ǀ ICANN
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
NCSG Excom & ICANN Board Wrap Up
Thursday 16 March 2017 at 08:30 CET

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Tapani Tarvainen: So good morning everybody. My apologies for being a minute later, two minutes actually. I was coming straight from another meeting. And I see we don't have too many people present yet. I suspect somebody has been partying last night or something to that effect.

Okay this is our conventional ExCom meeting with select board members. We have only one select board member present at the moment, and we don't have a formal agenda, which kind of tells us that we don't have any really bad issues at hand. Maybe a quick round if - I have some agenda items I know people wanted to speak about but those people are not present yet so we'll have to start with this.

Otherwise I'd like to ask our EC members representing the various constituencies to highlight if you have any specific concerns for your constituencies. Joan? Personal questions are fine too. Joan, please go ahead.

Joan Kerr: Hi. Good morning everyone. It's Joan for the record. So I was an event, two events, yesterday and a number of members of the NomCom were out and

about trying to promote the NomCom and for people to invite people to apply to be on the board. And so I wasn't really that interested but I thought I would ask what are you looking for, from their mouth? I mean you can go look at it on the website and all the paperwork and, but. And the response from the first person, because there were a number of them afterward, said, "Well, people with experience that could read a budget of $200 million."

And I - my response was, "Well, count me out." And I said, "Really? That's the number one priority for the board is looking for people with experience with - that could read a budget for $200 million?" And so I looked at the card and it said they were looking people with diversity and, you know, experiences and multi skills. And I said, "So, does the skills mean your ability to read budgets from 1 million to 200 million?" And he says, "No, no, no, we're looking for lots of skills." I said, "But you said the skill was the budget."

And he said, "Well that what the board - to be on the board that's what it is." So my question to him was, and to you, Markus, what - how does the board perceive its role? Because I was told the board is not about community engagement or building relationship with the ICANN community. If it is, let us know. And if it's not, why not.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Joan. I guess Markus you want to have a go at that.

Markus Kummer: Well I can try. I mean definitely your question is relevant and I'm equally surprised. I mean obviously you do need people on the board who have experience with - financial experience with budget or that sort of thing, but at the same time not everybody on the board needs to have the same skill set. I think the strength of the ICANN board is precisely that you have diverse skill sets there and 200 million budget is not part of my skill set either, you know.

But the second question about building relationships, this is I think definitely a perceived weakness and I think is shared among many of my fellow board members that we usually are locked in our little (unintelligible) board the

meetings. We don't have the opportunity actually to interact with the community, and this is also then what is perceived by the board as a loss of trust. You know, once you enter the board, you're sort of seen as having gone over to the dark side and you're not engaging anymore with community.

Now I think maybe where that comes from, you know, the - okay the board is not here with a task to build relationships with the community but I think at the same time it is essential that the board actually does that, you know. It's not, okay, do this and you take the box, we have done it, but it's an undercurrent anyway. I mean a board that doesn't have the trust of the community I think would be somewhat hanging in the air. So - and this I think a feeling which is shared by many colleagues on the board, you know, that we need to be better at that.

And we have started this discussion on building trust. Now we have a trust working group among the board members and discussing how to enhance and expand, and we had - or it took a long time to prove in the principle that the board sessions should be open but we had at this pitching this workshop we had the first session on the anti-harassment policy where we had actually open to discussion. But it was - it was a well-kept secret. Nobody knew about it, but it was there.

But I mean these are little parts of the puzzle I think that would help to enhance trust and to actually do what you address your question of building relationships. I think transparency I think is a key component as well in that. But I think these are all relevant questions and maybe we need to go back to the NomCom to make sure that their messaging is a little bit more open and not of one track.

Yes, of course we do need the experts with expertise in financial matters but that's not a requirement for every board member. I mean the strength of the board is precisely diversity and people from different backgrounds bringing in different perspective on any given issue. I don't know, have I answered your

question? I tried to answer it. It's very early in the morning but I think it's I think an important question and it's very - it's also a very multifaceted question but I think it's extremely relevant. Thank you for the question.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Markus. I see that a number of new people have joined the room. So I'll notify you that we don't have a fixed agenda and even though this is shown as the Executive Committee meeting with select board members, all NCSG members are welcome to participate in the discussion. And I see that Sam Lanfranco wanted to speak next. Sam, please go ahead.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you. Thank you, Markus, for being here. I have a question about an emerging issue. I was at the auctions discussion yesterday, the auctions proceeds discussion, and they were very explicit about how ICANN is constrained as a 501(c)(3) organization in terms of the fence around what it can and cannot do.

On February 4 the current president of the United States announced that he was going to trash 503(c) - 501(c)(3). He used the word trash. Whether we take him at his word or not I don't know. The motives behind that are quite complicated. They're not for here. But what I would like to - the question I'm going to raise within that other forum as well is I'd like to see ICANN at least adhere to the principles behind that.

That was the Johnson amendment originally. Lyndon Johnson got it passed it Congress as a kind of principled position and not have the ICANN lawyers simply say on a given day, "Gee, the fence isn't there anymore, you can do what you want." And so I'm going to try and push for it to be adopted - the principles behind it to be adopted even if the law changes. And so I'm just sort of signaling that early as something we need to worry about. We hope that - the U.S. has a president that occasionally eats his own words but we don't know.

Markus Kummer: Well thank you for the question. And it seems that the current president says a lot of things but to turn it into action… I think it's a very sound principle and in the U.S. many tasks in other countries are taken care of by the government, are taken care of by private sector, by foundations, and that's precisely why you have this 503(c)(1) code in the tax code. And I don't think it will go away that quickly.

But I think the principle, as you said, is very important and I would totally subscribe to what you're suggesting, that even if it goes away that ICANN as an organization should adhere to that principle to act in the public interest. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Markus. Robin, would you care to tell if NCUC has any specific concerns with the board at the moment you want to raise with Markus?

Robin Gross: This is Robin Gross for the record. Yes, no we haven't had - no specific issues have come forward from our constituency that I'm aware of regarding what we might want to talk to the board about. So I think we're okay.

Tapani Tarvainen: So everything fine and happy. Joan, you had a comment?

Joan Kerr: I have another question. Markus, could - we have identified a weak spot, which is building relationships. Perhaps you could share with us some of the things that you think, from a board perspective, that you've been effective at or that you'd like us to know.

Markus Kummer: Again, it's a big question. So how much time do we have? But the - no, I think the - also when I started my tenure on the board it was just sort of the IANA transition process had already kicked in but I think this - it was obviously big for the organization and I think one positive unintended consequence is that the organization goes out of it stronger than when it went into it. I think we have learned more to work together outside our silos to sit around the table and work together to find solutions to sometimes difficult issues.

And that is big a win as such. And I think you also see that is I think cross-communities while we quite normally don't love everyone, it's not just peace and harmony and motherhood and apple pie, but nevertheless I think there are professional relationships across constituencies which did not exist before the transition kicked in.

Now one of the challenges I think is to take this also forward, this positive movement and the - and we've seen for instance one of the thorny issues we're facing currently is the Red Cross and IGO issue, where we hit a roadblock once the policy was developed and we have to learn also from that to avoid that for the future. We have quite a lot of discussions on that with the various constituencies and I think someone put it it's a feeling that CCWG is good PDP is bad.

It's not about that but that may be the perception. And the perception is, okay, what worked during the transition, how can we actually translate that also into a PDP. And the various suggestions were made, you know, to obviously working groups they may well be open but, you know, they don't have the difficulty to make sure that governments actually participate actively, that we need to build sort of entry points on the way that allows people to come in, to comment on various stages and not just wait till the end of the process.

So that - this is something I think it does not have to wait for ICANN 3.0. We also discussed that, you know, and the GNSO is one of the parts of the puzzle there's a lot of dissatisfaction in how it works. And I think a lot of it is due to the fact that the current structure was actually kind of imposed and obviously structures that are imposed that don't come from within the community -- and we're facing the same thing now with the ALAC review -- it just doesn't work. So.

And we discussed the possibility of - well the - yes having a overarching review, a holistic review of ICANN as a whole, all the ICANN structures in the

organization effectiveness committee we are totally open to that idea. And I for one I would actually push for that. But it was also the feeling we need to let the post-transition ICANN settle a bit in its new form before we actually start overhauling it. But it's definitely something that is on the agenda that we look - I think once we called it Work Stream 3 I think, but we look at ICANN 3.0 that will take shape, you know, once the transition has been digested a bit more. But this obviously - these are big issues.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Markus. I note that our audience has been growing all along. So I'm again reminding you that this is, even though it's formally and executive committee meeting the board member that all NCSG members here are welcome to speak. And one issue we'd like to raise would be how to continue our rather successful attempt here in dealing with data protection commissioners and bringing privacy issues to the fore, how to engage them. Stephanie, would you like to comment on that?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes Stephanie Perrin for the record. And obviously we'd love to hear any feedback that you could give us on how the board has received that event. (Peter) and I are working on the next steps and the next venue and what would be the most effective way of using them if they're willing to come. We had a session yesterday with the RDS working group. That's the group that is revitalizing the Whois.

And they had prepared 18 questions for them and we got halfway through question number one, which I'm quite happy with because I have been saying these are complex analyses and you can't just go yes, no binary on each questions. Data protection analysis is more complicated than that. And I think we're getting that message across. But any thoughts you have, advice on how to sustain this and move it forward. I think at least the contracted parties and possibly ICANN are aware that there could be money involved in this now with the GDPR so that it might be time to do something. Thanks.

Markus Kummer: Thank you. I was not able to attend the session, but what I heard it was a very productive session, but not everybody liked the same bit of the session. We have a lot of time to take stock of that at the level of the board but I think the fact that you actually have all the people in the same room, on the one hand, law enforcement, on the other hand, data - the privacy people, I think it seems obvious.

You know, you and only thrash out a solution if people are in the same room. And the debate I think in the past has been maybe dominated too much by the law enforcement side without having the other side. They're part of the same governments but they've not been in the room. And I think that was a welcome initiative and a positive first step. And we don't know what the result is but obviously we need to work towards finding a solution and, you know, it's a - not everybody will be equally happy but the essence of a compromise everybody's equally unhappy. That's where we have to move forward.

Stephanie Perrin: If I may respond to that. I can assume you, Markus, that I'm rather used to being unloved by now. It's been four years of pretty steady pushback. So I don't think that's going to slow us down. You know, I would say we're not there yet. There's still quite a little bit of pushback going on. So navigating that over the next little while is going to be our next challenge.

And of course, we don't have money, you know. The data commissioners if they come or if their junior staff come, not junior staff but, you know, not the top guy, come to South Africa we may need to find funds to help them, and I don't think there's a mechanism for that. So if you have any thoughts on that too. We could start crowd sourcing it, but I don't think the publicity would be too good for ICANN.

Markus Kummer: Well I don't have an answer to that but the point is well taken.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you, Markus. I see Marilia, you raised your hand.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you, Tapani. Marilia speaking. I think that one interesting to notice is that human rights related issues they have percolated from being a very confined discussion in the cross-community working party on ICANN and human rights to other spaces. So the topic of the session dedicated to privacy came yesterday in the GNSO Council session, so I saw for the first time that registrars raised the topic and registries engaged and the IPC was responding. So I think that it is a topic of the organization and it has been established.

So I don't think it's premature to start to think about the way that this dialogue will evolve in a more structured matter, involving everyone that is interested. Because the GNSO clearly showed yesterday that it is a topic now, at least in this part of the community.

And the other thing is just an observation that I think it's really nice that the privacy people and the law enforcement are here but a lot still needs to be done in the sense of building dialogue among them. Even though there was someone from Interpol in the privacy discussion, if you look at the domain abuse discussions, there weren't no privacy person there. So I think that we still need, especially on the law enforcement side, to make sure that people are sitting around the same table so we get a more unified and coherent response to the challenges we have.

Markus Kummer: I have nothing to add to that. I think you - excellent comments and I couldn't agree more.

Tapani Tarvainen: That was a short answer to a long question but sometimes that's the way it goes. Anybody else? I'm not seeing any hands up. Oh, Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Totally different topic, and I do apologize for being late. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I wasn't, unfortunately, in Iceland so I didn't hear any discussion that went on on the GNSO next round of review. I tried but the remote access

wasn't the best, so we kept dropping off. And sadly, if I could convey a message that I've been hearing from Farzi all week, the remote access isn't great here and she's just in the state of Georgia. So, you know, is it Georgia? Yes. It would be the state of Georgia -- Atlanta.

So - but the ALAC, I gather, is responding to their review at the moment. I gather it's not easy to take criticism. We certainly went through that when we got our Westlake review, although I don't think the methodology was particularly good there. But I wonder if you have any thoughts on helping the - those who spoke - speak for the end user figure out how they ought to be operating.

Markus Kummer: Well just to the first part, I think we also - I mean in the OEC we just had a discussion and maybe what we are going to propose is that for future reviews do it in two phases. The first phase is the assessment and stop it there, then work out the recommendations based on the assessment. Current reviews do everything in the same thing. And I think that is also the weakness of the current discussion with the ALAC review, that everybody focuses on the recommendations because they don't like them but you don't actually look at the issues as such. You know, are they right in identifying weaknesses, do they need to be addressed?

And I think if you do it in two phases, that will be a much more productive way of approaching it. In the first phase, you look at everything there. You assess the situation. You assess strength and weaknesses and then you sit around the table with the community. Is this assessment the correct one, do these need to be addressed, and what other recommendations going forward? And if the recommendations are worked out with the community, I think they will be also much more sustainable in the long term if they're not imposed from an outsider.

To fully get it, I mean it's difficult to accept you have a few guys being parachuted in, talk to a few people, and then come up, okay, we reform

everything. Now the GNSO review was totally different and we somehow said don't address structural issues and it was a very narrow scope. And the NCPH was very actually unhappy and it led to a joint letter two years ago, yes it was at the D.C. intersessional, saying this doesn't make sense unless you address the broader structural issues. So.

But the - Reykjavik precisely I think there was the overwhelming feel that the GNSO needs to be assessed in a broader context of the whole organization, and we are open to that, I think. Also at the board level, we discussed in the OEC. I think it makes sense to have a holistic review of the entire organization. That would also include the board, of course, you know. And there have been, some six, seven years ago, I think there was proposals also to look at the functioning of the board.

But it's - the way I see it at least, you know, ICANN when it was adopted it was a tiny organization where the board had many ways operational functions because you just had to roll up your sleeves and help the few staff people to get the job done. And we never actually managed to translate the role of the board into what it should be for a bigger organization with much less involvement in sort of day-to-day issues. I'm not saying we do involve in day-to-day issues but there's still a tendency to be too much in the weeds of the organization instead of having a broad overview.

And also the board is I find just very big in terms of numbers. So when you sit around the table, you know, if you wait for everybody to add an opinion, it takes time and it's - so there is definitely I think merit in looking at the broad picture. But that is not for tomorrow. I mean it's good to bring that into the pipeline. We have all these sort of time table of reviews and, you know, the next review then of the GNSO I think should definitely look at the broader picture. I'm not sure whether I have answered all your questions, I think.

Stephanie Perrin: Unless I'm interrupting other people from asking questions, I've got a million of them so I'll just keep going.

Tapani Tarvainen: Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Yes?

Tapani Tarvainen: There are other people in the queue so if there are…

Stephanie Perrin: Okay I'll come back.

Tapani Tarvainen: …coming back. Anna, you wanted to speak.

Anna Loup: Yes. This is Anna Loup for the record. I'm conveying a question/comment from Farzi, who is participating remotely, as we have just discussed. She says, "I want to talk to board members at the NCSG meeting about GAC communiqué on the two-letter - two-character country territory codes at the second level. It seems like these countries expressed that they own two-letter domain names that correspond to their country code. We have given in to the request of the GAC on two – on these two letter domains and then they have given – then been given notices and registries have gone into enough trouble.

She says that normal people may also have a right to usual pronouns like it so just as a sort of question for comment on this issue. Thank you.

Markus Kummer: Yes. Thanks and hi Farzi. You're up late or up early given the time difference. No, I mean, this is a – again a thorny issue and the Board held the view that we actually – our decision was compliance with the GAC communiqué.

And the – but the political reality is that some countries feel they own two letters, which is legally speaking rather shaky I think and there's no international law giving them a right.

You know, Italy IT – but IT is also information technology and Italy doesn't own information technology or Nigeria with NG, and NG is a name in Asia which is quite widely used so they – Nigeria doesn't own the family name of all the people called Ng in Asia.

So – but the – at the same time we cannot ignore governments. I mean, that is – and that came across very strongly for those who were in the session we had with the GAC yesterday.

I mean, there are strong and emotional feelings among governments about these two letter country codes second level and - well what the Board said, "Okay let's discuss it."

But the idea is not to reopen a decision but at the same time again there are very strong feelings on the governments' sides that, you know, and in politics it's never say never.

I mean, it's – but we – okay we said, "We'll have a discussion and we will see what comes out of this discussion," but it's definitely not the intention of the Board to backtrack in whatever way but we have to see.

And my personal feeling is, you know, we really cannot ignore the – however – whatever their legal situation is of this issue but if governments have a strong position on that we will have to talk to them and we cannot ignore them.

But this is not the end and I'm sure it will be in the Copenhagen communiqué again and I'm sure that it will express their displeasure. I think the GAC would have preferred the Board had said, "We reject your advice and that's it," and they would have a procedure.

But we said, "Actually no, we accept your advice and we're in compliance with your advice," and that's the current tension. The GAC thinks, "No we are not in compliance with their advices." But yes it will not go away – this issue.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Markus. Does it satisfy you in order to continue? Anybody else? Stephanie you're back in the queue.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay. First thing on the – Stephanie Perrin for the record. On this issue of constructive engagement with the other side and, you know, when you mention the GAC I tend to drift off to the Public Safety Working Group.

Now I have offered to my country because of course I meet with them prior to ICANN meetings that I'd be happy to join their Public Safety Working Group, and they've graciously declined my offer so far but I shall keep at it.

We were told when we did our Data Protection Community – Cross-Community Working Group that, you know, that – not Cross-Community Working Group – the panel we had with the Data Commissioner saying it had to be balanced.

There had to be law enforcement. But we were following a – an abuse session about which I personally happen to know quite a bit from my previous experience.

They didn't have any data protection people there as balance. How could I get beyond that? Have you any little tips? Do I write to the Board a nice public letter complaining about this and listing why data protection people have to be on the same panel as when we talk about abuse, you know?

I volunteer for the Anti-Phishing Working Group on a – and then when I'm not busy volunteering here on trying to help promote public education on cyber crime.

Sounds like we don't know anything about this but we're kind of shunned from the room and that is a cloistered discussion in which we don't get to participate.

Similarly when they deal with the Contracted Parties about what needs to go in the contracts, well that's a contractual issue and it's sacrosanct. I was unable to crash the cross-field verification meeting between ICANN Compliance and the public safety guys and the registrars, and I don't know whether the registries are involved.

I think it's just the registrars. So that's enough examples but I could give you tons more where we're not allowed in the room, and then we have to play this chasing the train, dog chasing the fire truck game which is getting tiring.

The second question I have if I can just bundle them together is one of the problems – and I haven't participated enough in the budget exercise but it's kind of an annual ask for money.

We really need research money when we finally get some progress, so for instance on the data protection the Contracted Parties will now be getting a legal opinion and I'm sure that the – those who want the data will be getting their own legal opinions, and we need a contrasting legal opinion on data protection impact.

It's all about the questions you ask, right, so we have no money for that. I'm going to have to crowdsource that one too. Any suggestions about how we could manage to get the concept of research funds?

I don't even care if we have to put in an application to get the money, but there might be a budget that we could apply to to actually do the work that we're supposed to be doing here.

We spend gazillions on outreach but not so many gazillions bringing people up to speed to be useful and doing the research that we need to be effective.

Markus Kummer: Thank you. Again useful comments and keep up the good fight. But it is I think also a legacy issue the way the organization developed that the emphasis was given to this and not to that.

And the way we work is very much in silos and breaking down the walls between the silos I think is an ongoing process. Also the budget issue I think the past few years was a phase of growth and this is coming to an end.

So in a phase of growth it's relatively easy to add things to the budget, to this and this and this but now it's much more a phase where we actually have to do what we can do with the means at our disposal.

So asking for additional stuff in the budget is much tougher at this stage, but these are relevant questions and I think a session we had this week bringing in the Data Commissioner's – the Privacy Commissioner was a – an important start.

But it's definitely not the end of a process but I don't have any self-velocity for success to get what you want. All I can say is keep up the fight though it is important that we actually have all fights around the table and that's why, you know, the NCPH is actually a very interesting ecosystem within the ecosystem.

You really have all the opinions in this part of the House. That's – but yes no easy answers to your question but they're good questions.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Markus. I have another question from Ines.

Ines Hfaiedh: Thank you. Ines Hfaiedh, NCUC Executive Committee. I was going to ask Markus on the Board areas of interest in 2017 you have to encourage diversity, right.

I was wondering are we talking about only regional diversity because I've been to many communities and organizations. ICANN seems very, very diverse.

Are we talking about only regional diversity or also the diversity of ideas? Thank you.

Markus Kummer: I think of – as an organization we embrace diversity on all the aspects, you know, gender diversity, diversity of ideas, geographical diversity, linguistic diversity, whatever. You have it.

But embracing it as a concept is one thing and translating it into action is another thing. And yes I think – and as a shall we say average Board member, you know, elderly male from Europe I'm painfully aware that we have too many of my ilk on the Board.

And do we lack the gender diversity? We lack – because of the age diversity. We lack the linguistic diversity so – but you have follow-up question?

Ines Hfaiedh: My follow-up question is five – my follow-up question is do you have mechanisms to encourage diversity or is it just a principle that you are upholding?

Markus Kummer: Well this all the part of the workstream to discussion is a group on diversity but the mechanisms are not in place, no. I agree. But, I mean, you know, like a Joe mentioned, you know, the NomCom – yes we encourage the NomCom to improve the diversity in all the parts of the organizations where they can actually have an impact.

But we don't have mechanisms in place as such and we don't have quotas or whatever as you know.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Ines and Markus. Next in the queue Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Tapani. This is Rafik speaking. Yes for the diversity I think I asked already that question during the GNSO and the Board and tried to stress that we need to avoid any duplication of effort.

I think you just reminded that the diversity is one of the areas that it's under the Workstream 2, and there is a subgroup so it's now the community which has to work on all the aspect of diversity what we mean by diversity, what are the area we have to work on and so on.

So it's good also to remind that because I remember when I saw the presentation – another – and listened to the presentation was kind of concerned because that's back to the – not the relation between the community and the Board and the staff here, but how we avoid any like kind of parallel tracks in some area that – because if you already start the Board initiate by asking the staff or the staff itself maybe they see where they start some activities.

And in the same time the community is supposed to work on that – how we can avoid such situation because it will be kind of fait accompli, and that doesn't really help in the long run in term to improve the relation between the different groups.

So how you see that we can improve that? I also, I mean, I like maybe to highlight that we have something working with like the – about Internet governance with the Board Working Group and Internet governance and the Cross-Community Working Group and Internet governance and start to have kind of more dialog and trying to coordinate efforts so…

Markus Kummer: Yes I fully agree with you. They're valid comments. Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Again a short answer to a long question. I don't have anybody else in the queue at the moment. Any questions? I'm really so happy with the Board if we don't even want to pester him anymore. Miss Renata please.

Renata Ribeiro: Okay I'm not happy with one aspect of ICANN organization, which is the travel problems we're still having. I am a Fellowship Coach as well and we still had someone who had travel issues and such, but it was a continuous request in public forums, in budget requests, in many forms of communication to increase – to strengthen the travel constituency and the communication all over with the community regarding travel arrangements and stuff.

We are now in the horizon with two meetings, which have already been discussed. Johannesburg has already – on discussion for additional days for outreach and Abu Dhabi is of course on everyone's mind for travel arrangement – how that would work.

I wonder if the Board has any plan – any move whatsoever, the smallest ever in the future to try and improve this process. Thanks.

Markus Kummer: This is – well it was a big issue also in Reykjavik. It came up – all the travel and I noticed then there's a lot of discontent within the community. But there's not an issue that has offered reason to – Board level and it's not on their radar of the Board.

I mean, it's essentially something that is well within the competence of the organization as such, but thank you for raising this issue and putting it on their radar.

I think also sometimes it's small issues like routing people through the U.S. and it's not maybe necessary, and the U.S. is difficult these days. Some

people had problems in getting through the U.S. on the way to their final destination, so these are essentially small issues at the technical level.

That's – the organization should be able or the travel agency to solve but yes thanks for raising that.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Markus. I have Sam and then Stephanie. Sam please.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you. Sam Lanfranco for the record and it's actually a follow-up to the previous two comments with respect to travel. On the small issues like routing and visas and so forth I note that ICANN has a standard process for the technical people at the back of the room that if they have problems they lodge a – they make a request and they receive a ticket.

There's a ticketing process that's used for technical solutions. There is no ticketing process for those small, small problems. You submit a small problem and you wait and wait and wait and hope somebody will get back to you, whereas if it's a technical problem you submit it and boom you've got a – it's identified.

So that ticketing procedure at least for the small problems in travel should be in place. It's not there. It's easy to do. The second one is for the bigger ones of we need more money to do something.

Yes that's – you can't handle that with ticketing but you need some kind of procedure to handle that.

Markus Kummer: Just brief comment on that. I totally agree with you and I think everybody should be treated the same way. For this, you know, for an organization like ICANN to have different categories doesn't make sense to me at least but I think the point is well taken.

The other issue about the budget is then well you have the opportunity to comment on the budget but right now it's not that easy to add stuff. You know, if you want more from here you have to take it from there and that's about accepting priorities, which is much more painful in a phase of consolidating – a consolidated budget.

It's very easy when you have a growth phase. You just add a bit and add a bit here and there and ICANN has done that, I mean, in the past five years so it's an – tremendous expansion.

If you look at the staffing table I think the organization has what, trebled almost I think in terms of staff. But right now these days are over so we have to look at the budget careful but you have these opportunities.

Now we can't comment on the budget and you have to be aware and you want more for this budget. I assume you have to take it from somewhere.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Markus. I know that our Finance Committee Chair has already claimed that it looks like we have a – just spam in the fridge for us. It keeps for us the appearance as fleshing out so commenting on the budget may well be worthwhile, but Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you very much. Personally I would like to say that I commend Joseph for the work he does in constituency travel. I think they're underresourced for the size and complexity of the job.

I wouldn't know. I'm not his boss. I don't have metrics on it but I know that we're a difficult crowd and I think he's very patient. And my real point is I think we have to as an institution recognize the difficulty that particularly human rights people are going to be fighting in the next little mile trying to get to different countries.

It's always been a visa problem. It's a huge delay. It's an expense that sometimes isn't covered but I'm not even sure I could get across the U.S. border and I'm a former U.S. citizen.

So, you know, let's keep this in mind and let's not try and pretend it doesn't exist. I don't know how we do that but in meeting venue selection please how are we going to get into the United States the next time – most of us? Thanks.

Tapani Tarvainen: Want to comment on that Markus?

Markus Kummer: Yes the visas – I'm used to the issue in my previous function but I was very fortunate. When you work for the UN member states have an obligation to grant visas for UN meetings.

And for all the meetings hosted by Switzerland in Geneva the Swiss government attached a foreign policy priority to make sure that these meetings happen, and to actually make sure visas are issued even to so-called suspect people from suspect countries.

Stephanie Perrin: Sadly ICANN doesn't have that kind of clout I don't think.

Markus Kummer: No. And so it – now it is an issue. That is clear and the – it's – depending on the country, you know, working with the host country with foreign ministers. I don't think there were any particular issues with this venue here with - the Danes are open people, very helpful and as far as I understand there were no visa issues for people coming into Copenhagen.

I think there were a few routing issues of people having to go through the U.S. and have found it difficult then to go through. But this is definitely also something I think we have to draw the attention of the staff people, selection of the visa or fill the venues that visas issuing can be an issue.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you. I do note that in some meetings we actually had to select who we can bring from our part into a meeting based on where they can get visa. Poncelet you – could you catch a comment? I think you had a lot of problems with visas in the past.

Poncelet Ileleji: I think just based on the fact that – Poncelet speaking for the record – just based on the fact that when you stay in a very small country like The Gambia and you have to go to Senegal for everything and - in some cases you don't have the embassy and then you make a request to travel.

I understand Joseph is very busy that okay you can route it through London and you can pick up your visa at London because there's that understanding with EU states and then you don't get responses, you know.

But one thing I will like to happen in that situation is that there's a procedure. Okay they know the countries people are coming from, and if the person staying in that country's given advice ICANN travel should take the advice because they know their situation better. You know, so that's one thing I figured out from Reykjavik. Yes thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Poncelet. (Joan) you want to carry on?

(Joan): It's (Joan) for the record. I do work for another organization that has international conferences, and there were a lot of similar issues regarding visas, issues of – issuing of visas to certain countries and especially specifically from – people from Africa and the Middle East long before the present day situation.

So as a community member I suggested that the organization such as ICANN would write a letter to the embassies in different countries to anticipate the members applying for a visa so it was on their radar and it really works.

So I don't know if you guys do that or not but it really helps the people who were the attendees to get their visas in time because that was - a big problem is they – if someone had to come to the conference to present and they didn't get their visas there was always the issues. Are they going to show up?

So this made it easier so I don't know if ICANN does that or not but I've never had visa problems so just a suggestion. If you already do that it's fine.

Markus Kummer: I think – and not having followed that closely but as far as I understand this conference – the organizer staff – they're usually in touch with the host country.

And what I've seen also from my previous experience usually were to express if the foreign minister gives an instruction to the embassies, but even there you're never sure whether the information actually trickles down to the guy who has to issue the visa at the embassy concerned.

It may end up, you know, okay the ambassador may have been given the instruction but it may stay on his desk and may not have been passed on. So – but it is – and I will pick it up with (Nick) also as a suggestion just to make sure that it's done.

(Joan): Just to follow-up that was also an issue so I suggested that they gave a name of someone so that the person who would go in – they could actually go and talk to that person and so they had to actually act, not keep it on their files.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you (Joan). One issue regarding your travels - I want to bring up at this point that yesterday I got the urgent message that requiring that we name all travelers to Johannesburg by next Friday, giving us seven days to figure them out.

In this instance I think we actually can do that but still that's a very tight thing. So all the other – and I understand that knowing the names in time helps.

I'm not talking travel arrangement or visa arrangement but still it is a kind of a tight schedule to meet. And we have one minute to go. Would anybody – Renata take the last word?

Renata Ribeiro: Yes. Sorry to come back to another point but it's a similar thing - capacity building. So we have the fellowship program. We have the community onboarding.

The mentorship program within the Non-Commercial which is beginning. I just – it was a feat also for this and I highly praise and agree with Stephanie that Joseph does miracles on the travel constituency because of the 57 fellows for the first time everyone could arrive.

But I just want to know if – what are the – what is on the horizon of the Board in terms of capacity building strengthening, if it is taking us and - into account the regional and the travel hurdles that one – the regional perspectives and the travel hurdles that one may face.

As mentioned yourself Markus Reykjavik had the – had a lot of problems. It wasn't – it was a meeting. It wasn't our capacity building program but I wonder for example in Abu Dhabi if you have a fellowship or capacity building - have made out all right so if that isn't the Board concern like the capacity building programs, how to strengthen them and how to circumvent eventual issues.

Markus Kummer: Thank you. Well again this is what is noticed. There's a lot of positive feedback on all these programs and we heard that meeting the constituency. That – we heard positive comments on the various programs so we are happy to see that the community is happy with these programs.

But we have not discussed that sort of at the granular level you're raising, the questions you addressed but happy to also take it offline and follow-up with you.

As we're reaching a close let me say thank you very much for your questions and your interest. And my suggestion - if you have the (Cane) meeting can you go for a smaller room in Johannesburg? This really doesn't help the interaction to be in such a big room.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you Markus. The room was not my choice.

Markus Kummer: I know.

Tapani Tarvainen: And I'm afraid really have to close now. I should have been in another meeting two minutes ago and I suspect some others, so thank you Markus. Thank you everybody for participating here.

Markus Kummer: Thank you.

END