

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe  
GNSO – CSG Open Meeting  
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 10:30 JST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

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

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, everybody, for coming to the CSG meeting. We have with us Göran and Cyrus. Thank you very much for taking the time – and, Becky – sorry – to be with us today.

So I would propose is that maybe if you agree, Göran, you can start if you have any comments to share with us, you can start with that and then as you know, the three constituencies will be asking each one question to start with. And then we'll engage in debate if that's fine for you.

Göran Marby: I mean, this usually becomes very interesting. So when do we start with questions? I think that's easy.

Claudia Selli: Sure. We can do that. So we'll go to the round robin and we will start with the IPC, ISPCP, and then from the IPC's standpoint, Brian and Alex, I don't know who will go first.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you so much. Actually, do you mind if we can do for and go second? Would that be possible?

Claudia Selli: Tony, is that time for you to start?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So as a chair, I can hand over to Tony. I'm confident he knows what he's saying.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Okay, so, you kindly invited questions. And one of the things that we've been discussing in the constituency followed on from yesterday's meeting of the CCWG on Internet governance.

And we certainly commend ICANN for their efforts in getting some form of early warning of issues that are at the political level, that are likely to impact the ICANN environment and I think that's a really good initiative.

The surprise we had was when we looked at the charter that's going to underpin the follow-on operations from that.

It appears that the responsibility for importing that, which will help make sure everyone is aware of ICANN's mission and the facts of any matter they're relating seems to come down to ICANN.org rather than looping back in through the community.

There doesn't appear to be a community loop in there which is a concern because I think that the strength of ICANN is its multi-stakeholder environment.

And through that environment and that engagement, you get a lot of additional information, so has any thought been given to that and...

Göran Marby: I actually don't really understand because the whole charter is about to be transparent and have community engagement and am I missing the point?

((Crosstalk))

Göran Marby: ...and it still before 12:00 so I'm not waking up yet.

Tony Holmes: Well, we haven't got the charter up, but there were three elements to the charter, three follow-on action that could be taken. They all appear to be focused towards actions taken by ICANN.org without a community loop in there.

So the intelligence, I think is a really useful thing to have. Advance warning is always good. But the actions that can follow on to actually make sure that the awareness of ICANN, its role, how it operates and how it would be impacted didn't appear to have any form of community discussion.

Göran Marby: So, the reason my we did a charter for comments is to get comments so we can have, however, it's it transparency charter really, to make sure that the community knows what we are doing and can have inputs to it.

So that's the sort of intention of bringing out a charter. If you have specific proposals how to make that happen in a positive way, that's why we ask you for comments.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thank you. So we will send some comments back on that. Follow...

Göran Marby: And we're looking forward to it.

Tony Holmes: If I can follow-on from another aspect of that discussion, as well, I believe there is a discussion with regards to why ICANN engagement and other forums, as well, one of which is within the ITU, as well.

And the question that we have there - in fact, two questions. One is, what does ICANN believe it will actually achieve by becoming a member of the ITU that it can't do now?

And the second question is, has there been any risk assessment done on what that could possibly mean for ICANN in a longer-term?

Göran Marby: I mean, we are anticipating an ITU today under the flag of, for instance, organizations like right and ISOC. And it's actually, if you turn it around, why should we, ICANN, which you are part of - I mean, you are ICANN - not be able to stand with its own flag in the (unintelligible). It would have to stand (with) someone else?

And have to be asked permission for having - for asking them to convey what we believe is our mission? So we - did a lot of history in this. Maybe I don't know all the history that I've been active in ITU and that see some embarrassment, actually, that ICANN, as an institution, doesn't perceive itself of being as strong as ISOC and Right, for instance, or the other (RERs directly) or they're already.

The reason my we choose (ITUT) is actually because we have friends in ITUT. We don't have to go there as well. ITUT is about some of the things that are in the ICANN DNA which is about connecting more people to the Internet itself which I happen to believe in personally, is a very good thing.

So when it comes to risk assessment, sometimes it seems to be the perception that the ITU (directive) powers to countries within the (ITUS) powers. And you know as well as I do that in the ITU (four) are countries that meet and talk about things that definitely has an impact on ICANN.

And as I said in my opening speech yesterday, I happen to believe that ICANN, as an institution, is fairly good at making certain types of decisions.

And I think to some extent are better than qualified governments and I think it's important for us to stand up and have that opinion also within the ITU.

And as I said to someone else, yes, we can leave. They cannot take is over because we're members.

Göran Marby: Can I just come back? And I think part of the concern is that we were really looking at ICANN as an institution that is, in its own environment, equivalent to the ITU.

Yet, becoming a sector member of the ITU doesn't place ICANN at that level. In fact, it places ICANN way down the stack as a sector member because in all of the major conferences where ICANN may want to express the view, you can do that.

It's government that is at the table, not sector members. So the issue is, what does ICANN gain that it couldn't actually achieve through being part of the ITUD as a partnership arrangement rather than as a sector member?

Göran Marby: Now, first of all, correction. ITU is a member here. They're (unintelligible) within the GAC. And we're sort of doing the same thing with them now, so I think that we are equal.

And (in all of this) I would actually say that it feels a little bit strange for me to say that, in any way, we would, by joining ITU, become under them, but we are we are.

But the fact of the matter is that the governments around the world will not go away. ITU and the UN will exist, I think, for a very long time.

We have received very positive reactions from many parts of the community about this. In a bigger understanding that ICANN has to take sometimes to fight where it actually happens.

In the ITU, where I think I met you, by the way, in Dubai, was it interesting? Who do you represent?

Tony Holmes: I represented the UK government.

Göran Marby: The UK government. So, many of us actually go to ITU meetings. And this time it's the first time ever ICANN was presented on its own flag.

When I was invited on the stage to - by the Secretary-General, actually this was the first time ever any organization or country, which was not the host country, was standing up on stage during the opening ceremony.

There was a great respect from the ITU staff and its Secretary-General for ICANN as an institution and an organization.

We need to work where we have to meet organizations that we can defend a multi-stakeholder model. And I happen to believe that ICANN is strong enough as an institution, not to be feeling that we're in second place anywhere. And it was nice meeting you there and (unintelligible).

Claudia Sellì: Thank you. We need now to move to the IPC. (Alex) or Brian.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you so much, Claudia. This is Brian Winterfeldt for the record, I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Dean Marks, who's going to ask our first question.

Dean Marks: Hi there. Thanks. Dean Marks for the record. Actually this is a little bit more of a statement because there's been some questions that have been asked to the IPC about their participation in the EPDP.

So I just wanted to, in this public forum, read a statement to sort of clarify our outlook and intentions moving forward. And that's that the IPC look forward to participating productively in the work of phase two of EPDP.

We believe this critical work must be given the same level of support from ICANN org and the board as was the phase one work and needs to be subject to time frames and deadlines, as the phase one work.

We think it would be most productive and efficient to divide the work of phase two into at least two separate work streams.

The first work streams should address the policies around access and the unified access model and should, as a priority, identify the different categories of legitimate third-party interest that will be incorporated into an accreditation system as a part of the UAM.

The second work streams should address the questions and issues that were left unresolved and carried over from phase one to phase two such as the legal natural person registrant distinction.

We think work can effectively and efficiently be accomplished on these two work streams by forming separate workgroups within the EPDP team.

In addition, we support the continued work of the technical study group on access to non-public registration data and think that this group's work so far has added both substantive value and efficiency in working towards the goal of a unified access model.

We appreciate that there are legal questions about access to rejected WHOIS data, about potentially drawing up and submitting codes of conduct related to access in the UAM, about the liability risks for contracted parties and about the role of ICANN as a controller or joint controller with respect to the UAM.

We stand ready to work with the community and our colleagues in the EPDP team as well as ICANN org to address these types of issues.

Moreover, we also stand ready to work with our colleagues in ALAC, (SSAC) in the GAC to address the various concerns and issues that they have raised in their statements about the work of the EPDP.

And we share their concerns that policy development and implementation around access to redacted WHOIS data must be given as much attention, work, support and urgency as the work that was undertaken to reach the phase one final report recommendations. Thanks.

Becky Burr: So, just want to say on behalf of the board that thank you for that statement but also the board is deeply committed to supporting phase two. And we know that the board is equally committed to supporting phase two.

That work is critically important work and so we have looked – been very happy to receive these kinds of indications also from the registry stakeholder group said that is was committed to participating with - to working towards an expeditious completion.

And we expect all members of the community to come to the table in that spirit.

Just so you understand, you know, ICANN org has not sat idly by and is trying to move the ball down the field here. The technical study group work that Göran is initiated and that has had good results and that we're all looking at and thinking about now.

Some discussions with contracted parties consistent with the recommendations in the EPDP to understand roles and responsibilities have been commenced.

And, you know, ICANN sort of putting aside the mechanism, the UAM mechanism, there are implementation and compliance issues that ICANN has begun to think about and start thinking about.

I particularly appreciated the recognition about legal issues and the complications here because we are quite aware of dependencies that affect the UAM.

And that really is the how can you get to a uniform, consistent, predictable experience for users of that data. There are two ways to do it. One, you could get clarity from the data protection authorities about, you know, the rules, who gets access, to what data, under what circumstances, for what purposes and with what safeguards?

So I sort of call those the who, what, why, where, when questions, but - and you could take those and get legal clarity from the European data protection board or from (a corp).

It can't be just one data protection authority because they don't speak for all of them. And org has been engaged in conversations with the data protection authorities groups from the beginning and that is the path we expect they will pursue.

But frankly, no one should be overoptimistic about the likelihood that that is going to produce results.

The second pass for a UAM is to take the mechanism, the UAM technical model, that the (TSG) has put together with some input on who's going to identify and authenticate users of the system, and say, who, European data protection board, will you look to?

Who is going to be liable for data that process through there? That's another way that we could get to predictable.

So there's - now, ideally you would get both and it would be wonderful, but no one is sufficiently naïve to think that that is going to be easy but that is the path that the board certainly wants org to take.

And my understanding, I can look at Göran, that that's what they're going to pursue diligently. Meanwhile, there's going to be as much support, there's no flagging in support from the board or on phase two.

And I just think we do need to step back a little bit because I've heard some people say the case for this one was not sustainable. I think - I don't think we should automatically think that that means we're saying we're going to slow roll phase two.

We expect that not be the case and we will be clear about that expectation but let's not jump to the conclusion that because the pace of phase one, which I think probably was brutal for those of you who are involved in the three, three hour calls a week kind of thing.

No. Maybe it can't be three, three hour calls a week. But it obviously has to expeditiously and with a sense of urgency.

Okay, and just a final thing, on time frames, a couple of people have raised this with me, I think you know, ultimately, the board can express a hope, a strong hope that the group works within timelines.

But that is up to the PDP charter to establish those. So, I'll let - in case I said anything wrong.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Can I have - there is - on the timeline, I'm probably the first one to say it very hard to set a timeline. The simple reason is we can't - if we have a lot of things to work, that we have to do to be able to get analysis from many DPAs.

And, again, I remember I think it was a year ago, we had a fantastic interesting meeting here with some of the directors shouting at me and say that you will have no guidance from the DPAs.

And it was hard work to get to the (DPA)'s advice the first time. Now, we're actually asking them to go back and look at what they said before and come up with another solution to the question we ask them.

So we actually asked them to look at something completely in a different way. And it's even harder than they did before. So our internal - you can't make an omelet without breaking eggs.

And be able to have a unified access model, we have to (diminish) the contracted party's legal responsibilities. And until we got back together with all the questions we have to ask the DPAs, which we are doing with the European Commission based on the work of the technical group, then we can go and ask.

We don't know if we're actually going to get an answer. If you go in - as I said, if you go into any DPA's Webpage, it will say we are not a consultancy company.

They don't give - and advice, in this matter, is not an advice. It is something that what's her name yesterday said, it's not legally binding. It has a legal value because it means that the other DPAs cannot make another decision than the decision that comes out of the data protection board.

So it will be the same decision from all DPAs in all the countries. So it has a big legal value inside this thing.

And, you know, we have - now that we have the technical study group, (unintelligible) during (three) months. The next step of that is to connect that

with the accreditation houses, for instance, WIPO or (Europe pole) or whatever they're building, and to build that whole framework together.

And then go to ask the European Commission if they can help us. We didn't do this by chance. We actually had conversations with them before we started this work.

And then when we format like that, we have to go over the questions to the DPAs. And then maybe we'll get an answer. So that's why I'm saying it's very hard to set a timeline for the phase two of the expectation of the phase two to come up with a unified access model.

As I said this before and I'm going to say this again, the whole intent of the law, the whole intent of the law is to give the liability to the one who collects the data, processes the data. And that is, in our world, the contracted parties. Thank you. I hope (unintelligible) with your expectations, too, sufficiently now.

Claudia Selli: I'm sorry, (Alex), we have a few minutes so I need the (alternate BC) to – thank you.

Man: Actually, I can give you three, four extra minutes if you want to have a follow-up question because this is probably important.

Claudia Selli: Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: We are going in the same direction, Göran. And first of all, when we met in Barcelona, you wanted to know whether the community felt it was appropriate to move to a UAM.

And we all went to the mic and delivered the day after you delivered on a promise to set up a technical study group which was a bit of a surprise and a better surprise because here we are several months later and the technical study group finished the job.

And so the first thing I want to do is acknowledge that DSG, and Chantelle is going to display that slide that we used yesterday, the DSG confirmed - I know you don't.

The DSG that that cycle can work technically and most of us didn't have any doubt about that but it's fabulous to have it confirmed that way.

So I think it reminds me of the U.S. Navy construction brigade, or CB. Their slogan is the difficult, we do right away, and the impossible takes a little longer.

So I'm turning to you for the impossible part which is can you commit that ICANN org is willing, not that you know that you'll get a legal model, but are you willing to step into the role, the appropriate controller role, on the right-hand side of the diagram, to be able to make the UAM work legally?

Now, I realize you cannot predict whether that's joint controller or co-controller or (sole) controller. That'll have to get figured out. What we're looking for is a firm commitment that you're willing to take whatever responsibility is necessary to make that work. Thank you.

Göran Marby: It's not up to us to make that decision. That's the whole point we've been trying to say. We went out in 2017 in August and said we have some sort of control issue.

We have said (unintelligible) said, we are willing to take a role in this one, so that's beside the table. But remember, it's not up to us to make the decision.

We can have an opinion. But in the final (edge), in fact it's the DPA who makes that distinction. They are the ones who make that decision. We can have an idea.

You and I can agree and drink - champagne but you know what I mean. But it's actually in the hands of the DPAs and finally, the court, who makes that distinction. So...

Steve DelBianco: Göran, I'm trying to make a somewhat subtle question and the simple answer is probably right there. It was the willingness of org that, if the model calls for you to be some flavor of controller, from sole to co, joint, would you be willing to step into the shoes? And I think the answer is yes and that's a great answer. I'll take that answer.

Göran Marby: Yes, but it's also - so, I - I mean, let's be honest, guys. So I came in here the first time in I think it was Johannesburg and I told you exactly what I'm going to do.

And I've done that from day one I came up with a (unintelligible) model. I actually invented out of thin air a process that many people wanted me only to talk to the contracting parties (as a compliance).

And it took a lot of heat for that but we constructed (unintelligible) to be able, for you, to have an opinion. I give you guys email addresses to the DPAs as well. Yes. And we constructed this one based on that model with the strength of the community who all agreed on a couple of things.

Yes, it's going to be a covered model but we need the data. With that, I went to the DPAs in Europe who said, yes, you can have the WHOIS system. They didn't specify exactly what kind of information should be there but they said you could have a system.

They also said it's okay for you to have some information in public and some in private. That led to the template. And I always said that that is going to be the easiest (path we do).

So, and from the beginning, we said the same thing all the time. It's always that with reality. When you get closer and closer to the decision points, it gets harder and harder because the alternatives are fewer.

We - I think that we have proven from ICANN org that we want to take a role in this one but there are certain rules we can't take. For instance, if someone wants be to take ICANN org to be responsible for all the contracted party's missteps, indemnification.

It is impossible because we can't – we're –will you know, whatever you think, I mean, you have much more money than we have. We are nonprofit in California.

You know, we don't have that kind of money to do that. And I think that my board would say no, I mean, it would be - we have to raise the price a lot. But, so we always have known about the problem and we've been working on it.

I set up the technical group after the contracted parties all said, yes, it's okay to answer the discussion about diminishing the contracted party's legal responsibilities.

I asked you - actually, I asked the IPC the same question I actually asked to the GAC. So we come up with new ideas how to diminish their legal responsibility.

How many are lawyers in this room? Some of you. We will also look forward to your suggestions how to do it. So we have - anyway, we are looking at the technical model.

We talked about there are provisions inside the GDPR for public interest, not the public interest we're talking about. There is a new cyber legislation that is enacted April. You and I talked about that, Dean.

And you also have the NIS directive. We are asking a lot of different question to see how that would affect, not only the WHOIS system, because that's only one of the thousands of databases we have.

Transparency has always been a part of ICANN. So, to answer your question, yes, we have set were going to have a role but it's very hard for us to set down this is what we're going to have.

Because in the end, if the technical model has an effect, we don't - we have sort of philosophical discussions, if you have an accreditation house, you have a hub and spoke model and you have the contracted parties, it's probably, that's not a joint controllership.

That something completely different that is today undefined in the law. That's going to take some time to figure that out. So, it's not that easy to say I'm committing to be something because we actually don't know what it is.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. We look or willingness and you've indicated a willingness once again. So that a baseline commitment to be willing to step into whatever role is necessary, to take on sufficient responsibility such that we can make this model work, and for that, we're grateful. During yesterday's discussion...

Göran Marby: Well, I have the commitment but if we build this model are you going to pay for it in IPC and BC?

Steve DelBianco: Certainly willing. During yesterday session, there was a split opinion about, Göran, the far right-hand column, this notion of getting accredited. Some of us on yesterday's panel believe that the way (Europol), Interpol, WIPO, the way any of those entities would pursue a code of conduct accreditation by the data protection board is completely up to them.

Some of us don't believe that has anything to do with ICANN org for this community. On the other hand, once they do get accredited, they have to validate the credentials of the entity in order for you to be able to do the RDAP.

So what is your thinking about the role ICANN will play defining how one gets accredited in the far right-hand column?

Göran Marby: We came up with the idea - we use words as well as accreditation and that. And some of them have a legal meeting because they're actually under GDPR. So accreditation in the GDPR has a very special meaning.

When we talk about accreditation in this sense, it's actually who actually (does the work), who is actually accredited. That can be outside the actual definition of the law.

So let's, you know, who checks the organization behind the question is okay and make sure that it seems like it's legal? That is outside the accreditation part of the law.

In the side - I mean, right now, we're in discovery mode. Remember that the law is specific. The law doesn't - you might say that the law doesn't prevent the unified access model but it actually does because the law is specific about the role of - control on the contracted party's role.

So, what we're trying to do here, what I think is - you know, and I think there are some support from some of the EPA's and some - and definitely support from many parts of the European Commission who wrote the law to investigate how this is going to work.

So when we started the idea of WIPO to have them, to validate the questions and validate the organization, they're going to have some sort of specific role in this one and, therefore, liability.

And then this is sent to a hub and spoke model. I heard yesterday that someone thought that that should happen outside ICANN. That's a policy question for me.

That's not something that we decide because that organization has to take the risk as well. And I don't know if any external organization would like to take that risk.

I understand that in Canada, there is a potential to do that on a lower risk. That's interesting because if you can lower the risk in the system is good for all of us.

So, you're asking very good questions and join us to help us answer the questions.

Becky Burr: (Unintelligible).

Göran Marby: Yes, of course.

Becky Burr: I really want to add one piece of that. The question of who has, there's a code of conduct and that gets done entirely by the organization that's doing the authorization, that has implications for how the liability flows all the way down.

And so the answer to that question is it sort of depends on where you shift the liability. It may be that you can do better shift the liability of there's agreed-upon code of conduct, that they haven't put together all by themselves.

So there's no definite answer to it because it's a spectrum of where - but how and where you shift the liability and you can shift it in one place and shift it in another. So, there's no - I don't know what the answer is that there's no fixed answer at this point.

Göran Marby: I think all the lawyers understand. I don't.

Claudia Selli: Well, thank you very much for the engagement as for staying with us today.  
Thank you.

Okay, so we're going to continue the agenda and we have now the engagement with the SSR2 members. I don't know - I'm looking at Denise and the others. Yes.

Denise Michel: Hi. This engagement comes as a bit of a surprise to me but I'm happy to speak to and the commercial stakeholder group also has – Scott is also - serves on the SSR2. Is he here?

Claudia Selli: Scott is here, yes.

Denise Michel: All right, take it away, Scott. I have some slides for - should I send them into Chantelle?

Claudia Selli: Chantelle, can you put up the slides? Thank you.

Denise Michel: Okay, I'll just give you a quick overview and when the slides come up, we'll make sure those are displayed and shared. The SSR2 review team, bylaw mandated community review, is meeting extensively here in Kobe.

We're in the analysis and a little bit of fact-finding if left, but we're moving into the analysis and drafting stage. And so, lot of intensive internal work is occurring amongst the team here in Kobe.

We have some work plan that with the target of providing a first draft report by (Marrakesh) for the community to consider. We have for work streams that the team is focused on.

The first work stream is mandated by the bylaws. We have to review the implementation and assess that completion and effectiveness of the first SSR report, SSR1.

They had 28 separate recommendations. It's quite a lengthy undertaking. That is taken up a considerable amount of time and, of course, the SSR2 team was suspended by the board for about a year.

And so we're catching - you know, we spent this past several months catching up on work, integrating new members and further defining our work plan. So, in addition to looking at what happened with SSR1, we have three other work streams that we're focused on.

One is called ICANN SSR. That's focus on the SSR related activities that are pretty much solely within ICANN's remit. The second work stream is DNS SSR.

Those are hard with the team views as you priority activities and that ICANN may share responsibility for or may have a facilitation role in or the impact SSR responsibilities of ICANN.

And then the final work stream is looking at evolving SSR challenges and opportunities. I'll pause there to see if Chantelle has the slides and give Scott a change to talk.

And we're also happy to answer any questions. We had an engagement session yesterday that no one really came to. But we were hidden away in KCC and it conflicted with GDPR so we're not taking it personally.

Perhaps we should. And we have an online email address and, of course, a Wiki. Everything that we do is posted there and we're always accessible if people or groups have specific input for us.

Claudia Selli: Are there any questions on that? Scott, do you have anything more to add to what Denise stated?

Scott McCormick: No, I just second what Denise said and I think, you know, having the timeline of getting a draft report out, we've got the face-to-face coming up in May.

Get the draft out by then. And have it up for public comment, basically over the summer. And then issue the final report come – what's the fall meeting...

David Snead: Montreal?

Scott McCormick: Yes.

Claudia Selli: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks – Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. Sorry. I have a question to the (items) here talking about why, then, to the spirit of the team. You remember what happened the last time in the first round of the the SSR team, you know, and then the establishment of that team.

So, how is the spirit in the team? Do you have a feeling it's going well or are there any critical things, you know, which you see, you know, up for the future to have discussions here? Why it didn't use to be in the past. Did you see – did you hear my question?

Denise Michel: I'm sorry, I was speaking with Chantelle.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Denise, my question was, you know, with regard to the spirit on the team. You remember what happened in the past with your team. Eo, is that going well?

Denise Michel: Yes, I think it's going well. I think the new members appointed have been well integrated. We're largely on schedule with our workplan and, Scott may have...

Scott McCormick: Yes, I'll say as a new member coming on board last, what was that, spring, I guess, I have - was brought up to speed very quickly. I realize there was some discord probably in the previous team, as well. And that's been flushed out, so.

Claudia Selli: Okay, thank you very much. So welcome Becky and sorry if you waited a few minutes. Thank you very much for being with us today. And I'll leave the floor to you if you want to if you have a presentation and then we will follow up with some questions from members.

Becky Nash: Great. Thank you very much, Claudia. Good afternoon everyone. This is Becky Nash from the ICANN finance department. I wanted to, first introduced my colleague, Shani Quidwai, who is also going to be presenting with us today.

And then we do have joining us as well, Xavier Calvez, our ICANN CFO. We are here today to give an update on finance activities and to cover a very key component of the draft FY'20 operating plan and budget process to focus on the public comments.

So, if I could just go to slide number three, that would be helpful. The agenda. So, we're going to give a short update today on FY'19 financial overview which is the current fiscal year.

Then we're going to provide a high level overview of the FY'20 draft budget which was submitted to public comment. Then we have a section to cover the public comments that were submitted.

We have the public comments by theme and also by submitter. And then we want to engage on public comment submitted from the stakeholder groups represented today.

Just before going into the presentation, I would just like to highlight that the finance team at ICANN has posted financial reporting on our Web site, so we do publish quarterly financials that are available approximately a month and a half after each quarter end.

So we do encourage members to look at the financials that are posted on our Web site and I also would like to advertise that on Wednesday, tomorrow, we do have a public session which includes the finance team.

It is at 9:00 am, 9:00 to 12:00. So if there are conflicts, we apologize in advance but you can certainly come in and out of the session. It's also going to include financial updates similar to this discussion of the public comments.

We also have the planning, which is going to include the five strategic planning process and the five year operating plan and financial plan. And also an update on the two year planning process that was submitted for the comment. So, if we could just go to the next slide and one more slide. Appreciate that.

So, the FY '19 year-to-date, if we could advance the document down. Thank you. This is a quick snapshot of the FY '19 year-to-date results, which are the first six months of the current fiscal year. So, just as a reminder, I can have a fiscal year that runs from July through June. So, July 2018 through June 2019 is what we call our Fiscal Year '19.

This report provides actual versus budget, and actual versus last year, for the first six months of this fiscal year. So, as a high-level snapshot at the top left-hand slide, and it's actually one slide back, please. I apologize if I'm not running the slides here.

Funding of 68 million for the first six months, and expenses were 59 million for the first six months of FY '19. So, funding less expenses results in a net positive of 9 million for the first six months, or a net excess of 9 million.

This is then compared to our FY '19 year-to-date budget — so again, first six months against six months — where we can just show you that funding is tracking for the funding of 68 million, as compared to 67 million, is tracking, but the expenses are far lower for the first six months — so, 59 million in expenses as compared to 65 million.

So, there is a lower expenses of approximately 6 million, and that results in the net excess of 9 million as compared to 2 million on the budgeted data, and that shows a positive variance against budget of 7 million.

Just like to highlight that the FY '19 column, again on the left-hand side, can be compared against the same period for six months last year of FY '18. So, you can see that the current six months for FY '19 funding is ahead by 3 million, and expenses are tracking just on par to the same time last year at 59 million.

That gives you an update of the FY '19 year-to-date. Just highlight that we break out at the bottom of the slide the expenses as it pertains to the IANA services, which is the PTI IANA services as additional information, and then, at the bottom of this slide, we have the link to where we do post our quarterly financial statements.

Moving ahead to the next slide, this gives a view of funding versus budget for the first six months. Again, actual funding of 68 million is then broken out here by the various funding components, where we have on the left-hand side the registry transaction fees, which are right at-budget at 27 million. The registrar transaction fees at 17 million for the first six months of FY '19. Registry fixed fees, 15 million — again, on-par with the budget and last year. And registrar

other fees, which would be the annual accreditation fees, the variable registrar fees and any application fees, we're at 7 million on a year-to-date basis for the first six months. And that is comparable to budget, also at 7 million.

And then the other category, which includes contributions such as the CCTLDs, the RIR, et cetera, and that is on-budget at 2 million.

The next slide is year-to-date for our expenses. And I think if we just advance the slides to that slide, thank you, Number 7. This gives a snapshot of the breakout of the actual expenses year-to-date, FY '19 of 59 million into the cost categories that we report on and track.

For the first cost category on the left-hand side is personnel. So, out of the actual 59 million for six months, we had personnel at 35 million, and that is lower than budget of 38 million, due to lower number of head count than budgeted.

The next category is travel and meetings, which is right on-budget for the first six months at 7 million. Then we have professional services, also on-budget at 11 million for the first six months.

The next cost category is our administrations, and that is lower than budget. We have actuals at 7 million as compared to 9 million. And then the very last category is capital expenses, and this would be cash capital expenses and those are under-budget with nominal spending in the first six months.

Oh yes. Questions?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. One question. Okay, these big blocks are clear. The question is related to professional services. So, over whether over the years, the content of that, you know, what is allocated to the professional services, has been varied? Is there something came in in addition to former years? Or

because that it's just a big block, you can interpret whatever you like. So, my question is, did it vary what is all in that? Thank you.

Becky Nash: Thank you for your question. So, professional services would be payments to vendors. And they've been consistent over the past several years. Professional services would be firms that are hired to perform a particular function or a particular project.

So, from the finance standpoint, the type of professional services in our department relate to audit firms and tax firms. From our other departments, it would be vendors that provide either studies or activities as it relates to the ICANN org function. And it has been consistent. The categories are not changing, if that's your question.

Xavier Calvez: Yes. Just a quick complement to that. Specifically, this year, we, while we are at budget — Becky didn't have a chance to comment on that yet — but while we're on budget on professional services, we have a number of categories that are lower than budget and one that is higher than budget.

The one that is higher than budget is legal fees, because we have no — and a little bit intentionally — budgeted for large amount of legal advice on GDPR, and this is an area that has driven a lot of legal activity, as you all know.

And that's the part of our professional services that is higher than we originally intended, knowing that we had a very basic level of legal fee budget in this fiscal year that was not encompassing the few subjects that have triggered more spend there. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you; Marilyn Cade. So, for example, legal fees you mentioned. But if you had to retain other kinds of expertise, and I'm just thinking, for example, for the auction proceeds work. So, any kind of specialized expert that you have to retain for consulting. But we wouldn't see if you were retaining contractors to do policy support work, would that also come in that category?

Xavier Calvez: Yes.

Becky Nash: Okay, so if we could move to the next slide. This is the last slide in this section as it relates to funds under management. One back, thank you very much.

So, this gives a snapshot of the funds under management for FY '19 at the end of December. On the left-hand side, we have two charts comparing the ICANN operations, which includes the operating fund and the reserve fund. The comparison here is quarter-over-quarter, so the most left-hand side is our September 30, 2018 funds under management totalling 100 million.

On the right-hand side, we have the December 31st, or the end-of-December, 131 million. This is comprised of the operating fund for 26 million. That would be cash on hand for operations. It represents, normally, three months of operating expenses.

And then we have the reserve fund at 105 million. At the end of December, we have a footnote indicating that the reserve fund, or Flex, a \$36 million transfer from auction proceeds into the reserve fund prior to the end of December, and this was a part of the Board-approved replenishment, reserve fund replenishment strategy, which authorized a transfer from the action proceeds into the reserve fund.

On the right-hand side of the slide, we have funds under management for the new GTLD program-related funds. Again, it's September 30th as compared to December, and you can see that the total December on the right-hand side is (222) million, and that's comprised of the new GTLD funds of 118 million.

And that represents the application fees collected upfront for the new GTLD program, which then is reduced on an ongoing basis for expenses as it relates to the first round of the new GTLD program, which is still ongoing.

And the dark blue box is the auction proceeds. And again, we have the footnote noting that the 205 million of auction proceeds is after a transfer out of 36 million as part of the reserve fund replenishment strategy.

It's 36 million that was transferred.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Sorry. The figures show 34, to be exact.

Xavier Calvez: Yes, the graph here shows the balance that we have in the investment accounts. There's other elements that impact that balance: returns on investments, fees, and so on. So, the difference is also between two different dates. Right? So, there's movements in between. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Maybe that needs to be reflected in the footnote.

Xavier Calvez: Sure.

Becky Nash: Thank you. We'll make sure to make note of that. Questions?

Brian King: Yes, I'm sorry if this is a dumb question. I haven't been following this that closely, but is there a plan to replenish the auction proceeds back into that over time? Because I thought those weren't supposed to be touched until the community decides what to do with this.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you for the question. The Board decision on the topic does not suggest replenish the auction proceeds.

The strategy of replenishment specified that the reserve fund that is depleted — so the reason why there is that replenishment from auction proceeds — and from annual contributions from the ICANN organization's annual budget — is because the reserve fund was depleted, right, and very much below its

target level of 12 months minimum (travels) of operating expenses, it was about six months of operating expenses, so half of it.

So, the replenishment has occurred from auction proceeds. And the auction proceed — the working group, (CCD) develop auction proceeds is to your point developing the mechanism as for which the auction funds would be distributed. Not the use of it, but the mechanisms used to determine how the auction proceeds would be used, and you have colleagues very close to you who can explain further the topic.

So, the auction funds – the Board has made a purposeful decision to say some of that, it's important that the reserve fund can be replenished. There is that money available for the fiduciary duties of the organization to be replenishing its reserve funds and has considered that as a priority.

The other element — which is not part of your question, but just to be clear — the other element of the replenishment strategy of the reserve fund is for the ICANN organization to generate on an annual basis an excess, so that that little excess can then be allocated to the reserve fund. But there is no specific intent of replenishing the amount of auction proceeds that has been transferred from the reserve. Thank you.

Brian King: Thank you.

Becky Nash: Thank you. Let's advance the slides. The next section is a high-level overview of the FY '20 draft budget. On this slide, we are giving a trended view of the funding and cash expenses, starting with FY '17. Actuals, FY '18 actuals, then we have our FY '19 forecast, and on the right-hand side we have the FY '20 draft budget.

Funding in the FY '20 draft budget is stabilizing, and as such, that means that the funding is growing at a slower rate than in the past. And we are bringing expenses in line with that stabilization.

In addition, Point Number 2 on this slide is that the draft FY '20 budget assumes a \$3 million excess from operations that will be used to replenish the reserve fund. And that's exactly what Xavier had just mentioned.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Becky. Just to add on that, you can see that in the previous years, we have not budgeted for, but nonetheless had an excess after the end of the fiscal year. So, we were planning to have expenses the same as funding, but what effectively happened is that we spent a bit less than what was budgeted and/or we had a bit more funding than what was budgeted, which if you would zoom in on those columns, you would see that there's a bit of excess of funding.

So, what happens for those past years is while it was not budgeted, we still allocated the excess to the reserve fund. So, we've done that twice in the past 24 months. Once for 5 million; and the second time for 3 million. So, there's been \$8 million from original operational excess allocated to the reserve fund.

Now, the last two columns on the right, as we were just talking about in responding to your question, you can see that now we are budgeting for an excess. And that's the result of the replenishment strategy that the Board approved in October.

And we will continue to do that at least until we reach a replenishment that leads to the reserve fund to reach its target of 12 months of operating expenses at the minimum. If we use this as a benchmark, 12 months is 137 million. We are at 105. There's more to go.

So, on an annual basis, we will continue to create an excess; basically, spend less than what we expect to collect so that we have an excess at the end of the year, and that excess can then be allocated to the reserve fund. The

replenishment strategy approved by the Board indicates 32 million over 8 years to be allocated to the reserve fund in that manner. Thank you.

Becky Nash: Thank you, Xavier. If we could move to the next slide, we have a high-level overview of the draft FY '20 budget. On this slide we're highlighting, as I've indicated before, that funding growth continues to stabilize, and that the funding of 140 million in the draft FY '20 operating plan and budget is 2.2% above the expected FY '19 forecast of 137 million.

The slower growth in funding is just based on the fact that all of the new GTLDs are primarily now delegated, and the transaction volumes are stabilizing.

Point Number 2 is regarding operations head counts at ICANN where, while funding is stabilizing, the head count being projected for FY '20 is also stabilizing. It's growing at a much slower rate than previous budget submissions.

And we just would like to highlight that we are expecting that the June forecast of FY '19, we will have approximately 395 head count at ICANN org, on average. And then for FY '20, we have a modest 2% increase of 405, up to 405, which is 10 head count budgeted in the next fiscal year.

Jimson Olufuye: Becky, can I ask a question?

Becky Nash: Yes, please.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. This is Jimson on the line. Well, what could really justify the increase in the head count? Do you meet for various feedback, maybe at a Council meeting, was for the benefit of our members? Maybe you could respond to this?

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. Jimson is anticipating what I was going to try to say, so thank you, Jimson for that comment.

So, what I was going to address — and I'll come back specifically to your question, Jimson — is that the figures that we use on a projected basis are a bit deceiving because what happens is that we actually are never — as many people as our budget is suggesting — because we always manage under.

So, for example, the budget for FY '19 that we're under now is suggesting that we would have a head count of 423 people. That's what the approved budget says.

We are 388 people right now at the end of January is the latest that I have in my hands. So, that's basically 35 people less than what the budget is suggesting. So, we show here that we are planning for a forecast of 395, which would be an addition of 7 people, which, if you ask my personal opinion, I think we're not going to manage to do because we're going to be under that, likely.

The control mechanisms that we have put in place over the past few years, relative to head count, is that — are that we require the approval for any hire, including replacements. So, we challenge, basically, any hiring, including the replacement of existing positions.

And that approval requires the approval of the VP of HR, my approval, and (UR)'s approval combined for any hiring, including replacements. So, that has led us and given us the ability to not only grow less but actually reduce the head count.

Fifteen months ago, we were 400 in the organization. So, when we talk about increases from 395 to 405, this is what I'm calling stabilization, honestly. And also, because our head count fluctuates not only with hiring, but also with departures.

So, when I said that we were 400 15 months ago and that we are 388 today, it's because there's been more departures than hiring. Which is – can always happen in any organization, but the fact that we are challenging every single position to be hired has led us to be able to contain growth and even slightly decrease the head count.

While, if I may say, the work continues to increase. You are all seeing that in your own ways with the number of PDPs, the number of reviews, new challenges like GDPR that were not volumes of work that we all planned to take on, but that we had all to take on, and you have done that as well, a lot. So, this is putting a little bit more context around the numbers. Thank you.

Becky Nash: Thank you. The last two points on this slide, Number 3 and 4, relate to the reserve fund contribution that we discussed on the prior slides. And just highlighting that the FY '20 budget includes a contribution to the reserve fund, and that's the first time a budget has been submitted with that contribution included.

On to the next slide, Number 12. This is just a recap of the trended forecast, so we have FY '18 actual, FY '19 forecast, and the draft FY '20 budget that was submitted for public comment. This provides a breakdown of the costs by category, and highlighting again the increase to the net assets of 3 million being specified as a contribution to the reserve fund.

In the next slide we just have a final slide on the draft FY '20 budget where we've provided the funds under management estimates for the end of FY '19 as a forecast, and then for FY '20 draft budget.

So, again, this provides the movement in the funds under management, which includes that contribution to the reserve fund as part of the Board-approved reserve fund replenishment strategy.

If we go to the next slide, we're now going to provide an overview of the public comments that have been submitted for the draft FY '20 operating plan and budget, and then we will also provide specific details requesting some clarification on comments submitted from this group.

So, if we go to the next slide, I'm going to hand this over to my colleague, (Shani), who's going to take us through this section.

Claudia Selli: Do you think maybe we can go in a Q&A session? If that's fine for you, because we have only, I think, ten minutes left for the meeting, itself.

Man: All these other Agenda.

Claudia Selli: Yes, I know. I'll look at it for discussion on policy matters. We will go there. I was just asking to members whether there are questions that you would like to ask now on finance and the presentation that was given.

Jennifer Gore: Hi. Jennifer Gore. So, IPC submitted some comments on behalf of the FY '20 budget. I was just looking for a timeline in response to those comments that were submitted.

Becky Nash: Thank you, Jennifer, for your question. The FY '20 staff report on public comments is scheduled to be published at the end of next week. So this is the timeline that we had published as part of the operating plan and budget timeline. We were taking this opportunity here at ICANN 64 to have engagement with the different groups and discuss the comments.

And that's where, if we could just go to Slide Number 19, I realize that we don't have very much time, but at least Slide Number 19 gives a view of the comments submitted, first, by the business constituency, and then the next slide will give a view by the ITC.

But this just gives a view of total comments submitted of 143 by approximately 18 themes, and then where the comments from the BC that were submitted, how they compare with six comments and spread pretty evenly over the groups of the themes.

And then the next slide gives the same view for the ITC who submitted both on behalf of their own constituency. And on that slide, there, we can see again out of 143 that are categorized by these categories, the ITC had 15 comments that were submitted as part of their memo, again, concentrated in funding.

So, if there are any other questions just regarding these comments, we'd love to take them now.

Claudia Selli: So, I think also eventually, we can certainly follow up with questions in case there are, if there is any members that want to have more clarity on that, we're happy maybe to liaise with you and, you know, do it in writing or continuing the conversation and also for the next meetings.

Xavier Calvez: So, (okay), thank you. We were also suggesting to send that Chantelle can send the presentation, especially the slides that we have not gone over to the groups, so that anyone at their leisure can look at it. And of course, as you said, we would be very happy to answer questions by email, and we want to give you as much time back as possible.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much and thank you for being with us today and engaging. Thank you.

Becky Nash: Thank you.

Chantelle Doerksen: And Claudia, this is Chantelle. Just as a reminder to CSG members, as Xavier and the Finance team slides were circulated with the Agenda earlier this morning. And they'll be posted online as well. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Okay. So, we now move to the rest of the Agenda. We have ten minutes left. And I think what we have is now the open policy masters in Council, in particular, tomorrow. And I'm looking at the GNSO Counselors from different constituency. There will be a discussion on privacy and proxy.

(Murray Scott) or anyone else that wants to jump in and give an update. Yes? I see your hand. Yes, please.

Jennifer Gore: Sorry. It's Jennifer Gore. I was just raising my hand to offer to provide comments during that session to (bore) on the privacy/proxy.

Claudia Selli: Yes, sure. Victoria?

Victoria Sheckler: Thank you. Jen, I think that Claudia was asking about, you know, thoughts that we can get to Council, because it's going to be on – the privacy/proxy discussion is going to be on Council tomorrow, I believe. So, I think you have some talking points, perhaps, to share?

Jennifer Gore: I do, I do. In particular — let me just pull this up real fast. There was a letter set from Akram back in November, and he also talked about it in the Fall conference regarding the hold on privacy/proxy.

One of the things he mentioned was they would look at restarting the privacy/proxy post-completion of Phase 1 of EE PDP. And now that we're there, and the final report has been posted, and the recommendations of that report do not, from my perspective, do not have a lot of conflicts as it relates to the work – the privacy/proxy IRT are completed, we'd like to understand what's the mechanism or the trigger to restart the privacy/proxy IRT.

We noted also that the letter that Cyrus sent to the GNSO Council on March 4th talks about a little bit around resourcing and allocation, and it notes that perhaps the privacy/proxy IRT should remain on hold until the EE PDP work

is completed. As we all know, that could take — I don't even want to say the words, "several years," but that could take a long period of time.

So, we really would like to be able to hone in and understand what the challenges or the concerns that ICANN has with restarting the privacy/proxy IRT, as most of the work has already been completed. I mean, we were pretty close when the hold was put in place. So, I'd like to hear from other folks in the room their thoughts about that.

But I also just want to mention on the obligation of the registrars as we're going through this work with the EE PDP and the uniform access model, we want to make sure that once the information, the redacted information, hopefully, once we're able to gain access to it, or that information is revealed to us, we want to make sure that's as accurate as possible.

Every single registrar today is on the 2013 RAA. There's no other registrars currently on the 2009 RAA any longer. And in the 2013 RAA, as most of you all know, there's a cross-field address validation requirement of the contracted party.

And we want to understand what steps the staff has taken to continue to pursue that with the Registrar working group since that was also brought up during the Council meeting yesterday. Or I'm sorry, on Sunday it was brought up to the GDD staff that was giving an update to the Council. And from my understanding and participation in that session, there was not a response to that question.

Claudia Selli: Are there others that want to jump into the discussion? Victoria?

Victoria Sheckler: I mean, the other thing that I'm hoping our Counselors can raise with respect to the privacy/proxy is that, you know, that policy was approved in 2016, I believe. We're almost 2-1/2 years later at this point with no implementation.

In August of last year, Cyrus had sent a letter — I believe it was to COA saying, “We’re almost there. We’re going to move forward. It will be done super-fast.” And then, in October, Akram decides to put on the brakes. And as I understood it then, it was just for (face point). And then now, Cyrus is saying, “No, no, no. We have to wait.” God knows when, until its done.

I find that incredibly troubling when you look at everything else that’s been going on with registrar data, generally. And I would love for the Counselors to raise those concerns at Council tomorrow.

Claudia Selli: Yes, Alex?

Dean Marks: Actually, I’m Dean.

Claudia Selli: I’m sorry. I keep you calling Alex.

Dean Scott Marks: But I always feel — Claudia, I always feel flattered when you do that, so thank you. Just Dean Marks, for the record.

Just so our Counselors are clear, the initial letter came from Akram, saying — in response to a request from the Registrars’ group — to slow down the implementation; that the feeling of ICANN org was that that was not necessary, and it would actually be better to go towards completion of the IRT on privacy/proxy.

And then it was really in connection with Barcelona — either during Barcelona, or right afte — that Cyrus wrote the letter saying, “No, we’re putting it on hold,” and doing this complete 180-degree turn.

And I think part of the, you know, part of the reason is I think there’s confusion about on some of those folks’ part that privacy/proxy is completely the same as getting access to whois information. And so I just think, I don’t know whether there’s confusion or what have you, but as Vicky said, it’s

troubling, because the policy was unanimously approved by both Council and Board. Thanks.

Claudia Selli: Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, I would agree that we need to push on this, and I think last year, you know, there was this mantra out there that oh, privacy/proxy is going away because everything will be redacted, but anecdotally, that's not what I am seeing.

I am seeing registrars maybe wholesale, and just completely moving everything to privacy/proxy. And at this point we don't know if the UAM will cover that. If we end up with a UAM that says, "Oh, no, privacy/proxy cannot be revealed through this process; that's a separate process," then what's going to happen?

There's going to be a lot more proxy registrations, right? So, either, you know, I think we keep pushing on this, and then – but also try to work within the UAM to include proxy registrations in that process. So, it is a simplified – more simplified.

And Jen and I had a quick conversation, but one of the oppositions the registrars had to this was the accreditation fees for the proxy accreditation. And – but she was telling me actually those fees are based on cost, so I'm not sure that we can — I think maybe we could reach across the table to the registrars and, you know, say, "Hey, we agree you should get some relief from these costs," but if those are hard costs to ICANN, then that may not work.

So, Jen, is that ongoing? Was that 4000 fee that was proposed ongoing every year? Or...

Jennifer Gore: Susan, thanks. This is Jennifer Gore, for the record.

There was a, as I recall, and I'll have to go back and look at the accreditation model. There was a fee for contracted parties – known contracted parties' registrars – was one fee. And then there was another fee that was a little higher for those that were not currently accredited registrars.

So, there was a cost reduction for known contracted parties. But given the hard costs associated to the background checks that is required, and most privacy or proxy services within a given registrar are separate LLC. There are requirements on behalf of ICANN within their charter to perform those background checks.

There might be some opportunity, as we talked about, to possibly looking how those background checks can be revised. But it is an obligation on ICANN's side in order to have to perform those, especially if it's a separate affiliation or a separate business entity under the parent company of a particular registrar, for instance.

Claudia Selli: Yes, you can.

Brian Winterfeldt: The registrar accreditation fee is \$4000 a year, so that could have just been a short cut. Hey, that's a number we know about. Choose that.

Jennifer Gore: Can I respond to that? So, this is Jennifer Gore. Brian, you're absolutely — yes, because the same application process that came out of the working group was based on the registrar application process. So, the chain checkpoints that ICANN is required to do based on the recommendations was based on the registrar model. That's correct.

Claudia Selli: Any other comments on this? Otherwise, I think we are quite aligned, unless the (ISPs) view it differently, but I didn't see any disagreement on that.

Any other policy matters that you think we should be discussing now? We don't have much time left. We have a few minutes. Just looking around if there are other things that you want to bring on the table right now. Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Claudia. This is Heather Forrest. I just wanted to make a note. I had a very interesting chat with the folks from Analysis Group about the survey — survey, the review that they had done on the SSAC, which was very warmly received by the SSAC. And in light of some of the things that we were talking about, about our concerns around the structure of the GNSO and the next GNSO review and so on, and so forth, I wonder if anyone's interested in talking to those folks. They're in the room here today. And I'd be happy to introduce you. Thanks.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Heather. Yes, Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Heather, with respect to that, we learned this week that I think (Cherine) has hired (Brian Cute) to look at organizational change and improvements. How does that overlay with notions of structural change? Anybody have any ideas?

Heather Forrest: Steve, it's Heather. Good question. Look, I — we have repeatedly heard the message from the Board that if we have problems with something, we shouldn't be waiting for the Board to initiate. But really, it needs to come from the community. We hear that from the Board, we hear that from org. I would like to think that the last GNSO review went so poorly and left so many unmet needs that we use every opportunity to say we have unmet needs. And to the extent that this is something that we wish to pursue, I certainly think that that is a possible avenue of doing so. I also would suggest that we not overlook possible opportunities to self-initiate these sorts of conversations.

Claudia Selli: (Tony), you're...

Tony Holmes: Yes, thank you. Just tied to that, I've also had some conversations with a number of people who are aware of that initiative and will engage in it. And it appears that in terms of the impact on any form of structural change, it could lead down that road, but it's viewed as a longer-term part of that process, so I would urge everybody here to make sure that we try and advance that in terms of the work that Brian is going to look at at an earlier stage. Otherwise, it's quite a way out. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Any other comments on this? Okay. So, if there are no other items that you think we should be bringing up, then I would adjourn the meeting. Everybody.

END