Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
CSG Open Meeting
Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 10:30 AST
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 transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Tony Holmes: Okay, we need to make the most of our time. So I'm going to open up very quickly. Welcome, Göran, to join us with the CSG Open Session. And it's pretty much open order here to have this discussion. There are issues that we've discussed. One I'm sure will be a great surprise is GDPR but the floor is open to make the most of the 25 or so minutes now that we have with Göran.

So maybe you'd like to say a few words and then we can get going. Thank you.

Göran Marby: Hi, any questions?

Tony Holmes: Brian?

Brian Winterfeldt: Good morning. Göran, thank you so much for joining us today. One of the questions is similar to the question I asked yesterday at the large community session, but it is obviously critically important. So I would love to hear a little bit more from you about the way ICANN is going to ensure that when the model -- interim model is rolled out -- that proper accreditation will be in place so that there will be the ability of intellectual property owners and business owners, cyber security folks, and law enforcement to do their work. And the reason why I'm asking this question again is because there is a great deal of

anxiety in our community about an interim model that is very strict about what data is public facing that we've already seen with an accreditation model not flushed out. Our understanding is that there's been the ask to the GAC to do a lot of work hopefully in drafting a code of conduct, which we're getting mixed messages about whether they feel like they're even able to do that work. And obviously, the clock is ticking.

So we're a little anxious about that and we'd love to hear what you have to say about that. Thank you.

Göran Marby: Thank you. And that was the one question that we can do then because there were several questions. So let's start the tape recorder on this one. First of all, I want to say it's the law. You should know that. I didn't invent GDPR and my job is to take two things into account, the policy set by the community, which you can find in the contracts that we have, and the other one is the actual law.

And I have to find a middle space between then. What makes this unique is that icann.org has some sort of control in this as well for some of the data, which means that I legally have to make a decision, which we don't have process for.

So what we have been trying to do, as you will know, is to find out that sweet spot and we engage the community to do that. And I think we reached the level where someone offered me already during the gala yesterday, they're going to give me a t-shirt that I'm being good at sort of spreading misery evenly because everybody seems to be unhappy about the model but for totally different reasons.

So where we are is that there are several questions that we cannot answer and the only ones who can answer them are the DPAs. And that's why we presented to you the same material we sent to them, which is the cookbook,

which is the sort of hybrid model between different interests, but also more importantly, what we believe is compliance with the law.

We also in that document raise several other questions that you have raised to us, which we don't have the answer to. Because nobody has the answer to it. And I'm going to go sort of off this trail because you've heard this before a little bit later. But that's -- and so we're engaging in communication with the DPAs. We're eternally grateful for them. Six months ago, we didn't have a good conversation with them. We actually didn't have a dialogue at all.

Now, they've spent time with us and listened to what we say and we've been very neutral in the way we present things, in the way that we try to get your opinions there and others' opinions there. I also said I think for the last nine months that it will be very good if you contacted them as well.

I think there is -- I'm starting to feel there is some people who think that this is an implementation issue. Now, we get negotiated about implementation as we do in policies. It's not. This is compliance with the law. When it comes to what happens next, if we don't have -- we may like it or not -- but if we don't have a clear guidance from the DPAs when the law is enacted, what's going to happen is we're probably going to see a fragmented WHOIS because then it's very hard for us to enforce the contract obligations we have because we don't know the law.

Yes, okay, when it comes to the GAC, now, I want you for one second, forget about WHOIS. There is no WHOIS. We are creating this for the first time and we can call it anything but there's no one existed. And the information we have received so far is that you can see from a sliding scale from what we call the model tree, where it's due process. It has to go through court of law to get access to the information. And that's not only for you, that's for police forces, that's for everybody.

And that could be -- if I was only looking into compliance with the law that could be an alternative. We don't know what the DPA thinks about this. So what we've been trying to do is to come up with a model that opens up above, due process. That's what we're trying to do and the information we received so far -- for instance, for what it's worth, if you look into the paper from Berlin, the Berlin paper, it clearly states -- it doesn't clearly but it states that if ICANN as a multi-stakeholder came out with a model for this that would be a self-accreditation and we already received the information that they don't like self-accreditation.

DPAs are a part of government. We always call it a GAC but look at this as a vehicle for governmental (unintelligible) and there are the same (unintelligible) systems. So we've been trying to move it, find -- figure out a way that is not self-accreditation because that seems that the DPAs so far, to our understanding, if they provide us more information that could be changed, don't accept.

So we are totally willing on coming up with other alternatives, and also DPAs. But so far, we haven't really seen any proposals for accreditation. I don't even know what self-accreditation means because I don't know how they're going to work in practice. So that's what we're trying to do in this new (WHO WHAT) system we're trying to do, move it away because that's how I interpret that the policy set by the community to move it away from a totally closed system.

What we've done at the GAC is -- and some people yesterday during the panel, someone is we operationalized the GAC. First of all, it is government's -- it's a vehicle for us. For the first time, maybe, you can have some use out of it. And the first thing is we asked them, all countries by the themselves should make a decision about (unintelligible) police forces. I don't think we that decision, what's a legitimate police force.

And actually as run that through the GAC. No decisions made by the GAC whatsoever when it comes to police forces. Then we have the other side. Then we ask the GAC to come up with a code of conduct for behavior of people coming into the system, for instance, and when we talked about intellectual property, we for instance said that maybe -- and I haven't spoken to WIPO about this, but I probably should. We didn't have enough time, but WIPO is the one who controls -- makes sure that organization follow the code of conduct. It shouldn't be ICANN because going back to what we understood so for from the DPA (unintelligible) see us as a self-certification model.

So that's the -- and I want to point something else that comes out of the last couple of discussions is that let's say that you are now representing an organization that now had access to the data. That means that you have to -- how many lawyers are in the room? How many people here are lawyers? Yes, I'm going out now. But there is -- I shared this with you during the panel, another effect on this one is that if you get access to this data through certain provisions that the contracted parties has to have with you, you're actually smitten by the law.

So you can't run off and do whatever you want with that information. We don't really know how this works. I don't think anyone actually knows how this works when it comes to the WHO WHAT system. But it's something that you probably have to think about as well. I think that the bottom line of this is two things. We should have engaged in this discussion four years ago. We should have had a policy -- and that's the first one -- we should have a policy for WHOIS where we as a multi-stakeholder model balanced the right to privacy with the need for information. We haven't done that.

And that's something we would have needed. The other thing we should -- because where we are right now is that we are as fast as possible trying to figure out something and we've done a great job actually having the models,

agreeing on the tiered access model that we actually have something that we can now in six months actually provide them.

I don't like to do things hastily but we've done a good job in that. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. And one thing we certainly would agree on is the need for earlier engagement. There will be no dispute around that. Could I ask you to make sure you introduce yourself when you get the floor. Vicky, please.

Vicky Sheckler: Thank you. It's Vicky Sheckler. You mentioned that you've had multiple discussions with the Article 29 working party. It would be great to hear a little more detail about what they've been telling you.

Göran Marby: We have asked them to -- so we can be more open about the discussions. Actually, all the materials we have engaged with them is what we've said. We've made the cookbook, which is the end result of that. We did spend some time educating them about the WHOIS system itself. All of the materials is on the web. We have written closed blogs. We talked about it.

Up until now, it's been very much establishing a point of contact with them, sharing them the data that we shared with you. They've seen the (Hammenfield) papers. They've seen all of that. So we don't have any other documents that we've produced that you have not seen. It's now when we actually start talking and checking the system. And they have actually provided information back to us and that was the letter they sent in -- was it October? Someone has a better brain than I have -- where they hinted, because they have to hint, some of the things that we were waiting for, especially I would say the tiered access model was one of the big things. Go back and read that letter.

Vicky Sheckler: If that letter is the one that I'm recalling, I believe it did mention that even in the Article 29's working estimation, it is possible to have some personal

information be public as long as you've done the bouncing test and it has some justification for it.

Göran Marby: Yes, and I know there's a disagreement within the community and in the hybrid model about some of those data, and that's why we ask in the DPAs some specific questions. And I think that after discussion this week, also, asking questions about what some people call bulk access to get a better understanding of that. I don't know, did you (have --) or did I misunderstand that? I asked you to go directly to JJ and talk. I didn't get it.

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve DelBianco. We were able to sort that out, thanks, and thank you for participating for 90 minutes yesterday and being so active on it. But this notion of bulk access, as this diagram shows, the only bulk access in here is what's described in the cookbook when registries and registrars move bulk chunks of records from them to the data escrow providers on the left side and from them to ICANN.

There is no bulk access going out the right side to your public or tiered. It's a single record at the time and John Jeffery talked with Tim Chen has sorted that out. You can drop to the command line and type whois netchoice.org and you'll get the Port 43 answer. It's a single record at a time that isn't bulk. There are companies that do multiple times, multiple queries, and get multiple single answers back and accumulate them in ways that are incredibly useful to law enforcement and consumer protection like reverse WHOIS lookup.

But in no cases, bulk dumps of data going from contract parties to the users of WHOIS in that setup or in the cookbook. In fact, the cookbook only mentions the world bulk one time and it's the bulk that goes to ICANN. The cookbook doesn't describe this automated single record access, what we call Port 43 in today's world. But I guess in the RDAP world it might not be called Port 43. It could be called something else and Akram just met with BC, and we asked him, and John Jeffery, and others to clarify that automated record queries, where I give a specific netchoice.org domain name and get back an

answer, that that would be maintained both in the public and behind the firewall.

And so far, we've got assurances of that as well. But Tony, if it's my turn to ask a few questions, I'd like to focus Göran on some org process questions because later on today, we're going to meet with Göran and the board, where we'll get into some principles and concerns that we have. But let's focus you, if we could, on the process. When we met in Abu Dhabi, you used a contractual compliance angle to say we're going to suspend the contractual compliance pending the development of an interim model and that was understood.

But what process are we on now? Since we're trying to figure out what happens next and who gets to play in. So for instance, there's a temporary policy provision in the registry agreement, by which the board can approve a temporary policy and extend it for some period of time while the community is continuing to work on the real policy, the RDS PDP. Give me some sense, is that the path you are going to pursue with an interim? Once you decide on an interim, will it become a temporary policy?

Göran Marby: Someone called it a temporary restraining order. There are different avenues and that's one of them. And we're talking about it. We have law discussions about it right now. It's a catch 22 there as well because how do we formulate that? We don't really know how the model is going to look like in the end.

Steve DelBianco: Not the model but just the process. If we could just stay on process because we will be able to play our role better if we understand the process.

Göran Marby: It's one of the alternatives. It's on the table for the board to discuss right now.

Steve DelBianco: What are the other alternative processes for implementation of the interim model?

Göran Marby: How does the waiver system work? Should you save the waiver system?
                 We have to -- I never like to go into anything with one alternative and
                 whatever we're going to do, it's going to be something that the board has to
                 make a decision about that process and we are discussing this and
                 alternatives.

Steve DelBianco: That's helpful to understand that. And then with respect to the enforcement
                 actions, we just had a meeting with Akram and he reminded us that you had
                 something in writing from a DPA that indicated there might be some
                 forbearance of enforcement in May if term insurance's clear that an entity is
                 undergoing active positive efforts to work out a more compliant systems. Do
                 you have any assurances from DPAs -- this picks up on Vicky's question --
                 about the degree of scrutiny that the WHOIS system will get in May?

Göran Marby: We asked them that specific question. I think that the Article 29 Group
                 should communicate and not through me. They are positive to handle that
                 dialogue so that's not a problem. They need to make that answer transparent
                 not at least for myself and the contracted parties, who otherwise don't know
                 what to do.

                 They have in many other occasions written guidelines about that they will not
                 enforce if they see it. So it's a general principle that Akram has said, which
                 they have said openly but they haven't said it about us and the WHOIS
                 system specifically.

Steve DelBianco: One more question is certification. In yesterday's session, it's the right hand
                 side, the lower right hand corner of the diagram and certification system for
                 non-government, non-law enforcement, so the bottom right hand corner.

Göran Marby: We've called it the accreditation system.

Steve DelBianco: All right, I'll go with accreditation.

Göran Marby: So we don't end up -- because I heard something today about someone called it -- there was a different between layered and tiered, which made me -- I don't get that. So we can change it. It's just we used accreditation in the wording to the DPAs.

Steve DelBianco: It's accreditation. And you said yesterday for us to hug our DPAs, hug our administrators.

Göran Marby: I was specific, hug your GAC representative.

Steve DelBianco: Hug your GAC rep. Got it. Hug the GAC and so then what is it that we do to the DPAs? No, never mind.

Göran Marby: As a former civil servant, I will not comment.

Steve DelBianco: But Göran, you did say something that a lot of us in the room were uncertain it would be effective and it was notion that we are waiting -- I think to paraphrase you -- we are hoping that the DPAs will tell us what they have in mind for accreditation. And given the one way street of communications, I think it's highly unlikely we'll get anything specific enough from the DPAs in the short-term that will guide the construction of an accreditation system. Which would say that it puts it back on us and you remember Fabricio asked a question near the very end of yesterday's morning session.

If we've got ideas on an accreditation system, how do we feed them into the process. So we realize we have a PDP on RDS that's been going on for years and probably has some time left before it gets to design and accreditation system. So are we likely to have a short-term interim accreditation system? And if so, how do we most effectively surface some proposals for that on the assumption that we want to get them to the point where ICANN would present them to the DPAs, just like you presented the interim model to get a yes or no as to whether or not it would meet their needs.

Göran Marby: The obvious aim for the actions we're doing is that we will provide (unintelligible) provide clarity to the contracted parties with a forbearance, which means that there is no legal obligations for them to do anything with the WHOIS system until a new system is in place. And a part of that system will have to accreditation. You can't have a tiered access model without some sort of accreditation, from the scale of sort of due process to something else.

So my real concern from the policy standpoint is that I think it's unlucky we have a miss-fit between the policy set by the community and what ICANN actually enforce through our contracts to the contracted parties. I think that is something we have to discuss and I think that's a longer discussion as well because this is not the only GDPR that is going to pop up.

We will provide I think in April, we started a process after South Africa where we went out for a multi-stakeholder model and asked for input of other GDPR legislation, the process around the world, or some things that could have an effect, especially in privacy. We are compiling that list. We will not make any judgment is they are good or bad what the outcome will be. We will provide that list for you I think in April for you also to take into account if there are other things that's going to happen about this kind of legislation around the world.

And it seems to be a trend in many, many countries. And I think that the policies -- this is an area where it will have an effect on our ability to set policies. And my job is to make sure that you at least know about it and then we can talk about how to engage in that process. I mentioned for instance, in Europe right now, there is something called e-privacy legislation coming up. I know Claudio probably knows a little bit about it, where there is now, for instance, a discussion. There are two different consent -- ways of looking at consent. And that can actually have an effect on some of the things we do.

There is the e-evidence legislation that is discussed could also have an effect on what we do. So the policy that is working -- I'll answer your question this way. We need to have an interim model to be able to comply with the law. That's the answer. The policy work is going to be affected not only by GDPR but also by other legislation.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Let me just try to put the question to you then. If we have ideas for an accreditation system -- okay, good, so we send it to gdpr@icann.org. And the second question would be, will that be put out -- are you likely to put that out for comment and then submit it as a second cookbook to the DPAs?

Göran Marby: This is where you don't want me to go too far in security. In security, if we don't get straight (unintelligible) answers, we will probably have a fragmented WHOIS. This is one of the catch 22s. If we can't provide -- so we will provide that information publicly to the DPAs. But it's very short of time now where it's hard for everybody to judge in and have -- and that's why we're actually saying…

Steve DelBianco: What would be a goal for a date when you'd like to have an accreditation system not obviously completed, right, but specifications for an accreditation system for the non-law enforcement? What would be a target date for when you'd like to have that baked enough that it could be sent as cookbook appendix to the DPAs?

Göran Marby: As soon as possible, and I've asked for it for a fairly long time. I also asked you to be in direct contact with the DPAs as well to the point that I actually think I provided you with contact with the DPAs for you to do.

Tony Holmes: Steve, I'm going to cut you off now because there's other people in the queue and I realize time is type. So Susan, can you keep the question brief?

Susan Kawaguchi: I'll try. So to follow on, on the accreditation, the EWG laid out many principles and gave deep thought on an accreditation program. So I was

wondering if you'd had staff look at that and see if that's feasible at all. And even though the RDS PDP is working right now, I doubt that they would be a facility -- it wouldn't be bad to ask them, but it would be -- I doubt that is going to be a feasible way of getting something quick. But looking at the EWG report, and the work done there, and I was on the EWG so I'm familiar with it, is that something that you've taken a look at? I know some of the comments from the European governments have noted the EWG report and taken some text out of it. So they've obviously been aware of it. But I think that's a great starting point and it would be really helpful if we got input on the feasibility of that process working. It still needs work but we don't have to start from ground zero on this.

Göran Marby: I actually don't know. Despite what many people think, I have a great amount of lawyers to look through things. To repeat myself, the notion -- so far, what we think we know, and I say think because that could actually change. I truly believe the Article 29 group has a fairly serious discussion among themselves where they look at many different things and they aim is to come together. I don't think that they have 100%. If they would have had 100% tight solution to what they think the WHOIS, they probably would have told us. They haven't.

But one thing we sort of realized is that they seem to think that ICANN, the way it's structured today is an interest group, and therefore what we come up with that includes what we do, would be a self-certification process. That's what we think today but we're asking them if that is right or wrong. If we can come up with processes internally that will satisfy them that will be one way of doing it.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks. Greg, can you keep it short please?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan for the record. Just quickly going back to your initial remarks, I for one don't doubt that what has been issued is compliant with GDPR. The problem from my mind is that it goes so far beyond what is required to comply

with GDPR and puts in place a whole host of additional things, which may have been hoped for by some sectors of the community, but which are not required to do so. And I think you probably know what I'm talking about, but just in case the legal person versus a natural person and the geographic scope as well as some other things. But those are the primary ones.

So I don't think anybody here is complaining that this is non-compliant, rather that it's over compliant and that secondly -- and also that it goes against policy without having an actual compliance justification to do so, understanding that in certain ways it makes things easier to do and avoids certain hard tasks or questions.

Secondly, I was very -- a little disturbed to hear you referring to the Berlin Group paper as something that should be treated as a -- maybe I give too much to your remarks -- but it's something that should be given great credibility and credence when it was dumped on the doorstep on Friday with no chance to analyze or refute it, and an organization that is so lack in transparency, you can't find its membership or any information on who drafted the thing.

Thank you.

Göran Marby: I have to leave in a couple of minutes so let me address this. I understand your frustration. I would have loved to be able to give straight answers to some of your questions. I'm not -- I can't say exactly what is right or wrong. There are people who says that we have been under this law for a long time and we always broke it. This law has never been tested when it comes to WHOIS. It's never gone through the court of law and if we're really, really going to be scary about this, it might be so that this -- if something happen and we end up in the sort of court system in Europe, it's going to take five to ten years because we're never defined that answer. Because it's going to be the European Court.

Where for European Court, for instance, has made decisions like IP addresses is probably -- I can't remember the exact word and it's my fault because I took data retention there -- is private information. So we are trying to do as much as we can. With the help of you, we produced a hybrid model that contains what we think is compliant with the law without being over compliant. I know there are different views on this. There are parts of the community and other lawyers who says that we're under compliant and others who say we're over compliant. And that's why we actually, in the cookbook, raised those questions to the DPAs to have a discussion about as well.

This is not an implementation. You're not negotiating with me. We are just trying to provide as much information as we can. Eight months ago, we didn't have anything. We didn't have use cases. We didn't have your input. We didn't have those things. We created that in the last eight months and we predicted already in South Africa that this is what we need to do. This is how we're going to do it. We had to invent the process for community interaction to it as well.

Has it been sloppy? Yes. Have we reached everything that we wanted to do? No, but now are we are and I'm eternally grateful for a lot of discussions we've had. I think we accomplished a lot. Just the fact that most now think that a tiered access model -- we have meetings with you and the other parts of this. We actually agreed over 80% of the (pizza) -- that we actually have a (pizza).

So I'm confident -- I'm really happy that we came together. I know there are things that we still have to work out but the thing is, as you know this as well, the answer lies on the corridor of the DPAs. And you have at one avenue more to reach your DPAs and that is through the government's representatives who is just around the corner here. Talk to them as well. Their obligation as civil servants is to take that information back to their governments in Europe and so they can out -- because DPAs are not strange

fish. They're a part of the government. They have their independency rules but they're part of that.

Now, it's time for the governments of Europe -- the member states of Europe has to engage in this as well to actually talk among themselves with the DPAs to provide us with a clear answer to take away the uncertainty that nobody wants about the WHOIS system.

We can talk endlessly about if this cell should be open or not open. It's the hands of the DPAs. Thank you. I love coming here by the way. Always so nice to me.

Tony Holmes: And you're always welcome. And we appreciate you time very much. Apologies to those who were in the queue that didn't have a question. We do have to change now.

Göran Marby: Let's do it like this. If you have questions, mail them to me and you will get answers. Is that okay?

Tony Holmes: One minute?

Brian Winterfeldt: Can we do one last question?

Göran Marby: I'm already five minutes late.

Tony Holmes: Very quick.

Fabricio Vayra: I appreciate you being late. So Steve brought up, and I'll be direct, yesterday, I stood up and I asked you a very poignant question, which was if we have an accreditation model and we deliver it to you, what can be the process starting today, which was yesterday, of how to get that moving forward. Your response was in essence hug your GAC member. Now, while I appreciate that response in the context of the famed HBO show, Entourage,

let's hug it out, I didn't appreciate it yesterday. And the reason being as you know, an incredibly serious matter.

So instead of asking questions, I'd like to put forward a proposal and since you like to give straight answers, I would love one right now, which is this. In 2009, a group of 12 people got together and were able to, in three weeks -- three, not six months, not three months, not three days, three weeks -- put together the URS, the TMCH, the RRDRP, the PDPD, right, put all that together and put it out to the community.

Are you willing to take a model today, because we have one drafted that I can hand you after this meeting or whenever you'd like today, and commit to put 12 people in a room of a cross-community and come up with an accreditation model that we can bake into the calzone, or the pizza, or the oven, or whatever we want to call it so that we can have something so that we don't go dark on May 25th. Because when I bring up the parade of horribles, I'm not doing it as a threat. I'm doing it as a validated morning, as someone who's been on both sides of the brand holder issue and at a law firm. And I know that when we go dark, all the people who are pulling data today and are getting money, they're going to redirect that money to the parade of horribles. Are you willing to commit to that?

Göran Marby: So I'm going to be direct as well. You asked me the question and I answered, I don't know if your accreditation model would lead to less uncertainty because it's in the hand of the DPAs. But that's the answer to your question. You can do the best accreditation model in the world but we don't know…

Fabricio Vayra: The question to be clear is are you willing to commit to a process so that we don't end up on May 2th with going dark? It's not a question of whether it's right or wrong, the result. It's are you willing to implement a process to get somewhere. And I don't want to mislead the audience or you. Can we commit today? That's what we're here for. I don't want to talk in circles

anymore. Can we commit today to a process that puts a model to the community that deals with one of the most important aspects of this whole thing?

There is absolutely no argument at all.

Göran Marby: I'm going to answer your question. What does a community process about an accreditation model have to do if we go dark or not? Explain that to me because I don't get it.

Fabricio Vayra: Because if we put together a process that pumps out a model, we're not going to be talking on the 25th about a model. We're going to have a model as to whether we can go to a DPA, put it into the cookbook, whatever it is. Right now, we're just going to continue talking. Have you called the GAC and asked them about hugging them? because I'll tell you what, I have. I did before asking you that question and you know what their response is to me, not going to work. We don't want to have anything to do with it. That's paraphrasing.

So I can hug them all day long but we're going to get to May 25th with nothing and we can't do that.

Göran Marby: So they are going to ask you a question. How do you know that that accreditation model you come up with will be accepted by the DPAs?

Fabricio Vayra: Having an accreditation model to put before the DPAs is a lot better than having nothing to put together, which is why I'm asking the question, not what the model looks like, will you commit to a process, a community driven process, that fast tracks putting out a model that has input from everybody as we continue to talk about it? Because if we kick the can down the road, the parade of horribles is going to land on your doorstep, yours.

Göran Marby: What prevents you to start talking to people about that model now? You don't need my permission to go and start talking to people about a process. You don't need that. You can start talking to anyone you want and I've been asking for it for a long time.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I'm going to cut this off now. I think we've taken that as far as we can for here and very much appreciate your time and also the response. Thank you very much. We're going to change focus now and I believe Becky is with us. Is that correct? So we're now going to come back and talk about finance. Welcome, Becky.   Thank you.

Okay. So to try and get back on track, if I can hand straight over to you that would be great, thank you.

Becky Nash: Thank you, Tony. Hello, everyone. This is Becky Nash from ICANN Org's finance department. We have a presentation to review the FY '19 planning process and so I'll just ask if that presentation is available.

Tony Holmes: It appears that that is not loaded. Is that essential to take us through?

Becky Nash: Yes.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thanks.

Becky Nash: Thank you, everyone. I apologize for the materials not being sent over. From the finance standpoint, we wanted to provide an overview of the FY 2019 planning process and highlight the planning timeline that's underway at this time. So previously in many of our presentations, where we've provided timeline and/or after the publication of the draft operating plan and budget, we provided highlights of the next steps.

So just to brief the group on the current status. The draft operating plan and budget for FY '19 was posted for public comment on the 19th of January and

the public comment period ended on the 8th of March. We are highlighting that here at ICANN 61, we do have two sessions, one this afternoon and one tomorrow to review public comments that have been submitted. These meetings here at ICANN 61 are replacing calls that we had done in the past as it relates to asking for clarifying comments on what comments have been submitted.

If we could go to the timeline slide, the next slide please. If you could go to the next slide for the FY '19. Sorry. I can take you to Slide 10. There we go. Okay, so on this slide, just the key highlights are the public comment period ended on the 8th of March. The next key due date is that the public -- the report on public comments will be published on the 12th of April and following that report then we move into the finalization of the operating plan and budget. And similar to last year, we will be publishing the document that gets sent to the ICANN board, which is expected to be sent on or around the 15th of May, an we're anticipating board adoption to be scheduled on or around the 31st of May.

The reason why this timeline has been set up is that we…

Man:				…for the session.

Becky Nash:		Accelerated all of the steps in order to target sending to the board of ICANN the proposed operating plan and budget 45 days before the beginning of the next fiscal year. And that timeframe is earlier than what we've done in the past. Of course most of us would like to have a budget tendered and adopted well in advance, many months in advance.

But for this first year we targeted sending it to the board on the 15th of May. And that's also to ensure that we have enough time allotted for the empowered community process timeline. So that timeline is approximately 28 days. And based on this schedule that would permit us to have an operating

plan and budget ready for effective date on July 1 the first day of the fiscal year.

Next slide please. On this next slide quickly I just would like to highlight that for FY '19 we did produce a planning document that have a different structure than what we've done in the past. We really look forward to feedback from the community on whether this new process provides more visibility into the operating plan and budget. So just to highlight the documents basically are six different documents. The first one similar to last year we had received comments to provide an introduction and highlight for an executive summary. That document number one also provides comments and letters from the chairman of the board from Goran and also from our CFO, Xavier.

The next two documents are the budget. It's just document number two where we provided it as a stand-alone document for FY '19 as compared to prior years. And then document number three and four are considered new. And again we would love to hear feedback from the community as to whether these met the expectations of providing more information in an easier format to digest. In document three was highlighting the key projects and activities. And document four which previously had been attached to the budget where the operating plan and budget were one long document we provided Section 1 which is a summary of six modules of work planned for FY '19.

The next two documents are similar to prior years with number six as a detailed Excel spreadsheet as well by portfolio and by project. Next slide please. This slide provides a summary of the FY '19 budget. On the slide we've provided the FY '17 actuals. So those would be the 12-month of actuals through 6-30 2017. We do provide the FY '18 adopted budget. And then the last two columns are the columns that are reviewed in detail in the operating plan and budget where we have the FY '18 forecast and the draft FY '19 budget.

So just a couple of highlights here is that earlier in FY '18 we provided a forecasted view which is the FY '18 forecast. As you can see the funding expectations for FY '18 are lower than what we originally anticipated in the FY '18 adopted budget. And as a result we then also are re-forecasting our expenses to be lower in order to achieve a balanced budget.

The draft FY '19 budget as you can see compared to the FY '18 forecast is increasing slightly in the funding expectations $138 million as compared to the current forecast of $135 million for funding. And as a result the cash expenses are increasing moderately as well to $138 million to arrive at a balanced budget projected for FY '19. And as a nonprofit ICANN does project to be at a balanced budget where our expenses are not to exceed our funding estimates.

Next slide please. This next slide provides some budget highlights commentary. I just covered the first point about having a balanced budget for ICANN operations. The second point we'd just like to highlight is that the funding increases at a slower rate for FY '19 as compared to our original estimates in FY '18 adopted budget. And the slower growth in funding is basically due to the fact that the domain name subscriptions are growing at a slower rate and primarily due to the fact that the new gTLDs are now delegated into the root.

For ICANN operations again we are reflecting stable expenses year on year where we have personnel expense increases for the impact of personnel that had been hired within FY '18. So should they have been joined ratably during FY '18 we have the full year impact of that personnel cost in FY '19 plus any merit increase or increase in fringe benefits as it relates to social or health insurance type costs. So just to highlight personnel increases are offset by other cost reductions and our total budget is stable year on year excluding amounts forecasted for contingency. Final point here the headcount trends, headcount in FY '19 is growing at a slower rate and the end of period

projected headcount for FY '19 is 420 employees. We're only slightly 1% higher than the expected ending headcount for the FY '18 forecast.

Tony Holmes: Becky did you want to take questions as we're going through all or wait?

Becky Nash: Sure. I'd be happy to take questions. I'll pause here.

Tony Holmes: Okay thanks. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much Tony and thank you Becky. I appreciate what you're doing here with the highlights. I personally found the Webinars that you and Xavier conducted some time ago as we were preparing our comments very, very helpful. And this information really just summarizes what was presented there.

I think it would be particularly useful for this community -- I put up my hand some time ago -- I don't mean to interrupt you -- but I think we're fully across this information. The communities that you're talking to today we've also submitted comments to the budget. So we're well aware of the information that you presented. And to best maximize your time and ours the challenge that we have is that the sessions on the budget that are happening here at ICANN 61 we're conflicted with.

Tuesday is Constituency Day as you can see here. We can't attend the session this afternoon. We have submitted our comments to the budget and I think this - the best use of this time would be for us to raise specific concerns in relation to those comments because frankly we're not going to have an opportunity to do that this week. I for one would like to know both in my role here in the CSG and broader role in the GNSO how are we, you know, how are you going to handle the 41 rather conflicting comments that have come in on the budget what - you know, we have a limited - the pie, the size of the pie can't change. How do we reallocate the pie and what can we look forward to

by way of next steps, not just timeline but substance? What can we look forward to?

I defer to my colleagues. If they find this useful then by all means. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. And one other point to make if the additional information that has been provided as part of this cycle has been typically helpful I think it would be useful to have feedback on that as well Becky?

Becky Nash: Thank you for your comment Heather. I'm open to hearing from members here that would like to provide clarity on comments that have been submitted. I do realize that scheduling here at ICANN 61 has been difficult. And similar to the community we obviously receive the comments on the 8th of March and we have gone through a process of reviewing them, categorizing them and we really look forward to hearing from community groups and members that would like to provide information on their comments.

Tony Holmes: Okay Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you Marilyn Cade. I'd like to support Heather's comment. I – the BC has a budget Working Group. Our Vice Chair, Jimson Olufuye has led our analysis. We've as I said at the microphone in my individual capacity yesterday, "Oh I read all of it." And it is - thank you so much for all of the improvements in the documentation.

I want to clarify the comment that I made about the high level summary. It is not that the high level summaries you provided were not really, really useful but we had specifically asked for a single document which showed the what in what out. So that would be one comment. And then I do have a couple of questions but perhaps I should defer since Heather spoke first if she wanted to start with questions and then I'll add.

Tony Holmes: Okay. I think go ahead Marilyn, just raise them now.

Marilyn Cade: Well I did a preview - Marilyn speaking. I did a preview of my individual view at the public forum yesterday because I felt it was really important to put on the table in front of the entire community and in front of ICANN org my individual perspective as a business owner and a past business executive. I really don't understand the philosophy where the organization is not you are right we are not a commercial enterprise but I'm also extremely familiar with not-for-profit practices.

And I don't understand continuing to give pay raises of any size. I do not understand continuing to hire staff in any numbers. I don't understand – I understand Goran's response that those aren't bonuses, they're incentives. But hey in the businesses I came from -- and they were both startup businesses -- in the computer industry and in the Internet that stuff was totally frozen.

I also don't understand some of the other – I don't understand adding another HR person. So I have a lot of detailed questions but I will be there this afternoon because we're going to split up. But to Heather's point the sessions are really overlapping and it's very hard for most of our members to be able to attend.

Tony Holmes: Okay Becky? I mean we all have the same problem there right that the whole three constituencies we've really struggled with this? And I think that's something we do need to look at going forward but Becky?

Becky Nash: Thank you Marilyn. Thank you Tony for your comments. And again we do acknowledge the scheduling conflicts and we also tried to put two sessions very similar. They don't have different agendas just in order to permit hopefully attendance if not one day then the next day. So we definitely look forward to those that can participate.

And just in general the comments that Marilyn has previewed to us that's exactly what we want to hear is specifically if it's not something that was submitted in such detail we do want to hear rationale behind it. And we would be happy to go over different documents and better understand what the questions are so that we can be better prepared to respond. And again as the documents as they were published and also as we've heard through all of the public forum and opening ceremonies we do realize that this is a time for cost containment, prioritization with input across all community groups. And we look forward to engaging on that.

Tony Holmes: Okay Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I have a very quick follow-up. You'll recall that at the mic yesterday I asked for a specific document and ask that it be delivered because there have been I will refer to them as informal comments. I was going to use the word casual but perhaps that's a bit too sharp. There were informal comments that the board is going to voluntarily cut this or that ICANN org is going to voluntarily cut that that isn't reflected in the documents we have.

Do you understand the question that I made the point I'm making? So Goran said for instance I have told the board I will defer I don't know what it was it's - a bonus or a pay raise or something of that nature.

Becky Nash: I'll have to check into specifically what you were asking about. I mean I do believe that we put as much detail as we can at the macro level in the document but perhaps this is another…

Marilyn Cade: No, no this – these were ad hoc comments that they were making in response to questions from the community. So they wouldn't – that was my point Becky, it wouldn't have been reflected. You couldn't have reflected it in your documents.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay one quick additional question on this. Jimson?

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you very much this is Jimson Olufuye, Vice Chair Finance and
                   Operation BC. I like to echo previous speaker's position to the team for very
                   comprehensive documentation, really. In fact it's so comprehensive that a
                   novice would be scared to say, "Wow so many document. Oh I can't read it."
                   A newcomer will not - will find it difficult to grasp it.

                   So this what I have in mind. Perhaps we could label some executive
                   summary, just a summation. We (unintelligible) execute summary, okay? And
                   then in that section maybe one document. In the section you have, you know,
                   the full details, you have the Excel section sorry, you know, section by
                   section. But just one document with the high level at the (addition) executive
                   summary and with the proper documentation in terms of numbering can
                   easily say okay let me go here.

                   So that will attract a new person to say, "Oh the document, just one
                   document. Let me see. Oh executive summary let me just see that," and
                   grasp it immediately and with more interest to know about where costs are
                   and then going to the document and see more. That's kind of scenario I'm
                   thinking of.

                   Then secondly in the Council Standing Committee we – I place a question or
                   request for a clarification which I didn't get about what the sustainability or
                   what is it? What is the fact there's no fund for sustainability audit. So
                   sustainability is very important. We care about ICANN sustainability. And we
                   know auditing is very important. So what's actually is that? What do you
                   mean by that?

Becky Nash: Thank you for your comments. First of all we really do appreciate the feedback as it relates to making the documents more readable. On that point we did provide the highlight document which followed the three letters that were published as well. But I think the recommendation to have links or references to sections of the remaining documents that's very helpful.

But again one of our main objectives is to make the documents more readable and to have more engagement across the community on the operating plan and budget. So we will definitely take that into consideration. And then on your second point I believe you indicated that you had submitted a clarifying question and that we did not address it. Is that correct?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes on the standing committee's list. I think maybe (Lavay) was on that list so we actually asked him that question about clarification of what sustainability audit is.

Becky Nash: Okay I think I understand that it might not have been a clarifying question sent into ICANN org's Planning Email box. So I do apologize. I don't think that we addressed it because we weren't aware of it. So that's just something that we hope to highlight that we do have an email address that is the, you know, staff ICANN org email address planning@icann.org for anything related to the operating plan and budget or finance in general. So I would have to go review that question and I will certainly confer with our colleagues and identify if we missed a clarifying question and expand on it for you.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. I will actually resend it so to that particular email.

Tony Holmes: Okay so thank you Becky. But before we close just to say that I think whilst we would support what Jimson said that the executive summary would be useful please don't in any way take that as a criticism because we've been on the other side of that and asked for more and more information in the past. And I think Xavier and the whole of your team has done a great job in

providing that. So whilst that would be useful the rest of the effort you put in is really appreciated.

Becky Nash: Thank you very much.

Tony Holmes: Thank you very much. Thank you. And now I think - Theresa, thank you. So now we're going to change focus again and start looking at some of the strategic initiatives. Theresa?

Theresa Swinehart: Thank you so much. So I'll keep this quite brief. It's actually a lead-in to help you with your planning for Panama should that be desirable. If we could put the slides up and let me give a little context. I know that there has been some discussion that Cherine and others have also been raising in their opening remarks about starting to kick off a process in relation to the next strategic planning cycle and how to look at and approach to that that engages the community and looks at also long-term trends that the community has identifying to help really build that into the next strategic planning process. Now this is something that Goran had kicked off also within ICANN organization in the different departments and that also brought it to the board and that we felt it was really important to bring it out into the community.

We had sent out a note to the SO and ACs prior to coming into Puerto Rico but really appreciating that the schedules were tight and planning didn't allow for it. And so we want to make sure to do quick briefings here. And we are running a session with the GAC, a full session later today but otherwise just doing briefings here to help with your planning for the stakeholder groups that wish to do it.

So if we can have the next slide please. So one of the aspects in relation to this is really looking at what are developments and issues that are rising that as a community you see coming up that relate to ICANN organization that relate to the environment the ecosystem within we're operating obviously and some of the day to day responsibilities?

And it's not only in the negative in the sense of what are some areas potentially to mitigate towards from a strategic planning level but also what are some opportunities? Are there new stakeholders that you see are coming involved? Are there new businesses that are evolving, various other things of that sort? So it's really taking a look at those. Next slide. Thank you.

The scope sort of what a trend is itself is really around specifics to ICANN operations so that's sort of one bucket that we've noticed has been appearing. Community related areas, so the broader side of ICANN as an organization and the community within we operate but also importantly the geopolitical and economic environment at a broader level.

Let me give an example the development of national legislations or regional legislation such as the GDPR. Are there other legislative initiatives that are underway in the geopolitical environment that could have a touch point on the organization and is that something that we should be building into the longer-term strategic planning process around that? So those are just examples of the buckets that we've sort of seen emerge.

Next slide. The work that Goran had started within ICANN organization and the board had identified sort of 12 areas. And these are not in any way final. These are not in any way, you know, embedded in anything. They're more themes that have come up. And we thought in order to run the strategic outlook or the trend sessions with the community this might provide a nice basis to share to work with and to really have a conversation on our those – are these actually trends that everybody thinks are occurring, are there gaps, are there ways to formulate them in different ways, are they completely wrong? But we felt it was a good way to have the conversation around trends related areas more generally.

Next slide. Now this is not an isolated exercise. I'm sorry.

Tony Holmes: Okay?

Man: The questions (unintelligible).

Theresa Swinehart: Well let me run through it quickly and then I'll do that. So this is not an isolated exercise. Within the organization we run it sort of on an annual basis or are trying to. And the intention of this is as we go into the planning and use the outcome of the community discussions into the strategic planning cycle that the strategic planning cycle then has an opportunity to be tested on an annual basis with running this exercise with the community on an annual basis.

So working closely with Xavier and the operations team taking the trends related discussion, looking at the output of that working with the community and then as we go into finalizing the next strategic plan also building into that the opportunity to continuously look at that strategic plan to see whether from the dialogue with the community and trends related discussions with the community and the organization there is a need to update any of this.

Now you'll have heard Cherine discuss the importance on mapping a strategic plan as we go into the next cycle and making sure that that is also housed with the budget that is able to support that from an operational side. So this is all very much interconnected in how we're trying to map out the next cycles that we go into.

Next slide. So what's next? As I mentioned we're running a 90-minute session. It's usually a 90-minute session to go through the conversations with this. What we have done is we break the group into sort of groups of ten or 15 people to go and sort of have conversations with themselves and report back and say, "Okay we think there's a gap here but there is – this is one or this is how something might be framed," and then discuss it as a group itself on whether some of the priorities coming out of the discussions. Now there's no attribution to specific groups on any of this. It's more just to capture sort of

what some of the themes are overall and then to bring that together into how it might be framed against the current strategic plan and then where some modifications might be going in order to put a draft out for dialogue.

Appreciating again that we did not have opportunities here for all the stakeholder groups to carve out the 90 minutes or 70 minutes for the sessions we're also going to be working with your teams and your leadership teams to see whether any of the stakeholder groups want to be running sessions also in Panama. You can do it either as an individual stakeholder group or as a bigger group. So I don't know, you all might want to do it together or you might just want to do it with a Business Constituency separate from the ISP Constituency depending on what you want to do. And then we're happy to schedule that and then take that input and that'll start to cadence into a next strategic planning cycle.

So I'm happy to take any questions around that. Thank you for the opportunity just to give you the quick briefing. We do want to make sure that as many can be engaged in this is possible and as you heard Cherine speak about this also in his opening remarks this is an important aspect for the board with regards to the community participation in this.

Tony Holmes: Okay. So before I open up the floor just a comment on that, certainly the thing we always struggle with is the schedule.

Theresa Swinehart: I know.

Tony Holmes: And on that basis it probably would be something we want to consider at the CSG level. But in saying that I don't think it's something we just want to add on for a quite half an hour. This is really important. So if we can bear that in mind and maybe have a full session…

Theresa Swinehart: Yes.

Tony Holmes: …with the team the at next ICANN meeting that would be very helpful.

Theresa Swinehart: Tony you've highlighted a great point. We had gotten some requests, you know, only run it for half an hour, only run it for whatever. Really to do this well and also to have everybody have the same opportunity to be thinking about things we would really encourage a 90 minute -- sometimes you can squeeze it to 70 minutes -- but really encourage and we're happy to adjust the schedules our schedules to exactly what works for you.

Tony Holmes: Okay that's great because the only way we could do that is if we combine it and do it together. Otherwise it's just impossible. Steve and then Marilyn I see and Mark please.

Steve DelBianco: Hey Theresa, Steve DelBianco. We have you on the BC agenda for today and...

Theresa Swinehart: You're kidding me?

Steve DelBianco: Right, so we can skip the presentation and go right into the work session with us, the whiteboarding if you wish.

Theresa Swinehart: We'll need 90 minutes of your time for that. Sorry.

Steve DelBianco: We'll do our best. We'll do our best. I had another question for you that were you here for our discussion with Goran about a half an hour ago?

Theresa Swinehart: I was.

Steve DelBianco: Excellent. So you can see that we haven't yet learned the right way to ask relatively simple questions and get simple answers. I's just a cultural personality. We'll figure it out over time. But when we asked Goran questions inevitably we step on and hit a button or something and it – we get a different answer. So Fabricio's question was could the org, namely your group MMSI

stand up a expedited cross community process supported by your organization to in the space of two weeks look at an accreditation model?

And when we asked the question it occurred to me that Goran wasn't here. When you've done this before on the CCWG for the IANA transition remember how quickly you stood that up both the IANA piece and the accountability piece? And Fab was talking about years ago on work on the Applicant Guidebook when you were able to mobilize quickly staff support with the cross community discussions in Adobe, hosted sessions dial in notetaking and document management so that in the space of a couple weeks we could develop an accreditation system. So the question for you would be do you think you can help and then can you help explain that to Goran so that he has a better understanding of what we're asking for? It's not that hard.

Theresa Swinehart: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Okay so CSG.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: I'm going to move on quickly on that will come back - Marilyn?

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: No, no Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I would like to - Marilyn Cade. I would like to complement Steve on the unique way in which he asked Theresa if she has special translation skills. My…

Man: I will tell you (unintelligible).

Marilyn Cade: Steve first of all I think as you answer there's no reason the community itself can't convene. I would also suggest if there's input into this on accreditation ideas -- and I think we flagged this -- please provide that into that process. So I will just leave it at that for now let's move on on this. I've…

Tony Holmes: Okay let's focus back. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Okay thanks. The - Marilyn Cade. Of course the particular approach that is taken will be in the hands of the executive committee across the three constituencies. But I just want to offer a comment because of my experience in trying to do anything during the four day policy meeting that is not specifically about policy and offer a quick suggestion. It's impossible to get – there's a lot of overlap. You've already heard that from us about certain meetings. I think it's impossible to find a 90-minute slot unless both you and we are willing to go out of hours. And so I'll just reference for some who may not be aware of this is that in the past very often the Budget Working Group did meet from 6:00 until 9:00 pm or from 6:30 until 9:30 but I want to mention that it always came with the sweetener of food and wine. So…

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: ...two ideas. If we're going to try to do 90 minutes I think we have to do it where s- o we can have everybody. And that may mean out of hours which I just want to point out.

Tony Holmes: And just with that we always have to take account of where the meeting's hosted and the availability of us to do that. Sometimes it's not easy to...

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...do that.

Theresa Swinehart: And just so you know we're actually going out of hours - well if you want to say out of hours today the GAC is running from - Nathalie what is it 6:30…

Nathalie Vergnolle: Six-thirty.

Theresa Swinehart: …to 8:00. So from the team side we're more than happy to adjust to any timeframe that works with all of you.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Mark?

Mark McFadden: Thanks, Mark McFadden. So to start my comments and in total support of the strategic planning effort. But here's a concrete request is that as a member of the community for quite a while one of the things that I'm starting to see is that we have very specific reviews of parts of the organizations that do some of the same thing. And it's very, very good to have an overarching strategic vision for the organization. But there needs to be cross information between for instance ATRT2, ATRT3 and also the specific reviews.

And there needs to be some connection there. And your second to the last slide started to talk about those connections. But they for me one of the things that will be a success or a metric for success here is how well these strategic objectives get percolated back into - that's not a verb is it, percolate? It could be now get engaged back into the specific reviews and the trends that we see out of the specific reviews for instance in the area of security in place and things like that get percolated up into the strategic direction for the organization.

It' that connection between the strategic direction of the organization and the reviews of the individual parts which we struggle so much with. I mean that's a huge struggle right now for us as an organization. But it's that connection that seems extremely important to me. In fact I would say that one of the metrics of success here will be how well the strategic direction effects those individual reviews and results in concrete changes to the organization.

Theresa Swinehart: I think that's a really, really good point. And in figuring out how to tie these things together and make sure that lands there. So that's the kind of input that's going to be really helpful not only in the conversation around the trends but that also how do we make sure all the interdependencies are captured in the right way and are informing each other in a way so it'll be good. Thank you Mark.

Tony Holmes: Okay any other questions?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes...

Tony Holmes: One?

Jimson Olufuye: ...just quickly yes Theresa thank you. So can you retrace again how the community can be part of this telematics group?

Theresa Swinehart: So it's from an operational standpoint we would ask however the community would like to divide the stakeholder discussion around that to have a 90 minute slot. We would show – provide you obviously with the 12 that I showed up there but nothing's embedded. Those enough final in any way. They're just to help with the thinking around things.

We would ask the group to break out into probably a group of about five to seven. So it's usually two or three groups. You literally go to a whiteboard, you sort of talk about them, see if there's any gaps, discuss which ones you think are the priorities. You come back to the group and each of them shares that with the group and there's a discussion around it.

And then we just capture that. There's no attribution and I'll let Heather speak quickly on this. There's no attribution to, you know, this came from Jimson and this one came from Steve. It's more just as a group. We provide it back to you just to make sure that it was captured correctly and then bring that into

the information that we kept from the other stakeholder groups. So that's from an operational standpoint. I don't know if that answers your question completely. And I'll let maybe Heather talk to this.

Tony Holmes: All right and Heather?

Heather Forrest: Yes thanks Tony, thanks Theresa, Heather Forrest. So to put a fine point on what's been said -- and Theresa forgive me -- I'm not sure if you have mentioned it -- that the SO, AC chairs did this on Friday. So the seven of us came together and worked on this exercise. And I found it to be extremely interesting. I'm allowed to say I think that I was - I wasn't entirely sure what it was in the beginning and I came to a view in the end that it was time very well spent.

It was quite interesting to see what trends had been identified by staff and the board. And I do encourage the community, you know, for that to be a wholesome exercise let's say of a fulsome exercise and the community needs to participate. And I would encourage each of the groups within the CSG to do that.

And I've made myself available to the team as a sort of point of contact. If anyone's having difficulty in scheduling this I'm happy to run blocker on that. I would suggest that I wonder I guess we're bumping up against some challenges with ICANN 62 which is meant to be a policy forum. And we really should be sitting down spending our time on policy. So the timing isn't optimal so maybe we can do some creative thinking on how to work on that but I do encourage you to seize the opportunity. Thanks.

Tony Holmes: On the last point I think more and more we're bumping up to problems around the focus on policy here so isn't quite as smooth I think as it was planned and we need to sort of recognize that.

Theresa Swinehart: Yes.

Tony Holmes: Theresa anything to add?

Theresa Swinehart: No that's it.

Tony Holmes: Okay then we certainly look forward to working with you...

Theresa Swinehart: Thank you.

Tony Holmes: …....ICANN 62. Thank you very much.

Theresa Swinehart: Thanks so much for your time. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay. So were a few minutes in front but the next session we have with the CSG is the CSG meeting with the board. And I'll close this session, look forward to seeing everybody there. Thank you.

END