ICANN
Transcription ICANN Johannesburg
GNSO Working Session PTI FY19 RPM RDS GSE
Monday, 26 June 2017 at 10:30 SAST

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 recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks, everyone. And we'll get moving here. Next on our agenda - okay, next on our agenda is Elise Gerich from the PTI, and she's going to be discussing - well first of all, maybe you ought to refresh us on PTI as a new - relatively new acronym in the ICANN - the decoder ring glossary, maybe you can first give us an update on what it is and then launch into its budget, if you don't mind. But I'll turn it over to - now to Elise Gerich.

Elise Gerich: Hi. I do appreciate you giving me some time today. I will explain PTI briefly. But mostly this is hopefully going to be interactive and I'm going to be picking your brains.

                  So PTI is an affiliate of ICANN. And it was created to operate the IANA functions. That's it in a nutshell. We have six different contracts with ICANN in order to be the IANA functions operator. And I won't bore you with going into the details of all those contracts. They're on PTI.icann.org.

But today I'm here on a specific purpose and I want to talk to you about the PTI FY'19 planning project for its budget. And there's just three agenda topics, requirements, timeline and then discussion and hopefully you'll have some ideas for me to take back. Next slide please.

So the requirements for PTI, as part of our PTI bylaws, are that we need to create a budget nine months in advance of when the fiscal year begins. And we have the same fiscal year as ICANN, which starts in July and ends in June. It also says that in our development of a PTI budget, that we will consult with different supporting organizations and advisory committees in advance of preparing a draft budget which is in advance of putting it out for public comment.

So the way we have chosen to go about this is to reach out to different supporting organizations and advisory committees, and like I said before, pick your brains to see if you have ideas of services or enhancements or projects that you think we should consider when we're considering what to fund in the FY'19 PTI budget.

There's a kind of a baseline, just to make sure you all understand, there's the operations of doing the naming function, the numbering function and the protocol parameters functions, that's a baseline. But every year we have additional either software development projects or speaking engagements and things of that nature that people have proposed.

And so that's the kind of thing that I'm thinking - trying to find out what you might think would be useful to the service that PTI, which is operating the naming function, can provide and we're, you know, almost two years out so it's kind of looking into a crystal ball. Next slide please.

So hopefully you can read this. But basically we're at the first step of this timeline which is an informal consultation where we're gathering ideas to consider for the PTI FY'19 budget at which point then it goes into a draft

budget which goes out for public comment, which then goes to the PTI Board, for the PTI Board to adopt. The PTI Board adopts it and then they submit it to ICANN because just to make sure you know, PTI is a cost center, we don't generate any revenue, we get all of our funding from ICANN. And so when the PTI Board adopts a budget, it submits that budget to ICANN for funding then it goes into the ICANN process. And by July 2018, we have a PTI FY'19 budget for us to spend against.

I can stop now if there's a question about the timeline because then I'm just basically going to go to discussion.

James Bladel: Thanks, Elise. We do have one question from Michele. Michele, would you like to - an old hand, sorry. Any other questions?

Elise Gerich: Well I knew Michele was an old hand anyway.

James Bladel: Oh.

Michele Neylon: Oh.

Elise Gerich: Sorry, Michele, just had - I couldn't resist, you said it.

Michele Neylon: Mr. Chair, do I get to respond to that?

James Bladel: Negative.

Elise Gerich: Bring it on. No, anyway.

James Bladel: Negative. Please proceed, Elise.

Elise Gerich: I'm sorry, I couldn't resist. May I have the next slide...

James Bladel: We do it all the time.

Elise Gerich: So just to give you some thoughts of some of the things that my team has been thinking of that we might consider funding in the fy'19 draft budget are continuation of the project that we're in the middle of right now which is re-architecting the root zone management system to make it more modular. It was written in 2010, it's kind of monolithic, it's a little hard to make changes to and so we've begun a project to actually it's more like a program to make incremental changes and we would like to continue those in FY'19.

Another thing is - and we've heard from the naming community that a nicer API, customer facing interface, would be desirable so that would be something we could potentially put on our project list to fund in FY'19. And a third topic we've been thinking about is refreshing the IANA.org Website to make it look a little more modern. People tell us it looks kind of like 1980s, 1999 Website. So that's just to give you the kind of ideas we're considering.

And my question to you all is, the ask, is do you have any ideas of things that you think would improve the way you interact with the IANA functions naming operator, PTI? And I'll put them on the list. They'll go into the budget with the things we're receiving also from the numbering community and the protocol parameters community. We'll then check that list against what we can resource people-wise as well as then what we can ask for in the funding. So I now open it to the floor. And thank you for giving me a couple minutes to explain it.

James Bladel: Thank you, Elise. Is that now a current hand, Michele? Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Just in terms of updates to the IANA.org Website, one thing that would be useful if there was a way of doing it, would be to allow those of us who have an interest in specific TLDs and ccTLDs to be able to get notifications of changes. I mean, particular when there's a, you know, a change of control, a change of management delegation, that kind of

thing. I'm not so much interested in the gTLDs but more in the ccTLDs in that respect. Thanks.

Elise Gerich: So are these people who are interested and are the non-TLD operators and are not a contact for that TLD per se?

Michele Neylon: Under the RFC we would be what is the term, a significantly interested party, specifically when it comes to the case of, say, the dotIE ccTLDs, the largest registrar for dotIE, if there's any change in the IANA records in relation to dotIE. At the moment I'm getting it because I'm using a third party tool that monitors that page and a few others but actually being able to get it through official channels would be helpful so that I can then raise my concerns with the current registry operator.

Elise Gerich: Yes, the clarification is useful. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you. Next we have Erika.

Erika Mann: Thanks so much. I have one question which relates to the first bullet point, the re-architect of the root zone management. So my question is, the first one is how far are you? And how - what is the, if you can remind us quickly about the timetable that you have in mind. And the second one is can this all be financed out of the current ICANN budget or do you experience some - would you want to move faster? Would you want to do it in a different way if you would have no budgetary constraints, imagine you have some.

Elise Gerich: Thanks for the question, Erika. Right now there's no budgetary constraint that I foresee for this. One of the - it's a three-year project that we started about six months ago. The first phase of that we expect to be done at the end of this calendar year 2017, the calendar year. And it has multiple phases in it as we iterate. So we've been sort of planning internally how to finance this.

And one of the contracts that ICANN has with PTI is what's called the shared services contract and so one of the things we're doing is when we look into the budget package, is what resources we need from the development resources within ICANN that augment our very, very small development team that we have within PTI. And we right now, use a development team within ICANN to do most of the heavy lifting on this rearchitecture project, so we want to make sure that we lock that in in FY'19 and that they don't get reallocated to something else. Does that answer your question?

Erika Mann: Yes, it does. My - maybe just one addition, if you would have - could you most faster and would you see it as relevant as moving faster if you would have no constraints, not even, you know, a big team, whatever you want to do, what would be the ideal scenario you would love to see if you could? And if you can talk about it?

Elise Gerich: I think that the difficulty with moving faster is not so much - well if we had a bigger team right now that actually knew the older system and understood the system, we could move faster. But it's hard to bring people up to speed and so that's part of the slow down.

James Bladel: Thank you. And thank you, Erika. I put myself in the queue for a quick question, you mentioned that the PTI does not have any revenue, its budget is then, I'm assuming, you mentioned as a pure cost center coming out of ICANN's budget so should the goal then be to perhaps not necessarily grow that expenditure unless it's absolutely necessary to the critical functions of PTI? Or what is the threshold then for adding something new and adding a new cost center when something doesn't have a revenue component?

Elise Gerich: So I think the budget has sort of a baseline where in order to provide the level of service we provide today we've got to maintain that baseline. So I wouldn't expect that decreasing. And I don't expect huge increases in the budget because that would mean that we would be growing larger staff perhaps that would move on and off of projects that wouldn't be long-term.

So I think there just as there's an incremental growth in budget for cost of living purposes or for extraordinary projects or for services that the community is asking for, that we can't fund now, that that's when I would expect the budget to grow. If everyone's happy with the level of service that they're getting now, there are no enhancements that would make it easier for you to work with us or for us to provide the service, then we kind of have that incremental growth which is only based on, you know, normal growth of costs of everything. Does that answer your question?

James Bladel: Yes, I think so. Okay, we're up against time and the queue is clear. Just one final bit of business which is that my understanding is that, Elise, this is your last ICANN meeting that you are retiring after seven - is it seven years with ICANN, and if you can consider what changes you've managed to first IANA, the function, and then the PTI, new gTLDs, and the signing of the root and of course then transitioning from IANA to PTI, I think all of us in the GNSO community and at this Council would like to say thank you for your very considered and wise leadership during these very dynamic times for IANA and for the PTI.

And I think we're all confident that you've set the stage for and set a very high bar for what to expect from future leadership in this area. And thank you and we wish you all the best in your future adventures so thank you. And we're going to miss you.

Elise Gerich: Thank you very much. I don't have any words, those were quite kind words and I appreciate it very much. I've enjoyed working with the entire community very much.

James Bladel: And, you know, with that, can we say no more goodbyes, you know, it's getting kind of a theme for the past couple of meetings and I'm not, you know, it's kind of a downer, you know, okay. All right so with that...

Elise Gerich: You should rejoice for those of us.

((Crosstalk))

Elise Gerich: We're going to have new adventures.

James Bladel: For those that escaped, you know, it's like we're this - like this prison island or this penal colony and we're all...

Elise Gerich: No, no, it's not like that.

James Bladel: ...simultaneously sympathetic and envious of those who get away. So thank you. We'll pause...

Elise Gerich: Just one...

James Bladel: Yes, go ahead.

Elise Gerich: ...it's not about the goodbyes, it's - I want to thank you for giving me these few minutes. I knew Marika had to kind of work hard to squeeze me in and I appreciate that. But this will show up as that we did have an informal consultation with the GNSO and I do appreciate your giving me these few minutes so thanks for that.

James Bladel: Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Sorry, James. Heather Forrest. Very quickly, Elise, in relation to that last point there, if anyone does want to follow up and in light of the fact that you're escaping, where should they refer those suggestions to? Thank you.

Elise Gerich: Since the suggestions will arrive before I escape, you can either send them to me personally at elise.gerich@iana.org or you can send it to our general email address iana@iana.org and we certainly would appreciate that. If you

look at the timeline you'll see that we hope to have a draft done by mid-July and be going out for public comment soon thereafter.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you. Let's pause the...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: No, it's fine. It wouldn't be the GNSO if we weren't a couple minutes off on our agenda so thank you, Elise. Let's pause and restart the recording for our next session which is an update on another PDP from the leadership of the PDP that's reviewing the RPMs in all gTLDs. This group I believe we have Kathy and J. Scott and who's the third? Phil, Phil, there he is. Okay so we have all three of the leadership team present in the room. So as soon as I get the thumbs up from staff, and there it is, okay we'll begin.

Okay, who's going to take the driver's seat first, J. Scott? Take it away, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Good morning, everyone. My name is J. Scott Evans. And I'm from Adobe Systems Incorporated and I'm one of the three cochairs for the Rights Protection Mechanisms Working Group, actually the Review of Rights Protections Mechanisms Working Group.

So here you will see our projected timeline. This is not easy work. It is arduous work. It is actually in two stages. The first stage is reviewing all of the rights protection mechanisms that are in place except for the UDRP. And our idea is to prepare a Phase 1 report that will cover all of that work and have that out and matriculating through the community for public comment and finalization while the work continues on the UDRP which will begin we think next year, mid next year 2018. We've pushed out a little bit.

So what we're doing, for those of you that are online or following this that may not be aware of this project is, this is similar to the Subsequent Procedures

Working Group that is taking a look at how they - we rolled out new gTLD processes. Well part of that, a subset of that, was how do we handle conflicts within the system? And in 2009 the Implementation Working Group or the IRT, got together and came up with some ideas for rights protection mechanisms and then those were filtered through to the STI, which was another group that then took that work and modified it and came up with what eventually made it into the Applicant Guidebook.

And now that we're dealing we're looking at how effective they are. Basically we're trying to decide whether the mechanisms are functioning as they were designed and if so, are they solving the issues they were designed to resolve and if not, what if any changes need to take place? Pardon me.

And similar to what you heard from Jeff and Avri, with the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, is that takes a lot of consensus, right, because we have to decide, one, is it functioning as it should and as it was designed and we have to get consensus around that. And then we have to get consensus around if there are issues, what those issues are and then we have to get consensus around are there fixes for those issues and if so, what are those? And then once we decide on what those are, we have to get consensus around that.

And I don't know - I see a lot of old hands at the table, not just Michele, but around the room I see a lot of new faces and for those of you that have not been here as long as some of us have, this is probably one of the most contentious areas of all of ICANN. This is not a working group that has a group of like-minded people sitting around a table solving a problem, this is a working group full of very diverse views rooted in a lot of emotion, intellect, cultural views and so it takes working through.

So here you see on the slide in front of you for those in the Connect room and those in the room that's the phases that I talked about. And what we have been doing recently, and I think we talked with Heather and Donna and

James earlier this year when we had a catch-up call with you all, we've been breaking things down into small subgroups and having them consider some of the charter questions because some of the charter questions that we received were from the community and there were some duplicative questions, some repetitive questions, there were some that weren't necessarily needed to be answered, and so we're trying to get consensus around these questions and get them put into a format that t then the entire group can consider.

So we've had two groups that have done that. And in that we're also identifying to answer these questions what are we going to need as far as data, I'm hearing an echo. Oh. What do we need as far as data from the community and if so, where do we get that data? And I can tell you that has probably been as frustrating in the process as managing all the various points of view is getting people to give us the input we need when we identify input. And also getting full participation - I think you heard it from the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, there are a lot of people who have views on this, but when we ask for views, sometimes we get crickets.

And that's very frustrating because I know, I've been in this process long enough, when that final report comes out, everybody is going to say but you didn't listen to me. And I'm like, well, if you would have been there talking, we would have listened. So we do need participation and we do need to hear from various voices. And when we reach out to people, I truly understand that everyone feels overwhelmed. I've never met an employee who's worked for me, I've never been asked the question that it's like I'm sitting around having a pina colada in my office. We're all overwhelmed.

And when we ask you a question, if you have representatives on this group, then they need to be helping you get the information to us because that is difficult. And we are now getting to the crunch time where we've got our questions together for the trademark claims notice and the sunrise procedures, and we're going to start looking for data. And staff can only make

requests, but we need the community to participate by providing that data to us so that we then can come up with a work product.

You all help us with our work product, we are not all alone. We are - so we need that help, we need participation not in the working group necessarily but in your stakeholder communities to help us gather the data so that we can make a data-based informed decision and we can present that to the community.

So we've had some challenges. Much like the Subsequent Procedures group, some of the challenges are we find there are moments when people want to rehash issues that - some people feel are well settled within the community and that has been - that has added time to our timeline. But I think basically, you know, it has been going well. It is not as stalled as some would see from the outside. We've increased the amount of our calls to 90 minutes from 60 minutes. We've been having these sub teams who have also had calls, so people are spending three or four hours a week just on calls trying to push the pig through the pipeline.

So please don't think that we are not doing it, we're trying to handle the challenges as they come. They are sometimes - and we find - I don't know about GNSO work, but in our work we find that there are issues that we didn't even see on the horizon that come up and we get a little bit - I wouldn't say derailed, but we have two or three phone calls trying to resolve issues that were never in our timeline or our plan. And so but we have to resolve that because that's what you do when you listen to the community, right? You have to listen to them and you have to bring that to closure so that you can move on.

And we're doing the best we can. Luckily we have three cochairs so not one person has to give up their entire private life in order to keep this rolling, and we've been able to do it. I do want to call out our staff liaison, Amr and Mary,

have been excellent. And they do an incredible job for us. I don't know how they keep us straight.

And we should be very proud. I've been here a long time and the maturation from the support that we are receiving from ICANN to get our work done, while not perfect, is really come a long way. And I do think that it would be nice if perhaps some GNSO members would join some of our calls every once in a while and sort of see what the work is going on rather than just listening to these reports.

I think it would be very valuable if you spend an hour and a half just to tap in ask, you know, you could ask Mary, what's going on the schedule, find something that's of interest to you and just listen to the discussion or go back - everything is recorded and on our wiki page and you can see, you know, some of the things that were discussed from the notes and pick one and listen. I think you will be surprised to see that work is going on, it's good work.

But it is - we are now I think we're about six months later in our planning than we had originally - when sat down and did our original time plan - we're about six months later than that what we had originally desired to do. But I still think we're moving fairly well.

Now I have had the microphone but Kathy and Phil are here too and I know that they have perspectives as well. And if you have - if you will allow us I think let them say just a little bit before we get to questions if they would like to put some color to my presentation.

James Bladel: Thanks, J. Scott. And we'll go with Phil and Kathy. I would ask that, you know, the briefer we can make it the more time for Q&A and I know there's already a queue building so go ahead, Phil.

Phil S. Corwin: Yes, Phil Corwin speaking briefly for the record. Thank you, J. Scott, for that very succinct and comprehensive report on our work so far. It's been a

pleasure working with you and Kathy and we've had a couple moments of tension but we've been able to resolve everything and I think - know that our role is not to impose our own personal views but to administer this working group in an efficient way and keep it moving forward toward getting its work done.

As J. Scott described, it's a very challenging job. The UDRP may be more challenging but even right now with the new TLD RPMs we have to deal - we're required to deal with dozens of charter questions plus whatever other issues that members of the working group bring up. I think the working group is working pretty well.

We've had a couple of moments of polarization but I think the working group members understand that in the end what we're probably looking at to get consensus, not just within the working group, but beyond the working group within the ICANN community and approval of our final report from Council, we're talking about incremental change, changes around the edges, and we're not trying to relitigate every issue, we're trying to make the existing protections better, more effective, more balanced if they need to be.

We are going to be taking a look and we're going to be hearing from a panel of contracted parties at our three hour session here. We're going to take a look at the private protections that have developed in the marketplace, not to regulate them but to understand how they're interacting in the real world with the ICANN mandated protections. It's clear that things like protected marks lists are probably suppressed the use of sunrise registrations and a lot of our discussion seems to be going more toward looking at claims notice and whether that should be expanded in some way than expanding sunrise.

We are going to be looking at proposals for generating something within that claims notice area based on non-exact matches. There is literally a dozen different categories of non-exact matches and we are going to be looking at the pros and cons of each one and whether that should be added to generate

a notice either to the potential registrant or at least a notice to the mark holder that a domain has been registered.

And that's it. You know, we're moving as fast as we can but we are obligated to comprehensively deal with all of the issues enumerated in our charter. And I'll stop there and see what my cochair, Kathy, has to add. Thanks.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman. Very briefly it is a pleasure and an honor to work with this leadership team, J. Scott, Phil, Mary and Amr. I just wanted to share that we have 50 people a week to join us for 90 minutes so a lot of community time is going into this as well as a sub teams that have been kind of doing the advanced research on the sunrise period and trademark claims that is starting. So some people are spending 3 to 4 hours a week just on calls and we are very grateful for the community participation.

Since we are working on what is still fairly new consensus policies, you know, we have that difficulty that this is new, we don't have a lot of background. But we are trying to gather it - I just want to let you know that our meeting is Thursday, we have the three-hour session from nine to noon and would of course welcome your participation. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Phil. Thank you, Kathy, J. Scott, for your introductory remarks and your update. We have a few folks in the queue, I think first up is Erika, unless that is an old hand, okay. Then first is Heather. Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much, James. Heather Forrest. Following up on J. Scott's comprehensive introduction, I just wonder if you can all speak to I think the point that you've raised which is very interesting which is there are times when let's say there are discussions around whether something is or is not an issue, before you can even settle it lets say, there has to be a discussion around whether something is or is not an issue. And in light of the fact that you have 50 people on the working group, some of whom are not old hands,

how is that going, let's say, what process is being used to determine whether or not something is an issue? Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: The first thing that we did when we started this working group is we sort of did RPM 101, and we put together with the help of staff and entire history for the entire working group, and we give presentations on that to sort of give them a baseline so even the new voices to the debate would understand the developments.

Some of the issues that have come up were just things that, you know, let's just give an example and to everyone this will be - I'm not trying to open a can of worms, I would like to give you just an example. We've discovered that geographic indications are being put into that Trademark Clearinghouse, okay.

All geographic indications are being put in, even those that aren't registered trademarks have been accepted, from what we understand at this point. They are there aren't a huge amount of them, there are less than 100, but that came up and it opened up the discussion of whether geographic indications need to be in at all, so that sort of took us off a track a little bit. We resolve the issue.

I don't think I'm speaking out of turn and my cochairs can rein me in if I am but I believe our resolution to that issue, just to let you know, was that geographic indications that are trademarks can be in the Trademark Clearinghouse because they are trademarks. Okay? Everything else, if you want to have that discussion you need to present an issues paper to the GNSO Council and you need to have a working group look at whether geographic indications can come in. That is our conclusion.

But that's just an example of where people who aren't in the debate, it's something we didn't know until we started asking questions, was even happening. And it's created an issue that was not in the charter questions. It

was broadly but not that narrowly and so we had to handle it, so that's just an example of one.

James Bladel: Thank you, Heather. Thank you, J. Scott. My question was - and before I go on, I note that I'm the last person in the queue. We have a few more minutes and this isn't simply a format where only the councilors can ask questions, if anyone in the room has a question on this for the leadership of this PDP please make your way to the table. We have a floor mic as well, so feel free to join the conversation.

My question is if we could go back one slide, maybe with two slides when we were talking about the challenges associated with collecting data from contracted parties, and I know that there are number of contracted parties probably participate in this, but what sort of data are you looking to collect and what sort of concerns are you hearing from those who have about sharing it?

I mean, I think generally there's always a concern about the confidentiality of data that ICANN or some part of the community will, you know, decide to rank registrars or registries or do some sort of a name and shame exercise. And I think that's, you know, that's always kind of hanging out there. But other than that what sort of data could be helpful and what are you hearing in terms of resistance?

J. Scott Evans: I'm going to let Paul McGrady, who's been on one of the subgroups, answer that question because they've been developing that.

Paul McGrady: So specifically one of the problems with the data is not so much that the contracted parties are unwilling to give it, it just doesn't, as far as we know, exist. So for example there's this high abandonment rate after getting a claim notice, and we don't know if that's a abandonment rate because people got the claims notice and were instantly chilled and just didn't take any further

steps, or if they got the claims notice and said oh gee whiz, that's a trademark, I probably ought not do that. We just don't know.

And because when people abandon that registration effort, there was no pop-up that said we noticed you're abandoning the registration effort, you know, pick one of the four reasons why, right, we simply - so we have this number that we don't know if it means that the claims notice is really terrific and keeping consumers from being abused by, you know, preventing cyber squatting or if it's not terrific because people are getting a big scary legal looking document and just panicking and quitting, right.

And so that's the kind of data poverty that we're dealing with. So that impedes our work at least in relationship to the claims notice because you know, everybody has their favorite interpretation of that number but nobody can back it u, right? A good question for this working group is how do we, from this point forward, how do we collect that data so that and when we're here again in three years, five years, whenever the - this thing gets looked at again, we won't be asking that same question. We'll still have a gap because we won't see it, but we won't be asking that question.

J. Scott Evans: And, James, with regard to your question, I think this - the idea of the confidential information when you ask for things comes up in a number of realms, not just contracted parties. When we say contracted parties we talk - in the minds of most people who are - this is J. Scott Evans for the record, I'm sorry. For most people they think of registries and registrars, but the Trademark Clearinghouse operators are contracted parties as well with ICANN and for our work.

But we need to get a mechanism in place where there is, I think, a third party perhaps that can do analytics for us under an NDA and they'd give us anonymized information based on the questions we ask. We don't know who - which registrar because I think those issues come up a lot and it's just - it's a rote answer that you get and people are so used to giving it you get that

answer. So we need to figure out a mechanism that we can look at data so that we can make data driven decisions rather than making emotional decisions based on our personal viewpoint.

And I think we struggle with that as an ICANN organization, and we just need to get better about making data driven and so we need to get a mechanism. I deal with a company that deals with analytics all the time so I completely understand the idea of wanting to maintain confidentiality but we have to get some way, a mechanism that the confidentiality remains but the big data still comes to the groups that need to do the analytics on it.

James Bladel: Thanks, J. Scott. And confidentiality for me, yes, come on up to the table. Confidentiality for me comes from aggregation, you know, if you can say across the industry we're seeing this, as opposed to this registrar does X, this registrar does Y, this registry does Z.

Just checking, we have - on this point, Lori?

Lori Schulman: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay. We have a follow up then from Lori. Go ahead, Lori.

Lori Schulman: Hi, this is Lori Schulman for the record. I also want to say that I am the chairperson or the team leader or whatever it's called for the Sunrise questions and we've done exactly that, try to consolidate and make things a little more sensible and orderly and chronologic in terms of how the system works as well, that the questions themselves should follow the chronology of the path for the RPM that we're using.

But in terms of specifically the data question, we have looked at that very carefully and there are some hard data that we could get from contracted parties. One of the things - one of the questions that we're very focused on is

how is this working in IDNs and how is this working in, you know, are there enough sunrise registrations even happening?

Is the sunrise system even being used? So that's very hard data that we could get that probably - if we were to aggregate it in total, although I think it would be more interesting to know how many sunrise in each language or how many sunrise across the board and then compare the two in terms of maybe there's more languages that have issues than others. I don't know, but that's hard data, that isn't even anecdotal data.

And the other area where we feel in the sunrise side that really ought to be looked at is where trademark right may actually be impeding a practical registration and the example that is given frequently in our group is the dotNYC example where if you had Police, the music group, come in and you have dotNYC and you want to grant police.nyc that you have a claim from Police the music group, how does that work because both sides have a legitimate issue here. This isn't a question of one over the other.

So if there was a way to capture data that says where is a trademark claim bumping against what I guess I would call a public interest issue in the police.nyc issue, how is that being resolved, should it be resolved, you know, where is the priority? So again in order to answer that question the can't be anecdotal, it must be data driven.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you, Lori. Next up in the queue is Michele. Go ahead, Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. J. just - I appreciate - your introduction was helpful and it helps to frame this because to be honest I haven't had the bandwidth to follow this particular PDP but I'd love to but just there aren't enough hours in the day. In terms of data from contracted parties I assume that you managed to get data from the registries about the take-up of sunrise from registrars because I know that a lot of them have been tracking that. So, I mean, I don't know did you get that from them?

J. Scott Evans: We have not asked that question yet. And that will be coming.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. That we have not asked that question. I would assume we're going to be asking that question within the next six weeks.

Michele Neylon: Okay because one of the things that will probably help you because if you speak to some of the registries they were kind of running around would like with their hair on fire because they couldn't get kind of a critical mass of registrars to do sunrise. And, I mean, I'll fully admit, we only turned on sunrise stuff for dotIrish. If there hadn't been a dotIrish, we wouldn't have bothered. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks, Michele. And we are right up against time so any other questions from the room, absent that we will say our thank yous to J. Scott, to Phil, to Kathy, and for all of the folks who posed questions on this PDP. I know we are all watching it very to fully. And this is just Phase 1, it gets really interesting in Phase 2, I'm sure. So thank you very much for your work on this. And I think for being thorough and exploring those new issues as they arise whether they are part of the original charter would not so thank you.

                    Okay, we'll pause the recording and get ready for our next session which is the Next Gen RDS. I'm sure there's nothing controversial to talk about there.

Chuck Gomes: No, we're all on the same page.

James Bladel: Yes, okay. Let's just wait until I get a green light from - there we go. Okay and on this next group we are joined by Chuck. Hello Chuck, who is the chair, cochair, vice chair - I apologize you are the chair. And then I believe you have a couple of vice chairs as well, three, Michele and Susan. And I believe

there's one more. Oh David, okay. And I don't know if David's here in Johannesburg. Okay. So he's here?

Michele Neylon: Sorry, yes he is here in Johannesburg, I don't know if he's in the room.

James Bladel: He's not in the room. Yes, okay. Okay so with that we'll turn it over to Chuck for an update and then we have our slides loaded so take it away.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Appreciate it. And of course we have three great staff support people over to my left here, Amr and Marika and back on the back wall, Lisa. So I think all of you know them pretty well. We certainly do and appreciate them lots.

So I'm going to go through the first few slides quite quickly because they're mainly review of what you've seen before. You can see the first slide there is just a basic timeline for Phase 1. Keep in mind there are three phases in this PDP. And we'll have a slide that shows that a little bit better later on.

Does anybody not know what the project is about? I'll be glad to talk to that if somebody wants me to. Okay.

James Bladel: Nice try, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead and go to the next slide please. Current issues under discussion, I'd probably better focus on is a little bit. We're looking at - in Phase 1 is dealing with fundamental requirements for an RDS, registration directory services system, if we decide that one is needed. And so we are in that phase. And in Phase 1 there are 11 questions, four of the five questions are shown in the sub bullets there so relating to users and purposes, gated access, data elements and privacy, the fifth question has to do with accuracy, which we have - people have brought up but we haven't really deliberated on that yet.

So far we have reached 26 initial points of rough consensus to date. And we add those to an ongoing working document that is on our wiki, you can see that at any point in time. And at this meeting here we will be focusing on those 26 points, as we'll see a little bit later.

So the session this afternoon, the cross community session, what we are actually going to do is share those 26 points of initial agreement and ask for people there to share their opinions. We will take that feedback in and consider it in our meeting - are working group meeting on Wednesday and then also been in the weeks to come as well. Let's go to the next slide please.

Challenges, well as like James indicated, we don't have any challenges in this working group unlike the RPM group, we're all on the same page. And those that are really tuned in are the ones who are smiling or laughing, okay. We have our differences and we have our challenges as many working groups before us have had on this particular subject, okay.

We thought - we started off with focusing on requirements for thin data, most everybody probably knows what we mean by thin data so I won't spend too much time on that. But we thought that would be easy. It probably is easier than where we're going next but it hasn't been easy. What we did is we narrowed our focus onto what - thin data, like I said. And we started looking at some key concepts with regard to that, which will evolve into possible requirements.

Now we're just about done with that pass of the data on thin data. And so we're at this meeting, hopefully, going to make the leap into a little bit beyond thin data in our working group meeting on Wednesday.

Privacy and data protection is a hot issue that everybody I think is aware of and it was highlighted in the Copenhagen meeting. So certainly that's - we've

spent a lot of time on that but a lot of time on the other questions as well. Go ahead and go to the next slide please.

Continuing on the challenges, since - just since the Copenhagen meeting, we have increased our membership significantly I mean, by dozens, okay, to 192 members and 171 observers. Okay, we had a big influx of people join. And a lot of them very active. That of course provides opportunity but it also provides challenges. And we've been trying to deal with those.

As you know, people have some very deeply held positions about the issues we're dealing with and they're very passionate about them. Sometimes they get a little excessively passionate and maybe even aggressive and then we get into things like cultural differences and personalities and things like that. And in email, which a lot of the communication happens, people don't always pick up on somebody's sense of humor or when they're being - trying to be funny. So we've had those kind of issues to deal with.

Email, we've had our share of emails that have offended people. And we've had our - several people, of course we're not giving the names, but have gone to our ombudsman. Is Herb here? Welcome, Herb. So we're working closely with Herb, as is the working group as a whole. And he's going to be participating as much as he can in our sessions this week to deal with those issues. We've actually had in a couple cases, the need to institute some rules to try and keep a level of sanity and effectiveness, okay?

We've gone through streaks where the email list would just expand in 24 hours to some ridiculous amount of emails that none of us could keep up with. And so we're trying to manage that and try to keep people focused on a narrower set of issues at any given time so that it's manageable, not only for the leadership team but for the working group members themselves. And we've just started doing that over the last few weeks. And so far it seems to be working. I'm sure we'll have future challenges in that regard.

Let's go to the next slide. Okay, I'm sure you're interested in this part, our near term work plan. The - we've done a first - we did a first pass last year on the users and purposes, the data elements and the privacy issues started getting into gated access, as you can see and then where we're at right now, we've been looking at users and purposes, data elements and privacy. But all for thin data, okay so far, we haven't gone beyond thin data.

We've actually come up with a new term for thin data, you'll see there under DA, there little kind of to the right part of that top row of symbols there we're now calling that a minimum public data set. One of our members pointed out that the use of the term "thin data" has a lot of meanings in different contractual settings and everything and it can vary. So we've introduced a new term, minimum public data set, that we're using now and we'll be using that instead of thin data, although some of us that have been around for a long time will probably always think of it as thin data.

And then people have also brought up other data that may be part of that minimum public data set, as we move forward. So you can see from July to August of this year, we're looking at a second pass of the key concepts with regard to the fundamental question, keep in mind the fundamental question is do we need a new RDS? And after the first five questions out of 11 in the first phase, we have to come up with a first initial report, come back to the Council and make our opinion with regard to that and of course get Council input with regard to that.

Our target is to start preparation of that first initial report which would have our first stab at answering that fundamental question by the ICANN 60 meeting in Abu Dhabi the end of October. Next slide please.

I'm sure some of you are coming up with questions as we go, it's probably better to kind of work our way through this and then handle the questions because some of them may be answered as we go. So how can the Council and the community assist? One of the techniques that we're using - and this

was an idea that was really birthed by Marika that has proved pretty useful, to keep things moving and to give not only people that are in the in-person meetings or in-person or telephone meetings a chance to participate but those who weren't in those meetings.

So typically what we do in a given working group meeting, and we meet weekly for 90 minutes, most - well I won't say most of the time, we stay within the 90 minutes, sometimes we do - the - we try to see if we can reach some rough consensus for those on the call on a particular point. And if we do, we will declare that and see if there are any objections to those on the call doing that.

If there are no significant objections, we will then do a poll of the full membership over the next few days to see if there is agreement on that. Okay, and then assuming there's pretty strong agreement, usually we're talking in the 80% range or more with no super serious objections, we will then add that to our list of tentative conclusions and that's how we came up with the 26. And I already told you what we're doing in today's cross community session with regard to those 26 sessions. Next slide please.

Okay, so sessions this week, we've got the working group session on Wednesday. We have our cross community session this afternoon. And everybody is welcome to both of those. Okay, as is typical even in the open working group meeting we welcome full participation at these public meetings.

Some other resources there, we've got a - the briefing paper that was prepared as part of the - this week's meetings, our charter there's a link for that. And our online wiki space is referenced there as well. Is that the last slide? Yes, it is okay, all right.

So sorry to do all the talking on that. Hopefully I gave you a complete enough report that you can ask the questions you have with regard to this working

group. And I encourage the vice chairs that are here as well as our staff support people to contribute as they feel free, but what questions do you have?

James Bladel: Thank you, Chuck. Okay, councilors, we have 15 minutes to help Chuck and his team fix Whois. Any questions - David has joined us as well at the table. Susan, go ahead.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. It's a comment. And I just want to reiterate Chuck's point on the membership of the working group. We have a lot of people involved, which is a really good thing. We've had a little bit of challenges with working together and sort of figuring out the rhythm of this and making sure people understand where we are and where we're going with this process. But it's a really good problem to have. And we're hoping that Herb will, you know, sort of ease some tensions and help us move on from that. But you know, it really shows the concern of the community that this RDS Working Group has so many members. And I appreciate the community for coming forward.

James Bladel: Thank you, Susan. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. Michele for the record. I mean, this group has had some interesting challenges, and I think we will have some moving forward. Ultimately Chuck is basically working on this full time as a full time job. I honestly done know how he manages to keep up with it but he somehow does. And hopefully Herb's presence will help to calm some people down a little bit and maybe we can move things forward a little bit more productively. That will be nice but I'm not going to hold my breath. It is highly, highly contentious and we do have a number of members of the group who are not exactly helping themselves so hopefully we can move forward.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. Can I follow up on that point to you and to Chuck and Susan and David? You know, I think the RPM group, as Phil probably notes,

and I think we still have some of the leaders here, had some similar challenges with - I don't know if it was a newcomer or there was some individual, has it reached that point where you have to identify some folks who are perhaps not advancing the conversation, not moving the work forward and are instead kind of taking the group offline and then, you know, there are formal steps that the Council can take first with the liaison to this group and then escalating up to the full Council to help you in that regard. I guess what we're saying is, you know, it's not something that you need to take on on your own.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, James. That is appreciated. I think at the moment we've been trying our best to deal with it in the leadership team where we are taking certain people off list as it were and trying to calm them down a little and possibly get them to realize that they're one or two word responses to emails aren't particularly helpful, that the, you know, the sheer volume of email that they're generating and this kind of tit-for-tat type stuff isn't particularly helpful.

Now, the problem here is is that the interaction in - between some people and other people on the list is such that escalating it to the Council isn't really the best path forward, it really becomes a question of escalating it possibly to the ombudsman or somewhere else because we're talking about interactions where there is zero mutual respect. The fact that people have opposing views is normal and it's part of the healthy dialogue that we all love and cherish about ICANN, I mean, Paul McGrady and I don't see eye to eye but we can still, you know, have a reasonable exchange. Sorry, Paul, you're just sitting across from me. Nothing personal.

And, you know, that's fine and that's perfectly okay. The problem what we're having here is that there's a lot of people coming in, this is their first interaction with ICANN and they're basically just, you know, this is my view and any other view is just completely unacceptable and you're all stupid. So it's - escalating it to the Council I don't think would be particularly productive because then they will go back to wherever they came from and it - and we'd

be saying how evil all those ICANN people are and how it's an inside game and, you know, it just wouldn't be helpful. But thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Michele. Next is Stephanie. Go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I'm not sure what the way forward is, I just wanted to raise a couple of points, one of which I raised quite some time ago, actually, that we're trying to recruit young people with all of our programs, our Fellows, and this is an ideal list and so we've been pointing some of our new folks to monitor the list and be happy to mentor them and all the rest of it. And we've had some of them quit because of the really unfortunately - I don't know what a nice word - whatever Michele just said - tone of the discourse. So that's point number 1.

I think that we have to - I mean, obviously I have a skin like a walrus, you know, it's not going to bother me even if I sometimes get a little prim and say that wasn't very nice. But I think that from ICANN's perspective, we do have to ride herd on this because this is turning away excellent young people who we should be trying to bring in, not frighten away.

My second point is I do think that in some instances, some people have said, well they're too busy to read the documents. And since we went through a massive exercise of distilling that huge library of documents into two pagers, I don't think that excuse should be accepted really. I mean, I do think homework is required. I realize I sound like old school marm here, but homework's required for these working groups. And if you can't do the homework then please keep quiet because - or read the two pager.

Am I being unreasonable? I really think that's not a good excuse because some of us are toiling through that pile of documentation even the stuff that, you know, that isn't ours. And people are doing - if they're doing any reading they're doing selective reading and that's just not on, you have to agree to read everything. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Stephanie. And so the message it sounds like is that the leadership in conjunction with Herb and the office of the ombudsman, have a plan to help kind of iron out some of the frictions that are occurring with the group. It is a large group, as you mentioned, 192 is approaching, you know, the level of a small country's parliament so you guys are doing amazing work in keeping that together. But I am just going to reiterate that there are avenues at Council that are at your disposal should you desire or require us to intervene for some assistance.

My question - and I put myself in the queue - I think goes back to this slide or maybe one before and it's a question that I raised as one of my first Council meetings in 2013 in Buenos Aires, is that because this is a Board-initiated PDP, the GNSO continues to manage this work but ultimately it is - I believe - I've always been operating under the impression that the GNSO still signs off on the recommendations, still determines whether or not the threshold questions have been met and still essentially green lights this work to proceed from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and so on and into any kind of implementation.

Is that still the understanding of the working group that the - that this - because this PDP was initiated by different means, which is via the Board, it doesn't necessarily somehow it's not something that we as the Council just essentially watch it go by on the freeway, we actually are still the appropriate management body for that.

Chuck Gomes: So if I can respond to that, it's Chuck speaking. Absolutely, yes, the process hasn't changed because the Board initiated it. The Board has a special interest and they happen to have a committee that's watching it, but, no, the process is still the same, the Council has the same exact responsibilities for this as every other PDP.

But if I can, I want to go back because - to the previous discussion. I don't want to leave the impression that we have working group members who are not being responsive because that's really not the case. We've gone back, as Michele said, and talked individually with some. I can think of one at least that at first wasn't very responsive but that person eventually came around and was more responsive.

So I don't want you think that we have a bunch of working group members who are not being responsive to the leadership and the suggestions we're making, they really are. In some cases it's been a little harder, in some cases we've had to take other steps. But we shouldn't be surprised by that with this particular topic and the amount of interest in it, the amount of diverse opinions, polar opposite opinions, and so forth. So don't think that we have a bunch of members how are out of control. Some of them are more of a challenge then others, but at least in my experience, I've found all of them to be responsive with some nudging and so forth.

James Bladel: Thank you. Stephanie, is that an old hand? Okay. Any other questions from the table or from the room? And once again, this is open to any and all attendees. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I suppose we should possibly update Council with respect to the queries we're posing to the external legal advisors. So maybe Chuck could or Amr or somebody could speak to that very briefly. The reason I raise this is because in light of other activities both in - at GNSO Council and within the GNSO and the kind of wider ICANN community, this particular activity is something that others might need to be aware of.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michele. That is a good point. So after we did the - ask the data protection experts around the Copenhagen meeting a list of 20-some odd questions about data protection especially in Europe but not necessarily restricted to Europe, the experts were all from Europe, we got a comprehensive set of answers and there were members in the working group

who said, well, we would like to have an independent view of that the answers we got from the data protection commissioners - or they weren't all commissioners but they were all experts.

And so we have followed up on that. And hopefully this week, I don't think it's been totally finalized from a contractual point of view, but hopefully starting this week we have identified an independent legal expert that will be contracted with to answer the same questions that the data protection experts did. Not that we're questioning, as a leadership team we're not questioning the answers saying they're wrong, but there were people in the working group that wanted somebody who was not a data protection expert and supervisor and so forth.

And so that process - hopefully will be kicked off this week. The - a few contractual details I think the firm that we identified was ready to start immediately. What we're trying to do, just from a financial perspective, we're trying to use fiscal year '17 funds that are available that will disappear so that that uses less of the fiscal year '18 funds for this sort of thing. And so we rushed it because we didn't really start working on it until the last few weeks.

So far it looks like it's coming together. Now that information of course will be public information just like the answers from the data protection experts. This information will be available to the whole community. And so you can take the data protection experts' information, you can take the - this independent legal experts and there are a lot of other efforts going on like Michele mentioned and like all of you know, all of this will be information that will hopefully help all of us deal with what's in front of us in the next year.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. And we are exactly at time. So want to say thank you to - oh sorry, do we have - oh okay, we prompted two hands there. Okay so we'll go briefly here, Erika and then Paul. Erika.

Erika Mann: Chuck, I'm glad to hear that the independent experts will start working on it. We discussed this quite a while ago and I'm thankful for this. I personally, having been involved in this issue now for such a long time, I don't think it's a complicated issue, so the - and at least when you look at it from a budgetary point of view, because keep in mind the legislation - the European legislation came into law a while ago.

So all the law firms started working on this - on this package of law and they have - they pretty much have the, you know, the knowledge about, you know, how it shall be applied, not - might need to get familiar with our environment in case this particular law firm was not working on, you know, with anyone involved in the DNS environment so they might have to get familiar with it but otherwise it's pretty clear. There's some uncertainty because the law, unfortunately, leaves certain things open which might lead to re-nationalization in the European context.

But even this is not too complicated actually to understand and then to advise our contracted party, you know, what it would mean for them and what it means for ICANN. So I'm grateful for this that this is underway. If anything I can do to be helpful, you know, I'm here and more than happy and willing to help. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Erika. Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady for the record. Chuck, can you disclose the name of the firm that's been hired?

Chuck Gomes: We have not yet because the contract hasn't been finalized. Should that not happen we would - there's a second choice we could fall back to. But we're respecting that. To make this happen quickly we haven't spent a lot of time doing nondisclosure agreements and so forth, so right now we're respecting - but it will be disclosed.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you for that update and certainly we'll follow - not only the work of the group but also the management of the working group as we go forward. And certainly keep us updated on that outside legal expertise that you've retained. So with that we'll pause the recording on this session and welcome to the table Sally Costerton. And I note that the agenda says Tarek, but I believe Tarek had some travel challenges so he won't be joining us today. But Sally, you're welcome to join. And I'll wait until we have a...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...and batting for Tarek today is designated hitter Nigel Hickson. So soon as we're ready - we're ready. Fantastic. Okay, this is an update from the GSE, which is the Global Stakeholder Engagement Division of ICANN. And we have some slides, we certainly I think looking forward to some engaging Q&A as well. So with that I'll turn it over to you, Sally.

Sally Costerton: Thank you, James. Thank you all of you. I feel, looking around the room, that lots of familiar faces, great to see you. And for anybody who I don't know, my name is Sally Costerton and I lead Engagement at ICANN. Oh that's better. That's better.

Thank you for giving us some time on your agenda. I know we don't have very long so I'll keep my comments brief. But I want to primarily thank you for the comments that you offered on the budget. And you've asked some very specific questions which go to the heart of one of the key engagement challenges at ICANN, which is the following. How do we ensure that we fulfill our mission?

And we have a very high bar in our mission around engagement. And how do we do that in a way that is effective, that is cost effective, that ensures that we have the right people at ICANN today and into the future who have the right skills that can help the organization, the community grow and be successful? And that's a big ask.

The second question you asked was, how do we know whether it is working? It, being the strategies and programs that we put in place both from a staff but also this is a really now very interwoven process with the volunteer groups and the community. How do we measure progress? What does "done" look like? What kind of KPIs and progress metrics do we have? Are they fit for purpose? How often are we reviewing them? Do we even all agree that these are actually the right goals?

So I hope we can address that. And I've got some colleagues with me today in the room to answer questions including Xavier Calvez, our CFO, in case anybody has specific questions on that side of things.

Now I'm just going to go through a couple of slides to answer the question, who are we and what do we do? And then I will just touch on the other issue you raised in the comments on the budget, which was indeed about the budget, the spend on engagement and how is that made up. So I just want to use this opportunity to clarify that.

So at ICANN, very simply, and I'm sure you know, you all are so familiar with this, this is really the process, the strategies we use to involve people around the world who are affected by our work which of course is a lot of people. And specifically, in the nearly five years certainly that I've been at ICANN, I think it's fair to say that as a staff team we've shifted our focus from what one might call representation in the early days, feet on the ground around the world, a lot of awareness raising about ICANN and its mission, through the period of the transition, now having a much stronger emphasis, a shift from representation to participation.

And really now and into the future the teams that work with me are focused pretty much entirely now on how do we improve and increase and drive participation, meaningful participation. That means well equipped volunteers

who want to be here, who are able to be here, and who have the right skills to make the right sort of contribution. Next slide please.

Now, we do that through a number of different mechanisms. There are wide variety of programs that we're involved with, some of which we host and we create through a series of regional vice presidents, who are based around the world. And I think most of you are familiar with them, but also through some global coordination particularly around business engagement, which has been a great deal of involvement with this group, and Chris Mondini, who's here in the room, who's led that program. That's seen a really good uptake in interest and participation. I know we've had some very good meetings yesterday with African businesses and entrepreneurs.

We saw a spectacular event in Hyderabad in India and there's good evidence that some of those are turning into participants and they're beginning to be part of our community. So that's a really great example of where Chris's work with you in the early days there was a lot of staff effort increasingly, the BC, the ISP groups are really driving that with support from the staff team but it's really - you've made that your own.

Next slide please. I want to reassure you, if it is not obvious, that we - I don't think it is obvious actually - this element of the mission, this first paragraph, this is kind of tattooed on the inside of my eyeballs or perhaps my eyelids. This is what we do. This is why we do it. It's in the mission that we bring - we ensure that to the best of our ability we have global Internet users at ICANN and that they are able to participate not just as a representative group but they have the skills and ability to contribute to our work.

That is very connected to our strategic plan. Some of you are perhaps more familiar than others with the detailed goals but we put all our engagement work under two aspects of the strategic plan they're here on this chart. And they focus primarily on the regional and global engagement side of it, that side of participation and the skill building side of the work. Next slide please.

And this is what good looks like. And it sounds so easy. But it's a big ambitious goal. And you all know I think or - that there are - it's not just enough to raise awareness, demand is really going up for ICANN. That I do know. For example, we've seen over 600 applications to our Abu Dhabi Fellowship program. This is way more than we've seen in the past.

And I discovered, this week, somewhat surprisingly that a much newer program, our Next Gen Program, which is only three years old, and is designed to bring students (unintelligible) from the region where the meetings are being held, we've had over 400 applications for that also for our Abu Dhabi meeting. This is a nice problem to have, don't get me wrong, these are the goals we set ourselves.

And it's tremendously exciting to see so much interest in what we do. But it raises some challenges. Another area we've seen a great rise in demand is for participation in working groups, not every working group, but I'm happy to see that we're now seeing far greater numbers of people putting their hands up. We have some working groups now that have over 100 participants. That raises a whole other issue, triple that, thank you, Cheryl, of are we designed as a community to manage at that sort of scale?

And it puts some serious challenges on the resources of the community and the organization. So in a way it's kind of this is our goal but we also need to run to catch up as we become more successful at bringing people in. Next slide please.

Just quickly, where is the team based or where are we based? I think most of you are familiar with this. We are now all over the world in terms of our offices, focused on a mixture of engagements. And also support. So different services are available in different amounts, in different offices. But we have five regional hubs - five regional centers, different engagement centers who deal with specific issues. For example, in Geneva we have an office that's

dealing very much with IGO and NGO engagement because that's where they are. We have a team - we have teams in different parts of the world that are focused on specific stakeholder groups. Next slide please.

This is where the staff are located predominantly. As you can see here they're grouped in - alongside the ICANN regional structure. I think we don't - one of the things I was going to mention about the budget is one of the comments on the GNSO comments was that the investment in engagement is getting larger. I just wanted to perhaps take this opportunity to clear up a bit of a misconception. The headcount has gone up, I got to the bottom of this, James.

The headcount has gone up in the engagement team. The money that we spend on the actual GSE team has in fact gone down over the last three or four years so we are, I'm happy to say, becoming more efficient. We are becoming more automated. We are using platforms particularly for measurement, we use Salesforce to increasing the, if you will, professionalize and be able to measure the progress that we're making. So we are getting more efficient on the engagement team itself.

But I think also the - you should be aware that the way the budget is presented, is that the numbers are aggregated by the executive responsibility. And so what you see is about $16.5 million which comes under my name, but this is three different teams. I have the Meetings team, the - what is going to be the Public Responsibility team, used to be DPRD, and also the GSE team.

And I just wanted to let you all know that the last year that I've had purview of these three groups, has given us an ability to really push this drive to participation to integrate that work. Next slide please.

And then finally, here are some of the movers and shakers most of whom I think you all know. I wanted to just make one other comment, we work very

closely with Cyrus Namazzi's team, who look after the registry and registrar engagement. And Cyrus, just be very clear, Cyrus does not report to me. Cyrus and I work very closely and we do also right through this regional structure so the registrar and registry outreach and engagement is very tightly coordinated inside the organization to make sure that we are all knowledgeable and understanding of the different issues that we're facing in different parts of the world. So Cyrus works very closely with the regional guys in my team to implement those activities.

Last slide I think. Oh this is the rest of the team, sorry, yes, they didn't all fit on one slide. So that's it I think. That was the slide you prepared. So happy to take any questions that anybody has.

James Bladel: Thank you, Sally. First question is from Tony. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: Are comments accepted or only questions? Just from what you told us, I would just like to tell everybody that we had a sensation experience in Hyderabad with an event organized with Chris Mondini for the first time. Our constituency had 130 people from India in the room including the entire leadership of the Indian telecommunications and Internet data services associations. And it has produced several members from India and from countries around India who have joined ever since.

And two weeks ago I was in Brazil at - you had a booth again at the (Abrent) event which is an event for 4000 Brazilian ISPs. They became members of our constituency finally. And (Daniel Think) of your organization did a fantastic job there too. Just - it's actually a statement of support more than a question. And we hope we can repeat our experience in the Middle Eastern event in Abu Dhabi. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Tony. I have a quick question, did you mention offhand, Sally, that the meetings expense was part of your budget - I don't think you meant the broader ICANN meetings. Is it something else? Can you elaborate?

Sally Costerton: Yes, I can. Here's my man, he's going to tell you exactly what - which - what he's put in which bucket. Xavier has a special word, he calls we re-bucketize things. It's great, isn't it?

James Bladel: Is that French?

Sally Costerton: No, no I think it's just Xavier-speak. But I say that out of respect just in case there's any doubt for the record. The answer is this is the staff cost of the meetings team, this is not the operational cost. Is that correct, Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: There's a bit more than that, but yes. The meetings team reports to Sally. The costs that appear aggregated under Sally's name in the budget include, for reference Sally mentioned earlier $16 million in total for those three teams that she supervises. Out of that $16 million, the GSE team that's been described in those slides earlier, is half of that, is about $8 million out of that.

The rest is meetings costs and team for about $5 million. It includes the team that supports the meetings across the world and across the meetings, it's not just the three ICANN meetings. And some of the costs of the meetings themselves, though, looking at the cost of the ICANN meetings requires to go across several different functions because those costs are incurred throughout several functions as an illustration, the video, sound, costs of the infrastructure that you see is carried by our IT department because that's then who make it happen.

So the cost of meetings we look at it not from a department standpoint but from a cross departmental standpoint and we have separate analysis of the cost meetings, if you're interested the cost of meetings is approximately between $11 million and $12 million per year for the three ICANN meetings. It varies from $3.5 million for the cheapest to nearly $5 million for the most expensive, if you're interested, Singapore is usually our most expensive meeting.

James Bladel: Thank you. And just for comparison and keeping the spirit of the GNSO, since we have Xavier on the hot seat, the budget allocation for all in FY'18 for all policy development support is approximately half of the GSE budget or - to go by your comparison, equivalent to just the expenditures for their meeting team, about $9 million versus $8.5 million, is that correct?

Xavier Calvez: So the policy development support is $7.1 million, the GSE spend is $8.3 million.

James Bladel: Okay, so that I think is underpinning part of our comment is that, you know, we're starving certain parts of the organization and gasping for air and other groups are - yes, yes, go ahead.

Xavier Calvez: The policy development support increased year on year from $6.5 million to $7.2 million, so that's about a 12% increase and the GSE spend year on year decreased by couple hundred K so it's 2% decrease.

James Bladel: So...

Xavier Calvez: So the starving is a relative notion. The comments of the GNSO Council was indicating we spend more on engagement than we spend on policy development support. And I think that was the point of the comment.

James Bladel: Okay yes, and I think you correctly pointed out that engagement is part of ICANN's mission but I think policy development is in there somewhere as well. Okay, Michele, you're up.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. I suppose the thing boils really down I'm a bit concerned by how excited you get about the number of applications you get for a free lunch. I wouldn't see that as being a particularly meaningful KPI. I mean, the fact that there's an increase in the number of people applying for a

free trip to an ICANN meeting doesn't equate to an increase in actual meaningful engagement.

What would be much more interesting to see is things like say Tony's comment, okay, event X was held in location Y, group Z got X number of new members. That to me I can see as being something meaningful. But 25 people applied for a free trip to an ICANN meeting on the other side of the globe, doesn't equate to anything unless you can track that back to something meaningful. And that's what I seem to - what I constantly see as being kind of a bit lacking around this are those kind of meaningful KPIs.

Now in - okay from the Contracted Party House side of things, we're a bit odd in that unless you have a contract with ICANN, you don't get to play. I mean, that's because that's where the Contracted Party House and you can't be a member of either of our stakeholder groups unless you have a contract. But obviously there is that gap of, you know, companies that could eventually move to a point where they become directly accredited as registrars, or at some point in the future become registries.

Yet the focus on a lot of the stuff that seems to be around kind of fellowships and things like that seems to be more around this kind of fuzzy area. And I just would love to see something a little bit more kind of concrete, and maybe Chris Mondini and his team can speak to that because I know they've been doing some interesting work. But just really mapping the kind of outreach and engagement to actual onboarding of active participants and not people coming for a free lunch.

Sally Costerton: Thank you, Michele. You raise a very important question and you've been very instrumental, actually, individually in you've been the voice of my conscience if that's the right word over some long period of time on this absolutely important question. What you're asking for is that we measure the participation journey, that's what you're asking for. And it's exactly the right question. And I wish it were easier than it is.

We have had to put in completely new systems to do this. We had nothing at all four years - literally nothing. I mean, we were sort of counting post-it note level of who's doing what. We're now - we've made a lot of progress behind the scenes. And I share your frustration actually that I can't turn up here this afternoon with that but I hope I will be able to relatively soon.

The - that's why we've shifted so much of our emphasis away from what I said, representation to participation, because that's exactly right, that's the point. If as a result of our outreach and engagement we are not bringing new people to ICANN, then, you know, why are we doing it? And those people need to be well qualified volunteers. So what we will be doing from the beginning of FY'18 is starting to publish regional plans, which have clear what does done look like? What's the goal?

What are the KPIs against that goal? What are the milestones on the journey to that goal? What performance metrics are we using? And they, you know, we've had some very good metrics, some absent metrics, some source of proxy metrics like you say. Is the subscription to fellowships an equivalent, can we define that participation? No we can't. What that tells us is that more people are applying for fellowships. One can think that's a good thing or not a good thing.

It tells us that the potential to bring more people into ICANN, but it doesn't tell us that they are here. So we will keep working with you and keep sharing those plans at a regional level and you will see that begin to take shape. And we've now got to the stage for example, where we can - we are measuring and if you like, counting all the activity. We are beginning - we are at the beginning of the next stage which is turning that into participation metrics. So bear with us, I hope that when we see each other at least in the next few months we will keep having more progress to share with you.

Thanks to Tony's comments, you can see some good anecdotal data but it is not enough. This needs to be systemic, we need a machine, this is what my boss would call we need a machine and he's right to do this. And we have sort of parts of our machine but there's a couple of wheels missing and we've just about located the steering wheel, I think is kind of where I would say we are now but we're nearly there.

The other point you make is which is the other thing I just wanted to mention and we're at the beginning of this stage. At this next phase it becomes very important I think to, if we can, become more targeted about the people that we look for to come into these programs, the ones that we fund, the fellows and the next gen-ers so expect to see more of my teams coming to you to ask for specific requests, what do you need? Not just which countries you need people from but what kind of skills are you missing?

You might say, look, we would love people who could do some basic coms for us to help us to do some nice graphics and speak - I don't know, you might want more engineers, you might want more lawyers, I don't know about that. But I'm being serious, you know, over time we now need to move towards a better matching of the people that are coming in through the pipeline with the needs that are in the different communities. So we will work on that as well as working on the KPIs and measurements so please, let's keep that discussion going. Thank you for the comment, I do appreciate it.

James Bladel: So we have a couple more folks in the queue and then we're off to lunch. So first is Wolf-Ulrich, I put myself in the queue and then we have Tony. Go ahead, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks, Sally. Well, my question is a little bit in this direction as well, well, just to make you aware about the problems we have after people are - have been attracted to join - to come to ICANN meetings. Well the problem is well, to keep them attracted, well, to the

work, yes, to keep them really so and to participate in the work in working groups and to be engaged.

So as Tony said, we have got a number of new members, but keeping them really attracted here to this work and this is where we need also support from ICANN not only from your side but maybe from others as well that they could follow up with that in order to help us in this direction. Otherwise we shall fail and we shall - you will see the next time the same faces as every time here in this round and that is not what is the goal of all this, so that's my concern here. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And Tony, you're up next. Or actually I'll go behind you, go ahead, Tony.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks, James. Tony Holmes from the ISPCP. You mentioned as part of your response that the meetings is also a consideration. And I just wonder, Sally, because originally when we had the plan for the meetings team it was to focus really on policy aspects for these meetings. And I think part of that was an intent to reach out to parts of the world that couldn't host ICANN meetings because of the sheer volume of numbers and the demands that that places.

But these meetings, they seem to be maybe a victim of our success, they seem to be growing very quickly to large numbers. And I'm interested to know whether you look on that as a measure of success or whether you recognize that that really wasn't where that effort was originally focused and what is your view of that for the future because they're becoming very large sessions and it's increasingly putting demands on the community to get policy work done but it has other benefits as well. How do you view that moving forward?

Sally Costerton: Thanks, Tony. That's an excellent question, slightly in with a philosophical question. Yes, I was involved very closely with the group that put the proposals together, community group, to come up with the idea of the policy

meeting. And you're right, those were the two primary goals, let's declutter the agenda, deconflict the agenda so that we can focus on policy work and let's try and make sure that we have an agile enough meeting, a small enough meeting, that we can use - can really lean in to countries and regions that are difficult to get to because we can't go there with a big ICANN meeting.

Now the first point is not really part of your question I think, the second point is. What I'm very happy to see here, for example, in Johannesburg, is how many sessions we have with African stakeholders here. I've been at a session this morning for example, which AFRALO has put on which in the audience I would estimate looking at the room at least 50 students from the Innovation Hub at Johannesburg University. Most of whom have never been to an ICANN meeting, and I wouldn't mind betting at least half of them they'd probably never heard of ICANN until their university teacher suggested that they should do this.

And we were able to spend time with them, we were able to bring ICANN's expertise to that. Steve was there, Tijani and Aziz were there. And this is I think - this is in the spirit of what we wanted to do. So by coming to - and this is not the only one, just before the meeting we had a capacity development session with over 50 law enforcement professionals from South Africa which was done in connection in conjunction with the GAC undeserved working group a straightforward capacity development session.

Out of those 50 law enforcement people that came, not only had most of them not heard of ICANN, most of them were unaware of the Domain Name System at all and the role that it plays in the life of their citizens and the incredibly important aspect of cyber security. Now they have cyber on their job description or they wouldn't be here.

So the fact that we can do sessions like that by being here, is very key. Now that you're going to say to me is, but what happens when we get so big that

we can't do that anymore? That's a very interesting question. The - we will have about 1500 people at this meeting, maybe 1400 registered, that's exactly the same pretty much as Helsinki. So in that sense you, this policy forum, hasn't actually got bigger, but what we are seeing is far more local participation, particularly here this week.

Now, does that make the agenda more cluttered and it more difficult for you to do policy work? I'm not sure, I think you'd have to tell me. But I certainly think that it's allowing us to in a way bring you to those communities. And please don't underestimate the importance of that because seeing you work is a very important part of creating the will which is what we're saying, how do we get people motivated, to want to stay and be part of this process? And part of that is seeing you in action. And if you're not doing policy work in a way you're kind of not in action if that makes sense.

So I think let's keep an eye on it. I think if it really does become a 2000 person meeting, and we stop being able to go to the cities we want, we really need to look at that. We need to go back and have another look at it because I think it would be very difficult for us to achieve those goals if that happens.

James Bladel: Thank you, Sally. We're just a couple minute over time, I got myself and Rafik and then we'll close and move to lunch. So in the same vein as some of the other comments and questions that you've heard, you know, let me back up a step. I don't want to speak ill of the departed but our previous CEO used to like to come to each meeting and say there's 2000 members at this, there's 5000 - biggest ICANN meeting ever in London in 2014, only to be topped, I think, a little bit later you mentioned that our policy forum, which was originally envisioned by the meeting strategy working group to be a nice 500-700 meeting team is not double that.

But you can't just count noses. Okay? I think what you were saying is you see a spike in that region, a spike in participation from India, from Hyderabad, now we're seeing a spike in African engagement. One of the kind of trendy

sciences right now is cohort analysis. And I think ICANN could possibly benefit from tracking those folks as they go through the process to see how an increase in 1000 new participants at an ICANN meeting in India translates to increased participation, helping those folks find a home in the community, an appropriate group to attach to and then how are they volunteering?

Are they running for leadership office a year down the road. Five years down the road are they still involved? Or was it, as Michele said, they wanted to come and see what ICANN was all about and have some lunch, get some Wi-Fi and go home. You know, that could also be you know, one of the, you know, one of the outcomes. So this tracking that, you know, I think you called it the volunteer path or the cohorts that behave as a group.

And, once you have that, I think you need to be able to demonstrate what the financial constraints are. If we had more increase in money X or more increase in headcount Y, we could translate that into more engaged volunteers. I think right now, if I can be blunt, you guys are just kind of swinging around and see, you know, see what happens you know, because we don't have a way of tracking that back to dollars spent attending a particular event, you know.

And again, if it sounds like we're putting you on the hot seat here, it's because one of the themes that we keep hearing as councilors and management of this process is volunteer burnout, volunteer exhaustion, too much work, not enough people. You have the potential to solve that for us, to be the recruiting arm that brings in the cavalry that rescues us from ourselves, okay. And so I think that's why we're putting this under the microscope is show us that these dollars are translating into people and translating into new volunteers so that we're not kind of looking around the table and seeing the same names and same faces.

And perhaps to avoid that and to make sure you're getting the right motivation is instead of funding travel or funding fellows or whatever, you

know, put them on an earn out program so here, you know, your first year after your one year anniversary come and get your rebate on the travel that you spent. Your second year, maybe a little bit more. I know, Cheryl, but rather - but look at the alternative, Cheryl, is that we're paying - you're making - for the record Cheryl is making a lot of faces at me right now.

But my point is that I think the alternative is let's fund some people to come to ICANN and see what it's all about, how about let's enter into an agreement with them that if they come to the second, third and fourth ICANN, that first one is paid off, something like that after the fact. Put them on the hook. So that's my you know, if it sound like I'm ranting it's because it's really is, I think fundamental to the sustainability of the multistakeholder model because we just said good-bye to Elise and before that we said good-bye to Chuck and before that we said good-bye to Glen, and we are - we are not finding a bench here to call up some newcomers to take their positions on the field and we need that from you. Thanks.

Sally Costerton: Thank you for your comments and I don't mind at all being in the hot seat. I willingly share your sentiments, I truly do. I think you're focusing on exactly the right issues. We are desperately well aware of the volunteer burnout issue. That is another reason why I'm putting so much emphasis on driving volunteer participation rather than just, you know, counting noses and people subscribing to newsletters, not that that doesn't have its value.

I hope we're not completely swinging around in the wind. I'm going to try - I'm trying really hard not to be defensive here so that's my only bit of defensiveness. But I just feel that's, you know, I've got my team in the room, so it's a little hard. But what I - I won't go into it now whether it's because it would take too long but if people are interested I'm super happy to have a separate session on this.

One of the key barriers to this has been the measurement tools. What you want to do is that's the thing that's tattooed on the inside of my eyelid, it really

is, it's what is the connection between people, staffing and people participating and how much does that all cost and can we build, if you will, a sort of engagement model or participation model that allows all of us to say well, okay, here's what we now know. Actually, this program that we put all this money into doesn't have half such a good return as this program, which we didn't think was going to be such a runner, but in fact it really really works. That's where we need to get to.

And nobody wants that more than me. And we - I hope we'll keep coming back, I hope we'll keep having these discussions because that's the goal. And when you look at that in the mission, that's what I think we're being asked to do. And I don't - I know that until we can prove that data, until we can have that discussion, we're not going to be able to fulfill that mission fully truly.

And that's in every sense, not just in this group. So no, thank you for asking the question. Keep asking them. I know that we are making progress. I know that we will continue to make progress. And the final thing I would say is that one mechanism that we're using is piloting small groups so the Indian Business Users is one example. We've also now got enough data on the Fellowship program, although I'm tempted to, you know, Michele is going to start looking at lunch again, but no, it's a serious point.

We have to look at areas where there are large - that's one way of doing it, that you spotlight particular programs and say can we run participation data on particular areas. So business engagement has been one, the Fellows is another. And we now have all our Fellows have been surveyed this year, or everybody, everybody for the last 10 years.

And then they're all in the Salesforce database, we know where they came from, to a large extent we now know where they are, we know what the barriers to participation were because there is one last thing that I would say and I think you all discussed this, ICANN isn't always the easiest place to

come and join. This is really Wolf-Ulrich, to your earlier point. We like - we know we need more support, we know we're exhausted. We're trying on the other side to bring in the cohorts and we want to make them the best qualified, the best fit for the needs you have .

But we also need I think to look sometimes at our culture at ICANN about how welcoming we are sometimes, about how much space we give to newcomers, and I recognize there's an enormous tension between the intensity of getting the work done and the need to have people that can just arrive fully qualified, roll their sleeves up and help. And sometimes that's just an adoption process that takes a little longer, and that's a human issue. That's not a process issue. I hope that's helpful. But thank you for the discussion.

James Bladel: Thank you. So we're at 10 minutes now over our schedule. And I had put myself at the end of the queue and maybe prompted by my last tirade, I prompted two more hands to go up. So I will come to Sally's defense now since I jumped a little too harshly earlier and ask Rafik, Stephanie, I can entertain your questions, you are eating into our lunch hour. But I could certainly give the opportunity to speak if you promise to keep it extremely brief. And that would be Rafik first. Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, James. But I think you may show the leadership by being concise yourself. Sorry to say that. Yes.

James Bladel: And, Stephanie, you're up next please.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Okay so quickly so we have experience in NCSG NCUC to work with GSE team in our own initiative for outreach. And we have membership growth and so I really appreciate working with (John Jack) and (Adam) on those matter, so wanted to highlight that first.

But what I want really to emphasize is about managing the expectation of those who you are trying to bring to ICANN regarding Fellowship or any - all those different program because I'm not sure what kind of message that is really spread by the GSE staff in the different initiative and effort. And what you are explaining to those who are you trying to bring and let them to participate in ICANN because in my personal experience as a former NCSG Chair when I am talking with a new member, they come like through Fellowship or so on, I find that they have a lot of expectation from us as a community to help them a lot.

I understand that it's important but as we are already kind of overloaded volunteer that's really kind of - make us more kind of - put us in really complicated situation. So it's important to manage the expectation to explain what does it mean to be involved but also we can provide much more support for them and to help them to be kind of active participants. So that's really important about the messaging because sometimes when I see all the - what you are trying to sell, to those about ICANN, it's quite - there are a lot of - you are setting the expectation too high. The reality is what you expecting them to be part of the community and that's why I really emphasize again that the community need to be involved in all those initiative and how it's shaped which is not the case for some of them.

James Bladel: Stephanie for real.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. Just three points really, and forgive me if I missed this earlier when you were talking about re-bucketing, I'm struck by the fact that there might be 50 law enforcement folks who don't know about the DNS, that fills my heart with fear. So I think that really I don't know how strong your public education mandate is, but there is a public education aspect of coming to a region that I think we should re-bucket that and call it public education and don't call it failed recruitment, you know, if those people are coming away with a much greater appreciation of what we're doing here, then that's enough.

And secondly, I would like the record to show that the raging privacy advocate here doesn't see anything wrong with spamming people. You're giving them a free conference, free lunch, free drinks, free this that and the other, ask them, tell them that you're going to - we would like them to do follow up. We want feedback on what did you get out of this? Are you interested at all in joining ICANN? If you're not, fine, what did you learn? You know, I don't see a problem with that and I - it's certainly not a privacy problem if you tell them from the get go, you know, if you're going to come to this meeting, it's free but we're going to send you this thing and fill it in with garbage just like Whois.

And then the third thing, I think we're all very passionate about this, at least I sure am because I'm on way too many things right now. And the chasm between bringing people in as fellows and getting them up to speed where they can really function on a complex working group, even if they aren't scared away, you missed my earlier intervention on how RDS we have to be nice so that we don't scare away the Fellows, I think that we need really a lot of concerted work on bridging, getting over that, the academy is great but it isn't doing it yet. We can't take on all these mentorship roles so I think we need a much longer session with you about how we attack that problem. Thanks.

Sally Costerton: I know you need lunch. That's such a great way to end this session. I gladly take on that request. We are in the middle - we've just started in this - just in the staff team a wholesale pan ICANN org review of the capacity development, capacity building, whatever your favorite expression is because that's the key. And we - I personally think, and this is how I'm beginning to, you know, move resources around in the buckets, we now need to intensify our efforts to train people. I mean, this is the word I used before I came to ICANN. We need to train people, we can't just put them through a fellowship program and let them loose in the wild.

And we know there isn't a good enough conversion rate between - and that's partly why. Some of it is people to people. We've had some focus on that. That trouble with that is that it's not scalable. And so we need a great deal more coordination, and a great deal more effort and energy coming in from all of us, we make those investments now, we use them many, many times. We now have the platforms in place I think broadly to do that in a way that actually works properly so music to my ears. I couldn't agree with you more.

James Bladel: Thank you, Sally. And on that note, we'll probably draw this session then to a close. Thank you for your updates and for your candor in addressing the questions and comments and thank you, Xavier, for riding shotgun as well as Nigel. With that we will pause the recording and note that we now have on our schedule a working lunch through 1:30,

END