

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan  
GNSO Working Session with ICANN Board Part 3  
Sunday, 11 March 2018 at 12:00 AST**

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

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

Heather Forrest: Thank you everyone and welcome to this joint session of the GNSO Council and ICANN Board. Thank you everyone for being here. We have I think just about everyone that we're able to get in the room up here at the table. And of course welcome Cherine Chalaby, our Chairman of the Board and CEO Goran Marby.

What I propose that we do - we have some topics that were suggested by the GNSO Council here before us. Quick chat Rafik, Donna and myself we think that it might be appropriate in light of the order of this morning what we've done immediately prior to this session to reverse the order of our points here.

So we might start with the road ahead and then turn to goals and then turn to SSR2. And I'll just check with you gentlemen if you're okay if we change the order of things.

Man: Yes.

Heather Forrest: Yes. All right. Excellent. Thank you very much. So with that then if I might turn to Rafik to take us through some points on the road ahead. Oh sorry. I'm sorry. Donna. That's you. I'm so sorry. Thank you. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Heather. I thought you two were tricking me. Donna Austin, Vice Chair. I'm from the Registry Stakeholder Group. So as some of the Board are aware and certainly Goran is aware the GNSO Council had a three-day strategic planning session in January, which we found extremely valuable.

And, you know, we developed an understanding of what our roles and responsibilities are, you know, in light of the new empowered community but also in the management of the PDP, which is one of their primary roles.

And we developed an understanding that we knew we had a high volume of work but we actually had to stare at a spreadsheet that indicated that really laid it out for us that there is a significant body of work that the GNSO Council oversees and the GNSO actually takes that work forward.

So taking into account the continuously high volume of work and the pressures of the FY19 budget, we see a need and benefit for prioritization. And I think we're reflected that in our comments on the budget.

And considering the many activities currently under way in ICANN, which to the Board considered to be a top priority, what milestone and I'm sorry but this is a multifaceted question.

But what milestones or achievements is the Board hoping to reach by the end of 2018 and also longer term in the next five years and how does that align with the policy development work that's currently under way in the GNSO?

So I guess we're kind of interested to understand that. In developing your priorities how do you factor in the work that's happening within the community?

And obviously is the body that's responsible for the policy development we see that as - should be prioritized in some way because it's a core mission of ICANN.

So we'd just like to have a conversation/dialog as to how that fits in with the work that you've been doing. Thanks Cherine.

Cherine Chalaby: Thank you Donna. The question on goals and this question have so many interrelated things because on the goal side you also talk about long-term goals.

So would you allow me to kind of respond to these two together and I'll tell you how I propose to respond to them? And if that's okay. And if it doesn't meet your objective, we can continue the discussion afterward.

But so I want to start talking about the short-term goals of the Board, how does this align with PDP work, your priorities and then the long-term goals and then talk about prioritization. That's okay? Yes.

Heather Forrest: Yes.

Cherine Chalaby: Okay. Which means I'm going to take question - the road ahead and the goals together. Okay. So let me start with the short-term goals. We have what we call - we call them annual goals. And we operated on a fiscal year rather than on a calendar year. We are okay?

So if you remember prior to the AGM we published a document -- it was in the form of a blog -- about - we called it the FY18 Board Activities and Priorities.

And in that document we described the five main areas of responsibilities of the Board. And for each one of those area we included what our main focus, i.e., activities during FY18 and what are in addition to that our own operational priorities.

With regard to the activities in FY18 we said that these are mostly community driven. If you know that the Board doesn't create its own activities per se. We try all the time to align ourselves with the community's priorities.

So for example, we did say that in FY18 our focus is going to be on GDPR, on observing what's happening with RDS PDP and new gTLD PDP, WS2, auction proceeds, the reserve fund and so on.

And in terms of operation priorities just I want to stress this is our own internal priorities of how to make the Board more effective and more efficient rather than these are community's operational priorities; the things like how do we improve our openness and accountability, how do we improve - what consultation papers we need to produce and post to the community for consultation, for comments.

Also how do we improve our own skills and so on? One of the things we also looked at the effectiveness of reviews mandated by the bylaws and how can we improve that. So and for each one of these operational priorities we have our own deliverable measurement and so on and so forth.

So we're coming close to the end of FY18 to finish 30th of June. And we are just beginning to put together our priorities for FY19. And we intend to issue a similar document, exactly the same for next year. Right.

But to give you an example of a priority that's going to happen to us next year that is not a focus on the five-year strategic plan and we'll talk about that a little bit later.

So what I'd like to do now is to better answer the question how do we align with your PDP work is to take our priorities and activities in FY18, some of them will spill over into FY19, and try and align those with your own priorities and see if that is - if that answers the question.

If you remember, we said in the document, and is good to perhaps repeat it again, that we look at our responsibilities under five areas. We call them blocks; areas, blocks, same thing.

And the first one is very relevant to you. It's called the oversight of policy development and cross community activities. And there are others as well. So if I focus on that, that is to me most relevant to you.

So what did we say in this document? We said that GDPR is a priority for us. Right. And I'm going to bring my fellow Board members in some of this discussion as we go along.

So how do we - I want to show you how we aligned with the priorities of the community on that. We the Board believes that ICANN org and the Board we've done everything possible working with the community and the DPA and now we've presented an interim model to the DPAs and I'm waiting for guidance from them. Right.

So maybe on this one I just want to ask Goran to probably give us a real update as to where we are and how does this align with your priorities as well. So Goran, could you talk about GDPR please?

Goran Marby: Anyone interested? Not really, no. Next question. So first of all I want to reach out to everybody and I'm going to say this so many times during the next couple of days is that I'm really grateful for all the participation from the different parts of the community when it comes to GDPR.

And we - when we met the first time in South Africa about this, we had nothing. We really started then by asking for the (user) cases. We didn't have a plan. We didn't have - we had the beginning of a plan. We didn't have a process. We didn't have the contacts. And we didn't know how to achieve.

On the last six months we have together achieved a lot. And we have now sent over to the DPAs - we had a conference call with them last week. Sent over what we call the - and this is again based on my bad sense of humor, combination with that morning temper; I call the calzone model because it's a pizza and it (folded) because it's a (peer) access model. Yes. I think it was hilariously funny when I invented it.

We sent it over and we probably sent it to you as well. And that is a comprehensive - I hope you all read it; fifty-nine pages of documentation of why we're doing it.

In that also we added on things that we don't have the answer to, which comes directly from the community. Because we didn't want to say that this is the model that we now believe. There are unanswered questions. And we want to be able to convey that - those questions to the DPAs as well so they can take that into account and give us guidance.

One thing again to remember I don't take sides in this discussion. That's not my job. My job is sort of two-folded. One of them is to make sure that the decision's already made by the community so you can see in the contracts that we have that we stay as close to them. At the same time we have to be compliant with the law. I usually say that I'm in between a rock and a hard place. But that's what we have to do.

The next step of this is of course to wait for guidance from the DPAs. They are the ones who now have to tell us what they think. And it has to be the Article 29 group.

The interesting thing is that legally the Article 29 group is a volunteer organization that doesn't have the right to really do firm legal advice. We have a very good communication with them, which we didn't have six to eight months ago.

And we are hoping to have as much more information new can next time we're going to meet them at the end of March. And they have process for discussion with going forward as well. So that's really where we are right now when it comes to GDPR.

Cherine Chalaby: (Okay). The other area of focus in this year 2018 we said it was the registration data service, RDS policy development. And what we said in the document, and I'm going to ask perhaps Chris Disspain to comment a little bit more, that are hoping that GDPR will inform the RDS PDP at one stage.

And that the Board is supportive of making the GNSO - supporting of making RDS PDP a priority hopefully in FY19. Chris, do you and to add any comments on that?

Chris Disspain: I'm not sure I've got very much to add to that Cherine to be honest. I think we just - we recognized, you know, the interrelationship between the two and we stand ready to help in any way to - for that PDP to be a priority. And we are going to - we are going to talk about - the Board is actually going to have a session to discuss that later today.

Donna Austin: Thanks Cherine and thanks Chris. Donna Austin. So I guess from a - we did briefly touch on this Cherine I think when we met with you during the strategic planning session. We might have mentioned to you Goran as well.

We're cognizant that RDS PDP was a request from the Board. The PDP itself was initiated as a result of a Board request. And I think to the extent that you believe that GDPR should be taken into consideration within the RDS PDP, it might be helpful to have a communication to the Board to the - to outline the extent to which you think it should be taken into consideration. Thanks Chris.

Chris Disspain: So thank you Donna. And Cherine, if I can respond, I think that's right. And I think we are having a session I think it's this afternoon and in this public

Board workshop to go - to talk about exactly that. And so I'm hopeful that at some stage in the not too distant future we will be able to say something to you about that.

Cherine Chalaby: Donna, we've answered the question.

Donna Austin: (Yes).

Cherine Chalaby: Okay. Okay. I'll move on. So the next area of focus and activity for us is looking at the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. Now the Board's position is that we remain committed to the launch of a future and subsequent round. And of course we're awaiting the PDP and the GNSO recommendation.

But we also have another session lined up in our workshop to talk about what preparatory work we could start thinking about and doing in anticipation of a recommendation from the GNSO. Any other Board member wish to add to this? Avri. No?

Avri Doria: Yes. Avri Doria speaking. So basically what we're starting to look at is working with ICANN org while waiting at least for the first, you know, draft of the work that's being - the initial draft what can be done in preparation and then looking at how to stage things and then looking at how that would need to be budgeted, et cetera.

So we're right at the point now of having to sort of set up -- that's the task that we've got -- and start to work our way through it. And a lot hinges on - we're starting to have some knowledge based upon what the subgroups are coming up with.

But it's really once it's folded together into that first draft that there'll be an idea at least to some degree of certainty of which way things are headed.

And that will enable, you know, certain budgeting and certain sizing of the project to be done.

Cherine Chalaby: Okay.

Donna Austin: Cherine.

Cherine Chalaby: Yes Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Cherine and thanks Avri for the update. Just to note, and you may have already seen it, the Council comments on the budget do include a request for that planning to be commenced and considered in terms of budgeting for FY19. So what we're hearing I think is some - we will take some level of comfort out of that. Thanks Avri.

Cherine Chalaby: Okay. Thank you. I was told earlier you didn't hear me well so I'm approaching to the microphone. I hope that's okay now. The next area of focus that's of relevance to the GNSO is the curative rights PDP.

And the comment here is that the Board believes that the timely completion of the curative rights PDP is essential to the finalization of the IGO (action) and curative rights issues.

And we will work collaboratively with the GNSO and the GAC in an effort to align the GNSO policy recommendations with the advice received from the GAC.

I'll ask Chris -- this is his area of specialization -- perhaps to add a bit more if you wanted to.

Chris Disspain: Really? Wow.

Cherine Chalaby: For the last five years.

Chris Disspain: Yes. That's five years I'm not going to get back. Well again, I mean that - we've said what we need to say. I mean we - it is to some extent in the GNSO's hands with the finalization of that PDP.

I understand that there may be a few issues there. And if you guys want to talk about that, I'm happy to - we're happy to listen. And if there's anything we can do to help, we're happy to try and do that as well.

Cherine Chalaby: Any question on that - on the GNSO? No? Okay. The next area we're focusing on is the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability, WS2. You should know that we are meeting I think on Wednesday with the co-Chairs and Rapporteurs of WS2 to discuss two things.

One is the recommendations and two, the Board principles for implementation. The question asked of us is when you receive those recommendations, what will you do with them. Right.

So again, we are talking about preparation for this session today. And we will meet with the group on - I think on Wednesday. I've had contact with (Thomas) -- is he around; I think he's around -- and with (Tijani) as well on this issue. And I think there's an agreement on the agenda for that meeting. Happy to take questions if any.

The next one is the CCWG on auction proceeds. We know that the CCWG is now focusing on the mechanisms for disbursements. I understand there's various models being discussed.

The Board is not in a position at this stage to have a view on any of those mechanisms. But what we wanted to do is to be helpful. And we have - (actually) we have a session this afternoon to discuss what will be our criteria or way of looking at models.

And then we want to share them with you so that you know earlier on in the process where we're coming from and our way of thinking rather than wait until the end and then start saying oh this model is good, this model is not good.

So we want to be very open and transparent and communicate that with you. So hopefully this evening I think when (Becky) and (Martin) will come they'll be able to communicate in a transparent way our initial thinking. And it's only our initial thinking on that. Yes. Any questions?

Woman:

Thank you Cherine. I mean maybe let me thank you first and the Board for the good work and (compilation) we have from the very beginning with the Board. So we tested a way of cooperating instead of waiting until the very end and then have to debate so we have a continuous discussion about areas, which are more problematic and more difficult. And so we are very thankful about it.

Yes. I think it's a good approach. Just go and review them objectively. I mean this would be my only advice. And look at them and then come up with a judgment, you know, which one you favor more.

I would recommend not even maybe to take a decision at the first, you know, in the first exchange. Just to get a plus and minuses. That's - and then this would help us already in our debate in the later - in the afternoon today. And then we will continue the discussion.

So just for those who are not involved, we have the first exchange today with what we call our experts. So we have the internal model, which we will debate today, which will be the (unintelligible). And then we will have in the future other experts, which we consult with as well. So it's absolutely timely to hear from the Board today about your thinking. It's good.

Cherine Chalaby: Thank you. Okay. So in terms of the PDPs, those are - and the Cross Community Working Groups, those are the ones we have an FY18 focused on. Have we missed anyone that we should have focused on as well?

Heather Forrest: Thanks Cherine. Heather Forrest. May I ask a question since you focused specifically on policy development and that's because we steered you in that direction? Perhaps if we read our question a bit more broadly, are there any other milestones or achievements that fall outside of that basket let's say that you feel are important to raise here.

Cherine Chalaby: Well, yes there are. So there are things like KSK, right, the key signing key rollover. And is David Conrad here? No? So this is one area - do you want to talk about that one area where I think there is a plan being put together that's going to be shared with the community?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Cherine Chalaby: Sorry.

Man: (There's) a public consultation.

Cherine Chalaby: There's a public consultation already out on that, right. There was another milestone in terms of replenishing the reserve fund. And we've put a public consultation document on that. And we made it clear in this document the various sources of fund and we made it very clear that one of the sources of fund cannot be asking for more money from contracted parties. Right.

So that was very clear in the document. If you allow me later on I'll pull the document and then be a bit more specific, yes. Okay. To give you an overall view of all the other priorities. Okay.

So I talked about the Board's priorities for FY18, how this aligns with the GNSO PDPs in the various working groups. Now I'm to talk a little bit about longer-term objectives and particularly five-year objectives.

I'm going to start by saying the Board does not have separate five-year goals or longer-term goals. We believe that the three entities, the Board, org and community that we are all bound together by the five-year strategic plan and the five-year operating plan.

And we don't create longer-term priorities outside that. Because as I said earlier that we drive our priorities from the communities' priorities. So we need to work together in the new strategic plan.

And in fact we will soon begin working on the new strategic plan for the period 2012 to 2025. And that plan will have three major parts. First is our vision of where we want ICANN to be in the year 2025; secondly our mission and thirdly our strategic objectives.

Regarding the mission - the vision, sorry, of where we want, excuse me, of where we want ICANN to be in the year 2025 we believe that is not going to be significantly different from what exists currently in the strategic plan. It may be that we collectively will decide to change a few words. But the vision of us as an organization is not going to change substantially.

Regarding the mission statement in the new strategic plan we think this is also already defined for us in the bylaws. And we believe that we should be aligned with that mission. And maybe the community decide to do one or two small changes but by and large the work is done regarding the mission statement.

So our focus for the strategic plan is going to be on the third part, which we call strategic objectives. And we're going to start working with the community here in San Juan and in Panama on those strategic objectives.

And the way we're going to do that we're going to start by defining and understanding and identifying the key trends and forces whether it's internal or external that will affect our ability to meet that vision and that mission over the next five or so years.

And I think, you know, that we start the - ICANN started that exercise with the Board already. And I think they've done it with the SO and AC leaders. And now they're going to take it to other constituencies within the community and also here and in Panama.

The objective would be that we finish this strategic plan for the year 2021 to 2025 by the end of 2018 - calendar 2018. That's where we think we ought to all coalesce around that because it's not going to be a very thick document. It should be a document of maybe 20 pages or 25, I don't know; maybe less.

And then once we do that, then we would all go into the next stage of developing a five-year operating plan. And that five-year operating plan has to be fully costed because something we have not done in the past.

Has to be fully costed so that we know not only how we're going to implement our chosen strategy but also at what cost. And as you know, there's been a lot of discussion around the budget, around funding leveling up, around expenses, which have been increasing by 16% on average over the last ten years.

These also now have to be managed. So we cannot come up with an unrealistic strategic plan. It's going to be realistic. We're going to know where are our limitations and how much it's going to cost us. And we will have to agree on those priorities. So that's going to be our major focus in a way in FY19.

Heather Forrest: (Can I comment on that)?

Cherine Chalaby: Yes. Please.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Cherine. Heather Forrest. I think - so as Cherine has said and I'll let's say specify so that everyone's very clear. As we use the term SO/AC leaders, which is a broader group and then there's SO/AC Chairs. So just so there's no confusion that anyone thinks I've missed something.

Indeed the SO/AC Chairs met on Friday prior to the start of the meeting and spent a bit more than an hour with (Theresa) and her team to go through this exercise. It was indeed very informative. I found that, you know, to be quite an (expand size). Donna was able to participate in that as well and unfortunately Rafik was traveling.

I did offer to (Theresa) at the time the GNSO was there is a very big community and we have a number of different stakeholder groups and constituencies and to any - to the extent that there's any help needed in coordinating the setup of that discussion happening within each one of those groups, I'd volunteer leadership to help her with that. And (Theresa) is nodding for the record. So (Theresa) now we're committed on the record to offering that help to you.

The one thing I would say Cherine is I wonder if Panama is the appropriate opportunity for that exercise to move forward in the sense that we really try - we jealously guard our policy development time. And that is the policy forum.

And having been through this discussion this morning and indeed in Los Angeles about all of the policy development work that we have and we really need to guard every minute for that, I wonder if we can't try and think strategically about how to not eat into that policy development time. Thanks.

Cherine Chalaby: Well, I think we sympathize with that completely. And Goran, do you want to say something about that or (Theresa)?

Goran Marby: No, I can do it. And thank you for giving compliments to (Theresa) and her team. I mean the notion of this one is to start any strategic discussion with the question what is the problem instead of coming up with solutions before we have any problems.

I know it's been ICANN way. But so what we're trying to do is identify trends coming from the community that you think are risks or opportunities for ICANN as an institution.

Could be the organization. It could be the community. But it's really about the institution. And on the basis of that, the Board will then take those trends, figure out - see if there are things that we can do to mitigate those things and then come back to the community so the community can say we think that those measures on the trends that come from us are they right or wrong.

And I - this is the first time we do this. And it's going to be an evolving process. And we need engagement in this. So it's not - but it's not time sensitive in that sense that we have to be - we have to have done it by. This is really yours and ours together a process that we're trying to do. Thank you. And also it's a fairly fun process. Wouldn't you say so Heather?

Cherine Chalaby: So I'm going slowly and deliberately so that we have an opportunity to (make it). You asked me two - there's one more question from Donna about prioritization. How do we deal with it? And you asked me also the question about what are the other priorities.

So I can answer the question about what are the other priorities and then focus the discussion on. So other priorities are internationalization - internationalized domain names. Is (Rom) here. (Rom), do you want to mention where are we on this, IDNs and...

(Rom): Thank you Cherine. There are really two major areas that we're looking at. The IDN guidelines have entered - they've gone through two sets of public comments. And it's in front of the Board for a briefing and it'll soon be followed by consideration for adoption.

You'll - the GNSO folks will care about this even more than normal because on the contracted parties side the IDN guidelines become mandatory once they're adopted. And the guidelines of course apply to both G and ccTLDs but on the ccTLD side it's the ccNSO Council that works that process.

There is also work continuing on IDN variance in the - at the top level. And finally, in public consultation is the root zone, LGR, the label generation rules and the procedures that come to that.

The Label generation rules, the idea there actually is quite an important one. It starts to get at the point of saying that the - what are the core minimum standards that ought to be there.

And one of the things that the Board is starting to think about is in future - for future languages and want to get added to the root, to consider whether if a registry submits a language table that is already conformant, if you will, to the LGR, then potentially that goes through a very rapid approval cycle.

Currently these things go through an RSEP and sometimes and RSTEP process. So there might be some efficiencies to get gain there. Thanks Cherine.

Cherine Chalaby: Thank you (Rom). And question on IDNs? No? Okay. The next area of priority was the thick Whois consensus policy, which I think this is behind us because we passed a resolution on this issue. Okay.

The next area was the information transparency initiative. Again, the Board approved the launch of a critical project really in this area. The purpose of

this, and this will take three years to complete, is to develop a centralized governance system for about 104 pieces of ICANN documentation in order to make this information transparent, searchable and easy available for both internal and public use.

I did talk about the key signing key. I did talk about the reserve fund. I did talk about the five-year plan. Yes. The next one is the long-term security and stability of the DNS.

I think this is something we are still in discussion. I don't think we're reached any decision on that. But this is something that we're keeping our eye on how the DNS should evolve. And yes, to come to deal with different use of domain - all domain names and also emerging new technologies. So that's an area that we're looking at.

We're looking at the L-Root strategy and the robustness of it. This is another area where we're focusing on and we're waiting for recommendation by - our technology as well our Board Technical Committee together to put this in front of the Board I think in Vancouver around next workshop in about a couple of months. Office of our technology officer, yes; basically David Conrad. Right. He is a department in his own rights.

Man: Has some people working for him.

Cherine Chalaby: Yes. And then this could be of interest to you. We moved forward with some strings like (unintelligible) and mail. We asked to see the SSAC to get us a - we've put those on hold. And we've refunded the applicants. And we've asked for SSAC to give us an estimate for a study on name collisions. And we're looking at this. And we're in fact having a discussion with them this week.

There are also many pending requests for considerations and pending review of the community priority evaluation, which has just been completed. And the

Board is going to take a resolution this week to accept the report that came on the community priority valuation and to restart the work on those reconsideration requests.

Dot Amazon was an important priority. And maybe I should tell Goran to touch base on that a little bit.

Goran Marby: Well the GAC asked and the Board gave me the mission to facilitate the negotiations between the different parties. And because of respect of the different parties, I can say it goes well.

Cherine Chalaby: Okay. So he's saying don't ask me questions basically.

Goran Marby: I can also say it's not bad.

Cherine Chalaby: All right. And then we had quite a few other strings that were waiting and now we're making progress on them and ask Chris. Chris, can you comment on .Persiangulf, .HALAL, .Islam...

((Crosstalk))

Cherine Chalaby: ...please. Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Sure. So we had a - we had a sort of high (access) of a number of reconsideration requests due to the independent investigation into the CEP that's finalized those reconsideration requests.

So these are resolutions that will be before the Board on Thursday. So the Board's likely to pass resolutions now to get back into process with those. So we had some issues with .HALAL, .Islam and .Persiangulf. And again, we're going to pass resolution on Thursday to put those back into process. Did I miss anything Cherine? Was there something else?

Cherine Chalaby: CEP but...

Chris Disspain: CEP I mentioned.

Cherine Chalaby: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Yes. I think that was it.

Cherine Chalaby: Persiangulf, HALAL...

Chris Disspain: Persiangulf, HALAL, Islam.

Cherine Chalaby: Yes.

Chris Disspain: You mentioned another one though, which I've forgotten what it was. Anyway it doesn't matter. That's where we are with those. And so there was - we're processing through what things need to happen with that.

Cherine Chalaby: Okay. And then finally, there are other small ones but finally (Q1) are the reviews. We feel that there are too many reviews though mandated by the bylaws whether they are organization or special reviews taking place at the same time.

Next year I believe there are nine of those taking place. Plus we need to kickoff ATRT3. And we feel that there's a bit of a burnout and not enough volunteers to do all the work. So we're looking at way of making this more effective. May I ask Khaled who heads our Operational Effectiveness Committee to comment on that please?

Khaled Koubaa: Thank you Cherine. Khaled Koubaa for the record. So in fact indeed we are learning a lot from the reviews, the (type) specifically for this first round of reviews.

The OEC, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee in charge of the oversight of the reviews is looking onto how we can learn from those (unintelligible) and develop a way to assess the impact of the reviews.

There's also a very important document that is now available for you to look at it, which is the guideline for specific reviews. We thought that this is a very good framework that will handle the effort of streamlining the reviews. So any kind of comment would be more than welcome on that document.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much Cherine. Heather Forrest. I wonder if I might ask a question here in the spirit of moving us forward. So one of the - one of the concerns or discussions that - concerns raised, discussions that we had in the context of the SO/AC Chairs meeting was we seem to all feel that we're in a less than ideal position with the number of reviews happening at the same time and the cost of reviews and the figures about the cost were very, very interesting.

And (Theresa), I would like to follow up with you on that data so that we can share that with the Council please. How do we - how do we move forward? I mean the suggestion was made in the SO/AC Chairs meeting. It's the community that has to change the bylaws.

But we don't have a process for that. We've really only changed the bylaws sort of incrementally up to the point of the transition exercise. So rather than kick this football around a few more times, no, it's not mine; no, it's not mine; it's yours. How do we move this one forward? Thank you.

Goran Marby: So can I...

Cherine Chalaby: Yes.

Goran Marby: You asked me.

Cherine Chalaby: Yes.

Goran Marby: But it is - yes, you're right. This is undefined territory. As I'm never afraid of entering undefined territories, I would say that yes, the decision lies within the community. And if enough - you asked about the numbers.

There are two things for this and one of them is probably more important. Next year we're thinking of running nine different reviews. So we can see the current reviews and see - take Question 2 for instance in the terms that the participation of those groups dropped off sort of in the (end).

And when I speak to people about the accountability review coming up next year, they all look at me like please - I shouldn't say that on record. Please not. So maybe there is.

So one of the fantastic things with this community and how we do things is that we don't have (job) processes for everything. But actually I'll be obliged that I - if enough people tells me and asks me come up with proposal and look at it, I can set up a proposal as I do sort of with a bucket. I throw the first stone for someone else to comment on.

Or in practical terms you talk about approximately 700 - if we would move the accountability for one year, that would move \$700,000, which is a fairly - if we would align the - align ourselves to say that we will have four reviews per year instead of having nine one year, zero next year, we will probably on average save about a million point two plus the work it takes.

If enough people who think that's a great idea for us to look into, we will. But that's the - and we don't have to construct new processes for something that may not happen at all. So that's an answer.

Cherine Chalaby: Steve DelBianco, I wonder if you want to comment on that because I remember during the transition you were very articulate about the five-year

period and having to do things from a certain point of view or review has to start. How would we go about if the community wanted to make a change in terms of staggering those reviews over a couple of years rather than do all of the nine next year? What's your thoughts on that in regard to (unintelligible)?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Cherine. Steve DelBianco. And I would have you look at the two kinds of reviews, the Board driven review of the ACs and SOs, which are seven of them and those occur every five years.

And I believe it's sort of up to the Board to look at whether there's flexibility if plus or minus 12 to 18 months before you start the next one; things like the GNSO review. You're probably want to do so in some form of consultation with the community who's getting that review. Those are the outside.

The second category are specific reviews that are community driven and they are no less frequently than every five years. But one example is ATRT, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team Number 3.

It's the community that has to name the up to 21 review team members who then convene, elect a chair and work on their scope. And the communication, AC and SO leaders we are only gradually beginning to form a cohesive group there. And it would really be up to them to designate the team members and get ATRT3 started.

So the community, not the Board, has some flexibility about perhaps pausing the formation of ATRT3 -- this is an example -- pausing it until later in the year or perhaps even 2019.

And the community would be doing that and inform the Board of the community's decision. Because the bylaws say that the Board shall cause those reviews to happen and you provide the support for that review. But the community ultimately determines the speed at which that review proceeds. So Cherine, I'm trying to give you some non-bylaws changing answers.

Some answers that wouldn't require a change to the bylaws but would still allow the communities, community in consultation with the Board staff to have a little more flexibility to normalize the timing of these reviews. Because with a total of seven AC and SO reviews and four specific reviews, that's 11 over the course of five year gaps between them, that means we should normalize this at around two reviews in process in any given year.

In an ideal world we'd smooth it out to roughly two a year instead of the bad luck of nine.

Goran Marby: I always appreciate when I agree with you. And I think (both me and) Cherine pointed that this decision belongs to the community when it comes to those reviews. And then as Heather pointed out, I think that this is one of the things that I like with this.

This is how we start a discussion. That's how we initiate a discussion in the community and then the community with our support if needed will continue the discussion. Our job sometimes is to formulate so the discussion can start.

But I totally agree. This is - that's why it's in the (unintelligible). That's why we have all those things in the (unintelligible) because the community has decided it. We cannot say from our side it's not going to happen.

So we're also pointing out there's some flexibilities in this one, which we will look into from the Board perspective. And if the SO and AC leadership would like to work on the other flexibilities because there's also - there are always pros and cons.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. We are well aware of the fatigue of volunteer community. But we need to be aware from your perspective of when there would be cost savings - significant cost savings achieved by normalizing instead of having nine...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...and that was helpful.

Goran Marby: Yes. That's why we need a conversation I think as well. Thank you. We need to figure out something to argue about as well Steve. Otherwise we will fall out of form I think.

Cherine Chalaby: Khaled and Michele.

Khaled Koubaa: Thank you Cherine. Khaled Koubaa for the record. So there is a discussion as well and it's inside the Board and I have been discussed this with different community members and something that I have been looking at since my first term as Chair of the OEC, which is in fact the - what we call the theory of change.

There's something in the Article 4 of the bylaws that we all agreed on, which is theory of change that says through independent reviews we will improve and maintain accountability and transparency.

We all agree on that theory of change. But like every theory of change, it needs to be scientifically proven. Unfortunately (enter) today we don't have any scientific way to measure the impact of the reviews. And this is something that we need to look at it.

We need to measure the impact of the reviews that we did in the past and that way we will be able to say as community if this is the right way to go ahead or not.

And this is an effort that the OEC will probably look at it by the end of this year to make sure that we have a tool for you as community to decide and to

judge on the impact of those reviews on the accountability and transparency of our organization.

Cherine Chalaby: Michele.

Michele Neylon: Hi Cherine. Michele for the record. Just one thing that Goran mentioned there in passing kind of tweaked my interest a little bit. I think maybe it's a possible misunderstanding somewhere along the way.

I mean the concept of the SO/AC leadership having any power to do anything I think is a bit misunderstood. I mean the talking to the SO/AC leadership in order to kind of have some kind of channel of communication is one thing. But it would be quite hard to get somebody in a room there to actually make a decision without going back to the respective group.

Goran Marby: Could I - I answered this question 200 times for the last three days. And so I'm going to make a very important statement, which I think that I - for instance, whenever I have the meeting on Friday, we don't deal with the SO and AC leaders for collective decision making group.

The reason why we have that meeting is because we want to make sure that the different parts of the community talk to each other at one central point where we facilitate the discussion. So they're not talking to me. We're setting it up so they can talk to each other.

I never anticipate that anyone from the SO leaders make collective decisions for their communities. So when I speak about the community, I always speak about the community in general. So when I say that I - we need to have a community decision, I don't think it's the SO and AC leadership because that's not how you set up.

And I'm sorry if I ever - there are some mechanics in this one. But that's - so I will try to learn the language to avoid any doubts. Thank you.

Chris Disspain: (And so) could I say something?

Cherine Chalaby: Yes.

Chris Disspain: I just want to get back to the point about the review problem. Simply put, we have identified a problem. We believe that there are a (bunch of) issues as well as volunteer tiredness issues and all sorts of things.

We would like to start a conversation. Consider this the first step in starting a conversation. That conversation will continue with your subgroups, with the groups that sit with the ccNSO, et cetera, over the next few days. And we'll figure out what to do.

But the ultimate point is that it's the community's decision at the end of the day. What we're going to try and do is to facilitate coming to some sort of an understanding of the challenges, what the benefits would be of staggering, delaying, whatever you want to call it and go from there.

So there's no question of giving anyone the say that shouldn't have the say or all that stuff. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Heather. Stephane Van Gelder speaking. Just on the - a small point on the review scheduling. If we are thinking about delays and altering the timeline of the reviews, I think we ought to do that before we start to select for some of these reviews and have people put up their hands say right, I'll commit to spending that time on that review and then finding that the review is delayed for a couple of years, which seems unfair to the people that have volunteered to participate in that review.

So if we're going to delay, which - or rearrange the timetable, which sounds like obviously something that may need to be looked at, I think we can do that

but after - before we've called for volunteers; after we've called for volunteers, probably stick to the plan timeline. Thanks.

Goran Marby: Very good notes I would say. Thank you.

Woman: Cherine, Stephanie Perrin.

Cherine Chalaby: Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And this is a question really that goes back to the long range planning although it does have something to do with the whole crazy idea of having nine reviews in one year.

And that would be mapping ICANN's procedures to a maturity model. It seems to me that ICANN has progressed quite a bit in the five years I've been here in terms of productivity, globalization, all kinds of metrics, you know, that we don't necessarily specifically measure; at least we in the community don't.

But - and I'm not aware but I haven't done the research yet of multi stakeholder organizations being mapped to either a (coso) model or, you know, an integrated maturity model but I think it could and should be done so that we actually measure our progress going forward.

So we had for instance - GNSO we had an excellent workshop this morning following up on our strategic retreat in January. We're actually dealing with the problems that beset us in having a large global multi stakeholder model with 200 people participating -- poor Chuck; I say it every time -- in the RDS, you know.

How do we actually move the markers and get up to a higher level of maturity in terms of our procedures and expectations of one another, levels of trust, ethics, human rights, which is now in the bylaws? How are we going to do

that? Privacy. All of these things we're kind of still at the bottom rung here and we need to map it. So if you have any comments on that, I'm interested.

Goran Marby: To measure what we do is very hard. (Mark me). There is a guy from Gothenburg University, which name I don't recollect, who's actually doing a study about the accountability of ICANN. I think that's (Dan Schulz). Yes. However, he works from (Gothenburg), my hometown. So I like him. And I think that's the kind of study - the outside studies of what we do is important.

The other thing I would like to get some market on - we have spent at - because of the (months) (set) from you and we really like them in that sense. We spend a lot of time and effort of something we call the accountability indicators, which you can find on the Web, which I ask you to have a look at to look at how ICANN org think that we progress according to the mission and the things that we are tasked with to do. Please have a look at that.

That is not your institutional question, which I actually don't know how to measure it.

Man: So I'm going to make - (Mike).

(Mike): Thanks. I don't know if anybody else has noticed but we've just spoken to you for a really long time and you asked a question about your strategic priorities, which you haven't presented to us. And then we've asked you questions about your goals and long-term goals and we're going to talk at each other instead of talking to each other.

And this is the only opportunity we get to engage with the GNSO as a whole rather than the constituent points. I've made the same comment to other SOs and ACs, which is why not tell us what you're up to. We'll tell you what we're up to.

And we can actually engage in a dialog instead of sequential monologues. Because I don't know if this has been helpful to you but I'm gaining no idea as to how this fits into your expectations, your needs; how we can adjust things, what your feedback is.

Now if we need to adjust the timing so that we can have a more fruitful conversation or we need to change the process, then let's do it. But right now I didn't get a lot out of the session and I unfortunately need to go to another session now.

Hopefully you guys will be able to wrap everything up in what remains of the session. But this to me was not particularly productive. And I really think we need to just work on how to make it more productive so we can hear you, you can hear us and then we can exchange ideas.

It was only in the last few minutes where there's been exchange around reviews that I actually started feeling that we're talking to each other instead of talking at each other.

Cherine Chalaby: A good moment to transition to Heather to talk about your goals and your - okay. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks. Cherine and I were hoping to transition and (Mike) made his point, which is exactly that. But unfortunately now we have two minutes. So we haven't - we thank you very much Cherine and your colleagues for dealing with the two major points that are there for you.

Perhaps we might I think usefully follow up on the points that were missed here that - the things on the slide. What I will say is on behalf of the Council because we don't really have very much time to open the floor, in terms of the topics that were suggested by you, I wonder if you want to prioritize although I take (Mike)'s point Board member integrity screening, which was a last minute addition to this agenda.

In terms of the answer to your two questions specifically there, what are your key goals in 2018 and what are our most relevant longer-term goals, happily we have an answer to that that isn't just manufactured out of the sky having been locked in a room together for three days in January.

And we have put together, and I've communicated to you Cherine the report of our strategic planning session. And as I offered in the SO/AC Chairs' meeting, very happy. In fact I'll say here volunteer the entire leadership team to liaise directly with the Board to walk you through the goals that are articulated there, how those are articulated, how we've come to those.

But at least in this instance you've caught us at a fantastic time because that information is documented and it's documented in quite a bit of detail. So that captures both our 2018 goals that was the primary priority but also that longer term thinking.

Of course we've now coined a phrase, which is the scary spreadsheet. That scary spreadsheet sets out what's on our workload for 2018 and beyond. And we'll be carrying that forward. That really in a pictorial form illustrates our goals for the next ten months and beyond that.

So to the extent that I can follow up with you - Donna, Rafik and I on those but I can say it's not that we're evading the question. They are documented there.

Cherine, to you, would you like to give us a very high level summary on why Board member integrity screening was put on the agenda at the very last minute or should we follow up on that afterwards?

Cherine Chalaby: No. Simply that if you recall in Abu Dhabi, we said that we will do Board member integrity screening across all members of the Board whether they are directors or liaisons.

And we know that not all SOs and ACs actually do this as a matter of course. And I think we have or we have put a blog out or a consultation paper out saying we would like to know what your views on that and whether you'd be happy for GNSO members on the Board to go through the regular integrity screening. That's all there is to it.

So we're following on a promise we made in Abu Dhabi that we will consult with the community, each SO and AC and see if they are - if they're happy with the process or not. (Becky), sorry. I didn't see that. (Becky), sorry.

(Becky): Yes. Just to - this isn't - so the contracted parties and the non-contracted parties - well at least I think have not typically used ICANN's screening process. Some of the SOs who appoint members to the Board do.

We did all volunteer to be screened. That screening was done. We published the results of that and are asking for input from the entities that appoint members of the Board of Directors, which would be the contracted parties and the non-contracted parties as posted the GNSO in this case if they would like to use that process and to provide some input into that.

Heather Forrest: Thanks (Becky). Let's give the last word to Rafik please.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Heather. So hearing the comment from (Mike) and (pretend) he's not here. Maybe it's the way to move forward how we can improve this because we are in kind of a (core) situation. Again, the question from the Board asking us if we have any topic.

And so there is no kind of (unintelligible) preparatory process between the Board and us to prepare for this session. If we want to dialog, it means more preparation.

So if we can change from the format that you put on the question to ask and asking that if we have a question, I'm not sure that may be the most effective. And that may be what happened this situation because we had kind of, you know, question to all the groups. Maybe can be somehow a little bit frank.

And when you're asking what the goals. But if we can find a way to work that. I know that's challenging just a few weeks before the meeting but if we can find a better way to prepare for this session that we can make it more productive if we want.

Cherine Chalaby: So that makes sense. And I think if we moved into an issue driven discussion rather than our question, your question and we put two or three issues, no more than that, that gives us enough time to talk about. For example, (whether) put the special reviews as an issue and have a dialog around that; both sides.

So that makes a lot of sense rather than here's our list of questions. Give me the answers. Here's your list of questions. Give me the answers. So I do like this suggestion very much. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you very much Cherine and Goran and Board colleagues. We very much appreciate the time with you as always. And we wish you a very pleasant and productive week. Thanks very much.

And Councilors and Board members to the extent that you're interested, we are shifting to a joint meeting of the RPM and subsequent procedures PDP to discuss the timeline and issues relating to those two PDPs. Thank you very much. We can stop the recording for this session.

Man: Thank you.

END