that kind of technology for the last (unintelligible). So me and (David), we started talking about how we're going to do that because we also have to reach outside our -- the ordinary ones we talk to, mobile industry, other new technologies. You have IoT and all of those things.

And we -- and then we need to find a format where we in the community can also talk about it because it's also some could see that discussion as you're out of your element or you're out of your mission, or that could have an effect on businesses. So we are also thinking on how can we handle those discussions to actually see, well, if we want to look around the corner.

So I will not commit to one, but I think we all have a common interest to try to figure out how we can go from here. And it goes with everything, actually, how the system works, how users are going to use it. Even business models sometimes because there are operators in the mobile space who would like to change and what I usually say, they want to terminate the traffic into the mobile networks instead of therefore doing it sort of cable TV version of internet.

And we need to understand, and the only way we can, in the future, say that we are -- we should be around is by understanding and actually improving ourselves. And that discussion I think needs to be started. And it's technical business, policy, and everything into an (unintelligible). But let's start with the technical one and we will try to figure out a way to come back to you. Thank you very much because as you can probably hear, it's very dear to my heart. So I really like you. Thank you.

(James): Thank you, excellent exchange. Last word on this topic is Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much and thank you for that excellent list that you explained to us. If I heard correctly, there's a sense that after all the dare I say turmoil of the last couple of years, what with Work Stream 1 and 2 and the transition, and the amount of work, nobody wanted to talk about burnout during those two years. But there is a sense that, okay, we can all breathe and it will be back to normal now.

So my question is about complexity. Is life going to be less complex with fewer moving parts? And the last question was a great segue into this. My sense is possibly not that, but that could be because I'm on the RDS PDP and the level of understanding that we need to reach to reach a conclusion on that one is staggering.

So I'd love your thoughts on whether it's going to work and with respect to the meeting schedule, we can see that even though it was well-intentioned to move to those three different meeting, I'm not sure it matches the complexity and the workload that we've got in front of us. So maybe reviewing that if we -- depending on your response.

Man 4:   This is my -- I started first time in Marrakesh and I spent the first couple of months understanding how the acronyms worked, and then I gave up. And I'm going to share with you something I've been talking about several times and I talked to all the (unintelligible) leaders about it.

A couple of months ago, I sat together with Theresa Swinehart in my office and I asked her, I said to her, "I don't really understand how the process works. I have problems understanding. Can you do me a flow chart?" And she's a very positive person. She said, "I will do that and come back a couple of weeks later." We're -- that was in October and we're still not done.

So what we're trying to do now, and I'm doing this for no other reason than for transparency because I think it's very important that everybody understands

how the different processes actually works. And we started to use the word impasse, and the impasse comes from where we find things that not everybody agrees upon in the processes or when the process could stop.

I can't invite all of you but I actually took a snapshot of those reviews, how they look today, on my walls in the office I'm having here in Room 16. I shouldn't have said that probably because I'm not judging on this one, but I think it's so important everyone understand where you are in the process, how that processes works, how they interact to each other, how they start here in the GNSO, how do you transfer with the coming up to the board, and how the advices works around the board into the analyze phase, before it comes into implementation, and all those varieties of that.

And I can say, maybe it doesn't come as a surprise from you, it is a system that is built in with checks and balances, and therefore, and therefore could be fairly complicated. And sometimes it could also be -- this is my -- I don't know this as well as I do. Sometimes it's really hard to understand where to go from the next phase and then the whole process can restart.

And I'm really -- I know that sometimes when I say things, people say you can't say that because your predecessor said that five years ago and it was (unintelligible). I'm really trying to -- I do this because I don't want anyone to be able to hijack the process. I want people to understand it. I want to be able to stand in front of the newcomers and tell this is what you're getting into.

It doesn't sound positive but to understand -- so we can help to facilitate the discussion and maybe you can have a discussion how it works. Because it is a complex system and it's not only about policies. It's also about reviews and all the other processes.

But it's really a community decision how to handle them. Some of the things are in the bylaws. I can only cite at this (unintelligible) so our plan right now

is that we will present this in Johannesburg to do a high level interest meeting if we are allowed to by the community. We have proposed that and actually just go through all those things.

And then you can tell us if I should do anything and the board should do anything or we should -- because I worry, to be honest, that we are dependent on you who are volunteers, to spend an enormous amount of time on telephone conference calls. And when I start to look on all those things together, I see the tendency of saying that people -- that you work too much with this.

So what I'm trying to figure out is there an underlying structural problems that we can help with to actually support you better instead of just saying that you'll have to cut the review there. You'll have to cut something there. So we can actually go down, all the way down and my team has heard me say this many times that sometimes what I do is peeling an onion, layer after layer, and crying all the time.

(James):   Thank you, and on that note, that brings us to the end of the queue and to the end of our list of questions for this session. And I note that we have our next attendees coming into the board. Oh, Elliott.

Elliott Noss: It was just on that point if I could very quickly. Goran -- so Elliott Noss, Tucows. There is a structural problem and I don't know if there's anything you can do about it. One of the greatest challenges in this structure -- and it's a function of the nature of the beast -- is that we have two groups, those who ask for things and those who provide those things and that tends to break down into the contracted and uncontracted parties.

I don't want you to hear that from me as a complaint or a lament, but it's a structural challenge because there is, with no break on one side, don't hate the player, hate the game -- the right thing to do is to ask for more. With no benefit on the other side, the right thing to do is to want to be asked less.

So that is a structural challenge that we all face. Thank you.

Man 4:	And I'm so happy that I can say I wish you good luck with that discussion because it's your discussion. And tell me when you're ready, thank you very much.

(James):	All right, thank you and we're a few minutes late so I thank the CSC for their patience. I thank the board, of course, for joining us and for having such a spirited and productive dialogue and an exchange of ideas. And we'll pause the recording for now.

Man 5:	Thank you, (James). Thank you everybody.

END