
SAN JUAN – GNSO Council Meeting
Wednesday, March 14, 2018 – 13:00 to 15:00 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, everyone. Let's get started. May I ask our technical team to start our recording, please. Fabulous. Thank you very much. So good afternoon to everyone. This is our GNSO Council meeting of the 14th of March here at ICANN61. Before I turn it over to Nathalie to take us through roll call, there's a matter that we need to raise as it affects roll call and that is the very, very unfortunate news that we received this week of the passing of Ben Fuller who is a member of the GNSO Council by virtue of his position as a ccNSO liaison to the GNSO. I'm very, very sad, of course, to have a -- a sitting member of council pass during his term. Over the weekend we had an opportunity to enter some reflections into the condolences book that was circulated by Nigel Roberts. If you haven't had an opportunity to do so and would like to do so, staff or I can help you find Nigel to be able to do that. Also, with many thanks to staff for helping with identifying an address and so on. We'll be sending some flowers on behalf of council to Nigel's (sic) family. So with that, Nathalie, may I ask you take us to roll call, please.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks very much, Heather. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 14th of March, 2018. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it. Thank you ever so much.
Pam Little.

PAM LITTLE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Donna Austin.

DONNA AUSTIN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Rubens Kuhl.

RUBENS KUHL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Darcy Southwell.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Michele Neylon.

MICHELE NEYLON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Carlos Gutierrez.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Patullo.

MARIE PATULLO: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Susan Kawaguchi.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady.

PAUL McGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Phillipe Fouquart.

PHILLIPE FOUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Stephanie Perrin. I don't believe we have Stephanie in the room yet. Arsene Tungali.

ARSENE TUNGALI: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Heather Forrest.

HEATHER FORREST: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tony Harris.

TONY HARRIS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Martin Silva Valent.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Ayden Ferdeline.

AYDEN FERDELIN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: And we have maybe Syed Ismail Shah joining remotely. Syed, are you on the line with us?

SYED ISMAIL SHAH: Yes.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Welcome, Syed. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Erika Mann.

ERIKA MANN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: And we also have icann.org GNSO support staff in the room with us. So may I please remind everyone to remember to state your names before speaking for recording purposes. I'd also like to note for the record that Stephanie Perrin has joined the council meeting. Thank you very much, and over to you, Heather.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you, Nathalie, very much. So you will notice the absence of the AC room in today's proceedings. What we have in front of you on the screen -- and we'll have to do a bit of moving back and forth between screens -- at present we see the agenda. For the purposes of our remote participation, because we do like to make that a significant feature of our council meetings when we

meet at a public ICANN meeting, what I propose that we do since we don't have any motions on the table, we do have a number of discussion items which you see on the agenda here, is we have an open microphone time scheduled for the end of the meeting. If you have interventions, then please let's raise those in the context of that open microphone and you can direct our attention back to which agenda item you wish to speak on. For Syed, Syed, my personal request to you is you're our only councillor not in the room. If I ask if you're willing to interrupt at any time, please don't feel that that's an uncomfortable thing. Alternatively, you can ping to -- to staff, to the support staff, perhaps to Nathalie, I can make you the point of contact, Nathalie, and Nathalie can raise that to my attention to make sure that we join you into the queue. Otherwise, those in the room, we do have a microphone standing in the room and we'll call for that open microphone time in -- at the end of the meeting.

With that, item number 1.2 --

SYED ISMAIL SHAH: Will do.

HEATHER FORREST: Perfect, Syed. Well done. Thanks. Are there any updates that councillors wish to raise at this time? Paul.

PAUL McGRADY: Paul McGrady, for the record -- is there a record? Even though there's no Adobe? If a tree falls in the woods and there's no Adobe does it make a sound? Just -- I updated my statement of interest to reflect that I am now the liaison to the RPM PDP and did some other modernization efforts like putting my correct job title, that sort of thing. So enjoy the exciting read.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Paul. Heather Forrest. Any further updates to statements of interest? No, seeing none. We note in the agenda for this meeting the minutes of two previous council meetings, the January meeting of 30th January and the 22nd February meeting of -- the February meeting of the 22nd. That being the case, we're entirely up to date, which is wonderful. Thanks very much to councillors and staff.

Let's turn then to item number 2 which is our discussion with ICANN finance on the draft FY '19 operating plan and budget. Xavier, I saw you. There you. You're very welcome to join us at the table so you've got a ready microphone or if you prefer the standing mic, we can accommodate that. Can I suggest, Xavier, I

know that you have a presentation loaded up and I understand that it's -- it's a fair number of slides. We have had the benefit of your presentation within the various SG&Cs throughout yesterday, throughout constituency day, and not all of us were able to attend the session that happened earlier this morning in relation to that sort of direct Q&A. If I could suggest that rather than a presentation we did more of that Q&A, I think that would be of the most benefit. So with that, Xavier, over to you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you very much, Heather. Thank you very much for everyone to take a -- some time to invite us. This is very useful for us to be able to meet with you.

As you indicated, Heather, I offer the presentation because this is a presentation that we use for all of the engagement sessions that we have with various SOs and ACs, but I know that your specific interest is relative to the budget process and therefore, that's what we should talk about. I only wanted before we go there to simply mention the reserve fund public comment process that is also going on right now. A number of comments have been submitted in the budget process relative to the reserve fund. Just want to remind everyone there is this comment process open since last week until the 24th of April. And it's focused on the replenishment of the reserve fund, if you

were interested to look at it. And with that, I'll go directly on the budget process. Can you please give us that next, next, next, next, further, next. Thank you.

This is simply -- I'm not going to go through this chart. It's simply, one, tells you that there's a lot of work relative to the operating plan and budget process. As Goran said, it's a 15 months process for a 12 months year. And we are right now where this green vertical bar is. We are right after the public comment process has closed. It closed last week, Thursday. And we are now starting to work hard on addressing the public comments that have been submitted.

Just quickly going over the next steps of the process, we have distributed yesterday -- and when I say we, it's my team has consolidated all of the comments, sorted them by topic and has distributed yesterday to all the members of the organization, I mean by that the ICANN staff distributed the comments by topic. So we sent to Maguy Serad all of the comments relative to contractual compliance and so on because these experts, in quotes, within the organization on various topics are the ones who will draft the comments. Sorry, the responses to the comments. And we'll send them back to my team for consolidation. After that we will have a centralized review that helps harmonizing a little bit ensuring there's no overlap, there's no inconsistencies, and we will review these comments and the

responses to the comments with the management team first and then with the Board Finance Committee.

The Board Finance Committee plays the role of a -- in this specific part of the process, in a quality control role of ensuring that we have adequately engaged, considered, and responded to the -- to the comments before that information then goes to the board along with the finalized budget for their consideration of an approval. So the board and the -- and the Board Finance Committee are very careful in trying to make sure that we have correctly listened to the -- the comments and been able to address them. And the Board Finance Committee verifies that we've gone through the process, will read the comments, read the responses, and provide us feedback on adjustments to that. Then it goes to the board and the board will do the same, look at the comments, look at the responses, and determine on that basis whether the budget that is subject to the approval has correctly taken into account, adequately taken into account, the comments. When I say taken into account the comments, it does not necessarily mean that every request is granted as it was formulated. It simply means that we have listened, we have considered, and we have made a decision that is explicit correctly formulated to either agree or disagree with the comments.

With that the board will decide on approval. If I assume it will approve, that is expected to happen towards the second half of May. And from that point on, from the board decision on, runs the 28-day period for the empowered community to consider whether this decision of the board to have approve the budget should be the subject of a potential veto or rejection as per the direct term of the process.

So if nothing happens within the 28 days, then the budget is considered effective. It's been approved by the board, it's not been rejected, it's therefore considered effective and it will therefore be applicable and effective from July 1st on.

Should there be a rejection process initiated as -- at the outset of the 28 days, which is the period during which the empowered community can consider that action, if rejection is initiated then, then it goes to the next step of escalation of the rejection process, which is not yet the veto but it's on the way towards a veto. And at that time it will take weeks, of course, for that process to happen. But in the meantime, July 1st, then, while there is a veto process ongoing, the caretaker budget will kick in. The caretaker budget, if you remember, if you were part of the transitions discussion, is this budget that is put in place while there is a veto ongoing so that the organization can continue functioning but also that is recognized that there is a veto process on the budget that is not the subject of community

(indiscernible) and agreement. And, therefore -- and the caretaker budget is described in the section 2.6 of the budget document number 2, for those interested, section 2.6. And we describe how that caretaker budget is determined, and this is what we would then apply on July 1st.

With that I'll stop and see if there are any comments or questions. I think we have a question over there by Michele.

Carlos.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Yes. I could just see it in Michele's computer the composition of the Board Finance Committee. Because it has changed a lot. It was led by Cherine for a long time as I was very active there. But Michele was so kind to show it to me because -- Adobe Connect.

MICHELE NEYLON: Xavier, for once, I'm not beating up on you. I'm actually helping you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I'll take anything you can give, Michele.

Yeah. Ron da Silva is the chair of the finance committee. He was vice chair last year until -- when Asha Hemrajani was chair. He's now in his second year of leadership. And the committee, by the

way, is also working on succession planning, because Ron da Silva has entered the last year of his current term. Doesn't mean that he's not going to be renewed. But he's working with the committee on his succession. That's the overall process. I don't know if there's any question on the process --

There is a question on the process. Two questions.

Go ahead, please. And then Paul.

RUBENS KUHL:

Rubens Kuhl, Registry Stakeholder Group. I wonder if there's still time to consider the comments made by many contracted parties this week about the funding estimates being too optimistic and probably resetting the budget to a more realistic funding expectation?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. So, Rubens, there's been a number of comments submitted by various organizations specifically related to funding.

I don't have the number in mind. I think it's about five or six comments that are specific to funding in the public comments submitted. And a few I have in mind, the one from the ccNSO SOP working group which suggests that their domain name

registration volumes are such that it's either a stable number or a slightly decreasing number that they would be expecting. And, therefore, that our assumptions should be revisited for that purpose.

So I think that's very consistent with what you just said. And, therefore, we will address that comment. I'm not addressing it now, of course, because we'll do it in writing in the report. But it will be covered, because it's already been a comment submitted.

I think we have Paul and -- Heather, I should let you moderate.

HEATHER FORREST:

Quite right, Xavier. Heather Forrest. Xavier, may I just follow up -- in fact, timely. I'm going to put my flag down. Just to emphasize the point that was made this morning, you just said there were five comments that spoke about funding. I think one of the most important interjections that was made in this morning's meeting with yourself and Becky was to say that we don't want to give over emphasis to the number of comments because, of course, when the registries submit a comment, there's a number of parties then that are submitting that comment. And it appears as one comment and so on. So this can't be reduced to a very simple quantitative exercise, whereas,

there were five comments on X but 19 on Y. So 19 is, obviously, more of a concern.

Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you for that point, Heather. It gives me the opportunity to elaborate on that. So we have consolidated the comments. There's about 155 comments that we have received. What we do is that we receive a statement of comment from a submitter. It's a document that may have 10 different points in it. So we break out that one document into 10 different points by each of the topics that it relates to. And we have offered this morning during the session that there was on public comment, the second session after yesterday's session. We have offered the statistics.

So what I was referring to, as Heather indicated, is that we have five comments on funding. It's simply statistics relative to the public comments.

We will, of course, answer every single comment individually. Though, of course, the comments that are similar will receive a similar response or sometimes the same response simply because the comments are similar.

So there's no prioritization given to answering comments on the basis of the number of comments that relate to one topic. It's simply helping us allocate the comments to the various experts within the organization, which is why we are doing this quantification and this analysis. And it also simply helps understanding what are the main topics that are addressed during those comments. But we will answer systematically every single one of the comments individually.

I think there's several people in the queue and Donna in addition.

HEATHER FORREST:

Xavier, it's Heather. I'm happy for you to manage the queue as best you have a good view of the flags from your end. If you prefer I manage it for you to make it easier for you, just let me know.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I see who is in the queue. I don't remember who was first. With that caveat, if you pardon me, I know Paul was there and then after Stephanie, Erika, Philippe, and Donna.

And I don't even remember in which order I just mentioned those names.

So Paul, please.

PAUL McGRADY:

Paul McGrady, for the record.

This council was part of the chartering of the Cross-Community Working Group on getting rid of the auction proceed money.

And --

[Laughter]

I think that's vital.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

It's important, apparently.

PAUL McGRADY:

But yet this budget has a part that calls for the notion of taking a big chunk of those auction proceeds. Is it 78 million? I'm not sure if I got the number right, but it's not small.

But anyways, how much? No -- for the reserve fund.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I'll clarify.

PAUL McGRADY:

Fix all the numbers. But, anyways, it's a lot of money.

But I was hoping that you could talk a little bit about the rationale behind that. The Applicant Guidebook seemed to imply that it would be for good causes. We set up this Cross-Community Working Group to identify good causes. We're kind of slow, but there's not -- you know.

But, anyways, if you could explain to us how those two concepts work together, that would be great. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

And Paul and I are working in tandem because he was nice enough to help me rehearse that question yesterday during the IPC session that we had.

So a couple of facts.

The public comment on the reserve fund replenishment that I mentioned at the beginning earlier is a separate public comment process focused on the replenishment. And this is where the proposal that Paul is referring to appears.

It is -- there's no indication or information relative to the FY19 budget documents specific about the replenishment of the reserve fund.

So, going back to that topic, that document on replenishment of the reserve fund is a strategy offered for public input by the board on how to replenish the reserve fund now that it has been set at 12 months of -- minimum of 12 months of operating expenses. And, when I say "set," it has been like that for the past 10 years. And it's simply been reconfirmed at that level.

The strategy contains three buckets, if I may use that word. First, the organization -- we need to generate savings so that it creates excesses up to \$15 million over a 5-year period that would be allocated to the replenishment of the reserve fund. That's one.

The second action would be to use a fraction of the auction proceeds currently held by ICANN for the purpose of replenishment of the reserve fund. And the suggested fraction of those auction proceeds is an amount equivalent to the amount by which the reserve fund was depleted as a result of the IANA stewardship transition expenses. That amount is 36 million.

And the remains then -- the remaining gap. Sorry. I forgot to say. The gap between the current level of the reserve fund and its target is 68 million.

We are, more or less, at six months of operating expenses. We need to be at 12. We're missing 68 million.

So, after the two first actions, savings from the organization, auction proceeds, there is a remaining gap of approximately 17 million. And the document on the public comment suggests three different sources in no specific order either using leftover from the new gTLD -- the current new gTLD program funds, if there would be any left -- happy to elaborate on why I'm saying that.

Second, additional operational savings from the ICANN organization.

And, third, additional auction proceeds to be taken away from the auction proceed fund to the reserve fund. Paul was referring to using as guidance for this consideration the Applicant Guidebook that explains -- or that, when the auction process for -- to sort the competing applications was designed, that if there would be proceeds, they could be utilized in various activities such as -- and there's a list that is offered and that Paul was kind enough to read yesterday.

So there was, at the time that the consideration for the replenishment was reviewed, there was a sense that there's a certain amount of urgency in quotes, which not everyone agrees with, to be clear, in replenishing the reserve fund.

It is believed that the organization cannot produce enough savings to -- in the short time frame, replenish the entire 68 million, which is, as we said, about half of ICANN's budget.

So the Board has considered what about using a fraction of the auction proceeds? And it's also been a topic discussed in various forms including the CCWG on auction proceeds.

And then the next question was how much? And, though it's not specific to the concept of auction proceeds, the amount that has been very recently depleted from the reserve fund, taken away from the reserve fund and the only expense that has been applied to the reserve fund in the past is the IANA stewardship transition expenses.

So the two concepts were associated together. And it is offered, therefore, a fraction of auction proceeds up to the IANA stewardship transition expenses, not because the two are really connected but more because that's what the reserve fund was depleted for.

So that's the rationale here.

I think we have Stephanie and then Erika and Donna and Keith and -- sorry, Philippe, Keith, and, sorry, Tony.

HEATHER FORREST: Heather Forrest. Very quickly, just to give you a time check.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes, thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: So you have a working group meeting that starts in two minutes. We're over our time in the council agenda. Donna has put down her flag in light of time.

I think what we probably need to do is think of a vehicle for channeling further questions to you through, perhaps, the SCBO, if that's an appropriate thing to do. I don't want to cut off the dialogue, because the council considers this an important matter. I would suggest anyone who feels that their comment is best raised here as opposed to a follow-up, because it's clear we do need some follow-up, let's manage the queue that way. How many flags do we have remaining? We have Erika remaining. Tony Harris remaining. Stephanie remaining.

So I would suggest we do -- Erika, I suspect you're in direct relation to what's just been said. And then let's do Stephanie, and we'll close the queue with Tony. Thank you.

ERIKA MANN:

Erika Mann, for the record. I will keep it very short and will cut the longer comments and will send them by email once you have defined a process to continue this debate.

I'm just interested in one issue, Xavier, which I can't find anywhere and we haven't discussed yet. This is how you want to bring -- let's assume we will be in agreement on the replenishment from the auction proceeds for the reserve fund. How do you then want to bring this into the process of the -- either the FY19 or FY20 budget? Or will this be then just the process where you assume that, because of the legal and fiduciary responsibility, it will be a quasi automatic process where the money is quasi withdrawn from the auction proceeds and will then be moved to the reserve fund?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Very quickly, this is a relatively practical question.

I'm simply envisioning that, if there would be, after this public comment, after a decision of the board to proceed with a withdrawal of the auction proceeds, that, if there is a board decision that's been made that states that, it's very easy, practically speaking, to withdraw money from the auction proceeds investment that is currently held and put it into the investment for the reserve fund that is currently held. It's a wire

transfer, if I'm oversimplifying. And it's very easy, and it could be done in a timing that's very short after the decision, if so desired.

ERIKA MANN:

Am I allowed to have a follow-up question? Quick one?

Would you be -- the management of the Board be able to restrict us to the transfer of the money in relation to the IANA transition and not for continuation of further replenishment of potential missing gaps in the reserve fund? So you see where I am hinting towards? Yeah?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I think -- sorry. I think your question is, if that would be done, if 36 million would be allocated from auction proceeds to reserve fund, can it be stated as the end of that possibility --

ERIKA MANN:

Of the one time -- yes.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Of one time. I suspect it would need to be formulated explicitly as such. But, if it's stated as such in -- maybe in board decisions so on, I think that would be, obviously, possible.

I would welcome the fact that this is actually offered as part of the public comments. Because that would be a really strong basis for being able to do so.

Thank you.

Stephanie and then Tony.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Stephanie Perrin, for the record. Ditto to what Erika said. I'll follow up with the SCBO. But I just wanted to put it out there.

It is my opinion that ICANN as an organization is more ossified even than government in terms of its administrative structures. And in a time of declining revenues, we need to find more flexibility. For instance, the bylaws say we have to have a review at a certain time. We need flexibility to defer that.

So can we start talking about those mechanisms in the context of being able to cut the budget as the revenues decline?

And you don't feel you have to answer today. Maybe that's a topic for discussion for the SCBO.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I'm sorry. I missed what flexibility you were referring to.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, even the flexibility in altering this budget if revenues suddenly start plummeting, you know? Flexibility in terms of a lot of the procedures are outlined in the bylaws. And so we have to get a bylaw change to get out of doing nine reviews next year. That sort of thing. That's just nuts, in my opinion, in a small organization. So the MS model is ironically more structured than government because of its pressures.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you very much for that comment.

I think that we do need to, going forward, develop mechanisms and processes that help us change decisions that may have been made in the past.

You're pointing out to an example. We have hard coded in the bylaws, in the fundamental bylaws, the reviews, for example. That's something that we may want to look at differently to carry out in a more effective and a more structured and in a smoother fashion rather than having very big peaks of reviews happening at one time and then less the next year and then going back to peaks.

So I think there's a very reasonable, logical way to go on reviews, for example, to be re-examined from the perspective of how and how often we make them happen.

And there's many other topics like that. Meeting strategy of rotating meetings is also something that's the subject of a decision. But it doesn't mean that we couldn't change that decision.

So there's some structural decisions that have been made in the past that we continue living with and that carry a cost or a burden for the organization and the community. There's some decisions within a fiscal year that can be reviewed in a more flexible fashion, but that still would take decision making as well

So processes that support the changes and approaches like that are very important. They also need to very much come from the community, right? We want to make sure we do what the community desires to do. In the reviews, for example, because it's in the bylaws, that's a topic that needs to be coming from the community and, of course, that we will want to support. But it makes a lot of sense.

I think we have Tony next.

TONY HARRIS:

Yes. My question is very quick. As a member of the auction proceeds working group, when we originally started work on this, the amount we were told was in play was \$150 million.

I understand that more -- more auction -- more auction proceeds were obtained after this. And I'm not too sure what the total is today. And that some of these new funds are still in litigation. So I'm not too sure when you're going to take a chunk of the proceeds for your purpose, which I wouldn't argue with that.

What are we talking about as a total amount from which this would be deducted? Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. So I'll give you numbers, but it's not my purpose. And it's the purpose of the community that would be reflected in that strategy of replenishment of the reserve fund, though I do have -- I feel I have a stake at it as an officer of the organization.

There is currently \$236 million of auction proceeds and interest reinvested from the investment of the auction proceeds into that fund.

So there were \$233 million of auction proceeds collected. The last auction collected was one of \$135 million for .WEB which is currently under legal proceedings, as you were pointing out. So from our perspective there is about 103 or 4 million dollars of auction proceeds from the previous auctions, \$135 million of the last auction proceed that's under, currently, legal proceedings, and that's the amounts that are currently held by the

organization. So if fast forwarding, there would be effectively a decision to take some auction proceeds from the -- from the two -- for the purpose of replenishing the reserve fund, we would obviously need to understand what limitation there is to take any of those auction proceeds. But there's 235 million available currently, again of which 135 under legal proceedings. Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: Excellent. This is Heather. Thank you, Xavier, very, very much for your time. And I know we've run you over by seven minutes to the finance working group. May I suggest then that we follow up with Xavier and actually, Ayden, it might be helpful if you're able to corral that effort through the SCBO. We'll follow up on the council list, Xavier, and we might come back to you with a list of further questions, if that's acceptable.

XAVIER CALVEZ: That's a very good approach. Thank you very much for your time and your invitation.

HEATHER FORREST: Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Heather, and thanks, Xavier. So just one minor point of clarification. And I know Xavier knows this but just for everybody here at the table and in the room, there are two different sort of pots of money, right, associated with the new gTLD program. There is the auction money that we just discussed with Xavier and then there is the over -- essentially the excess monies collected from the application fees associated with the new gTLDs. And Paul, I heard you use the -- you know, you threw out the number 80 million. That's about, I think, the estimate for the overcharging of the application fees. That is a distinct bucket of money from the auction proceeds. And so what they're talking about here is the auction proceeds could be used to refund the reserve fund. The extra money charged from the application fees, there's an expectation certainly among the applicants that on a -- because the program was run on a cost recovery basis that those funds at some point, once the program is complete, would be returned to the applicants. So just to make sure that everybody understands that there's two different sort of buckets of money. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Keith. This is Heather. That's very helpful. That's very helpful. And we'll look forward to -- I'm looking at Erika. We'll look forward to an update as well from CCWG auction proceeds as to their current status when that's available and we need to

merge these two discussions. So excellent. Thank you very much, everyone. So you might notice that we -- that was a little bit unusual in terms of process. We wanted to get -- ironically we wanted to get Xavier off to his working group meeting. Indeed we run him over time. But we need to circle back now to the opening remarks of our meeting, what would traditionally be item 2, and our review of the projects and action items lists. So if we could start, please, by -- and I actually think -- I skipped an item, too. I apologize. Let's leave the projects list open. That's all right. No, no, you don't have to make up for my mistake. Any -- we need -- I skipped 1.3, which is the review of the agenda. Any amendments to make to the agenda? I would like to add an item under AOB, if I may, please. I'm -- and we can do that as a closing item, so it can come after the open microphone, but I'd like to put on the record a specific thank you to -- to staff members supporting the meeting. So if we could come back to that under AOB, if you don't object? No? No other changes? Excellent. Thank you. Sorry about that.

So --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: This is Susan Kawaguchi. I just wanted to make a brief reference to the accreditation model that we proposed today.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Susan. We'll add that to AOB as well. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Michele, for the record. I'm not sure if we want to go down the route of opening that up because I can see that just causing -- causing headaches. Maybe it might be more appropriate for Susan to circulate the document list so people can actually have a discussion about it? I'm not opposed to discussing it. I just think that we could end up going down a hole with that one if we open it up now.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Absolutely. I'll send that to the list. And it wasn't -- it was just to make you all aware because we would like input from all stakeholders but not a discussion for the council today.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Susan. We'll take that on note then and we'll wait for that on the list. And I do want to try and focus us -- this is our excellent opportunity with a face-to-face meeting to get some public input and there are a number of things that we'd like to

have some public input on. So to the extent that we can preserve our time for open mic, I think that's a good thing.

So back to the projects list. Project list has -- you would have seen that circulated in your inbox prior to boarding planes for ICANN61. It has fairly few modifications since we last met. We noted in our February meeting that we had shifted some items out of current status and into -- into completion. There's nothing I have singled out based on the red line that probably needs direct discussion, and I don't think -- does anyone have any questions on this one? We've had very few substantive modifications to this since our February meeting. Any concerns, comments, questions? No? And nothing staff needs to note? I'm getting the signal that there's nothing that Marika's team wishes to draw to our attention. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Heather. Donna Austin. I'm not sure whether it's appropriate to raise this now or under -- have we talked about curative rights?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

(Off microphone).

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Can I just -- it's a question related under the board vote on the PDP protection of IGO names on all gTLDs. And just to flag for the council that during the contracted parties house discussion with the board yesterday we had some discussion about IGO acronyms, the fact that they are still not available to registry operators to be released. There was a temporary reservation made by the board, I think it was five years ago, four years ago, but that reservation -- that reservation was only in place for 12 months. I think when we had the facilitated discussion with Bruce there was -- there was some agreement around a notification process for IGO acronyms, but I think there was an understanding that because we thought the curative rights PDP was going to wrap up in a more timely fashion that we didn't have too much more discussion around IGO acronyms. So this is a live issue at the moment for the contracted parties house, particularly the registry -- well, actually I should say more so for the registries and the registrars. But it is possible that when we go -- and we have requested that during the GDD summit, which is in May, so two months away, that we will have a very pointed discussion with the board about how we can take this forward and get the release of those names. So I just wanted to flag that. I think one of the reasons that we -- council hasn't done anything about it is because we thought that curative rights PDP would be wrapped up in a more

timely fashion. But it's now become a bit of a hot button issue for the registry stakeholder group. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST: Understood, Donna. Thank you. And I think that's one that I would suggest that we actually put some substantive time on the agenda to discuss in April. Yeah? And that would be timely in the sense that it would come before the GDD summit. Berry, please.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Heather. Berry Cobb, for the record. Two quick items. One just a slight correction. The reservations that occurred in 2013 for those names are permanent until policy changes it. It wasn't 12 months temporary back from the 2013 aspect. And I'll just note for the council that from the project list perspective there were actually two line items related to the IGO/INGO working group. You will recall that there was recently -- the policy -- consensus policy was published as due to the implementation for the full names and IOC and some other Red Cross names. That has since been taken off. We kind of split it apart. One was implementation. This one that's still at the board vote level is in reference to the two outstanding recommendations that were inconsistent with the GAC advice. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Berry. Donna Austin. Not to dispute what you're saying, but I'm pretty sure there was a temporary reservation on IGO acronyms, but we can take that offline and sort that out. It's just something -- significantly important.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Donna. This is Heather, and I note Phil is asking, you know, should he speak to this now. No. And I think what I -- what I would recommend that we do, it's helpful, Berry's note about the specific change to the projects list, that there were that bifurcation of those items. Based on the substantive questions that only emphasizes the point that I think we should come back to this on our April agenda. So we'll make a note to add this as a discussion item.

So any further comments, questions, concerns, in relation to the projects list? Seeing none, may I ask then that we switch on our screens in the room to the action items, please. Thank you.

You'll note here that we've made some excellent progress with action items. The assignment of council liaisons, staff have circulated a call for volunteers in relation to the liaison to the ccNSO. Response very kindly made to that by Philippe. Are there any further volunteers for the liaison to the ccNSO role?

This is filling the seat that's being vacated by Keith Drazek. No? So I think two things to do. One, are there any objections to Philippe taking on the role of ccNSO liaison? Seeing none for the record, Philippe, congratulations, and thank you very much.

[Applause]

PHILLIPE FOUQUART: Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: And may we also formally note in the record, Keith has very ably served us in that role. Keith, we appreciate the time, effort, and energy that you've put into that and building clear, strong communication channels between us and the ccNSO. So thank you very much. Excellent.

The reason this item remains unchecked completely is we still have the remaining -- one remaining liaison role that is open, and I will note that there has not been a tremendous clamor to fill it and that is our dear friends at subsequent procedures. This is something that we need to do as a matter of priority because as it -- as it is now, Paul is -- we're really on Paul's patience in that while we've got Paul in RPMs, I don't want us to have us in a position where we have no liaison to sub pro. It is the PDP arguably with the most work tracks, needs a liaison very, very

quickly. So I'd like to prioritize this. And perhaps we can all do some thinking between now and the wrap-up session as to how we might want to progress that forward, bearing in mind some of the comments that were made on Sunday. Yes, Paul

PAUL McGRADY:

I just would -- Paul McGrady, for the record. And I just might say it needs a liaison or two. That the work track is so big that may need one and the plenary plus four may need one, if that makes sense. Something to think about.

HEATHER FORREST:

Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

I'm looking around the room, and I'm wondering whether we have -- Carlos is work track five but I don't know -- I mean, I think I'm down as a member but I'm going to have to step back as an observer. But if this is -- if the liaison has to be somebody on council, I'm not sure beyond Carlos we have anybody else on council that's following that, besides yourself, of course. Yeah.

HEATHER FORREST:

Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks. Keith Drazek, for the transcript. I'm thinking out loud here, and if -- if we were to consider -- and I don't know if even this is permitted in the bylaws or our charter to have two for a PDP, and we could carve out Work Track 5 as being one that perhaps Carlos could cover. I might be able to step up to the role of covering the rest or maybe it's, you know, the overarching liaison with a co-liaison or something like that, if we're going to get creative. I only mention this because I have colleagues who are involved in every one of these work tracks from VeriSign. So colleagues from VeriSign. So that would be in a sense a built-in bit of support to help track and to help keep track of things. I don't particularly -- you know, I'm not clamoring to do this, as you said, but if we get into a bind and no one else has the bandwidth or the availability, then I could lean on my colleagues and perhaps, you know, perform the role in terms of keeping up with things. So I'll just throw that out there. I'm not necessarily saying that's a -- we may need to make a decision today, but it's an option.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thank you, Keith. Out of one frying pan and into another. May I suggest, colleagues, that what we do here is I think it would be useful to have a bit more discussion. I, for one, would like to get a better sense of the plenary versus work track question and let's put -- shift the substantive discussion to our wrap-up when

we can take on board -- Cheryl is nodding assiduously -- when we can take on board some of the comments that were raised on Sunday and let's also loop in our sub pro leadership as well to get some views from them. But Keith, I very much appreciate your remarks.

KEITH DRAZEK: And just one other thing. Sorry. I should just say for the sake of - - so everybody understands, that my colleague Mark Anderson is now one of -- is the registry stakeholder group co-chair of that group, so just so everybody understands there's that -- that's what I was talking about is RDS.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

KEITH DRAZEK: We were talking RDS, right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

KEITH DRAZEK: Oh, sub pro.

[Laughter]

HEATHER FORREST: All right. Keith is going to be the liaison --

MICHELE NEYLON: Coffee is at the back of the room, I believe.

KEITH DRAZEK: Michele, I think I need something other than coffee at this point.
Thanks. Sorry, everybody.

HEATHER FORREST: Unprecedented volunteerism, Keith. Straight to the Ethos Award for you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, he's on that committee.

HEATHER FORREST: Separate award for Keith for overenthusiastic volunteering. Shall we move on before Keith volunteers for something else in the liaison role. On drafting team on the charter, let's -- here, Keith, here's one for you to volunteer. Drafting team on the charter related to the next steps for the ICANN procedure for handling WHOIS, of course that will remain on our action items list until June 1, pursuant to the language you see here. We'll

just take that as a matter of note for the next few council meetings so that we don't waste time with it, but it's sitting there. You'll notice that we had an updated -- an updated list here, the charter for the CCWG IG. It was on council leadership to ensure that that item found its way onto our agenda for this meeting, which it has. Standing committee on budget and operations, opportunity to offer sincere thanks to all members of the SCBO and to Ayden for successfully submitting a comment on behalf of the council on time in relation to the FY '19 budget. So thank you Ayden and colleagues very much. And I think it's very clear, Ayden, that you're not out of the hot seat in light of the discussion we just had moments ago with Xavier. So thank you very much for your willingness to continue in that role.

Post-implementation review framework. This is ongoing. Staff are working on this in the background, and when they have an update, they will -- they will communicate that to us so we can pick that up as we go. And GNSO members, for the ATRT 3 review team, so this is a matter that is still under discussion amongst the SO/AC chairs in view of the operating standards of specific reviews. Comments that have come in, the secretariat and the staff have noted these two outstanding obligations but they are essentially waiting for instructions from the SO/AC chairs. So we have that remaining open in our item. Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Quick question on that. Since it was October when we nominated these poor souls, should we at least reach out to them and say -- I mean, we could do this the standing selection committee and just say thank you, thank you, are you still interested and we really are hoping, sort of give them some sort of a non-answer but pat on the back?

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Susan. This is Heather.

Actually, the council instructed leadership to do that in January. So we've done that since then. Reached out to each one individually. Thanked them very much for their willingness. Asked about willingness to continue and so on.

And the response back was very positive. Thanks for filling us in. Thanks for not forgetting us. We'll hang on for a little while, but please don't take forever. So that's where we are now, and I think we'll just keep that channel of communication open.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I had forgotten that. So thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: Michele and then Donna.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Madam Chair. Michele, for the record. Just a slight segue, but it is related to this.

During the joint contracted party house meeting with the Board yesterday, there was some discussion about potentially resetting the cadence of the reviews, which, you know, deals with a number of pertinent issues. Not only the man-hours, manpower, you know, the volunteers required to man -- to work on those reviews. But also the budgetary implications of that.

I believe Goran Marby, the ICANN CEO, talked about potentially putting forward some kind of discussion paper or something. He is actually in the room here, so I don't know if wants to say anything. But that's something that probably would be coming our way sometime in the next few

weeks. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Michele, very much.

Goran, would you like to speak to that? Are you happy for us to carry on? Very happy not to speak for the record, according to the CEO.

Thanks, Michele. I think that's very helpful. This is one thing we mentioned over our weekend session as well is this timing of reviews and how that merges with budgetary pressures and so on.

We're at a point where the community needs to discuss this as a matter of urgency. And I believe it's very important that we engage in a robust manner with any proposals that are made by the CEO and his team.

I think it's helpful that that gets presented in the form of a discussion paper that we can all respond to as opposed to unilaterally from the GNSO trying to make recommendations as to how we go forward on this. But, as soon as we have that input, I would suggest that we form a small team to work on that. So thanks very much, Michele.

Back to action items. GNSO operating procedures and bylaws. All green ticks here. Fantastic progress. Very much thanks to the very effective work that we were able to do coming out of our January strategic planning session and the time and effort and energy that we were able to put into those changes.

The ICANN staff -- you'll notice the last item there, the ICANN staff has informed the ICANN board of directors of those recommendations that we made. And those will be considered in due course. So we shall receive an update whether that's

done. May I ask that we scroll down the screens just for the benefit of the folks following the screen.

You notice now we bifurcated our action items. We have so many things to do that we now have to create extra lists for them.

Our new practice is to note anything that's not necessarily council or staff or leadership but other action items that are on our list to be noted and put on to a separate list.

And we have here the demarcation of completing the consolidated timeline of RPM, PDP and sub pro. I thank the leaders of both of those PDPs very heartily for their discussion with the council on Sunday. And I believe we have matters to follow up in relation to that in tomorrow's wrap-up session, so we'll come back to that tomorrow.

Any further comments, questions, in relation to action items?

Sincere thanks to staff for helping us to complete a number of those items. And we can close that out and come back to the agenda, please.

Excellent.

So we have nothing on our consent agenda for this meeting, which then takes us to item number 5, which is the updated

charter for the cross-community engagement group on Internet governance. We note that there were some discussions around this in our meeting of the joint GNSO and ccNSO councils. With that, I turn the item to Rafik. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Heather. Rafik speaking.

I tried to brief again about the changes or I guess we can start the discussion about the document itself.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Rafik. It's Heather. I note this isn't, of course, the first time that this has been on our agenda. You did put the updated charter on the agenda for February. And it was done just a few days before the council meeting, so we didn't have a chance to go back and consult with our respective SGs and Cs. Now is an opportunity, now that we've had an opportunity to socialize within the SGs and Cs, I would encourage councillors to take this as an opportunity to raise questions, raise your comments, any items that you think that this group could use or that Rafik to take back to this group by way of refinements and so on. So let's offer that as an opportunity. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay.

We'll start with Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Rafik. And thank you, Heather. So I just want to note that, as one of the people, one of the councillors who was involved in sort of teeing up the original motion, recognizing that the CCWG IG no longer fit the model of CCWGs -- and I don't think we need to rehash all of this. We're all familiar, I think, with the history.

I do want to say that I think the CCWG group and, in particular, the folks who are involved in updating this charter have done a fine job of addressing the concerns that were raised.

I think, as we noted, going back to the original discussions and throughout, that there was a recognition at the council level and at our stakeholder groups and constituencies, that the work of this what used to be a CCWG and will now be an engagement group was very, very important and that the actual work was critical, that our concerns were in no way directed at the function or the work of the group or the criticality of having interaction and engagement between the ICANN community, ICANN staff, ICANN board on these issues of Internet governance.

So that is still my view. I think that it is very important that this engagement group move forward.

I feel like the work that Rafik and others have done in that group to develop this new structure that we're calling an engagement group is absolutely on track. And I fully support the work that's gone into this. I don't have any questions or comments at this point.

But, certainly, if others have questions or comments or thoughts or anything, feel free to weigh in. But I think the work has been good and certainly on the right track and addressed the concerns that I had about sort of the conflict between what we were calling a CCWG and what the requirements for CCWGs were.

Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Keith. That's quite positive.

So maybe if we don't have any -- I'm not sure if we don't have any further comment, I guess, question for us as a council. Because, by the motion, we are automatically withdrawing by this meeting. So -- as a chartering organization.

And so the question for us how we will coordinate with other -- like the ccNSO and the ALAC about the new vehicle.

I understand that the ccNSO have their own kind of -- they may ask for a division and changes. But then the work for us how we can coordinate that can be always tricky between three parts.

So the question is how we can schedule the creation of the new vehicle.

GNSO will be out for a few months from the current CCWG but how we can plan for the next steps. So I think this is just -- and I see that Cheryl wants to -- sorry. Darcy and then Cheryl.

DARCY SOUTHWELL:

Thanks, Rafik. Darcy Southwell.

So we discussed this with the registrar stakeholder group on Tuesday, I think it was. And I agree with Keith that we've done good work here to sort of refocus and try to get away from the CCWG. And I know this came up before. But we still have concerns when you look at the budget at ICANN and that we have challenges here with decreasing revenues and increasing costs.

And not to belabor the point, but we still don't quite feel like we have some answers in understanding what money in the budget goes anywhere near this.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

We'll try to respond. As far as I know., Thanks.

So, currently, in terms of budget what we get as resource just the thing, we don't have full-time staff supporting the working group.

Just we are using partly one resource from the -- one or two resources from the government engagement team. We use within the GSC.

So I think we can expect -- and this may be in terms of budgeting that they will continue the support.

I guess maybe this may be a fair question. Can we -- we can ask them. And we can get a response to the council if it can alleviate any concerns.

So I understand also, because I heard many times, that some people may think that the members of the working group are getting travel support to attend Internet governance event. It's not the case. We don't get any kind of support, even if sometimes we participate in organizing workshops. No, we

don't support anyone to go there. People are going in their own capacity, with their own resources. So just to -- but we can ask the staff to maybe give more details about the support. Yes. Cheryl.

HEATHER FORREST: Sorry, just to clarify.

Cheryl is next in the queue. And Greg, because of the lack of the AC and everything else, what I said in the beginning is let's come back during the open microphone time. We have dedicated open microphone time. And you can identify which agenda item you would like to speak to. And we'll come back to it, I promise. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I didn't realize you were at the microphone. My apologies.

From an ALAC point of view, I thought it was appropriate to remind you that, as a continuation as a chartering organization, the resolution that the ALAC has already done has no transition problems. Because it was vehicle neutral. It has the principle support for it to continue as a chartering organization in whatever construct wasn't a CCWG. So there will be no delay

from at least that co-chartering organizational perspective.
Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you for this clarification.

Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much, Rafik. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I just wanted to support the general tone of Darcy's question.

I wish we had better breakouts. And I really appreciate the transparency that the finance department has given us this year with the budget. I'd like to know what all our meetings are costing us. Because, as we dynamically will have to do more budget work -- I hate to pick on the RDS -- what are we spending on that? You know?

How much staff support is that costing us? What's our contracting bill? These are things, particularly the contracting, that we don't get a window on.

And so let's not -- and I don't mean to suggest for a moment that Darcy was picking on this particular group. But there's plenty of groups where we should have a much better idea of how much delay is costing us in these meetings. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Rafik. Heather. I'd like to follow up on Stephanie's comments.

For the benefit of everyone in the room, we can note that in our January strategic planning session, one of the ideas that we discussed was the idea of better cost accounting in relation to our PDPs.

And I think it's important that we not -- that we utilize that as a more holistic thing and not simply drill down on PDPs. To the extent that we're going to reasonably and rationally talk about fiscal prudence, that can't just be limited to a particular bucket of activities. So I think, Stephanie, your comments very much align with where our discussions were in January. And I think that's one that as a community we should follow up on. So thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So now it's Carlos.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Yes. I wanted to go to your previous question, Rafik. If we should go straight into the substance, I think we should go straight into the substance.

I was the previous liaison to the previous CWG before it was CCWG because I personally very interested. And I was able to participate in this session in this meeting's session I think it was yesterday.

It was packed.

It was packed with government engagement team which does not support the GAC. That's a totally different government activity. There were many government participants from the GAC. The business constituency was in the front table participating very actively.

There were many board members. And I really appreciate your comments, Cheryl, of maybe we should go for a vehicle-less definition of Internet governance. Because the agenda was totally flexible. It was more like a debate club. Maybe because Olivier comes from a British university. So I think it's a very strange situation. It's like a sailboat tacking right and left according to the wind. So maybe we should go for a structure-less type of engagement and leaving a lot of freedom to any volunteers there. Because it's kind of an oxymoron trying to find a dress for this type of activity. And, of course, I support that the budget is analyzed not only in supporting volunteers but also taking a look how many different parts of the organization take part in engaging with governments. Thank you very much.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. So maybe -- Rafik speaking. Trying to respond to several comments I heard.

With regard to the budget, as said, we can ask for more details. But just I've explained before many, many times, we're not getting that much support. We even have a hard time to get staff for us.

So I can understand all the concern because of the context of the budgeting. But -- I'm surprised that we are getting -- because I didn't see that much.

But we can ask for details and specifics to explain how we are expecting to conduct that in the future.

To respond to Carlos, we have this many terms why we should get involved or not.

So we try to elaborate the kind of the goals in the -- in the mission and the goals in the objectives.

So to be fair, ICANN as org is already involved in the space in the Internet governance space. And even the Board has its open working group that it's involved with there.

So the question was how the community can participate in such effort. So we are trying to have this space that everyone can join

and to participate. We made it in a way as a new vehicle that to move from it seemed that the kind of cross-community as a term have -- (indiscernible) kind of seems made scarce somehow different parts of the community. So we are moving from that and creating this space.

So we have that now.

But, again, so we try to follow-up and ask the related stuff to give all details and, too, also, if we can clarify what we kind of support to get if the new vehicle starts and the GNSO join as chartering organization.

So I think we have in the queue Donna. Yes. Okay.

So yeah. Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Rafik. So I just wanted to follow up procedurally next steps are. I just want to better understand what our next steps are. Sorry. Keith Drazek for the transcript. I heard Cheryl say that ALAC's motion or resolution essentially said whatever it's turned into, we support it. We're not going to have an interruption.

I think the way our motion was drafted, if I'm not mistaken, is that at the end of this meeting, we're no longer a chartering organization of what used to be the CCWG.

So my question is: Is the next step for this council to vote on a motion at our next meeting potentially to essentially sign us up to being a chartering member of the engagement group? And I just want to understand sort of, like, what our next steps ought to be.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Keith. Rafik speaking. I think it would make sense to do so. But, since we heard, like ccNSO has some reservation, if we really want all to be in that engagement group.

So I guess we can leave them some time to send back what they may ask for, revision and so to have everyone the same. So we should not kind of approve a charter. And we have different version.

I'd say let's do it quickly. And let's give them the time to -- yeah.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Rafik.

I agree completely with you. I think it makes sense to coordinate with the ccNSO and ALAC to make sure that we're on the same page and get it done once and correctly. So thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you very much, Rafik.

So with that -- and thanks to Keith for that reminder of next steps. Because it is indeed an important discussion that we'll need to continue to engage in. And we'll look forward to any updates that you have from -- in responding to the ccNSO's questions and concerns. And follow up then. Great. Thanks, Rafik.

Let's move on then to item number 6, which is an update on the GNSO Council's input into a consultation on the fellowship program.

Rafik, I understand that I think we have an update here to give. Again, this is one that's only just sort of come on to council's -- onto the list just immediately prior to the meeting. So it might be one that we need to circle back to.

But I'll turn to Rafik

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Heather. I hope that people don't get bored that I always (indiscernible) for this agenda item too. So maybe for the context we get that request for report by the questioner regarding the fellowship program. And so when we discussed and the council feel that we should respond to that but focusing on the area related to GNSO. So we had a small team formed by Michele, Martin and Tatiana and myself. And what we tried in the beginning just to agree, and we have kind of two guiding principles. That we need more measure and more metrics regarding the program since we are bringing the fellows to ICANN meetings and, in fact, to participate in the process. I don't think we are going to -- we're not trying to measure like for all fellows, really focusing on those who are expressing that they want to participate in the GNSO processes and also GNSO stakeholder group and constituency.

And so with that, we tried to respond. In some questions there was kind of requests what we think as the metrics, and we tried to develop like it's not just a mere attendance of -- at ICANN meeting doesn't equal a real participation but how they participate in working group. Are they attending conference call, are they participating in the drafting, are they participating in the discussion and so on. And try, if we can, to get more measure that we can use in term of -- in view in particular for those returning fellows.

So we focused really that it's the relation between the fellowship program and the policy development process. So how we can help the GNSO and the PDPs to -- need to get more volunteers using this existing program. So I forgot to say, I'm sorry that we sent a little bit late the comment but what we are looking here is really to get input from the council so that we can work on some parts of our response. So we have still some area that need to be resolved. We didn't have time as a team to work on that. But it's an opportunity to get some -- some input regarding the response. Yes.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Rafik. Donna Austin. Apologies because I didn't understand this was on the agenda, but I kind of have a little bit of a fundamental question here for the council. One of the concerns that I have about primarily focusing on these programs and how we can get people fed into the policy process, one of the challenges with our policy process and because there are -- they are on very narrow niche kind of subjects or topics is that unless you have a dog in the fight, it's really hard to maintain the dedication to stay in a PDP working group. And we've all -- you know, we've had a long conversation in January around, you know, the stamina that you need for these efforts. And I think we need to be careful that when we develop these responses or comments that we're really stick about what our expectations

are. Because these -- you know, I'm sure all of us that have been involved in a PDP effort, that it's not easygoing. It is really challenging to maintain the interest. So I would just at a meta level, I just wanted to make that comment that let's be realistic about our expectations when we do these comments. It is, you know -- it is really challenging. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. (saying name) has asked me to clarify, you're asking that we have our expectation from the program or expectation from this questionnaire?

DONNA AUSTIN: So I think for the -- the council's expectation about what we can provide in these comments and our understanding, based on our knowledge of what it takes to be involved in the PDP, that we be really stick about those when we provide our comments on the fellowship program.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, thanks, Donna. That's why we really want to restrict ourselves to around PDP and so we can add more -- we cannot always know maybe the challenge and difficulties, so yeah. I think Heather, yeah.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Rafik. Heather Forrest. I'd like to make a comment here really from a council perspective. This is not something that I've discussed with my constituency or my stakeholder group, but it's a general concern that I have that ties into our discussions around the FY '19 budget. And part of the reason why I pushed Xavier to specify the non-quantitative evaluation of comments on the budget is I'm concerned that we have a number of comments that have been made around these sorts of stakeholder engagement activities and I don't want the number of those, the quantity of those, to overshadow or outweigh the bigger picture concerns that we have about the budget. And I don't want us to lose sight as council. I entirely support Donna's comment that we tailor our input here and we be very careful about what it is that we want to input. But I don't want us to lose sight of the ultimate goal which is, I think, you know, if we -- if we extrapolate from the various comments that have been made across the GNSO community about the budget, this is not our biggest burning concern. And I don't want that -- if I'm misinterpreting, then I hope that you'll correct me. And very, very quickly, because I don't mean to, but I think our concerns are around fiscal prudence and operational sustainability and so on. And I just -- I just note that because this is on our agenda, and I don't want anyone to walk away and have a sense that this

is our biggest -- pardon me, deepest burning concern. And I see lots of heads nodding, but if I've said something incorrectly, it's innocent and I've just misunderstood. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Heather. We have a queue. I think Stephanie, Michele, and then Tatiana.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin, for the record. And my apologies for strolling in late. I was actually upstairs at the stakeholder engagement meeting for North America, and I didn't get a chance to make my comment, so I will later, of course. But I would just like to stress the point I made earlier about flexibility, and we discussed this at length in California at our retreat. I think we need to -- we need to change the way we get people to engage here and make it more articulated and on a scale. I can assure you I have had -- I was about to say at our meeting but there's a whole vast array of retired baby boomers out there. We were going for the young people. We could use some accounting expertise, we could use some statistics expertise, we could use some retired policemen here, and I have had a retired human rights lawyer sitting around my table listening to dear Chuck chair a RDS meeting and apart from saying my God, you've got a good chair there and no way in hell

will I ever show up and participate in that. We're at the drinking from the fire hose phase here. And it's the same with the young people. To get them up to speed where they feel confident enough to open their mouths at a PDP, particularly a fractious one, that's a couple of years and they should be out looking for jobs, you know? So as Donna said, if you don't have a -- I sound like a mother, I know. If you don't have a dog in this fight, you're not going to be here. And that doesn't lead to a multistakeholder community that works.

So we have to start figuring out how to break these into little pieces, you know? If I could yank a human rights lawyer into the RDS every now and then so there wouldn't be just me and people telling me I don't know what I'm talking about, that would be great. We could have -- you know, is the model that we've got now the best we can do? Or is it just the one we've grown up with, that's my question. So I agree, I get confused between the NextGen and the fellowship and the North American engagement and all of it. Let's get -- map this out and figure out what pieces we can get people to bite off. Thank you. Oh, and one more thing, I don't have time to mentor anybody, and I don't suppose anybody is really busy, maybe Keith does, he's only signed up for a few things there.

[Laughter]

So some mentors that have retired would be great.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Stephanie. Okay. We got five minutes left and the rest of the people in the queue. I just want to say, I'm not sure that what you comment really specific to the questionnaire, so anyway. So Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: I'm swapping with Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, thank you very much we're swapping because I want to address what Heather and Donna just said because this is exactly -- that was exactly my point behind drafting this comment when I was the one who supported it. I think that we are trying to make it not in the context of budgetary requirements or cuts there. We want to comment on engagement on the value of this program and on expectation and real involvement. And it's not a question -- I mean, in a way it is a questionnaire related to budget, but I consider it related to bringing people in. Bringing real value. And I think that it would be very sad that if this comment would be considered on -- only in the context of budget. So thank you very much for your comments, and I think that this is -- this is the input we can take

with us. So just to strengthen the involvement part and focusing less on the money. Because I don't believe we focused on money that much actually.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks. Michele, for the record. The commentary that we put -- that the we pulled together on this was something that was developed over the course of several weeks and, you know, there is a -- there is definitely a displeasure, discontent, and general kind of unhappiness with how the fellowship seems to be feeding into various parts of the ICANN circus. And I think, you know, Donna's right. I mean, the expectation that people would suddenly go through fellowships and start becoming super-doooper active members of PDPs is ridiculous. But nobody seems to have ever actually asked us what we want, how we'd like to have this and how that could be improved. What we seem to have is this kind of thing. I mean, to a certain degree I think the comments from Stephanie are pertinent. I mean, it's this kind of disjointed oh, we must get lots of young people because young people understand the Internet. Gee, I'm not that old, for God's sake. And whereas, you know, there are probably people who have experience of certain things outside this space who could bring valuable input. But maybe not being engaged here all the time because that takes up way too much time. So I think what we aren't focusing solely on the financials,

but we can't ignore them. I think we've struck a reasonable balance there, and I think Rafik has done a good job of shepherding the input from those of us who were feeling rather passionate about the entire thing. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Michele. It was one we have a really short time left, so I just ask people to be really, really brief so we can move to the next agenda item. And I think there is still opportunity to add comments in the list. So Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Philippe Fouquart from the ISPCP. I'll be brief. I just wanted to -- there will be a lot to say about the previous comments, but I just want to note that within the ISPCP, we are - - we can provide some comments on this. We are developing some text for that purpose. We're generally cautiously supportive of the process. Bearing in mind that we do not -- let's put it this way, we do not have a large share of the pie so we think we are somehow objective. So there we are. I just want to state that we are working on this, too, with a broader scope, meaning not focused on PDPs only but on ICANN in general.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Philippe. Martin.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: Yes. I'll try to be brief. Martin, for the record. First of all, I would like to stress that this is like very normal. I've seen working groups within the council there's like a scene, that we assume that there is a general position. I do not agree there's a general position or discomfort in the fellowship. It's like the echo chamber. We find people that maybe, you know, do the same things that we do. We assume everyone does. In my experience I found the other way around, but I won't state people are happy with the fellowship either because I know that my own bubble has its own thing. So it is not true there's a general discomfort like it's all bad, we all have to change it. But there is a general discord, concern or curiosity on what the (indiscernible) means, what it's doing, why we don't have -- why don't we have enough data to write the conclusion. I do agree there is a concern there. But not just a general discomfort with.

Second, to assess these programs, fellowship, NextGen, or whatever, we have to set a real goal behind them and not just ask things because they're engagement programs. Like the fellowship is not to bring only people to PDP. That's one of the many goals it has. So we actually to address, we have to see it from our perspective of GNSO. That's okay. We are PDPs, you know. We are concerned from that perspective. But the program itself is broader. We should try to understand and

grasp the whole idea that it's trying to do. The NextGen is different. They're not the same thing. So I would be -- I will try to be responsible and honest on the process on how we write the conclusion. If we say we don't have enough data, let's hold conclusions until we do and demand that all the strong wiki we have as a council but do not write a conclusion, a recommendation, or ask for a change, like asking that we demand the fellowship to have ten fellows for one PDP in this year. We don't know that. (indiscernible) takes years to develop, and it has been changing and (indiscernible) --

RAFIK DAMMAK: Martin, I hate to cut anybody, but all those -- I mean, we need to be brief. I think your point was made.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: I'm almost finished.

RAFIK DAMMAK: And we still have like three people, so just to give everyone a chance. Thanks.

MARTIN SILVA VALENT: I am finished. So I would like to bring that part of -- let's be responsible in how we write those conclusions. We have every

right and almost obligation of looking to those things, but also have the obligation to be careful on how we change things. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Martin. So we have Ayden, Rubens, and Darcy, and that's it, yeah.

AYDEN FERDELINE: Thanks for that, Rafik. Ayden Ferdeline, for the record. Some of the comments that I'm just hearing I don't think actually are being asked as part of the consultation. So the consultation is only asking some very narrow questions, and I'm hearing broader questions speaking to the value of the fellowship program. That is not what we're being asked. We're being asked how do we as the GNSO Council responding to this questionnaire, how do we participate in the selection process, and we don't. And if you look at the selection criteria at the moment, you look at the selection panel, there was no one from the GNSO actually on the selection panel for the Fellowship Program. So I think the consultation is actually asking us, what are we expecting the program to deliver, what are our goals, and how do we want to be involved, if we want to be involved in the future of the Fellowship Program. It is not asking us whether we want the program to be smaller or larger. We all have different

views here. It is simply asking us on a process front what level of involvement do we want in the fellowship program should it continue in the future. And that was what I wanted to flag, the fact that I think there is a fundamental flaw in who is serving on the selection panel at the moment in that there is not a single person from the GNSO, and that might be why we're not seeing a lot of the candidates who are chosen progressing into -- into GNSO-related activities like we might want. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Rubens.

RUBENS KUHL: Rubens Kuhl, registry stakeholder group. When we mention financial concerns, we need to separate things related to the current financial status, which is decreasing funding, into for money.

I heard many comments from stakeholder groups and constituencies about return from our investment in the fellowship program. So it's not only about not having the money. It's also about what's being done, what's being achieved by the money.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Rubens. Arsene.

ARSENE TUNGALI: Arsene Tungali. I would like to know how long do you have to submit the comments. What is the deadline.

Secondly, how long is the drafting team going to take to bring their draft responses to the council for discussion.

And I would suggest to do it ahead of time to allow more time for the council to discuss the draft responses before the deadline. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Arsene. I think, as it was indicated in the agenda, the deadline is the 13th of March.

So we already now shared the version we have, but I think not working with the team. We kind of agree that we will continue to resolve the point that is still up. And, hopefully, we'll send another version to the council list for discussion. And I think the post that we're sincere, doesn't need to be in council. We can agree within the list. Yeah.

Okay?

So, Stephanie. Sorry. Closed the queue.

Yep. Yeah. Time management still matters since we still have several agenda items.

Yeah.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks, Rafik. I'm mindful that we'd like to reserve time for the open microphone. And we have folks who have joined us. We've eaten into some of that time. I don't want to dissuade conversation. But I do think, given that we've only had a short period of time to see that on the list, we definitely need to follow up on it. So let's do that.

So with that -- and, Jen, with apologies. Thank you very much. We can turn to you now.

So this is item number 7. It is the review of the inter-registrar transfer policy. Jen Gore from ICANN org has agreed to join us. You might recall that this went out on the council list with a specific ask for specific questions for Jen to make the best use of this time.

So, Jen, happy to turn it over to you. Welcome. Thank you for rejoining the council, as it were.

JENNIFER GORE:

Thank you, Heather. Thank you, councillors. Jennifer Gore, ICANN staff. I'll quickly run through the slides, because I know you're pressed for time. Within the 2014 inter-registrar transfer policy working group final report, there's a recommendation for a review that will be convened by staff.

They are convening a panel of community members to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine if the policy updates resulted in improvements to the IRTP process and dispute mechanisms and, finally, to identify possible remaining shortcomings.

This review should occur once all of the recommendations of the various IRTP PDP efforts have been implemented.

Those were implemented as of 1st of December 2016.

Move on to the next slide. Thanks.

So it has been proposed to deliver a post-implementation IRTP status report to the council by the 1st of May.

The status report will include the following: A summary of the policy recommendations of the IRTP working group, A, B, C, D and stated goals or intentions of the policy recommendations, details regarding the subsequent implementation of the policy recommendations, and relevant data points ICANN org has collected that may inform the subsequently formed panel

review of the impact of the policy recommendations, potential issues or gap that ICANN organization and the community have identified via specific complaints and potential options for the next step for council consideration.

With that in mind, I will turn it over to you, Heather, or for questions.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Jen, very much.

At a first glance, my comment to Rafik and Donna was it's another review. And we have a broader discussion here about reviews and resources. So I think that needs to factor into the discussion.

Jen, you have a queue. And we're now eating into open microphone. Not that I want to cut the discussion here. But we just want to be mindful of our interventions. We have Michele, and then we have Philippe, and we have Susan, and we have Rubens.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Madam Chair. Just a couple things. First off, in relation to the specific policy, the impact to the policy is broad, wide, and very disruptive, which was not the intention when the policy

process kicked off several years ago. We've ended up with -- we've ended up with something which is that way.

But I think councillors should be also mindful of the paper that we were looking at in L.A. around reviews of policies in general. And, if you could try to bring feedback from your stakeholder groups back to council, that would be helpful.

Because, as Heather points out, it's yet another review. We need to have them, but we need to work out how to conduct them. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST: Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So remind me which part was not working in this. Am I confused in this? Wasn't part of this sent over to the PPSAI -- what was the transfer of registrant issue with this policy?

JENNIFER GORE: Per the direction from the council for the PPSAI, the part that's going to be discussed during the comment period of the privacy, proxy is the transfer process associated to registrations that are affiliated with the privacy proxy.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. So in some ways this policy isn't -- yes, it was -- all the work was completed a long time ago. But then that became an apparent issue.

So, to me, until the PPSAI part is figured out, do we really need to review this yet, would be my question?

HEATHER FORREST: For the record, everyone's looking around waiting for someone to reply. Thanks, Susan.

Look, I think it's an important question that we probably want to capture and follow up on. I don't anticipate this is our last discussion with Jen on this topic. So I think what we can do, Jen, is capture that one and any others that come up after this meeting and we get them back to you?

JENNIFER GORE: Absolutely. Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: Perfect. So with that, Rubens, you're standing between us and our next guest speaker. Thanks.

RUBENS KUHL: Rubens Kuhl. Just to warn us that everything that we collected regarding transfers has been obsoleted by GDPR.

So it is an interesting academic exercise to look what happened before GDPR. But we should probably also look what happens with transfers, transfer issues, transfer disputes after GDPR.

JENNIFER GORE: Thank you, Rubens.

Thank you, Heather.

HEATHER FORREST: Perfect. Thank you, Jen, very much for joining us. We'll follow up with Jen and capture the question that's been raised by Susan and anything else we'd like to ask Jen on this and we'll follow up. Thanks very much.

Now let's turn to our agenda item number 8, which is any other business. We had two items specifically on the agenda here -- an update from Wolf-Ulrich Knoben who is joining us remotely on the GNSO working group. And I would like to propose on behalf of the leadership team that we take 8.2 off our agenda today to make sure that we have time for open microphone. This is a unique opportunity that's offered by a public meeting. It doesn't mean we won't talk about 8.2. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Madam Chair. Just one thing I have been asked to mention on behalf of the registrar stakeholder group is that the registrars have written to ICANN in relation to policies impacted by GDPR and a way forward for operationalizing transfers.

I can circulate the letter to the list, but just so people are aware.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Michele. I think it would be very helpful to circulate that to the list.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, we are missing you here in San Juan. Over to you, please, with the -- so you're not able to see the room. But we do have a number of folks who would like to join the public mic. So over to you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Hi. Thanks, Heather. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Can you hear me?

HEATHER FORREST: Yes, we can, Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Great. I can also see you. But with a backlog of 20 seconds, I can see you.

So happy to give you a short update on the GNSO review implementation. What I'm talking about is exactly the review which started in 2014. And, as you know, this is a funny thing that we are still talking about and discussing the implementation of this review as we already have started now to hammer on the Board in order to shape a new review, which is coming up next year in a new fashion.

So let me make it a little bit short. Just briefly -- I don't know. I can see the presentation. Let's go through that first slide. Is that up?

HEATHER FORREST: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich. We have the slide that says, "Current status."

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much. So we had three phases, two of implementation to implement all the recommendations in terms of different priorities. And, as you can see, the -- two of the first phases have already been agreed to implement and have been seen and have been checked by all members of the working group that this work has been done already in parallel as the

recommendations have been worked out. So that work has been done. This is full in shape here

And for the phase 3 -- so we have in total 15 further recommendations to work on.

We are in shape with that. And we think about that in May. We can have implemented eight of them. Seven recommendations are still pending because of -- they are interrelated to the input from ongoing work with regards to GDPR.

This is specifically for the recommendations who deal with statements of interest and the related data that should be collected in the future.

And there are other recommendations which are pending on input from the cross-community work stream on accountability of the Work Stream 2, especially from the diversity subteam recommendations.

So we will pick up these recommendations again after this ICANN meeting and check, you know, what is the progress on the input we can do to these recommendations with regards to the input coming from the other groups.

That in total makes it that our group is on track and on schedule with all the recommendations.

My specific point I would like to raise, which is on the next slide, please, is two recommendations which may affect the budget question.

And this is related to the translation and transcription services.

We just started that discussion. We would like to come up with a kind of recommendation how to deal with that in the future.

But this is a work which may come back to you as well to discuss depending on the input data we have to think about. You know, there are a lot of meetings held over the year on working groups. And, if you count all meetings, for example, from the last year, working group meetings, there have probably been 350 meetings in different working streams, working groups.

And, if you count, you know, the work which has to be done in translation and transcription service, depending on the number of languages, you are -- you have to translate and, depending on the number of working groups -- so you may really start with some requirements of budget in the size of some hundred thousand U.S. dollars.

So we try to come up with suggestions and parameters to take into consideration. And, as soon as possible, you should then discuss it on council.

So going to the timeline, next slide, you will see we are in shape. Our timeline is that you should have up to the end of this year in total to finish our work, we are confident that we can be on time and even a little bit before that. But, as you never know, we are a little bit cautious on that.

So that's it. And thank you for your attention.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich, and for your willingness to join us remotely.

May I suggest that we follow up with Wolf-Ulrich via the list? And that enables us to turn our time and attention to the open microphone.

So we have then three -- PDP 3.0 as a talking point. And specifically to address some of the feedback that we received about our different way of approaching things on Sunday, that's not the only topic that we're opening the microphone to. But we certainly welcome any input -- any input that anyone would like to give. That said, Greg, you had an intervention earlier. And I've held your place on the microphone.

Over to you if I can ask -- so we really only have 10 minutes for this. So, if everyone at the microphone can make their point and then we can follow up with you, that would be great.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Greg Shatan, for the record. I'll be brief. I was following up on Darcy's question to Rafik about the expenditures on cross-community group on Internet governance. And I think that the expenses -- I'm a member of the group. And from my experience, the only support and, thus, the only expense we would get are those surrounding having the calls or having a meeting here. So that would be scheduling the call, call support on Adobe Connect, if there is still such a thing, and sending around transcripts afterwards. That sort of thing. That's the limit of ICANN support as far as I can tell. Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks very much, Greg.
Chuck, to you, please.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks. Chuck Gomes in my role as chair of the RDS PDP working group. Let me start by saying thanks to what you're doing.
I think the focus on improvement of the PDP is right on target. And I thought the session Sunday morning was very good.

What I'd like to report to you -- and this is still in development. So I won't give too many details, because we haven't finalized all of those. The leadership team agreed this morning to try and implement one of the ideas that came out of that session on Sunday.

That particular idea had to do with commitment, commitment to the consensus policy process in contrast to just advocating for a particular position.

So in the next few weeks -- and we haven't communicated with a working group yet. We hope to do that in the next couple weeks. We're going to work on that. See if we can implement something that would take that one idea and maybe help us make speedier progress in terms of what we're doing. So thanks again for your efforts and what you're continuing to do on that. It's much appreciated.

HEATHER FORREST:

Thanks very much, Chuck. It's fabulous to see that the discussions from Sunday are already generating some ideas within the PDP leadership teams. I think that's exactly what we were hoping for. So sounds fantastic. And anything that we can do to help you, you just need to let us know. Thanks very much. Please.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thanks, Heather. It's Bruce Tonkin. Just a little bit of an observation and then some advice. An observation is that the purpose of the GNSO Council is to manage the policy development process.

And I looked at the site today, and there's a project list. Looks about, like, nine projects underway in the section that relates to policy development cross-community working groups. And normally, as a manager, when you're managing a portfolio of projects, you would start a meeting with this like are these projects on track or not.

And traffic lights would be a good tool to use here, I think. To say I've got nine projects, how many of them are green? In other words, they're on track, on target, making tangible process? How many of them are amber, there's some issues? And how many are red?

And the council's time then would be focused on the ones that are red and amber. And your choices are either you provide some assistance to get them off red or you cancel them. And I think the cancel -- this is like a layer above this policy development process. But you're focused on individual policies. But I think the council needs to get better at managing the portfolio of projects. You've got a limited amount of resources.

In some cases, these projects are holding up progress across the organization.

And in some ways it would be better just to kill them so people can move on rather than have a whole bunch of projects that appear to be in red status. Just, as a tool for your next meeting, why don't you actually take the projects and give them a traffic light rating as to whether they're on track and delivering, whether there's issues, yellow, or whether they're red, they're just stuck. They're not making progress.

Also just some advice on reviews. I've heard comments there's a lot of resources on reviews and, therefore, maybe we shouldn't do some or maybe we should delay them.

Why not just do a review efficiently? I think you can do a review in three days.

Day 1, talk to the body that's actually being reviewed and get their feedback.

Day 2 you get people outside the body to develop feedback.

And day 3 you develop recommendations. Vast majority of what we do in this organization can be done in three days. There should be no reason why we take longer to do the review than the work.

And in most cases by the time the review is finished, the body being reviewed has moved on. It's three, four years later. Massively inefficient. Should be able to do reviews in three days. Don't stop doing the reviews. Do them efficiently.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks very much, Bruce, for giving us our new mantra about things not taking longer to review than actual doing the work. That's great.

I have a queue of Michele and Paul.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Michele Neylon, for the record. Bruce, totally agree with pretty much everything you said. Some of this is stuff we were discussing in detail during our meeting in L.A.

The council, I believe, is very conscious of the dysfunctionality in some of these PDPs. And several of us were advocating for a more surgical business approach to a lot of them. If it's not working, kill the damn thing. The product is not selling, why sell it? Totally agree.

I'm not sure of the traffic lights. Why not? Happy to try most things.

PAUL McGRADY: Paul McGrady. Thank you, Bruce.

We've taken a look at these. And we know some are malfunctioning. Takes a lot of guts to kill something. I think you're one of the least radical people I know. And for you to say it's okay to consider killing off something I think will lend some bravery to us. Because I do think we need to take a hard look at some of this stuff. Thank you.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you. Just plus one to what's being said. And we need tools as well. I think we need information but also tools to balance these. I come from a different environment where that's straightforward. But I think we need to make progress in that respect. Thank you.

HEATHER FORREST: So, Bruce, thanks very much for giving us tangible ideas that we can start to discuss. And I think this, too, needs to be a top priority on our agenda for the next meeting that we talk about how we can in a substantive way contribute to this discussion on making reviews more efficient and effective. So thank you.

Phil.

PHILIP CORWIN:

Thank you. Thank you, Heather, and greetings, former colleagues. Phil Corwin now with the registry stakeholder group. Some quick personal comments in regard to PDP improvements. One, in my role as co-chair of the RPM review working group, I've taken the message to heart. I'm already talking to working group members here, and I plan on our next call to impress on our members the need to adhere to our timeline and to encourage active discussion of ideas for operational roles for expediting our process to move forward with comprehensive but not overly prolonged consideration of the many topics before us.

Switching to my experience -- my unhappy experience as co-chair with the IGO CRP working group and noting thanks to Susan Kawaguchi who in her role as liaison to that working group is going to be engaging in active outreach over the next week or two to get a sense of where members are at to see if there's any hope of getting consensus on the substantial issue before that working group, I would give you three thoughts about possible issues to deal with. One, I would suggest that when a working group is focused on a particular issue and when the interest group that is the focus of the working group refuses to participate in the working group as members, it might be a good idea to stop it right at the beginning because it creates a very difficult dynamic within the working group when the people

whose interests are at stake refuse to participate in the official membership capacity.

Second, there needs to be more specificity, I believe, in the guidelines about the authority of the co-chairs to conduct polls and take other operational decisions.

And, third, based on the section 3.7 challenge that the co-chairs faced when we attempted to conduct a poll in November to get to initiate the consensus call, process section 3.7 needs to be revisited.

It's very vague now about what that process is other than the appellant who fails the appeal gets a conversation with the co-chairs and then with the council chair and/or her representatives and what the result should be.

And, really, the timeline. Because that was an appeal, while the holidays were partly to blame, that appeal was filed in November. And we're still trying to resolve it now in March. So there needs to be much more expedited process for section 3.7 as well as some restrictions on when it can be invoked and not just be invoked willy nilly whenever one member of the working group has a dispute with the chairs over procedure.

Thank you very much. I hope those are helpful.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks very much to everyone who has contributed to our open microphone.

I'm mindful of the time. And I would also like to say, although we're often seen as not terribly exciting on a Thursday, we are specifically going to come back to the topic of PDP improvements in our wrap-up session tomorrow morning. And I encourage everyone who would like to contribute to that process, you know, please -- the feedback we've had from Sunday has been overwhelmingly positive. And I think that's wonderful. We don't want to give the impression that this is the end of giving input.

I encourage you to come back for that.

May I then add -- come to my added agenda item, which is a very specific thank you on behalf of the GNSO Council.

So in this fun environment of discussing the budget and staff costs and so on, we don't want to give the mistaken impression that we do anything other than overwhelmingly value the input and the support that the staff provides.

So, on behalf of council, may we please specifically thank and note these thanks to Nathalie Peregrine, Terri Agnew, Julie Bisland, Michelle DeSmyter, Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Julie

Hedlund, Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Emily Barabas, Ariel Liang, Berry Cobb.

[Applause]

Thank you from all of us to you. Thank you very much to you all. That concludes the GNSO -- Keith, apologies.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Heather. Sorry for jumping in at the last minute. But I'd like to build in on what you just said.

In the context of our work and reviewing PDPs and everything that goes into the level of work, whether efficiency and effectiveness, right? Those were some of the buzz words that we had coming out of Los Angeles. And we consider the issues and the impact of these various work tracks on volunteer council participation, community participation. We absolutely have to make sure we also consider the impact on staff in terms of their bandwidth and their ability to support us in our work.

Without the staff, we wouldn't be able to do what we do. And, if they're stretched too thin as we are as a community, it's not going to be good for anybody. So I think we just need to make sure we remember that and factor that into our considerations. Thanks.

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks very much, Keith. Beautifully said. Much appreciated. Any further input before I do it again, cut someone off unintentionally? No? Brilliant.

This concludes the GNSO Council's meeting for March 2018.

Thanks very much to everyone. And we look forward to seeing you in our wrap-up session tomorrow. Thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]