ICANN

Transcription ICANN Hyderabad

GNSO Joint Meeting: Registrar & Registry Stakeholder Groups

Sunday, 06 November 2016 at 09:00 IST

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or

inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to

understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an

authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Paul Diaz: We have our agenda up on the screen. We'll be breaking in about an hour
                    and a half to head over for our session with the board. With the time we have
                    available for start on the first priority is to make sure that we're comfortable
                    and thought through the issues that we're going to raise with the board.

                    We've previously circulated on our list some key themes key concerns. We
                    share that with the board. They came back with their own sort of high level
                    things they wanted us to consider. Fortunately they all tie together fairly
                    nicely.

                    In the interim a couple of our colleagues have been working on sort of a
                    framework which introduced all this and Stephanie I'm going to be calling on
                    you because as Stephanie has taken the pen and put together a strawman it

is a very well-reasoned well researched and argued statement on a number of concerns we have about the way relations interactions with staff have gone for the last couple of years months. And it's probably too much to get into tremendous detail now in certainly not with the board. It does lend itself very well though to a letter that intends to tell the board today that we will be sending shortly after the ICANN meeting. But in the interim Stephanie or Jordyn just want to kind of give people a sense of how to position it, how you've been thinking about it?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Jordyn stepped out so I'll take this. So one of the issues that I feel like we've been seeing persistently across a lot of different work streams is that I get the strong feeling that staff seems to have its own stake in the process. I feel like the last mile battle time and time again for the last or like for six months to a year regardless of the issue is that like we're fighting whether it's the community process or an intra-registry process. We're not fighting within the community the last battle with ICANN staff.

And I'm really curious as to why it is. We're seeing a lot of messaging now from (Yurin) that staff is a facilitator, staff is just one voice amongst many. And consistently I think that doesn't match with the actual experience. And in this like analysis that I pulled together we mapped a lot of different issues that seem to fit within this sort of inconsistent pattern where what staff is doing is not the same as the facilitator or coordinator role that they portray.

One of these so for the registry side, one of these that we've been seeing is this issue with the - oh my regular alarm for the weekend - is this consistent issue with a thick Whois policy and the consistent labeling and display profile or the consistent labeling and disclaimer requirements.

And on top of that we've seen staff push really aggressively to have this operational profile and we held two different comment periods. I think we've pushed back pretty aggressively against it. And staff was receptive to some of our concerns but they've been seemingly totally blind towards why

registries would want additional requirements to implement this RDAP profile. And it comes up against this staff as a facilitator role that we're hearing from (Yurin) and from the board.

Another one on the registrar's side is I think ITRPC. And I guess for a little bit of background on that issue is we're seeing a problem where there's two scenarios in which you could decide to apply this for a registrant that's using privacy and proxy services, the change of registrant processes and additional set of verifications the registrars are now going to have to go through if they want to change certain contact information even if a registrar transfer is not occurring so within the same registrar. And for a customer that uses privacy and proxy data you could choose to apply it either to the actual cuts for customer information or to the public facing information that actually just reflects the privacy and proxy service provider.

And we took the position and I think most registrars have taken the position that the sort of private data, the actual customer information is a significant change here. If you're doing this process to try and prevent against domain hijacking and the person that you want or the significant change is the change to the information that is in, that is required to be escrowed that is the customer information and not necessarily in scenarios where you're turning on or off privacy or it's just a generic change of the privacy contact email.

And the policy is silent on this but staff has taken a position that is actually the opposite. I mean in this case I think it's just because it's something that's much easier for them to enforce but where there's a lack of clarity staff has often taken it upon itself to insert new requirements, to insert its own position. We see it time and time again through the different advisories. And adjust it comes up against this role because we don't have the same ability to influence these positions that are coming directly from staff as we do from stuff that is coming out of the community or from stuff that is coming out of working groups within the registries or within the registrars.

Two other really good examples of this on the registry side are also the security framework where in the last meeting we saw some like pretty aggressive interventions by Krista Papac basically saying what the - what position the registry should take. That I think came off as a threat to most of the registries and similarly we're now saying problems given that we provided them with a pretty aggressive redline of what they had put forward for the Spec 11 3B Advisory. So I don't know I think there's like an important conversation to be had around why we're seeing this mismatch between what staff is saying it's role is, what (Yurin) is saying the staff's role is and what we're actually experiencing.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you Stephanie. The draft document It's in Google Docs. Can you make that available to the fullest now?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Paul Diaz: And again the thought is that we will tell the board that we have a letter forthcoming so everybody please take a look at this. Let's polish it. It's very substantial but it's I think a good thing very, very good points to make formally by a letter to the board. That will be from me to Crocker and, you know, gives us something specific to look forward to and we can measure against not just talk about at a ICANN meeting, nothing happens and then we wait till the next meeting. It'll be a much clearer marker. So look for that and we'll make sure it gets out to both lists. (Reg) okay. I see we have a queue going. (Ken)'s been waiting in the room and then I have Chuck and Jonathan. (Ken) go ahead. We can't hear you at the moment (Ken).

Ken Stubbs: Can you hear me now?

Paul Diaz: Go ahead, perfect.

Ken Stubbs: Fine, I apologize. It's a long way between Florida and India. I have a couple of high level concerns and I'm speaking personally myself because I'm going

to be rather frank. First of all I honestly feel we're being manipulated by staff and it bothers me. I think staff is and Paul you - (Samantha) you made the point very clearly with the (unintelligible) that you have with (Krista). Staff tends to move towards the direction that needs it easiest for them forgetting that their responsibilities if you believe (Yurin) is to facilitate the process in a way that works best for the community. That's the first concern.

Now I'm not afraid I won't do it because I'm here and you're there and we've already got an agenda but I'm not afraid to talk to the board about that. The other point I want to make very simply is I'm sure you're all aware of what we call banker mentality. How many times have you heard the saying that the banker really makes the decisions because the banker knows what's best for you? And I believe that we see too much of this in the ICANN staff and it's basically they'll live with the day to day problems that we have. They operate on the theory that they know what's best for us.

And I think if we don't put our foot down at some point in time -- I appreciate the formalities and the letters -- but if we can't be frank with the board in some venue then I'm very concerned because what ends up happening is people in our group get one on one's of members of the board but they don't realize how serious this is and how frustrating it can be. And this is I'm frank - this has gone on for year after year. The last four or five years especially since the initiation of the new gTLD process we've seen even more of it. Now maybe that's because of the concurrent growth. But, you know, I'm really bordering on begging the constituencies to get a little bit tougher with the board in - with respect to this and thanks for hearing me out.

Paul Diaz: Okay, thank you (Ken). And again when you see the draft it's very well argued and it pulls no punches so I think we're in agreement and moving in the right direction. Chuck I have you next.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Paul, Chuck Gomes from VeriSign and first let me say thanks to Stephanie and Jordyn for doing this. I think it's really important and agree

with the importance that (Ken) has put on it. But I just want to remind everybody that we have some approve recommendations. They're not consensus policy but they're approved by the GNSO Council and the board and that's the policy and implementation recommendations.

Now I forward some information on that to Stephanie so she has that but there - that - those recommendations have a lot of flexibility design into them intentionally but they also deal with IRTs, the policymaking bodies roll, the GNSO and particularly impacted stakeholders in the implementation. So I think we're going to have to start educating, re-educating staff with regard to what those recommendations say with regard to implementation.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Chuck, excellent points. I would ask please be prepared to make them again when we present in front of board because we're going to try to position this in part an educational efforts. There are new directors, (Becky)'s with us (Becky Contechos). But other directors who do need to be reminded or educational opportunity for us please raise that and we'll also factor it into the letter. Jonathan I have you next.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Paul. I really like the work that Stephanie and Jordyn and if anyone else contributes to I think it's great. And so having said that I think there's two ways of looking at what (Yurin) is saying or appears to be saying right now it's either he's deliberately or accidentally misinterpreting the way things have been being done or there is an intention to change the way things are being done.

So that's the only additional lens through which I don't think it changes anything about what we say. It just we just need to recognize that perhaps he's recognized the problem and is intending to change it or he hasn't understood that the problem is there. So either way we say what we need to say. It's just recognizing that that but with - there may be a change in process but it's very useful to scope it out as we have done in any event.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Jonathan, good point. Okay I have Christina, Stephane and Jordyn.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette. I actually have a comment on a different issue so if the other folks in the queue wanted to speak to this one I can go back towards the end.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Christina. Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Paul. Stephane Van Gelder. Just to pick up on Jonathan's point the ExCom had what I thought was a very productive meeting with some of the ICANN staff a couple of days ago and got a very clear message that there has - there is a change of approach that's in the works at the moment with the change of CO. So I think it's something that's worth bearing in mind.

And I think we ought to be, you know, everyone's working very hard including staff and I think we ought to be cautious even though we naturally want to put our opinions forward. We want to be cautious we don't single out anybody. The message we got clearly was that staff should be a facilitator and that they should not be approaching problems with their own solutions but rather taking the lead from the community or the ICANN board. So I think, you know, myself and other members of the ExCom that were there came away pretty happy with the message that we had and I want to make sure that everyone else is aware of that. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Stephane. And, you know, we touched on that at the very beginning and to Jonathan's point it remains to be seen if it's where exactly staff comes down on this. Is it lip service? Is it a genuine shift, a recognition of change fault still to be determined? Okay I have a queue in the room and a queue online. Jordyn I had you next. I also see Donna, Rubens and maybe (Ken)'s back in the queue but Jordyn please?

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks Paul. It's Jordyn Buchanan and thanks to both Jonathan and Stephane for I think some useful context around framing this issue. I think it makes a lot of sense I think to go in assuming good faith on behalf of the organization. I think at least in this first pass through this we should assume that and frame the issue that way.

And roughly and, you know, even Jonathan if you're right that he's just confused about the situation as opposed to intending to change it at this point the information is still helpful and I think just framing it as like (Yurin) we've heard you we agree that's the right role, hears examples of places where we see that has gone wrong.

But I think it's also important to not get to bogged down in the specific examples. Specific examples are great but what - they're that's the level at which we should be operating with staff and, you know, maybe senior staff. Maybe it's, you know, Akram (Major) and other folks we should be talking about when we see things really going off the rails after a while.

But at the board level I think fundamentally we need to be communicating that the engagement's just not working right now that there's, you know, I really call it a lack of common sense by the staff. You know, their - the implementation I think the IRTT in (unintelligible) on the registrar side is a more obvious example of where it's like the staff position fundamental just like disregards the intent of the policy and like they're, you know.

As (Ken) said, you know, it's maybe banker rules or it's whatever it is, lazy rules, they're taking the thing that's easy for them to measure without regard of what the intent of the policy is and imposing it on the registrars despite the fact that every other - every single registrar as far as I can tell came to a completely opposite interpretation from the staff. So that's a good example.

The RDAP profiles I think, you know, an example in the opposite direction where staff's doing a bunch of work for no apparent reason where no one

asked for this operational profile but, you know, (Francisco)'s spent like three years creating it and now they're sort of ramming it down our throats. But like, you know, why are they doing these things?

These actions just fundamentally don't make sense and don't serve the needs of the community and I think that's what we need to be communicating to the board at a high level is the staff really ought to be serving the needs of the community not sort of having, you know, their own initiative and serving the needs of the staff and especially when it gets out of sync with what the desires of the community are.

Paul Diaz: Okay one sec Graeme. I'll come to you in a moment. Well said Jordyn. As long as we keep it high level, don't get so far down in specifics that we kind of lose the board. We want them to truly capture and digest our key takeaways. Whoever's driving if you can scroll up a little. You'll see the questions from the board what do we the board and ICANN organization need to do to make the transition work for you and what do we the board and ICANN organization committee as well need to do to advance trust and confidence? All of those, everything you've said directly answers those questions, addresses the question so we're well-positioned to discuss this. Graeme I have you next.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you. This is Graeme. I am the last person who should be maybe defending staff on ITRPC because I think it's not great policy and the implementation is even worse but I think they do have places in the IRT that they are referencing for their position so we need to be a little careful about how aggressively we pitch that. I think their big questions within that IRT. I don't think it was done well. Let's just be a little cautious with the specifics on that.

Man: So Graeme I'm not disagreeing that they have language they can latch onto in order to support their position. That is almost always true but what they do is they come up with their staff position then they look for language to latch onto as opposed to look for the community's vision and what to see how to

massage that into the language that exists because that's what they should be doing right?

Like you should assume that the community wanted to do what it says it wants to do and then figure out how to interpret the language that is written down to match what is articulated as a community it's in instead of the other way around. They often figure out what the staff intent is and say oh community we figured out how to like interpret the language that you approved in a way that's we find beneficial as opposed to what you're telling us you actually want. That just makes no sense.

Graeme Bunton: Right okay. We can frame it that way. That works.

Paul Diaz: Okay. In my queue I have Donna and Rubens and Chuck. Christina we're certainly going to come back to you with your issue. Just want to be sensitive we're mindful of the time. It's 9:15. And we really haven't focused on what it is we're going to say. Stephanie presented her position or gave us an oversight but we need the high levels and we want to make sure that we're all in sync and comfortable with what we're going to say to the board. And I note that Stephane has to step away.

He's agreed to lead or introduce thoughts on the second bullet point. You can see on the agendas that we want to make sure he has a few minutes to share what he intends to say so come back to the queue but let's make sure that we don't lose track of time. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Paul, Donna Austin from Neustar. I have a terrible sense of data (boo) in that we've been through this before. That's what data (boo) means right? I remember that, you know, (Jazmin) led a group that I think (Reg) and number of others were involved in where they, you know, we kept a running tally of things and at the end of the day became a little bit too hard and finally decided that well we've checked all the boxes so we're calling and end to it.

So I think going into this we need to have some understanding of what is our expectation to come out of it and what happens if we end up with status quo.

When we had the conversation with Akram and Cyrus, Krista -- I can't remember -- earlier in the week one of the things that Akram said to us is, you know, "Come to us with solutions." And we countered that and said, "Well we have, you know, we put solutions in front of you and you don't consider them." And I can tell you from experience with two characters we've done that so many times now.

But I just wonder one of the other things that Akram suggested is that, you know, if you need funding for certain things then, you know, let us know. And I wonder if we get it - because in my mind a lot of this is about communication. And it's a very adversarial environment that we're in. And we get to a point where there is equal frustration and nobody's too keen to move one way or the other because, you know, generally these things have been going on for so long that I think it's the emotion and sometimes not the substance that's causing a lot of the problem.

I wonder if there is any value that we try to engage a mediator when we get to the point that we're not going to get any further because we can't, you know, we're just too clouded by what's gone before. And I think if we can, you know, perhaps use an independent third-party to try to get to the, you know, the guts of what the problem is and see if we can find a solution that works for all parties maybe we could resolve some of these things earlier.

I do have a real concern that the IRT's becoming problematic. And the privacy proxy one I think if it's not started it will start soon. There are 43 members on that IRT and it's headed for controversy already because we know that there's the real possibility that some will try to change the policy recommendations. So I really wonder if we're getting down the road and we know that we're getting to a point where we're not going to reach resolution

can we say to ICANN we really think that mediation's going to help us with this?

So I just, you know, we've been here before. We didn't get a great deal of satisfaction from the result. (Yurin) might be hopefully, you know, will have a different approach than Fadi but I wonder if, you know, in thinking about this what are the solutions that we can potentially put forward that we think might overcome some of these issues because I think at the end of the day it's communication. It's the adversarial environment that we work in and we don't trust them and they don't trust us either. But perhaps a mediator might enable us to get past some of these things a little bit earlier than we generally do. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Donna, very well said. And please make those points later on. The board should hear it as well. And Christina is your question dovetail off this? Do you want to hop back in? Okay let me put you back in.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry just picking up on what Donna was saying. I think we have to be extraordinarily careful about how this is presented because I think there will be a natural inclination on the staff side to interpret this as personal and much more adversarial. And while I don't think a help us help you approach is necessarily the right one I do think that it's really important that we emphasize the common goal for the organization and try to the great extent possible to make clear that this is not personal because I can see it going sideways really quickly otherwise.

Paul Diaz: Absolutely agreed. Thank you Christina. All right Rubens I had you next.

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you Paul Rubens Kuhl .br. I'd like to point out that while you're discussing possible causes for (administrative) staff behavior like banker mentality or trying to do what is easier for them it's usually not a single case, a single root cause. Even in a single issue we could see more than one

cause. It could be the banker mentality, it could be being lazy or it could be a (sit in) stakeholder that is always among us which is law-enforcement.

Usually if you - law-enforcement driving (unintelligible) though. So that's way sometimes it's in saying where did this come from? Apparently from nowhere and nowhere it's law enforcement that has direct connection to them. So it for any issue you have could be any of those three root causes and sometimes a combination of those so we can simplify things in trying to look for a single root cause on this.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Rubens. And going to the board's question about what we and they include the community which necessarily entails law enforcement as well what we can do, make sure we include that point, make sure that's articulated in our face time. Hang on a second. Chuck I had you next, Stephane pressed for time so I'll continue the queue but let's make sure that we give him time before he has to run.

Man: Sure.

Paul Diaz: Was your point continuing this discussion…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh it is, absolutely. I think we're making - one of our problems is we're making - this is Chuck Gomes by the way, a false assumption. And the false assumption is that staff because they're tasked with leading IRTs have the responsible - responsibility for interpretation of policy and therefore we need to negotiate with them on that. I think that's wrong.

And again sorry for the broken record but in the Policy and Implementation Working Group we dealt with that and we made it very clear what staff's role is. They do lead the IRTs and lead on implementation but if there's a question about interpretation of policy that has to go back to the policymaking body.

Now I'm not opposed to mediation and so forth but I think there's a plan already for that.

If we think that staff is not interpreting policy correctly is should - it's supposed to go back to the policy making body and the GNSO Council is that body and they will need help. It's not that we're dumping it on them but there's a procedure. It's not a matter of us negotiating with staff whether they're interpreting. There's provisions for that already if there's disagreement and interpretation about the policy and I think we need to take advantage of that.

Paul Diaz: Okay. A lot of extremely important points being made. Everybody please let's digest this while we listen. Again we provided - the board had asked us for key issues. We have three up there. For Jonathan and Jeff there's probably a connection so at least two.

We want to touch on what Stephane was intending to raise. We'll hear from Jonathan and Jeff, get their thoughts on what's raised then let's collectively kind of figure out a way to stitch all this together. I mean this is a unique opportunity or, you know, we get this three times a year in front of the board but I'm kind of struggling on a path forward. How are going to articulate all this in the time we have in a way that will engage the board if they ask questions, they get drawn into the conversation not just as talking at them. And then we wind up going away like we traditionally do. So please everybody think about this. Stephane you have as much time as you need.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Paul. Let me start by apologizing. The NonCom Working Party Review Team is having its first meeting with the board now which is horrible timing but forces me not to be here for this slot which is unfortunate because there's an item there that you see in the Adobe screen which is a discussion that started in our group about both resource allocation and volunteer fatigue and volunteer fatigue being one of my pet subjects. I jumped on that.

There was a lot of work done and many thanks to Chuck and others for contributing to a draft of comments that we are proposing to make and that I would lead during our meeting with the board. And we would be trying to address obviously the work load and the fact that it's spread between what we perceive to be a group of volunteers that it's too small to handle the workload either because there aren't enough volunteers or because there aren't enough volunteers with time, sufficient time to be able to handle this workload.

We also feel that it's is a steep learning curve for people that are newcomers to our processes for them to become effective in both working groups and other environments but it's difficult to prioritize the work that the time frames are long from the multi-stakeholder model and there's a never-ending supply of time sensitive issues to deal with. I also wanted to add that there's a language barrier that's extremely steep. And I've said this before but obviously if you don't speak English very well it's going to be very difficult for people to get themselves involved. And I think there's a low or a lack of clear expectations on what's - what people are expected to achieve in their volunteer work.

So we've tried to set these points out. We've tried to set them out in a way that we're not rehashing past observations but that we're both offering - we're talking about the volunteer fatigue but also offering some sort of remedy for it or at least ideas that could be acted on that might help with the problem.

One of those ideas that we've been working on is teaming first-timers with experienced ICANN participants training working group chairs and co-chairs, mentoring I guess you'd call it, i.e., eat experienced participants providing advice to less experienced participants but that does require some kind of established framework for it to work. It can't just happen ad hoc I don't think because then it says not to happen, realistic expectations of the workload and especially the timeframe so that people or companies that are volunteering

people for this work do have a realistic expectation of how much time these people will be expected to give away from their day jobs.

There was an item about opening Adobe rooms earlier so that the working group calls or any volunteer work calls are immediately effective once they start rather than fumbling about for ten minutes trying to get Adobe rooms to work. There is a suggestion that we collect data about how the volunteer pool changes over time to try and understand where some weaknesses or where there might be a lack of support, lack of volunteer support, what areas might be impacted by those.

A suggestion that perhaps there might be more translation and interpretation skills so that people feel confident that they can speak in their own language and perhaps come to working groups and both understand what other people are saying in English or in their own language and express themselves in their own language.

And finally more certainty. I'm sorry I mentioned that point already but on the timeframe the ability to break down issues so that we're not looking at work items that last over years but perhaps work items that are broken down into quarters or a few months, blocks of time that are more manageable for people than that give them more certainty. So the idea is I framed it is for us to highlight some of these problem areas and then offer solutions rather than just complain.

And realized this is very centered on volunteer for because this is the item that I put my hand up for and we started working on. There were questions on our list about we haven't discussed resource allocation. So my suggestion would be that if anyone wants to speak to that I'm quite happy to lead in with volunteer fatigue and then have someone else take the resource allocation.

But the working document that we have so far does not address resource allocation to the same extent. I hope that's a concise enough summary. Thanks Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Stephane and we'll see directly at the meeting or will you be able to come back from your session? Okay. Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: So how do I say this not sounding annoying? I don't know what the board can do about this problem. I think this problem is almost 100% in the community's fault. I feel like we have no discipline whatsoever about constraining the amount of work that we take on as a community. And I think if you look at like what the big policy work underway is it's extremely demonstrative of the fact.

Like we have this giant who is PDP like thing underway where they're going through every possible requirement of a Whois system. That's work that's been like tread over several times in the past. I understand how we get there because we never have agreed on what the purpose of Whois and what all the requirements are but we're probably not going to agree this time either and we're going to continue to battle that as a community.

The PDP on subsequent procedures, you know, has five work streams and is dealing with every possible issue related to new top level domains. Like the scope of what we take on as a community is just massive and the board can't do anything about that unless we impose some discipline on ourselves and like actually figure out how to run efficient policy processes.

And it's just I don't like Stephane you're right we can get some metrics about like who's doing what but the fundamental problem of like they're being too much work to do for the amount of volunteers at hand is like that's something that the - that' we've got to own in particular. I feel like that's the responsibility of the GNSO to like manage the policy development process and it's just not happening right now.

Paul Diaz: Let me come - excellent point Jordyn. Let me come back to in a second. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Newman. I agree with Jordyn to some extent on this issue that we put it a lot on ourselves but I also disagree in the sense that ICANN keeps adding additional things that we have no control over. So the Whois was something that was added by ICANN as opposed to us. It wasn't that the community itself wanted to do all of this stuff. And there were a bunch of other things that were added by ICANN including all of this kind of accountability and the transition stuff and not diminishing its importance. But I do think there's a lot of things thrust upon us like the marketplace index and, you know, just things that are just initiatives that come out of wherever.

               I do also think that part of the fatigue is that the same people feel like they have to be involved in everything. And I'm guilty of that too so I'm not - but I don't complain about fatigue because I know and I understand I bring it on myself. So oftentimes the people complaining about fatigue are the ones that are not willing to let others participate in the work.

               So I mean I look around and, you know, the people that are involved the most in this group whether it's Chuck or myself or Jordyn you we kind of do it to ourselves. Now maybe that's the feeling that we just - going to have to say we just feel like we have to be in everything and we're going to miss something if we're not. So I agree in the sense that the board's just going to kind of look at us and go what do you expect us to do about it?

               But I also just want to transition into this is part of as the resources my issue. So what I was going to say and I wrote out a statement but essentially, you know, the purpose of travel support for example is to provide resources to those who would otherwise be unable to obtain funding absent such support but also to increase the diversity of participation amongst the Internet community and the activities that are performed by ICANN. I'm reading this very quick just so we can get it done.

For the past several years it appears that extra funding for travel to ICANN meetings other than what is generally made available to SOs and ACs has always been made available to those participating in the ICANN transition and accountability process.

Yet very little funding has been made available for those participating in ICANN's policy development processes one of the very core activities that ICANN's responsible for. In other words ample funding has been made available for those that seek to justify why ICANN exists or proving ICANN's accountability as opposed to supporting the actual mission. This seems completely backwards and we think needs to be changed.

For example the current meeting a request is made for funding for participants in the subsequent procedures PDP that were otherwise unable to attend this meeting in person for lack of funds. Two of the persons were actual work track co-chairs who have dedicated a considerable amount of volunteer time in their endeavors. We were told that in theory they could receive one nights funding to attend but no support for airfare or hotel stay or any kind of per diem. Due to inability to receive that funding they were unable to attend.

Subsequently we found out that eight persons received full funding from the CCWG and accountability. Four persons received - an additional four persons received partial funding for to account for full airfare of eight people, 54 additional hotels stays 53 extra per diem days. Of the 12 people that received funding all of them are frequent ICANN participants that are key members of stakeholder groups or advisory committees that could have sought funding from their own SOs or ACs and previously have gotten such funding in the past.

I don't want to diminish the importance making sure that ICANN is an accountable organization but then again does it matter if the organization is the most accountable organization in the world if there's no support for the

organization to carry out its mission. We're not asking for additional funding to be made available but that the allocation of funding reflects the core mission and activities of ICANN so I just want feedback on that.

Paul Diaz: Okay I have a queue going. Stephane I realize you're pressed for time. Are you comfortable with what you've heard so far if we transition the others?

Stephane Van Gelder: Well there's couple other things I just wanted to react to. First of all my suggestion would be that Jeff cohost the topic with me or whatever you want to call it if that's okay with everyone. He seems to have clear views on the resource issue. And perhaps as the conversation unfolds you will get other input. You can include that in whatever statement you want to make.

I would - coming back to what Jordyn was saying my approach was going to be not at all to ask the board to solve the problem. But I think the board is part of this community and I think our opportunity when we talk to the board is an opportunity to get messages out that will be heard in the most audible fashion possible because when we talk to the board a lot of people listen.

I do think that there is a management issue. And management whatever we think about the bottom-up process I think there is an element of top-down management in ICANN that's still prevalent. So I do think that if the board - the more the board is aware of this issue and once again entering it in a positive constructive fashion by providing ideas for resolution or solutions rather than just complaining about it I do think that will help.

And time management, the ability to stem the never-ending flow of issues that we're dealing with and one other message I think is key which is just the fact that the more volunteers are swamped the less effective we are of serving our communities. I do think that's a valuable message that we should be providing to the board. So I really take what you say to heart.

I think it's extremely, you know, the way I should be presenting this is certainly not please board give us a solution to this. We, you know, it is a self-inflicted problem to an extent but it's a communitywide problem and the board is the community's board. So I think we should be presenting it that way. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Okay Stephane. Let me get back to the queue and just suggest as people are mulling over what we began with, what we're hearing now. Maybe we have the issues that we have on the screen get lumped together but we needed to collectively decide how to present the major strategic issues that we lead this discussion with and then how to boil that down into a message that is digestible by the board that's going to stick with them. Please keep thinking about it. Michele you're next.

Michele Neylon: Thanks good morning. Michele for the record. I'm just following up on this discussion around volunteer fatigue and resourcing of everything else, a couple of points. As many of you know I was chair of the registrars for the last three years and we used to have an SO AC leadership roundtable meeting type thing the Friday before the meetings. And this came up and it was something that ICANN senior staff were fully supportive of. Oh, there's a massive issue here, it needs to be dealt with. Let's do something about this. And the certain amount of work was done and then nothing happened. It just kind of died faded away and wasn't followed-up on.

The GAC chair and I are meant to be discussing this topic as well in follow-up from Helsinki but it hasn't happened yet. But I have spoken to him in the last couple of days and he will be following up there. They're conscious of this. I 100% agree with the points that Jeff was making around ICANN pushing timetables and disagree with Jordyn sorry.

I the - yes we within the community can say no to things. We do but they don't listen to us. They still force it on us. Whois is a prime example of that in multiple occasions over the last I don't know how many years multiple people

including the US GAC rep has said that there were too many things going on at the same time and nobody seemed to - nobody listened to us or really just listen to us and just chose to ignore us.

The ICANN staff managed the timetable around a lot of these or on a lot of these processes and saying we appreciate that having a timetable and setting it is good in terms of project management. But they seem to be pushing it a in terms of getting things done quickly as opposed to getting things done properly. And there is only a certain number of people available to actually follow these topics.

And this comes back again to issues we're having with these IRTs and things like that because with the – there's a finite number of people who are familiar with the topics but by the time that you're to have at IRT plus multiple other PDPs on the same topic I'm sorry there's only 24 hours in the day and they can't be everywhere. I think the idea of getting Stephane to start it off and Jeff to follow through would be good. And I - and in terms of the travel support that does definitely need to be hammered home because over the last 2-1/2, three years the IANA transition sucked all the air, all the energy and all the resources financial and otherwise out of the room. Yet we in the background are still meant to drive forward with the IRTs, the PDPs and all these other things that started long before that.

And then this kind of thing is like oh, IANA's transition's done. Now let's try and get, you know, 20 PDPs done in the amount of time it would normally take to get two done. I'm sorry that just does not work. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay, trying to manage the queue. Jordyn you'll be next but let me - I'm sorry (Ken) should be next because I keep skipping him and then Jordyn, Donna and Chuck. And then let's take a pause at that and collectively consider where we are and what - how we want to present ourselves in front of the board. Okay so (Ken) go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yes Paul I'm just going to make a suggestion. I think it's extremely important that we use exactly the same tone with the board that you are planning on using in the communication that you're going to be sending up to the board. If not, we're going to have one of these situations where when they get that letter they're going to say well wait a minute, why didn't they talk about this? You know, and we may have talked about it but we didn't emphasize it.

So my suggestion is that we stratify the three items and put the most amount of emphasis where the group collectively feels it belongs. Even if you need a show of hands right now I think it's extremely important that we do this otherwise we're going to lose the board's attention if we get too far in the weeds here. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Thank you (Ken). And that's exactly like again I want to say we'll take a pause and figure out where people want to go. Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: So Stephane's not here so he won't hear me reactive to his comments but I guess what I will say is, you know, we have limited time with the board. I think we all really prize the opportunity to talk to talk with them. I think we want to make that conversation as actionable as possible. So while it is good to have them understand our concerns it's also good to be able to make sure that we're asking for something from them as opposed to just complaining them - at them about things. So to that extent what I'm hearing in this conversation in terms of actions that might be helpful are twofold.

The first is it sounds like, you know, if we agree that the community has some role in this but at times what we feel like is that staff or the board or whoever are imposing work on us that we're not ready to undertake and/or pushing for timelines that are not realistic then I think one thing that we ought to suggest is that GNSO Council is the place where the policy development process and where it can be - and if they manage the policy about the process and that can also be a focus point for understanding what level of community

engagement is possible across a broad swath of issues that affect at least the gTLD community.

And so they ought to have the ability to push back. You know, if the staff wants to be like a healthy marketplace whatever the GNSO even if it's a staff driven initiative the GNSO Council should still be able to push back on it and say look the volunteers that are available aren't able to do this right now and so this is an issue that needs to be put aside. And so have the - have one point within our community at least that's responsible for owning the overall work set that our portion of the community at least is responsible for and then maybe the council could coordinate with other bodies as well and make sure the overall level is reasonable. So that's one suggestion I would make.

And then secondly agree 100% with Jeff about travel support being an important element here. I think we had an interesting conversation with ALAC leadership yesterday which maybe we'll talk about in more detail at some point else in the agenda.

One thing I really took away from that is that we're in the habit of funding leadership as opposed to funding work. And what we should perhaps suggest as, you know, as Jeff pointed out maybe we don't want to suggest a change to the overall amount of travel support but maybe we should be rethinking who we're supporting and in particular focus on supporting people who were really doing work on particular active work streams.

And that would really I think, you know, the people that Jeff's talking about that aren't leaders necessarily in their respective organizations but that are responsible for making the work proceed let's make sure those people are at these meetings. And that would really broaden the pool of available volunteers because people could just be interested in one topic and then still be funded to go to ICANN meetings. I think that would help a lot in terms of broadening the talent pool.

So I think those are the things I would suggest here. And I think that's a really good way of combining Jeff and Stephane's topic in a way that would really resonate with the board.

And then just to answer your overall point Paul how do we sort of engage with the board? I think we could take the topics that Stephanie brought up earlier and as you said maybe just use that as a response to the questions from the board. And that gives a sort of a coherent way to like use this existing agenda to sort of drive home the points that we're making here.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Jordyn, makes a lot of sense. Let's get through the rest of the queue and then come back and make sure that we're in agreement that. Donna I have you next.

Donna Austin: Thanks Paul, Donna Austin from Neustar. I just building on something that Jordyn just said in relation to, you know, a more targeted travel funding for the people actually doing the work, it kind of strikes me we had a four day meeting in Helsinki which was largely focused on policy. We're going through a seven day meeting here and I really question the are we getting the most out of these meetings that we can possibly get?

So, you know, those people who are suckers for PDPs if they're all going to be, you know, in the same place around the world three times a year why don't we build on that and actually have, you know, more PDP work or progress the actual work rather than, you know, high interest topics that are essentially talkfest's but don't get us anywhere.

You know, we are all in the same place three times a year. We should focus on getting more of the systemic work done rather than focusing on the, you know, the fluff analysis to some extent if I can put it that way. And in terms of scheduling we should actually pull out what the priority topics are or work efforts are and make sure that they are baked into the schedule before we

start. And then for all the other stuff that aren't necessarily high priority and a just nice to have maybe they just go on the back burner for the next meeting.

But I really think that, you know, there's a lot of white noise at these meetings. If we really are struggling with volunteer fatigue and most of those volunteers are in the same place three times a year maybe we can lessen the burden a little bit if we try to get more of the work done while we're here rather than, you know, you do three months focusing on PDP work intercessionally and then you lose three weeks as you gear up to come to a meeting and focus on something else and then you kind of lose another week as you go home and recover. So maybe we can find more opportunity during these meetings to get some (unintelligible) work done rather than the white noise.

Paul Diaz: Chairman's prerogative, hang on a second Chuck. Sam?

Samantha Demetriou: Sorry Chuck, this is Samantha Demetriou. I just want to respond directly to Donna. I very much agree with you especially around the way the meetings are set up. Like we're all here and this meeting is seven days long. And so like the subsequent procedures PDP those are half day session of a seven day meeting.

And then you and Avri Jeff had to go and give basically the same update to like six different groups over the course of three days. I actually thought we made some good progress in the Helsinki meeting when we had these bigger sessions and it was like this is the time. If you want your update about this topic you come to this session or like just too bad.

Like I would even do like they do a policy update Webinar before the meeting they publish up. I really think we could trim these meetings down and not just have, you know, the same kind of updates being said over and over again and yes use the time to focus on the actual work because face to face that gets done so much faster than calls. So I very much agree with this point.

Paul Diaz: Okay thanks (Sam). Chuck thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Well said (Sam) -- very well said. So I tried to put this in the chat but for some reason I failed. I'm not sure what I did wrong. But I want to fully support Jeff what you said about the travel support. But you said one thing too that I think we need to grab a hold of.

As an SG we should assume some of that responsibility and start looking at our own budget in addition to the ICANN support for travel for policy development work and so forth. We should consider as we look at our budget to see if maybe we should start offering some funding through our dues to needy individuals who are active in the policy development process. Though I'm not saying that in place of the ICANN adjustment I'm saying to fully comply with what you're saying we should look at how we can help there too.

Paul Diaz: A fair point Chuck and I'll add that to the list for Eval 4. All right so let's take stock for a moment. We've said an awful lot. I think Jordyn's done the most in helping focus us on how to present, how to lead. Jeff if you're comfortable with Stephane's suggestion you guys are like a one two punch.

Jonathan, your topic originally we thought was more link to Jeff's. Do you want to still present you're separately? Do you want to tie it in as well? We kind of need to strategize here about how we use the limited time we have and make this impactful.

Jonathan Robinson: Not 100% sure Paul but I think it seems to me that some of the themes that have been coming out is sort of getting things back to normal focusing on the core work of the PDP bringing things back to our group doing the work and leaving things rather than being staff led. So I mean I'd be happy to - the way in which I thought we needed to make this point there must have been something that catalyzed it originally in the sense that I'm not 100% sure how clear we are as a community including the board on the difference between

the role of the CWG and there's a sort of bias going towards CWGs and a lack of attention on our core PDP related work.

So my thought here was to simply say that there's been some high profile, you know, CWG related activities recently. The community's done good work to define the standards and we recognize that the board has done seems to have moved in its willingness to accept the output of the CWG subject to it not being in conflict with their fiduciary responsibilities and so on.

But these are in no way a substitute for the work that goes on in PDPs which is really our core work. And I suppose that was really my intention was to highlight that and make sure that the board was cognizant of that and was willing to recognize it. So I'd be happy to make those points and around those ways that I've just described or if others feel that this is superfluous given where this conversation's gone and we don't need to do it I'm, you know, receptive either way.

I don't feel, you know, that we absolutely have to make these points but I did feel that there was sort of a collective I don't know what the word is. We were collectively enamored with CWGs and therefore we're resourcing them, very excited about them and so on when actually our core work is domain name related policy and we just need to get that perhaps the right way around. So that was really where the thinking was behind that point. So open to any feedback or comments about how we weave that in and whether it's a necessary point to make still at this stage.

Paul Diaz: Okay think you Jonathan. And everybody (unintelligible) Jeff you're first.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I think just - sorry this is Jeff Newman. Just to support what Jonathan said, you know, when I was giving one of the six updates to - at this time to the GAC the GAC members, some of the GAC members have expressed to me that they are - they do not want to participate in a PDP because it's quote controlled by the GNSO. And they instead are trying to recommend moving

the geographic names issue into a CECWG because they would feel much more comfortable in doing that.

Obviously that's a complete duplication of efforts and I think that's completely inefficient. I would love to encourage them to come into the PDP and work with us. It's open to everyone. But Jonathan's right, they seem to be enamored with CCWGs but we need to kind of remind them that look developing domain name policy around generic top level domains is the primary province of the GNSO. We were trying to make it as inclusive as possible and we welcome their participation but forming a CCWG on something like that would completely go against our policy development process.

Paul Diaz: Okay. I have James and then Jonathan and then…

James Bladel: Thanks Paul, James speaking. And I just wanted to weigh in on this. I do agree with Jonathan and Jeff and the points they've raised. I think that the GNSO has also come down fairly succinctly on setting the boundary from any CCWGs that would stray into policy development. I think this group perhaps may be, you know, then making a new issue out of this can just reiterate that our contracts only recognize the legitimacy of policies that are created through the PDP process and not through some alternative vehicle.

And I think that, you know, we - if you look at the council agenda we also have a discussion coming up on the relative to the proliferation of CCWGs including the one on Internet governance which doesn't seem to fit into the framework that we've already adopted in that it doesn't really have any boundaries around its work. It's more of an open ended effort. So I think, you know, if we want to raise this with the board I think it's fine to just kind of hit that note a couple of times and then move on. I don't know that that's something that the contracted party house has to carry alone. I think it's something that resonates well across the entire GNSO community about CCWG string into their remit. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you James. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I think I was trying to recall why at this point and Jeff remembered it well. I mean in part it's things like that where there's a temptation in parts of the community to undertake what is GNSO policy work in other forums. And the other I guess might have been that there's some concern about doing this properly. I mean we all know of at least one example where there's recommendations gone to the board and they've got nowhere and they've sort of sat and haven't been dealt with so it's also about going through this cycle properly.

And I guess at a kind of overall level it's about trying to get things back to normal. And in some ways that ties in with the volunteer fatigue and the other themes. It's bringing things back to a more normal way of working after this frenetic period of work in and around the IANA transition and all of the resource and other issues that that implies. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Jonathan. I can say for sure that that's going to fall on very sympathetic ears on the board. I've had several directors tell me that that's exactly how they feel as well. Okay Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. I actually very much agree with Jonathan, Jeff and James on highlighting the primacy I guess of the GNSO and PDP like the new gTLD and things that deals with gTLDs. But I think it would be useful perhaps for us and also may be smart for us to think about perhaps exactly what Jeff said and things like the geographic names then within the our PDP whether some subcommittees can spin into a CWG.

And that might actually help our cause. You know, we can bring it back to the GNSO just to make the final decision on matter which then when it goes to the board the board can pinpoint to saying hey this subcommittee has already taken those consideration into account. And then the, you know, GNSO

finally makes the decision on what the policy should be. That might be a smarter way to do it. And perhaps we could highlight to the board that or others that that may be something that we would consider as well.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Edmon, very interesting thought. Perhaps you can work that into the discussion if you would please.

Edmon Chung: Happy to if others are comfortable with it.

Paul Diaz: As people mulling anybody have an instant negative reaction to that idea? Donna please?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Donna Austin from Neustar. I think that happens anyway that there are subgroups that are formed within the PDP. If we start calling it a CCWG or a CWG it takes on another meaning so we need to be really careful with the terminology.

Paul Diaz: Okay. Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. Just a reminder if you have an output of the CCWG then being fed into a PDP it will probably generate a delay in having that policy approved. Even if you do an expedited PDP that we still have a delay so if we start that being a GNSO PDP from the beginning it will be faster.

Paul Diaz: Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Paul. Donna Austin from Neustar. Jeff I'm kind of interested to get a better understanding of why the GAC thinks that a CCWG is easier to work in then a PDP because it's a different process but not really. So was there any rationale or reason given as to why they thought it was easier?

Jeff Neuman: It's not that it's - sorry this is Jeff Newman. It's not that it's easier necessarily. I think their view is more an emotional view of a PDP is controlled by the

GNSO and ultimately it's the GNSO Council that approves it whereas a CCWG they feel like they could have a role in the leadership of it. They feel like they can - it doesn't necessarily need to go back to or it doesn't only go back into the GNSO for a quote approval. So it's not like they can point to anything tangible about the way it operates but it's more of an emotional political feeling as opposed to anything that we can point to in terms of how it operates.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Jeff, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I actually was going to respond to the question. I would've given more or less the same answer as Jeff. I heard it said separately and it was - I tried to say look GNSO working groups are open. You know, you have the opportunity to participate but the sense is so Jeff said it pretty well.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you both. Thank you all. Let's take stock. Where are we? How are we going to present this? How are we boiling this down? We've discussed an awful lot. Some of these things for what it's worth my view don't necessarily lend themselves to discussions with the board. I think they're more tactical or more should be focused more on staff after the fact.

I don't want to color the color the conversation in a debate but for a moment try and put yourself in the board's shoes. What are we going to say that is going to resonate, that is going to stick with them? We can follow-up with more detailed and tell them we will follow-up with more detailed explanations and whatnot but there's an awful lot that we've discussed in the last 75 minutes and I think it'll be pretty hard to expect the board to take it all on board. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. This is Jeff Newman. At least with respect to this topic I like the way Jonathan kind of kicked it off in terms of, you know, all of these comments are really now us getting back to normal. And that's kind of the theme. So I really like the way he phrased that. So whether it's talking about the reallocation of

travel funding or resources or whether it's talking about the priorities of ICANN and which policy groups we participate in and not forcing too much on top of us, it's all about getting back to normal now that this transition is behind us. Let's just do what we were chartered to do. So I like that theme.

Paul Diaz: Okay Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: For instance in principle I'd prepared to lead on that and the others could follow. My concern is that I really don't want Jordyn and Stephanie some of that stuff to be lost either. So how do we - where does that fit in because if I lead on CWGs back to normal you can see how then resource allocation, difference in support, travel funding and so this will all cascade out of that quite neatly.

And you can see how that would work and it could be a discussion around that but how do we make sure that some of that - that almost is like a separate thread that one that, you know, that whole thing about staff initiatives and the divergence so how do we get that in?

Paul Diaz: Okay. I've got a queue growing.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Paul Diaz: I see Jordyn. (Sam) did you want to go first? (Unintelligible) second. Jordyn go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sure. So I think I - Jonathan I think you're exactly right. And I think that as with Jeff I really like that back to normal framing device. And I think you guys can probably just bonce through all three of the topics that we've suggested in that frame. You know, you could leave it off to talk about the CCWGs and mentioning the fact that like this is just, you know, we don't need to get too deep on this but that this is an example, pass it off to Stéphane and Jeff to sort of work through the other issues.

And as long as we're careful about time boxing that conversation and maybe Paul can help, Paul and Graeme can help sort of manage that then we can sort of say okay here - those were our topics but we want to make sure that we address your questions as well and then we can use that to pivot to the conversation around sort of staff behavior.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Jordyn. I mean that works for me. It seems a logical way forward. Anybody have any other ideas? Okay Sam?

Samantha Demetriou: This is Samantha Demetriou. I very much agree. I actually think we can use the questions for both parts. So I think we can set up with okay it's post transition, we're getting back to normal. You guys put two questions to us. One is what is the board and the ICANN organization which I'm assuming here means staff need to do to make the transition work, i.e., and where do we just interpret that as saying what you need to do to support us in getting back to normal work?

And then from there I think the three points that you had just said that Jonathan, Jeff and (unintelligible) will cover all go from there. And then we can kind of break and then say you asked us a second question which is about advancing trust.

And I actually think that Stephanie and your this big overarching issue it has a lot to do with trust and I think it's a very easy hook back in there. And so we can just kind of use that to outline. And like you said I agree that we need to be pretty disciplined about the time. So probably need to think about how we want to split up the 90 minutes.

Paul Diaz: Makes sense. Okay I've got (Reg) and Stephanie. And the point (Sam) just made about time is really important. If we lead with the three issues that we had we have to be disciplined that we leave sufficient time to get to the macro

issues that Jordyn and Stephanie have raised. It's doable. We just have to be conscious of the time. (Reg)?

Reg Levy: Thanks. This is Reg Levy. This is an issue that came up with regard to the strawman proposal that Stephanie and Jordyn put forward that there is a concern raised that we don't want to sound too confrontational towards staff in front of the board and in front of staff. And somebody on the back channel raised the issue that we have only 90 minutes with the board three times a year.

And it is a very public meeting that we have with them, but that the board gets together on a fairly regular basis and raising the question of whether or not we might want to ask for access to the board during some of their retreats or similar get-togethers. Even I think telephonically -- it's not like we all have to fly out to wherever the board is meeting -- but maybe just call in and have a conversation that's a little bit more one-on-one. I don't think that that is something that we all need to discuss here today. It's just something that I think we should keep in mind especially when we're meeting with the board today.

Paul Diaz: That's a neat idea (Reg) and just part of constructive criticism in offering solutions that's one that we might want to throw in and just say let's explored in the future. Thank you. Stephanie?

Stephanie Deshesneau: Stephanie Deschesneau. While it might not flow as well as some of the other topics that we pre-mapped I do think that the issue the that Jordyn and I put on the table it's not getting back to normal per se. I think we see it around getting back to good. And I think the framing the people raised earlier all about Yurin has presented this vision, staff as a facilitator staff as a partner and we believe in that they we think that's great. We love hearing that.

Here's a discrepancy we perceive and then there's a couple of tangible suggestions that have come out of it. I think the one (Reg) just raised Donna around how we're like open to working with a mediator and making things better. I think even if the flow is a little different there's a way to put it into the same frame that also might help address some of the concerns around being too confrontational.

Paul Diaz: Okay Jordyn. Go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: I was just going to say briefly I thought (Sam)'s framing was awesome. I think that's exactly how we should approach it if unless anyone has objections.

Paul Diaz: I hope you're not objecting (Ken) but I see you in the chat. Go ahead. Still on mute (Ken)?

Ken Stubbs: Yes I'm not objecting. I'm just pointing out that the overwhelming majority at the time it was taking in this session we - was in the discussion about the concerns we have about the relationships that are currently existing with the staff. And I am frustrated because I'm afraid that because this is quote a public session we want to turn it into some sort of a kumbaya moment. And it's almost as if we believe that any communication that we send to the board after this is only going to be held in by the board. It won't be distributed by the staff.

If we aren't willing to get out in front of the concerns we have about the way that the structure is treating us at this point in time then we're just going to continue to live with this.

I had a conversation over three years ago with one of the key people at the GDD about communication and I received all sorts of promises that lasted for 90 days. I'm sorry but I'm a little distressed about the direction we're taking. It just reeks of telling the board what they want to hear.

I think you should take the questions that the board gave to you, turn them around and start with what question you think is the most important, tie it in to the concerns that we have and follow it up with solutions that we feel would work to make the whole process work better. I'm sorry that's just the way I feel. Thanks Paul.

Paul Diaz: No need to apologize (Ken) but from my view I think we were all thinking along the same lines. (Sam)'s construct I think gets us there. This isn't going to be unnecessarily adversarial concentration with the board but it's absolutely not going to be a kumbaya moment either. So and with the commitment to provide our thoughts in writing after the meeting if you've seen the draft right now we'll continue to polish it but it is definitely not pulling any punches.

All right we have about 15 minutes. I think we have a decent sense of how we're going to present this. Stephanie or Jordyn either you prepared, which of you I should ask is prepared to just present the key ideas? I mean we should all feel comfortable jumping into the conversation. A lot of very unique or specific thoughts added.

I mean the board loves to - they should love to hear from everybody in the community. This is not going to be the Graeme and Paul show. It really shouldn't be. So Jordyn?

Jordyn Buchanan: So I was going to suggest maybe Stephanie and I could talk with Chuck and Donna and anyone else who's interested during the half an hour transition we have coming up to sort of frame the issues a little bit more and then we can figure out amongst the four of us how we want to present it.

Paul Diaz: Perfect.

Jordyn Buchanan: And if anyone else wants to join like I said feel free. But those are - I haven't really - especially Chuck's perspective on the…

Paul Diaz: Policy and implementation.

Jordyn Buchanan: …policy and implementation I think we want to make sure we get that in and I think Donna's thoughts on mediation of where one of the few tangible things that we suggest as part of this as well.

Paul Diaz: Agreed. And if in the course of conversation if we miss things and people realize whoops you forgot it please weigh in, raise your hand. Okay so the with time we have left let's touch on some other things of joint interest for the contracted parties. GNSO Council stuff one of our counselors or James need a couple of minutes? Do you want to update the rest on at least the motions that are in front of you this week?

James Bladel: Sure I can quickly and, you know, some of the other counselors please feel free to jump in. The two that are probably going to attract the most significant attention are one a motion to withdraw the GNSO support as a chartering organization for the CCWG IG. We had a fairly lengthy discussion with the ccNSO at our lunch on this topic yesterday.

                    I think the concern is and if I can frame this properly the concern is that the CWG IG is - it's doing important work and the people in, participating in that CCWG are certainly working hard towards representing and advocating for this model and other organizations but is it really a CCWG? There's no workplan. There's no immediate deliverables or any recommendations or reports anticipated. And so the question is can we move it to something else?

                    I think that the difference of opinion is that the ccNSO expressed to us yesterday they'd like to see that something else stood up first before we withdraw support. I think that the at least one of the significant groups of the GNSO believes that the - that we should kill this thing, pull the plug. And that doesn't of course doesn't mean the GNSO folks have to stop participating in this. It's just that it would become something else. And then I'll pause there

before going onto the next one because I see that Keith wants to jump in on this and that any other counselors want to put their 2 cents on this?

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks James, thanks Paul, Keith Drazek. You know, so just to add on to what James said and he framed it perfectly right is that we heard clearly from the ccNSO yesterday that they do not intend to withdraw their charter or their charging support for the organization. And we know that ALAC will want it to continue so they are another chartering organization. It only needs two chartering organizations to continue in force. So the GNSO withdrawing its charter of the group will not kill it. So we have a choice here. It will continue. Do we decide to as the GNSO and, you know, registry and registrar interests do we I think we've sent the message with this motion that we see this as a problem because it does not fit the newly adopted CCWG model.

The question is do we want to continue to engage in this CCWG to either update its charter, to make it more reflective of the newly adopted model or do we want to withdraw our support and from the outside in a sense push for some other model? So it's going to continue. The question is do we as the contracted party house feel so strongly about this that we want to push the GNSO to withdraw its support at this time? My expectation based on conversations with others and, you know, feel free to jump in other counselors is that I think the non-contracted party house is going to seek a deferral which raises some questions because we are supposed to if we want to have this continue sort of recertify at this meeting that we want to continue as a chartering organization as the GNSO so.

Paul Diaz: Yes Keith it's that last part that I think is key is that we are being - we have a task at this meeting to affirmatively renew our support as a chartering organization. The motion is to withdraw it. So even if we defer their motion the default is probably that we didn't affirmatively renew our support is a chartering organization. And, you know, if I can go back a bit this goes back to something that Jeff raised, you know, this is a CCWG and I don't know what sort of support it's getting from travel. I would say minimal but it is

certainly getting some sort of some level staff support, you know, that again is more of an outward facing evangelizing organization as opposed to something that's working on internal recommendations.

So I'm open to any ideas Keith. I think that we heard from the ccNSO loud and clear that A, they're going to renew their support but B, they are also dissatisfied with the current structure. They want a reboot is what they called it, a refresh of the charter.

You know, an alternative might be if we are going to have a deferral is that we look between now and then as a way to put into a motion that we want to see a new charter before we would affirmatively extend our support as a chartering organization. We would like to see a new charter that is a little clearer on what their workplan is and what their deliverables are because right now neither of those seem to be very clear.

Paul Diaz: Okay. We have a bit of a queue. (Ken) you're next. Go ahead. Still on mute (Ken)?

Ken Stubbs: I didn't lower my hand.

Paul Diaz: Okay. No problem. Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks James, Donna Austin. I agree that, you know, we've got some concerns about this CCWG for a number of reasons. One of the risks of course if the GNSO does withdraw its support and the ALAC and ccNSO continues is that we have no control is the wrong word but there's no accountability from the GNSO for this working group. So I think that's Chuck's put it into the chat but I think perhaps that there's approach here is a reboot and try to keep them honest I suppose in terms of that charter development. And also, you know, once they've developed charter to see whether at that point in time there's an opportunity to say we really don't think this constitutes a CCWG and maybe there is another way forward at that point.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Donna. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes just briefly. Two things one James' point about the funding is something we definitely need to be aware of. Even if there's no direct funding there's definitely staff support. As was brought up at other discussions on this very topic as some – the regional engagement stakeholder support I can't remember what in the hell they called it themselves offices are able to give support for some of these people in that group. And but at the same time some of the discussions and things that are going on there and the kind of tracking of external issues is pretty important. And that was something that was raised yesterday in the meeting with the ccNSO but just maybe it's a matter of just simply reframing it, putting it under some umbrella or whatever or relegating it to being a mailing list. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Keith?

Keith Drazek: Yes thanks Paul agree with Michele. I think right now the - my understanding is that the expense of the resources is very, very minimal but there's also the question of, you know, precedence other groups and CCWGs and so that point is not lost on me.

                  But I think it's I've heard a couple of times folks say that this is a group that's sort of looking outward and externally and focused on the Internet governance space and that's true. But it's also important to remember that the CCWG IG was initially set up following the Montevideo statements before NETmundial.

                  And it was the community recognizing that we broadly across the entire community needed to have input and influence with the staff of the board and to stop the runaway train or at least control the runaway train that was happening around the whole broader Internet governance engagement by ICANN. So I think it's yes it's external facing and looking at times but it's also

sort of the mechanism or the community mechanism for input to staff and board on Internet governance issues. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you guys. For registries at least we have GNSO Council for the discussion scheduled in the afternoon. We can dig a little deeper and provide guidance. Registrar counselors I don't know if you need the same level of coordination from the Stakeholder Group but we will certainly come back to you with however we've collectively decided to move forward. James any other issues?

James Bladel: Yes that was the easy one. The next one is a motion to accept the report from the Charter Drafting, Bylaws Charter Drafting Team which essentially lays out the new bylaws changes and operational changes in how the GNSO will participate in the empowered community.

And I welcome some of the other councilors to weigh in on this but generally speaking this was a compromised proposal that has consensus but significant opposition from I believe primarily the Commercial Stakeholder Group. We made a commitment in Helsinki that this particular report because it deals with the bylaws would be subject to a super-majority threshold so we're beholden to that earlier commitment.

There is a friendly - or sorry there is an amendment being proposed currently that in my opinion and I believe Rubens assures this as well as the seconder of the motion is such an extensive rewrite of the motion that it is neither a friendly nor an amendment, it's actually a separate motion. You know, where do we stand on this? I had had conversations with both the CSG folks and the NCSG folks. It seems like it's very much a fluid target.

If I had to play it out I would say that the amendment probably will not pass but the original motion will stand. We may tweak it to change for example the common period that some have noted as too short. We may tweak it to add a

legal review which is always going to happen anyway but then we'll probably subject it to - subject it to a vote.

If it doesn't meet the super-majority I'll be honest with this group I don't really have a Plan B. The good news is we don't have a ticking clock here. We have an interim solution in place but we still need to if we're going to send it back to the drafting team for reconsideration we'll have to do that with some guidance. I say this because I suspect from what I'm hearing from my conversations with the CSG and NCSG that there's a potential the folks will try to use the motion to reopen some of the issues of the report and I think that's inappropriate. And I think that we as contracted party house should be on guard for any attempts to use the motion on the council floor to change what's contained in the report. I don't think that's appropriate.   So I don't know if any other counselors want to weigh in or if you feel that this is maybe I've been unfair in framing that but I think that this is something that there we need to keep an eye on as well because it could have long-lasting impacts on how we operate in a post-transition environment.

Paul Diaz: Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Thank you. James any updates on what would lead the CSG in friendly amendments in really friendly and really amendments?

James Bladel: Nothing official Rubens. I have heard some back channel that one of the ideas which was again considered by the drafting team would be to the NCSG counselors are not bound by their ExCom the way the contracted party house and the Commercials Stakeholder Group councilors are bound and I think that might be something that we could discuss. But again that was covered in the report and it was not part of their final recommendations. So if we're going to reopen that discussion I think we don't do it via a motion. We send it back to the drafting team with some guidance.

Rubens Kuhl: Just a follow-up I have talked with some people in the NCSG that are not councilors and they think they seem to be at ease seeing not having their counselors bound even in our community decisions. So they should be the ones that could be complaining about this and but they seem to be perfectly okay with that so I don't see that as a problem if they don't think it is either.

James Bladel: Yes and I'm just kind of relaying some of my one on one conversation last night over a beer so I don't know if that person speaks for themselves or even a significant group of the NCPH so…

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck Gomes. And I think you characterized it accurately James with regard to the CSG's position because I as you know Wolf-Ulrich was one of the ones that commented on behalf of the CSG. And he did express the concern about the fact that the NCSG does not use directed voting of their counselors so that's definitely an issue.

But I've pointed out to them and I think I'm right on this - I'm - I welcome being challenged on it but under their proposed idea of having constituencies and stakeholder groups do the representation for the empowered community that would still be a problem. I don't think it solves that problem so I'm not getting that part.

Paul Diaz: James?

James Bladel: Yes Chuck I think that it doesn't fully solve or fully address the concerns. I think that it also opens up a new concern which is what do we do with our NonCom appointees is that currently don't have a constituency to bind their votes? So, you know, it's one of those things where you try to tug on one thread and another one loosens up somewhere else so it's something that we're going to have to discuss.

I generally think that the path we're going to have to take in this council meeting here in Hyderabad is we'll just put the motion, the original motion

perhaps with some tweaks in the common period length up for a vote and see if it survives. And if it doesn't then we'll have to capture those concerns and send it back to the drafting team.

Paul Diaz: Okay it sounds like a plan. Thank you James. Any other counsel related issues? We're at about half past. If we need a few minutes more we can keep going or we could break. Jordyn, Stephanie your team probably would appreciate a couple extra minutes, coordinate your thoughts so why don't we break if nobody's - sorry Michele?

Michele Neylon: Just very briefly and I'll be joining the council formally but just to think Volker for his service over the last few years that's all. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Absolutely think you Volker. Okay then. Why don't we break. We're right next door in Hall 3 at the top of the hour so we have 30 minutes. Please try to be on time and for those who plan to speak I don't know if we'll be all sitting at the front but at the very least please sit somewhere kind of conspicuous so it's easy to see to recognize you being near the microphones, et cetera.

Cherie Stubbs: Before - this is Cherie. Before we all scatter looking for our (wins) a reminder that after the board meeting the Registrar Stakeholder Group will return to this room to Hall 2. The Registries Stakeholder Group will reconvene in Hall 6. So if you're out rambling we'll run interference for you but and each respective stakeholder group will be providing lunch for their members.

Sue Schuler: And please everybody feel free to grab a donut and some coffee on the way out the door give you some strength for the board meeting.

END