

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona
GNSO Working Session-meeting with ICANN Board-Session 3
Sunday, 21 October 2018 at 12:15 CEST**

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://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Heather Forrest: So this is the meeting of the GNSO Council with the ICANN board over lunch. Any remaining board member or GNSO councilor who has not eaten please be sure to jump the queue and make yourself a plate. Our staff team will make sure that that happens.

Technical team, can we have the thumbs up to make sure that we're recording and ready to go? Fab, thank you very much.

So with that I welcome everyone to this meeting of the ICANN board and the GNSO Council. We were posed the question that you see here on the screen by the board along with all of the other SOs and ACs I should say. The GNSO and other SOs and ACs were posed this question.

And in a change of style we've long been considering as a council ways to have a more robust dialogue with the GNSO rather than sort of prepared statements on our part. And we – pardon me – so liked the question that the board presented and thought it dovetailed very neatly into what we've spent much of 2018 on that we simply suggested that we turn that into an open discussion.

So with that I might turn to Cherine for opening context from the board and then we'll turn over the floor.

Cherine Chalaby: Thank you Heather. And I have to start by applauding the GNSO suggestion of doing this session as a dialogue rather than a question and answer session so thank you very much. That's exactly the type of engagement that we would very much appreciate having. Excuse my voice.

You may wonder why the board has put that question to all of the stakeholders, right? So allow me a few minutes just to frame it and answer that question so that you know where we're coming from.

Some seven months ago in Puerto Rico we said that it was time for ICANN to begin working on the new strategic plan for the year 2021 to 2025. And we said that this plan would consist of three things – a vision, a mission, and strategic objectives.

And we also said and agreed that we will start the work on the plan by identifying the trends that have an impact on ICANN's future. And since (unintelligible) about 700 man-hours of work has taken place including many sessions with the community in which hundreds of community members participated.

The board also had several meetings where it took together all the input and all the trends identified by the community. And unsurprisingly we found that there were a lot of similarities between the trends and that naturally they kind of converged into five main trends.

And those five main trends are in the area of security, governance, the unique identifier systems, geopolitics, and financials. The one that is relevant for our conversation today is the one about governance, the trend about governance.

And what we heard - we believe we heard, what the community said about that trend is the following. It said a multi-stakeholder model of governance which grew to fit ICANN needs has the potential of becoming less effective

and more expensive as it matures and scales up to represent - to respond to the increasing needs of our community.

And underneath that overarching statement about the trends there were many pointers by the community and many themes. And I'll read some of those.

So one theme was there's an increasing demand for inclusiveness, accountability and transparency across the whole spectrum of our activities.

Another one was the need for improving our policy development process to achieve consensus in a more effective and timely manner. There's another one concern that progress can be ground to a halt because of polarized interests.

Another one concerns about volunteer shortage and fatigue, another one inefficient reviews. And the last two ineffective involvement of some of our technical committee. And then the last one was large, expensive ICANN meetings that are full and cluttered with sessions.

So this is what the community said. It's not what the board is saying. And that is why the board, having heard all of this, is bringing this question back to the community. We don't have an answer to this yet. The board hasn't had time or even should not have the time to discuss this and come up with an answer.

This is a community question and that's why we're putting it to you so that we can listen and we can hear what does the community think about this trend and this trend because it does create challenges but also opportunities for us to evolve our multi-stakeholder model, okay.

So with that in mind we will hopefully be publishing or putting for consultation a paper towards the end of this fiscal year after having listened to all the

community about what are the main issues in your mind about our stakeholder model, if any. And do you think should it or should it not evolve and possibly how. As input the board will not put forward any ideas.

Now the board recognizes and understands that the GNSO is somehow ahead of the game with PDP 3.0 in which I notice there are some recommendation about immediate improvements and there are also suggestions for possible longer term improvements, right, and that you are at that stage of thinking of how to implement those.

Okay, so really it's up to you how do you want to do this dialogue, whether you want to focus on PDP 3.0 or do you want to talk about the wider aspect? We're really here to listen here and listen very carefully and engage. Your views are more important than our views because we don't have a view at this point in time. You're the people on the ground and you know the issues more than us. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Cherine for that helpful introduction. So my first reaction is to say it's brilliant to hear that the board is aware of and tracking what we're doing in the PDP 3.0 project. So that's a great starting point.

And with that I think what we ought to do Cherine is open the floor, simply make this in the true spirit of free-flowing dialogue. We're all here to listen and contribute. And with that I would say perhaps I can begin with a brief introduction for those in the room who may not be familiar with the PDP 3.0 project just to pick up on what Cherine has said.

This is an initiative that was commenced in January earlier this year with the GNSO having had the opportunity to hold what we call the strategic planning session, so three days outside an ICANN meeting to get together to raise questions around how can the PDP be improved. What sorts of challenges are we having.

And we've only just had a chance to discuss the recommendations that have come out of that process this morning. They are - there are 14 potential improvements on the agenda for Wednesday's GNSO Council meeting.

They go around some matters that are in some ways internal to us but in some ways more broad. So maybe that answers your question Cherine about, you know, do we focus on the micro or the macro. I think at least in PDP 3.0 we've tackled them both.

You're right, certainly one of the concerns that was raised is around volunteer burnout. But I think we've looked at that from a uniquely GNSO point of view in terms of how do we deal with disputes within PDPs, how do we deal with tensions within PDPs.

This morning we had a very robust conversation around the neutrality of PDP chairs. And it's clear that we have a fair bit more discussing to do in that regard. Are we moving into a space - if I might characterize this morning's discussion - where members of the community are not in the best position to chair a PDP because of their interest in a particular topic.

So we have of course been experimenting not just in the EPDP but for example with Work Track 5 in using external facilitators and so on to help that process.

We've talked about best practices in PDP chairing and how that could be improved. We've actually used the word policing this morning. Is it the role of a PDP council - or excuse me a GNSO Council liaison to a PDP - to police the activity of the PDP chairs, PDP working group members.

We've talked about the expected standards of behavior and how those dovetail into PDP work, all of these designed around the notion of making PDP work effective. How do we get to a final report? How do we get to the

point of having policy recommendations that come before Council? And of course once they come from Council they go onto the board.

With that as an introduction to – a very general one I might say – to PDP 3.0, I'd like to open the floor. Would anyone like to speak to the question that we have here, how should the model evolve if we want to summarize the question?

Should the model evolve? Maybe we've made an assumption in the question. Should the model evolve and how should we go ahead and do that? Any thoughts, open the floor. Happy to take hands. Rafik please. Erika, I'm so sorry. No. I'm sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Okay thanks Heather. So with regard to this question, and maybe before starting should we evolve or not the model, maybe as always we need to start with an assessment what was - I mean, why the thinking is that the model is not working.

I understand that the process that we went through about the polarizing concern that why we really think it's not working we have some more facts. Should we do more kind of - go more into details to see if it's really - I mean, I'm not going to say with cost analysis but really to - maybe to go further because maybe all just looking at symptoms, not real cause of issues that we are trying to fix.

Just I'm not saying that we should not go further but maybe to take a step back and try to assess the real situation.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Rafik. Erika, and with apologies Erika.

Erika Mann: Please there's no need. Erika. It's all okay. Personally I believe that ICANN's model must evolve but we need to recognize as well what we achieved and how far we have actually gone because it's typically a model

which you only – and I was a legislator – so it's only a model which you typically find in legislative cycles.

So the only missing part of us is that we are not setting laws. It's a self-regulatory body but not in the classical sense of setting laws. But all the rest is there so you do have the whole lobby cycle, including all the lobbying elements.

And of course you have the policy-setting elements which stem from the various communities which I think it's a very nice model in principle. The trouble is it needs to really - it truly needs to evolve.

I believe in particular in timing it needs to evolve. It needs to be clear if one agrees about a time frame. One has to meet the time frame. Now there might be occasions where it's not possible because – and this happens everywhere – but I mean in principle I think we need to work on the time frame in particular.

Most processes I find extremely long. You lose volunteers because I mean everybody is just so much engaged and typically has normal work as well, normal work life. So how can one actually attend all these many calls and be present all the time. So that's a particular area we really need to work on.

I have not an ideal solution what can be done but something must be done here. It's impossible to continue like this. Just can't work. And the complexity will evolve in our field.

So if we don't find a model that is more efficient because the complexity in our area will evolve because of government involvement and increasingly getting involved because they understand Internet topics more and more, not just in our field, in general.

We have to carry more burden from other Internet segments more and more which, you know, doesn't matter if we have seen it in data privacy but there will be other topic – intellectual property rights, different topics will come to our field, security. So we need to do something to make it more efficient.

Cherine Chalaby: Can I just respond to Erika? Thank you. Thank you for reminding us also that this is a model which has grown to fit our needs. And it is suited for us - so let's - we're not starting from - we're starting from a very positive point and thank you for making.

And all we're saying here is that we shouldn't shy away from fine tuning if we need to do so in order to even make it better and better. And as you said, we're in a much more complex environment. So and things get more complex, so thank you for focusing on the positive to start with. That's absolutely the right thing. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Erika and Cherine. So I have Paul, Michele, Susan. Paul.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady here. So I think Cherine and Erika hit on something that's really important which is we need to parse out which things are making it more complex because they're coming from the outside, right, new laws, new geopolitical issues that are out there, and then parse out those that are coming from the inside like scaling up the new gTLD program, basically what we were doing that made it much bigger, right? So that's - we did that, right? And so that layer of complexity is something that we caused.

On the list of things that we are causing on the internal side that I think are making this more complex is that I think ICANN the community – not ICANN the org and not ICANN the board but ICANN the community – has a real cultural crisis.

I see calcification. People are joining working groups not prepared to budge. People are coming in with preset marching orders from whomever they report to. They're not prepared to budge.

We have lost something in the last three or four years that's very precious and I don't know how to get it back other than to flag it that I really think that there is a cultural crisis that we need to figure out how to either get back to our roots and figure out how to work together again or we need to evolve the model, you know, to fix that problem.

And then lastly this is sort of looking down the road. We have a demographic crisis on our hands whether or not we know it. If I could – and I'm not going to – I would love to have anybody under the age of 35 in this room stand up. Right, yeah.

When you look around this room, I mean, there's an obvious demographic crisis. I know we're all going to retire together to the old folks' home for former ICANNers, right, and we'll all live together in harmony. But...

Man: Dot Harmony.

Paul McGrady: Yes, Dot Harmony. But we're not - as you look at the room we're not bringing people in. We're not telling them what ICANN's about. We're not replicating this model, right. And so I think that there's a recruiting crisis that we have now. In five or ten years' time, you know, it's going to be very difficult to staff work. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Paul could you explain - you've used the word - sorry, it's okay. Don't look panicked. You used the word cultural crisis or cultural issues. Can you elaborate on that because I think you're driving at some discussions that we've had within the GNSO this morning, touched on them lightly. But give us some flavor of what you mean.

Paul McGrady: Yes so - and crisis is a strong word but I think it's an important word, right, that what I've seen - and it's very fuzzy, and I apologize. As I lawyer I shouldn't bring up fuzzy concepts. I should have a ten-point plan about how to fix it.

But it's a fuzzy concept. What I'm seeing is that in working groups, people are digging in. They come in either with the presupposition that they will ride out the clock in order to maintain the status quo. Or they come in with the presupposition that if they don't get the changes to the status quo they want then they're prepared to blow the PDP up or the whatever – you know, whatever we're working on.

That's not where we were even five years ago and it certainly wasn't where we were 10 or 15 years ago, right? There has been a cultural shift. I don't know the exact root causes of it but I think we all feel it, we all sense it.

And the biggest symptom of it is the slowdown in the work. Things are just taking forever. In the meantime all the external changes that are coming at us – legislative, political, cultural – you know, they're moving at a lightning's pace. You know, the engineers are moving on, right? And everybody's moving on and we're slow.

And so again it's fuzzy and talking about leading, you know, a cultural reformation within ICANN, that's a hard thing to think about. But I do think that we're going to get slower and slower if we don't.

And then we're going to get - and then on my second point we're going to slow down and then eventually go out of business because we're all going to, you know, move to Florida, right? So at some point we have to also start back filling and, you know, hopefully passing on a positive community culture to the next generation.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Paul. So I have Michele, Susan, Keith, and (Chris). Michele.

Michele Neylon: Yes thanks Heather. Michele for the record. A couple things around this. I mean, we've spoken a little about the participation issues we're having in terms of there being zero incentive or willingness to look for solutions in many cases.

People are engaging in working groups and are taking the concept of the filibuster to new and interesting heights because lack of progress may be considered a win for some people. And there doesn't seem to be an appetite to just simply move on to pass these things or to sideline those individuals who are not contributing constructively.

I had the fortune or misfortune or I was a sacrificial lamb and was one of the co-chairs of the RDS PDP. And that was a prime example of people from various parts of the broader Internet community coming together in one place to not move on anything. They had - there was absolutely no willingness to consider a concept such as compromise, to develop new ideas.

I mean, it was one of the most frustrating experiences I've had and I live in Ireland. I mean, you know, there are many frustrations, hashtag Brexit. I mean, you know, there's a lot of things that would frustrate me. But that was ridiculous.

The participation models, there has been this kind of thing about inclusiveness, inclusiveness, inclusiveness, and I think we need to really get past that. We need to look at it more in terms of representation rather than inclusiveness.

No matter what segment of the broader Internet community you come from, there is a channel for those views within the ICANN community. If there isn't one, well then maybe that's something that can be looked at, that can be fixed. Though obviously certain segments of the broader Internet community

such as spammers and abusers of child imagery aren't going to be welcome by anybody. I mean, you know, that goes without saying.

But, you know, bringing everybody into the fold on every single thing doesn't work. Being able to get their voice through representation is possibly the way forward.

But a more important thing as well is in terms of efficiencies of all this entire circus. And this is something that we discussed in our strategic meeting in L.A. back in January. We said getting more transparency from ICANN the corporation around the costs associated with these policy development processes would be very helpful.

So as the board of ICANN that is something that I think you can actually take action on. Some of the other things are more philosophical. And while you might be able to take those ideas on board, I can't really see how the hell you can actually do anything about it because unless you find some way of mind melding or something, which I know Cherine would love to explore...

Heather Forrest: Thanks Michele. So I have Susan, Keith, (Chris), and (Tatiana).

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you. Susan Kawaguchi for the record. And, you know, I'm agreeing with both Michele and Paul.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Susan Kawaguchi: I know. You know, the PDP structure and the working on policy here at ICANN is definitely - there's a large issue obviously with it now. I'm starting to take this personal because I was on the Thick WHOIS PDP. That stalled. Found out today or this week that the PPAI, which I was on that working group, is now stalled.

And I was part of the leadership team for the RDS PDP and I recommended suspending that one and terminating it. So maybe the common point here is me. And maybe I'm the kiss of death. I didn't sign up for the EPDP so maybe there's some hope there for you guys. So I wish you lots of luck.

But part of the - but we knew back in I think the Thick WHOIS – working group started around 2013 – we knew about the GDPR. We knew about data privacy laws. But there was - it was very hard to focus in on them and really figure it out because, you know, there wasn't enough resources and we didn't understand what we really needed to be looking at way back when.

So you give a lot of people some information to work with but not all information. And I don't know how to fix that but I think we need - and I think this is pretty - most people in the room probably realize this now. We really need to be looking at what's going on outside of ICANN and how it impacts all of the policies.

That's a really hard, you know, nut to crack. But the PDPs need more information and more resources. I'm not saying money necessarily. But, you know, we've seen a lot of more information this year than we ever have from ICANN org on the work we do.

So I think we need to work on that. I also agree with PDPs should be representational of the community groups. I think we are past the time when an individual can walk in and assert their position and their position only. It's their personal position.

That isn't how, you know, my constituency works. At least here at the council I have to come in and say, you know, this is what our party line is. And so - and that's sort of a hard needle to thread because we also want everybody to have a voice.

But we have to put some rules and requirements around individual representation and group representation to move forward. I just don't think - I think we'll always be stalled.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Susan. I have Keith, (Chris), (Tatiana), (Carlos) and (Mike). Keith.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Heather. Keith Drazek. So just to go back to sort of the opening comments and to acknowledge the work under Heather's leadership on the PDP 3.0. And I want to acknowledge that and kudos to Heather for really kicking that off in January of this year and I think really getting a jump start on some of these conversations as we look forward.

I want to give two practical suggestions I think. And this goes to - again when we had our strategic planning session, the discussions about the need for efficiency and effectiveness, those were sort of the two key words that came out of our conversations that were incorporated into our thinking around PDP 3.0.

And so one is the need for precision and focus in chartering our work. I think one of the things that we've seen in our PDPs is that there's a lack of precision. Or if it's too wide open that it causes problems for the PDP working groups to actually focus and get their work done in a timely manner.

So I think as Council and as a community I think we need to be very, very focused in and targeted in the chartering of the work and to make sure that it is right sized or in the right size chunks to be able to get it done in a timely fashion.

And two – and this is piggybacking on something that Michele mentioned – is the need for implementation impact assessments. So as we're going through policy development and as we're considering implementation, we need to be thinking about what the costs will be to ICANN, to contracted parties, and to

third parties, to anybody that might be impacted by the policy recommendations and how the implementation work is done.

So I think the combination of those two things, both on the leading edge of the chartering of the work and then as we start to begin to wrap up the work, the focus on the potential costs of implementation of the policy work that we're producing. Thanks.

Göran Marby: Can I ask a question (now)? Without the - we are now trying to put as you've seen in the expedited PDP, we report that. But I offer voluntarily – and my team probably looks at me right now – if you want to do that, you know, to try to do that, just tell us and we will find resources for it.

I think it's a great idea so it doesn't end up in a sort of budget process two years later, which is what happens today, where the community has to rethink everything again because you have to make choices. Please, you know, I will set (unintelligible) and talk to you immediately to work out a plan to do that. I think it's a great idea.

Keith Drazek: Thank you Göran. And just as a follow-up I think you hit a key point there and that is prioritization. And that's also part of the impact assessment is to be able to understand where the costs are and where things - with a limited set of resources and a limited set of time, that we prioritize the work. Not to say things get set aside forever but it's a question of timing and resources. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Keith. Before I turn to (Chris) I'll just say Keith I very much appreciate your compliments. It's very kind but I'll say everything we've done this year we've done as a team and Donna, Rafik, myself and all of us here at the table, so kudos to all of us I would say. With that, (Chris), thank you.

(Chris): Thanks very much Heather. I just wanted to go back briefly to what Paul was talking about because I agree with everything you said other than the use of the word crisis because I actually think what's happening is normal.

If you look at the normal - if you look at a team dynamic, you know, we're in sort of - we're at the end of norming and actually going to start restoring soon because the places we've reached is a natural place to be. The question is what are we going to do about it, and that's the key point.

It's not a crisis. It's part of the cycle. And one of the things that often happens in circumstances like this is there is a tendency to try and layer on more layers of bureaucracy in an attempt to try and control things. And that may be an answer and it may be an answer in some bits and maybe not in others.

But I would encourage you to think about whether it's necessarily helpful all the time to just say well if we do this fix or we put this level of bureaucracy in, that will help us. I think it's about the community or this community specifically as a whole and in our own SOs and ACs, you know, taking stock and saying are we fit for purpose.

There's nothing wrong with that question. It doesn't imply anyone's made a mistake or anything's wrong. It's a perfectly sensible, logical question to ask, especially at this stage in the life of this organization. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks (Chris). (Tatiana).

(Tatiana): Thank you very much. I would like to pick up first on what Michele was saying about inclusiveness versus representation because when we started the discussion in L.A. during our strategic session I was very much in favor of representation rather than inclusiveness.

But right now I think that it is not about this balance, this trade-off between inclusiveness and representation. It's what Donna and Heather were talking about this morning. It's people we are working with and it's people we have to manage.

And this is really a cultural crisis and this is the crisis of a culture of consensus. Look at the EPDP example. It's all about representation. There is no inclusiveness. We have very efficient people representing stakeholder groups who are very efficiently standing strong on their positions and moving very slow.

And they only like - I see a very slow progress there. And I do think that there is something to learn like for example from those, what these professional facilitators do, how they basically almost force people to communicate to each other and to work together.

So I think that EPDP shows us that even if we limit representation by numbers, if we don't allow work in the (unintelligible) we still have to work on the culture of working together and reaching consensus. I mean, how people are going to do this.

And I also think that in terms of administering the policy development processes as we discussed this morning about liaisons and chairs and back to what Keith said I think you mentioned about chartering the work. I think that we should see which concerns are flagged by different groups and councilors during the charter discussions and we should come back and revisit those concerns because again as someone who is an EPDP alternate I see how the EPDP works.

It gets stuck sometimes because they are not always following the charter or we didn't communicate clear in the charter what they are supposed to do and when. So maybe as a council we have to be more precise and then we also

have to come back and check how it's actually going, so really taking over that administrative role.

And also I would like to thank the leadership for starting this process. I think that we should continue it as a process because I think that this is (trying) (unintelligible). We're not going to fix PDP (unintelligible). We have to see how it works. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thanks (Tatiana). I have (Carlos), (Mike), Donna, Rafik, Michele, and we have ten minutes left. So I'm going to draw the line at Michele. Michele is down, so I'm drawing the line at Rafik.

(Carlos): Thank you very much Heather and Cherine. Back to the PDP 3.0, I think it has been very respectful trying to look only inside at what we can do within or around - within the picket fence. But if you step a little bit outside my view is that we have lost the differences between SOs and ACs and all bystanders outside of the picket fence have decided it's more fun to be inside and join this field.

And that's fine. I mean, but that makes life much more difficult as we see it in Work Track 5, as we see it in the EPDP. And at some point, I mean, the PDP 3.0 will hit the limit because we're talking only about our internal procedure.

And the question is are we just moving to a parliamentary system and everybody gets a seat in the GNSO Council so we get the right balance because the ccNSO wants to participate and defend some positions. They could join the registries.

And if ALAC wants to become relevant again they can join the NCUC and et cetera, and we have to rebalance that. I meant ALAC, I'm sorry. I meant...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Thanks (Carlos). (Mike).

(Mike): Thanks. I've noticed a lot of discussion around the PDP and obviously that's of significant importance to the GNSO but I think the discussion goes slightly broader.

And I think what we're discussing – and picking up on what Michele, Paul, (Chris) have been saying – to me this is a question of trust. And I think there's been a significant breakdown of trust within this organization.

At one stage I think the organization had a common enemy which was the board and the employees. And we've been working very hard and I think reasonably successfully to try and restore some of that trust. But at the moment I get a real sense of mistrust in the community.

People think or have a perception of individuals or communities trying to get a particular advantage and we've seen some being very successful about it using the rules and the processes to obtain financial and other benefits out of these processes. And kudos to them.

But I'm getting a real sense of mistrust and a lack of common objective to try and move forward for a greater purpose but rather people digging in their heels for individual purpose.

I think Keith makes some good points. Everybody's made some good points but the one concern that I have is we're talking about resource and we're talking a lot about professionalizing the organization which is freeing the volunteer community to actually get to the consensus part by having proper prep.

But then the problem is nobody trusts the organization. So ICANN org provides resources then suddenly they're trying to influence the process. ICANN board makes a suggestion, we're trying to manipulate.

Somebody paid for by ICANN gives legal advice, no, no, we need an independent legal advisor. And to me, that is a critical concern is that we're dealing with a lack of trust where it's really difficult for me to now turn around and say no, no you must trust us.

But if we can bridge that divide, that trust divide, that we can actually start providing resources to the community, professional resources within the ICANN org and we don't have this perception that ICANN org is trying to manipulate the outcome for their own purposes but are rather providing a facilitating role giving you the information they need, distilling it for you, then I think we've actually got a mechanism to move on.

But if we've got a situation where Keith correctly says help us evaluate the (knock-on) effects cost benefits budgeting going forward and ICANN org puts that in place and then the community starts throwing rocks at it, well what's the purpose of it?

Or do we then have to have every part of this community have their own group of advisors so that they - it just is ridiculous. And I think to me that's the critical thing is we need to do more work on building trust in the org and the board so that we can actually help you do your work so that we can take some of the heavy lifting off you in terms of resources, legal advice, financial planning, project management.

Let us do that as facilitators for you so that you can get on doing the important stuff of building consensus.

Heather Forrest: Thanks (Mike). Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Heather. Donna Austin. So to pick up on I think (Tatiana)'s point and (Mike)'s point if I can put them together, so the multi-stakeholder model

seems to mean to people equal representation. And I think that's the wrong concept.

We should be in a position now where when there's a task in front of us that we have a pool of people that have diverse backgrounds and knowledge that we can put in a room together that can work on a problem together to solve it.

You know, our review teams, it has to be everybody - each group has to have the same numbers, you know, represented. We struggle with this problem with the GNSO. Every time something comes up, the ALAC gets three seats and the GNSO gets three seats and that's not fair because we have, you know, seven different groups within this organization. So we don't think that's fair to us.

But we need to get to the point that (Mike)'s making about trust. It's not just ICANN org and ICANN board. I think it goes broader than that. Within the community we don't have that level of trust that we can kind of reach across the aisles and have a conversation because I think at the end of the day you're probably going to come down to the same, you know, recommendation or decision that you would have got to if you had, you know, 200 people in a room.

But again it cuts down on the costs and all the extras involved if you can get ten people in the room that can come up with a straw man proposal, can put it out for public comment and then we see where we are.

I think (Mike)'s right. We've got the delays of bureaucracy that we have put in place. You know, to go to (Chris)'s point I think we're getting to the norm and how do we manage that moving forward. I think we're trying to overengineer everything.

So, you know, I think somebody mentioned grassroots. Maybe if we can get back to that. Used to be a smaller organization where just about everybody

knew everybody. We've grown a lot. We've got a lot of new talent that we can build on but we still – to the volunteer burnout issue – we still see the same, you know, usual suspects that are involved in each group that comes along.

So we're not doing a very good job of developing people to moving to those other roles as well, even though we've got a lot of - we've got Fellowship; we've gotten NextGen. We've got a lot of programs in place. But we as the older generation of the community don't have faith in the younger generation to step aside and let them have a fair go.

So I kind of think, you know, there's a lot of good points and if we can kind of meld all that together we'll probably come up with something to find a path forward.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Donna. Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. Rafik speaking. So I just want to make two short comments, the first that I think we are getting a lot of the concerns and the experience from different people in how they perceive the problems. And they think that there are - they are suggesting several solution.

I'm thinking the word how we should evolve and I think we can use this to have an evolution or approach here is we try to experiment solution. I don't think we are pretty sure how we can fix that or what we need to change. But we need to experiment to be (unintelligible). Usually I am conservative with this word but using here in this context, we are (unintelligible) enough to experiment and to assess regular basis, so to have this continuous improvement.

It's not just we think like a big project but we try to make changes here and there and evaluate if it's fixing issue and also help us to be sure that we are fixing the right problems.

The other comment to what (Mike) was saying about trust, I think if we need to build trust we should stop talking about we need trust. Trust should be done in the way that we have mechanisms. We try to - we (wilt) what is needed to enable the trust.

If you keep asking that we need more trust, we need more trust, it's kind of - I think this - my feeling is kind of strange. We need to do it in the way that we enable it. So I understand what you are trying to achieve but let's think how we can wield it in the organization and how we are doing things and so on so that people will slowly, slowly wield that confidence that we can do things.

So the trust is important but we should talk about it like this often. We have to do things in the ground how we can wield it. So I'm not going to say it's (unintelligible) word but let's focus on how to wield it instead of asking let's get trust.

Heather Forrest: Thanks Rafik. And so it's time for us to wind up. Cherine would you like to make some closing remarks?

Cherine Chalaby: Yes thank you. First of all I really enjoyed this dialogue. As we said in the beginning this is a good experiment and I hope we continue because it's excellent. A lot of good input.

The intention of the board is sometimes towards the end of the fiscal year is to come up with a consultation paper asking the community about its views on these issues that were discussed today and any ideas of how to progress forward.

And the board will not put a solution forward. The board will seek input from the community. So thank you very much on a lot of these questions. And we hope we continue the dialogue so that it shapes the consultation paper in a

manner that becomes very much more productive. So thank you very much. I really appreciated that. Thank you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Cherine. Thank you board colleagues. Thank you for your contributions, board members, to this discussion that it wasn't just us that spoke. We were keen to hear. We understand of course that you don't have a board position but hearing your individual responses to our own reactions was very helpful and will indeed help shape our discussion.

That ends our meeting between the GNSO Council and the ICANN board. We have a few minutes to swap over to the next session. Thank you to our board colleagues. Have a lovely rest of our day and Council will resume in two minutes.

END