

**Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
GNSO: RySG Membership Meeting Part 2
Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 10:30 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://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Samantha Demetriou: Hi everyone. This is Sam Demetriou. I'm going to give Paul a little bit of a break and share the next bit of our agenda now through our working session, which starts at 11:30. So, we're going to start with a post-transitional ANA PTI update from Lise and Kim, who have joined us here. And then, we'll move into a quick conversation with the Science team on the special BUD request for fiscal year '19. And then, wrap up with an update from the Universal Acceptance Steering group.

So, Lise and Kim, thank you guys for joining us. Please get started whenever you're ready.

Lise Fuhr: Well, I will head off. Lise Fuhr here and then, I'm on the PTI Board and I actually took a little with Jonas and we were on the former PTI Board. And while Jonas didn't continue, we talked how to actually establish a relationship to this group.

So, we're here today, both to actually introduce also a new Board Member, Wei Wang, who will introduce himself in a minute. But also, to, well, to do an outreach to you here, your thoughts on PTI, how you find it's going? If you have any questions? And also, it's a pleasure to also announce Kim Davies as the not so new anymore, PTI President and that he started late December. So, we are thinking we're a fresh new PTI Board. We wanted to meet you all

and hear where you are on this. And I can start with myself very quickly, from January the new Chair of PTI.

So, I'm there for a two-year period, the Chair is per year, but I have this year as the PTI Chair. We have (Sam Eisner) as our Secretary and (Becky Nash) as the Treasurer. And for the moment, what we're working on, I'll just give you a brief update. Of course, we are looking into doing the last bits of implementation. But mostly it's following the operational part and to look, we are also very closely following the CSC. And so far, we see things going in a very good direction. We're also, we had the budget approved this year too. The budget had no big changes after the consultation.

The only thing was that we actually cut the budget a bit because we merged two positions. So, we're saving money which I find everyone reckons is good. So, all in all, it's a good process, we're getting there, and establishing meetings. But as PTI is meant to be a small, efficient Board, it's not meant to do big things. I think we're, so far, still filling out functions.

And I'll hand it over to Wei. I don't know, Kim, if you want to say anything, but let me know. Okay.

Wei Wang: Thank you, Lise. I'll try to make it very quick and hand the microphone to Kim to give the updates.

Hi everyone, my name Wei Wang. And hi Paul.

Actually, I'm, as you might remember, because I'm working for the Ideation DOT, the Chinese dot URL. And I'm also serving as the Co-Chair of the Chinese of the Labels Generation and Rule for the regime. And it's good to be back here because, I think, I'm there, you know, the opportunity from the RSG and it's good to have your support and the community support to serve as the PTI Board. So, I will, you know, keep contributing to PTI as well to as to the RSG. Thank you.

Kim?

Kim Davies: Good morning everyone. For those that don't know me, I have been with ICANN request for some time. I recently was Technical Director of IANA. So, once I am new in the position in leading IANA, I'm not new to the environment. So, hopefully what that means for everyone, is stable, ongoing operations of the IANA services.

Just operationally, I think, stable operations is born out post-transition. We've not been in a post-transition environment for a little over a year. We recently completed our 2017 annual customer survey and the results suggest that, you know, our customers as a whole are either happy or very happy with our services. If for some reason you're pleased, do let me know.

Generally speaking, we, you know, we have a number of performance metrics we report regularly to the community. We have a Customer Standing Committee who was constructed as part of the transition and is represented as from the GCLD and the CCTOD operational communities. And they do a deep dive into our performance on a monthly basis. Generally speaking, we've been hitting those targets, so I think that relationship has been going extremely well.

As Lise mentioned, I'm very happy to answer any questions or get a sense from you on how we're doing, what you'd like to see different, or what you'd like to see stay the same? I will use this opportunity to just simply flag that, you know, IANA is a service provide to you as registry operators, you know, in a fairly narrow sense. But nonetheless, a critical sense and our job is to keep your TLDs operating in the DNS.

So, with that in mind, you know, we always want to have a communication line between registry operations and ourselves. That is very helpful in forming our future evolution. At the last meeting, I think I presented briefly about one

of the technical plans we had in updating our systems. But we're always looking to identify the best ways to have that kind of feedback, particularly with the operational staff, at registries.

So, any ideas that you have on how we as the IANA team can have a full dialogue with operational staff and registry operators, very happy to hear that because that helps us in forming our plans and our future development.

So, let's all I have to say.

Samantha Demetriou: Thank you Kim. Great to hear that things are going well and smoothly. We like to hear that. Do we have any questions for Kim, Lise, or Wei?

All right. Well, I think that's it guys. I'm going to let you off the hook a couple minutes early. Thank you for stopping by. Thanks for the offer for ongoing communications. I'm sure we'll figure out ways to take you up on that. And if not, see you in Panama.

All right. And next, we're going, do we have Kim in the room?

All right. Kim, thank you joining us. Today, we're going to get an update from Becky Nash from the Finance Team on the status of the Fiscal Year '19 Special Budgetary Requests. So, whenever you're ready?

Becky Nash: Samantha, thank you very much. Good morning everyone, this is Becky Nash from ICANN Finance.

For a Finance presentation, we provided several slides as it relates, excuse me, to the FY'19 Operating Plan and Budget planning process, along with an update related to our Fiscal Year '18 results through our December 2017 quarter ending Q2. So, we hope that the information provided is useful and also, sets the context of the planning process and timeline. However, we

were asked today to give an update on the FY'19 Additional Budget Request process.

So, here on the slide presented, I've summarized the steps from, for the entire timeline, of the SO and AC additional budget request process. So, just to recap, this process launches in the Fall of 2017, where we planned for the design of the process and launched the process for requests from the community on the Finance Community Wiki Page. That timeline was approximately early December and the due date for all the submissions was the end of January.

And we were just highlighting that for the FY'19 Operating Plan and Budget process, although the entire process was accelerated in this current fiscal year in order to achieve final adoption earlier than prior years. We did keep the additional budget request timeline the same and similar to last year. But just in general, that's something that we continue to review is how best to manage this process.

So, the next key step at this point is that we are here in Puerto Rico and we do have the opportunity to hear feedback on the process and the submissions. However, the actual evaluation of all of the submissions is underway at this time. Meaning that the way the process is outlined, as we publish on our Website, all of the requests are evaluated by an assessment team within ICANN Org. Using the guiding principles that are published on the Website and ensuring that they meet those guiding principles, in addition to reviewing the amount available for allocations under this additional budget request process.

So, the next key date is that the assessment team then presents recommendations to the ICANN Management team and to the ICANN Board through the Board Finance Committee. That evaluation will begin, or presentation of the recommendations, begins in late April. And then, after an evaluation by the Board Finance Committee, the recommendation is

expected to be sent to the ICANN Board for approval mid-May. And that's normally two weeks before a final Board resolution as it relates to adoption.

What I'd like to highlight here is that the actual recommendation to the ICANN Board and the anticipated timing for the Board adoption is actually the process and timing for the entire consolidated ICANN Operating Plan and Budget. So, again, I highlighted a little bit earlier that the timeline for the entire Operating Plan and Budget is approximately 45 days earlier in all the key milestones in FY'19 as compared to prior budget years.

And that's in order to permit a Board adoption well before the end of the fiscal year, so that budget could be adopted prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. In addition, that's in order to permit timing for the empowered community timeline, which is the 21 days plus the 7 days of a total of 28 days. So, our goal for this entire year has been to the Board adoption well in advance of the fiscal year and to permit timing for the empowered community process. And as a result, the FY'19 SO and AC Additional Budget Request process did not require a special Board decision earlier than the entire Operating Plan and Budget for FY'19.

So, I hope that that's clear on the slide here, that those last two dates are not just for these requests, but also for the entire Operating Plan and Budget for the fiscal year. So, I'll pause here to see if there's any questions?

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks. Donna Austin.

Who is the assessment team that does these evaluations? I understand, you know, from what we've been hearing from Cherine and also, you, this hasn't really been in the competitive process in the past? Because the money was available of that was the thinking, but my understanding is that this time around, this is going to be competitive. And what's the criteria that the assessment team is going to be using to decide what goes forward and what doesn't?

Becky Nash: Thank you for your question. Yes, I think the way to characterize this process in the context of the entire Operating Plan and Budget process is that there are limited funds available. And of course, then it's based on the assessment by the team using the guiding principles. So, I just wanted to clarify that unlike last year, where again it wasn't unlimited, it still has an envelope or an estimate. The estimate then this year was reduced by approximately 50% so that there is a placeholder of approximately of 300,000.

The assessment team is a group of management that are within all aspects of ICANN that come together in order to log, evaluate, and then go through a series of consultations internally using the guiding principles. So, I think similar to last year if we do review the report from last year, there is always a selection based on the guiding principles. And then, items that don't meet that criteria are listed as not applicable. And then, there is always an evaluation that goes through prioritization at that point.

Donna Austin: And so just to follow up. If you provided what the guiding principles are? Have you, are they public, can we find those somewhere?

Becky Nash: Yes. Thank you. They are actually on the ICANN Finance Wiki Website, where the actual templates there. And there's a series of principles there that outline exactly what the criteria and the intention of this program is.

Donna Austin: Thank you.

Paul Diaz: This is Paul Diaz for the record.

The timeline that you have up here. I think it's fair to say, may not have been very well understood by the community in the sense of, when the ABRs keeping the original schedule. And then, they the push to get Board approval to make time, that part was understood. But the logic of why ABRs stayed as they have historically have not, and I'm looking at the dates that you

provided. And there doesn't appear to be any more opportunity for the community to review and/or weigh in on the budget?

From, you know, we've provided comment, we were due, what, the end of February? March 8th, even? Okay. We just met the deadline. But again, to the points that are being made, this is a more competitive year for limited resources. There's likely to be some changes made based on the evaluation and digesting of the comments received from the community. And it's a smaller pie and it starts, you start slicing differently, and somebody's going to give something. And the only time we're ever going to see that is when the final version is published because the Board's about to approve it. It just strikes me that with this timeline, you're putting perhaps unnecessary pressure on the empowered community, to take a very hard look and potentially negative look at the budget? And I would strongly suggest that when we start planning fiscal '20, that all of that is taken into consideration.

You know, that there's more time for review and more transparency into the thinking and what not? Not that we find ourselves, I mean, with this scenario, we as a stakeholder group, for instance, we're not going to know what the budget looks like. Or, there will be no time to push back or offer support, whatever the case may be, because that's a very aggressive final few weeks in the budgeting process. In particular, when we had, you know, a lot of time the first talking about, you know, was in the late Fall.

So, it just feels like there's a big rush at the end and, you know, as a Chair, representing members, I'm sure we're going, there will be things that we don't like that's in the final. And not having any realistic time to express those concerns is really a source of concern for me.

Becky Nash: Thank you, Paul, for your comments.

I just want to highlight that we do acknowledge that the entire planning process has challenges in the timeline for the entire community. And just a

quick comment that on the additional budget requests, we, for FY'19, did try to maintain a very similar calendar timeline in order to permit the groups to make the submission on the, using the templates on the Finance Community Wiki. However, we do realize that the change in the actual adoption is maybe an impact that wasn't well understood. That there wasn't a special adoption of the additional budget request in or around late April or early May, as there had been in the past.

And then, a comment, just on the overall FY'19 Operating Plan and Budget. We do realize that the Draft Operating Plan and Budget that was published on January 19th for public consultation. That that timing, you know, is earlier in the calendar Q1 may have been challenging for many groups. We did realize that we needed to get it done before the ICANN meeting in the March timeframe, in order to be able to meet the deadline of tendering it to the Board of ICANN within 45 days prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year.

But we definitely will take your comments and other community member comments into consideration as we plan for the FY'20 cycle, which believe or not, we're already having discussions now on the timeline. So, we look forward to engaging on the timeline coming up shortly. Thank you.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks. I have a question from Ken?

Ken Stubbs: Yes. Hi. My name is Ken Stubbs for the record. And first of all, don't take my comments as criticism but rather as an observation.

For the last, I've been involved in ICANN since, long before it was started. For years and years and years, our back has always been against the wall. Chuck Gomes and myself, Marilyn Cade, we used to have to create our own process to do this. I think you guys need to seriously consider the idea of putting together a two-year budget. Because if you could do a two-year budget, you have enough advance time, if there are issues, to be able to deal

with the previous but already we're working on '20. By the time we see '20, we're going to be up against the wall again.

And I appreciate the fact that and I won't call out (Lindstrom), that she take it into consideration. But taking something into consideration can be as inane as saying, "Well, gee, it's a good idea, but we don't have time to implement it", you know? And we get frustrated because for some reason, you seem to think that we have the capacity with all the other issues that we have. To stop whatever the hell we're doing and concentrate on this and try to get it done within the time period.

You know, you have to correlate all of this from all the various SOs, it get extremely difficult. I'm a CPA, I've been through all that crap, you know? I know how difficult it is, I know a budget is nothing but a quantified plan of action. If that means you need to get the various divisions of ICANN, pardon the expression, off their ass six months earlier to get their plans for the next two years started. So, they can feed them to you even if it means that you create an expectation for them that at least gets the next year's budget information to you sooner, it would be very helpful.

It's very frustrating. Paul's incredibly polite and politically correct in telling you that it's irritating as hell. I'm sorry. Thank you.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Ken. Before we come over to you, Xavier joined. Xavier, did you want to respond? Please, go ahead?

Xavier Calvez Thank you. I'm sorry to have come in late. To Ken's point, I thank, Ken, for making this point.

Ken is offering a potential solution to the problem that has been going on for several years and that has increased over the past few years. So, those of you who participated to the transition work, for example, we'll remember how challenging it was to do the work. And then, after the transition, then

everything that was put on the back burner came back on the front burner. So, now you have a lot of work to do and then there's GDPR and tomorrow, there will be something else.

So, Ken, is really highlighting the challenge that the community, and of course, the staff along with it, faces to have too many things to do. When we come internally to the departments heads of the staff to tell them you need to do this, you need to do it like this, you need to do it at that time. Everybody's also quickly overwhelmed for the same reasons.

So, back to the two-year budget. So, I don't know if Ken remembers, but we talked about the two-year budget approach. I erased that topic during the transition because, and Chuck remembers, when we discussed the creation of a separate process for the IANA, sorry, the IANA functions, the PTI organization. That needed to be advanced versus the ICANN process, we landed with a process that takes 15 months of planning for 12 months of operations. And you've heard (Yuri) say that before. And the idea of a two-year budget has been resurrected from our conversations of the transition. I think it has a lot of merit. (Unintelligible) to engage effectively with a community that's already – is very busy.

And I'll tell you and (Vicky) can as well, we would like more time to conduct this budget. We go from step to the next. There's no buffer in this overall timeline.

And you feel the pressure and we all feel the pressure. So I think there's a lot of merit in evaluating the two year budget process. By the way that's a bylaw change, a fundamental bylaw change.

But if it's for the better and for the right thing to do why not so I think we can evaluate it. There's merit. There's need. There's also more things that we need to do to enable the community to really be able to influence what is

being done. We talked about this budget process. But we also should talk about how do we coordinate all together what this community does.

Today there's not a lot of coordination of what you all do in your various organizations. So if I try to illustrate very simply, if you guys have ten topics that you're interested to work on over the next 12 months and every other organization has also ten topics, we're talking about 100 topics maybe because not all topics are overlapping.

But if we manage to all coordinate what we're going to do over the next 12 months, maybe we're going to land with 50 topics instead of 100.

And that would be reducing the workload at any point of time. All the parallel processes and it would also allow those projects, those topics that are being addressed to be much more effectively addressed rather than last a long time.

So there's a lot of benefits and more collaboration in planning and coordination of planning. And I think that's the path in front of us for improving our planning process so that we're more efficient. And maybe a two year process will help with that as well. Thank you.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Xavier. We've got a little bit of a queue so Ken if you want to respond, just keep it (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: Just a very quick response. We need to ensure that you guys lead from the top. You need to set the examples for us. I will give you a perfect example. We're set up to do I believe it is eight reviews next year. It is overwhelming. Let's get realistic. Let's cut it down to four reviews every two years rather than every year. And it has to start at the top. Okay, thank you.

Xavier Calvezi: There's nine reviews scheduled for next year.

Ken Stubbs: Nine, oh my God.

Xavier Calvez: And by the way why are there nine is because they were pushed back from last year, because they pushed back for the year before and so on.

So, you know, it's just not possible to do as many reviews in the timeframe that there is and with the amount of time that they take. Now should they take as long is maybe a relevant question.

But to Ken's point though he had to come out of the room, the reviews are in the bylaws. So the top, Ken offer an idea.

And that's exactly what (Yuran) did. He said guys, there's nine reviews. How do you want to do that next year?

I know already I don't even need to ask. I know it's not going to happen. Not because you're going to decide necessarily let's not do it. But you won't have the time to get them done. They will start late. They will finish late as every year they have, absolutely every year.

So Ken is right. We can't find the time to do as much reviews. And that's on top of policies and processes. And you don't know what GDPR will lead to – have to do next year. There may be more work about it that's coming that we don't even know.

So I think there's a lot of merit to that idea. The idea has been initiated as part of budget discussions.

But the budget has just – current sequence of that workload, you see the workload. You suffer through the workload. And I think that there's a lot of merit on reviewing that schedule for the better.

And by the way there are some reviews that we do on topics where there's been so many recent changes that it's actually useless to do the review now. We should do it a little bit later when those changes actually had effect.

So there's a lot of value I think in reviewing the review schedule and be able to amend it for much more effectiveness and efficiency of the process, in reducing workload. Because we're setting expectations that we can't even meet as a community today on reviews.

Samantha Demetriou: All right, so I have a bit of a queue. Did you still want to jump in? Yes, please go ahead.

Jennifer Chung: Jennifer Chung (that is) for the record. Hearing from I guess Paul and also Ken who's now out of the room and Xavier talk about it, we really do support or no future two year cycle of that as possible for the budget review because there's so many – I hear now, there's nine reviews next year scheduled.

And I think perhaps I think – I don't remember if it was (Scott) or someone else who suggested at the ccNSO and GNSO Meeting that maybe a good idea would be to create a cross-community like working group for the SOECs to look at budget priorities because that could be one form of some kind of coordination. If that makes any sense because there is as I heard from Xavier there's like a big problem with their – for time and for review and if there's some kind of coordination from the community, that might be helpful going forward. Thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: Thank you, so Karen and then Stéphane.

Karen Day: Thank you. Karen Day for the record, Xavier I'm the Treasurer of Registry Stakeholder Group. But at this moment I'm going to speak in my capacity as one of the Leadership Team of subsequent procedures, policy as well and process.

And I appreciate your willingness to look at the two year cycle and to do more community consultation. And I think that will go a long way to help us avoiding the situation which we are in now which many of us view as completely unattainable where we have the FY '19 budget published that contains a statement that says there is nothing in this budget that will be used for subsequent procedures of offering of new gTLDs.

We are due to deliver our final report at the end of this year. That – if that timeline happens the Board could very well act on it before the end of this budget cycle.

Staff that – in the previous round was allocated to the new gTLD Program is being shifted. So not only is there no financial budget there, we're – the people resources re being taken away.

So regardless of what policy is developed, regardless of what Board action is taken, if there is no resource or financial means to get the next round on its feet, it's not going to happen.

And for the 2012 round the decision was made to begin implementation work a full two years ahead of the expected opening of the window. We're under that mark now. So we would encourage the two year cycle. We would encourage more community engagement.

And one other comment and this is just in my personal capacity with regard to the reviews that were mentioned. And that they are mandated. Yes, they are mandated.

But I don't believe that they are mandated to utilize external paid consultants and resources to the means that they are.

So I would suggest that as a part of looking at that review cycle we look at ways that the community can be involved in those reviews in a less expensive manner. Thank you.

Xavier Calvez: And I'm sure we'll have more conversations about sub-pro and the planning of it.

But our understanding - so first of all, there are resources to support the work that is going on and throughout FY '19 on that policy development process. What resources they are not in the budget is for implementation. Just to make sure nothing that's not what you said. I just want it's clear for everyone.

So the policy development process that is going on is of course going to be supported throughout FY '19. My understanding of the timing for that or the current planning for that group is that the final recommendations would be produced by the end of FY '19 which is in June, 2019 coming up.

And unless I'm mistaken that would obviously mean that the implementation will never start before, at best, a few months after those recommendations are produced.

But there's a clarification here on the timing. Thank you.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Just short question, as I understand it's all about like \$7 million something which were like cut from the original ideas. And during the same time there is something called name collisions, which was about \$3.6 million with a justification of full lines of text.

And it could be nice to know if it is in the current budget and if it is how it's called and why it's not called name collisions. Thanks.

Xavier Calvez: I think you're referring to a project issued by the SSAC that is a response to a question that the Board made to eh SSAC to provide the Board with an

understanding of what could and should be done to evaluate further name collisions.

So there's a – it's not a four line. It's a 20-page document that's been produced by the SSAC and that is in the draft format at the moment. But it's been published I think.

And that suggests a number of studies. And I think the amount of money that you're referring to is in the range of what's been discussed.

And the paper just came out. Of course it's not in the FY '19 budget and it before it become even budgeted for it needs to be reviewed by the Board. The Board has to have discussions with the SSAC. There has to be a decision made that yes, that's what needs to be done, which is right now it's a draft paper for the Board to look at, which the Board has not even yet had any discussion on.

So there's no funds in FY '19 allocated for that purpose and there will not be any funds in any budget until there's actually a Board decision being made to proceed on the basis of understanding the cost and on the basis of knowing how it would be funded.

Samantha Demetriou: All right, I'm actually I'm going to just jump in. We already started eating in the dawn time. We have one more request from Stéphane.

There is a budget consultation session scheduled for tomorrow Xavier.

Xavier Calvez: We have three sessions in total. One this afternoon and one tomorrow morning to offer for community organizations or individuals who have submitted comments to be able to discuss those comments with us. And that helps us understand better the comments and to respond better so those two sessions at 1:30 this afternoon to - and I think 9:30 tomorrow morning.

And then tomorrow afternoon we have the Budget Working Group Session, a three-hour session which we've had now at really every ICANN Meeting where we're going to present a number of things and community members can have a very interactive discussion on the budget and other topic, reserve funds.

So that's tomorrow afternoon at 1:30 to 4:45 if you have nothing else to do.

Samantha Demetriou: So lots more opportunities to provide comments and feedback on the budget stuff. So we're going to let Stéphane have the last word on this and also the response. And then we're going to close this one out to move onto Don. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks and Stéphane Van Gelder speaking. In my personal capacity I think the review issue is both peripheral and central to the budget issues.

Now I may be wrong on this but my understanding is that of the nine reviews that you were mentioned Xavier only the ATLC3 has a specific timeline of one year. All the others have no fixed timeline.

So that's an accident waiting to happen in itself. But from community volunteer time and budgetary standpoints so that's one thing that we probably need to highlight and continually highlight.

The other thing that I wanted to say is one point that Karen alluded to earlier on which was that these reviews systematically now employ outside consultants to drive them or to – I forget what the term that the – I think they're independent reviewers is the correct term that is used.

And having been the chair and still involved in the NomCom Review Team that is the community team that is working with this outside firm that's employed on the NomCom Review, what I've seen there is constant

misunderstanding or at least lack of clarity from the community standpoint on what their role is compared to what the independent reviewer's role might be.

So there's a possible budget saving aspect to that if we can clarify the interactions that we – and I understand this is a new model that was initiated with the ALAC Review, has been carried over on the NomCom Review, may be used for other reviews but still relatively new.

But I think what we've seen on the NomCom is a desire by the community to be more involved and resistance so far because by definition reviews should be done by outside parties.

So some issues there that probably need to go wider than this discussion. But obviously that have to be taken into account in the budget discussion. Thanks.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. That makes a lot of sense Stéphane. And you're speaking to one of many aspects. So it's better efficiency of the reviews in this case through clarity of roles and responsibilities of various parties involved.

But I would suggest that this is a very specific review conversation and either Theresa Swinehart or (Larry Yernick) can better support the conversation on that and try to help improving that. But what you said makes a lot of sense to me.

Samantha Demetriou: All right thank Xavier for joining us. Thanks for the answers to all the questions. And please also thank Becky for us. I know she had to take off.

Don thank you for being patient as we cut into your time. But we still have I think a good amount of time left before we break for lunch so please take it away.

Don Hollander: Thanks very much. My name is Don Hollander. And I'm from the Universal Acceptance Steering Group.

And I'd like you if you have a computer and if you have a computer browser, if you could go to uasg.tech; .tech is one of these newfangled domain name things.

So the idea, I'm just going to talk to a couple points. Does everyone here know what the idea of universal acceptance is? What the issues are? Anybody think oh, what is this thing?

So its 2010 the Internet name space started changing markedly. 2010 email addresses started changing markedly. And 2013 there's this blossoming of new choices for people to use for their sense of digital identity.

And people are using them and they're very excited about it. And the software people who have nothing to do with ICANN, nothing to do with anybody in this garden village didn't get the memo.

So they are merrily caring on and their software is out-of-date. And they don't know the topic. They don't know the issue.

So when I go and talk to CIOs around the world, I get three consistent responses. The first one is what. The second one when you explain the issue is, you know, it's a minute, two minutes tops and they get it.

And then the third is so what. Nobody has complained. You know we run an e-Commerce platform. We have 100,000 transactions a day. And nobody has called my Help Desk to say that this thing doesn't work.

So that's sort of one of the barriers to success, so the UASG has been taking the view, the focus on providing resources to the IT community, so software developers and CIOs. We call them the doers. These are the developer

system architects and the directors so the CIOs and people who tell them what to do. So that they are forewarned and ready before they get a complaint from their customers or from their colleagues in the C Suite.

That's the – that's our – that's been our approach, our focus. We are not all about telling people these are wonderful new top level debates. That's your guys' responsibility. We just want to make sure that as you become more and more successful that the IT guys are not embarrassed for being behind the times.

So that's what universal acceptance is. Some people think it's an IDN issue. It's not just an IDN issue. We see ASCII names not working.

We did a test last year of the top 1000 web sites in the world. We used a set of about eight or nine different email addresses. And 7% of the web sites accepted all our use cases, 7%. And 7% accepted none of our use cases. We did not test the .com. We sort of took that as a given, maybe we should've.

So it's an issue in the web developer's space. It's getting the message to them. We're preparing. We've prepared very good documentation and we think. And it's getting people to read it, to know that it's there, getting it to read it.

So the issues are very well understood, very well documented. They are generally really easy to fix.

So we have if you're still on the UASG web page there's a tab near the top, says Issue Logging.

So this is if you encounter a problem with your .berlin or .email or .photography web site where you can't use it some place you can log the issue there. That goes to ICANN's Global Support Team. And they reach

out to the - this, you know, web site owner. And they share the knowledge about universal acceptance with them.

And in some cases, people are able to take and onboard. And we've seen fixes within 24 hours. And we've seen no fixes at all after two years. We like the 24 hour response. It shows how simple generally these things are particularly if just opening up the ASCII space, usually there's some regular expression or something that say oh it can only be two or three characters. And that's just wrong. So we're working. We have that facility.

IDNs are not that much harder to fix. And we're seeing a number of organizations that are taking a phased approach. So the first thing they're doing is fixing their applications to make sure that long ASCII works.

And as they do that they create an inventory of wherever domain names and emails exist. And so that they can go back through the next time and support IDN domain names and email addresses that have non-English characters in the mailbox name.

So UASG is easy to explain, easy for people to understand and easy to fix. And the big issue with the commercial community is who cares. Nobody complains.

So if you guys could be more successful than it would be easier for me to be more successful.

So if you look at the web site, I'm not going to go through it with you but there's one section I'd particularly like you to look at and that's documents. Don't look at it now because there's a lot.

But in there is the material that we developed for the software community. We have some quick guides to universal acceptance. We have a very extensive introduction, a technical document; 70 pages. The quick guides

are available in about 12 or 13 languages, 14 languages. Swahili was the latest, Thai is in the works.

And if there's some language that you would like us to cover that we haven't, let us know, happy to do that. But there's lots of good documentation there. We have presentation material. We have training course material. We have videos and all the support and carry on.

What I would like this group to do is make sure your own systems are UA ready or that you have a plan to be UA ready sort of. In New Zealand we would call it eating your own dog food. I'm not sure what it's called in other culture. But it's walking the talk, something like that.

And the other thing we'd like you to do is work with your resellers and your registrars to make sure that they have this on their radar. And for those – I don't know how many of you use IDNs as either top level or second level, anybody here, a couple. Make sure that you have an EAI Strategy, EAI, Email Address Internationalization Strategy for - I think that what Ken is saying is we need more (unintelligible) for your customers because - but your registrants, your registrars and their resellers have a solution for customers who want to make use of those. And if you get the shiny new top-level domain in - like (unintelligible) Hong Kong, we were in Hong Kong earlier this year and the fellow running (unintelligible) Hong Kong said, yes, we started out with a hiss and a roar and then people said they found they couldn't use it. So, that's not so good. So please have an (EI) strategy either for yourself or definitely your registrars and definitely for their registrants and there are some good solutions. Gmail for example, can send to and receive from all of these email addresses, they can't host them but they can send to and receive from.

Microsoft can send to and receive from so there's two and a half, three billion email addresses that can support this. And we're going through and working

with the email software and service providers to encourage them to get that already. So our goal, raise aware...

...not so much the networking community but not just geeks generally but raising the issue with software (community) CIO's and providing them good documentation and making it easier for them to fix it and I'm happy to answer any questions and I hope I've given you back some of your time.

Samantha Demetriou: Thank you Don, that was a great and very timely update. I know this is an issue that's on a lot of people in this rooms radar so does anyone have any questions or feedback for Don?

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes, as more and more (unintelligible) for the record, as more and more (unintelligible) and also new (unintelligible) are releasing one and two corrector domain names, we should get out that quite a number of email forms and others didn't even recognize one letter (unintelligible) domain or two letter (unintelligible) name and said it's too short and that's not only a problem of the new (unintelligible), it really affects the (unintelligible) too.

Don Hollander: Yes, so thanks very much. When we looked at the - I told you that we did this review of the thousand Web sites and we looked at the code behind them and they use - almost all use regular expressions to do a first path at the filtering and they're - they are all wrong and they are all inconsistently wrong so we thought we would see the same regular expression used in many different Web sites and the way it seems to work is somebody is developing this Web site and I need a regular expression to do that. They go to GitHub or some - they go to the (mates) on the Internet and say have you got one? And they say, yes, I use this it works all the time.

But computer programmers are really nice people, they're all handsome and keen to make the world a better place. So they take the thing that their mate has said, this works fantastic and they make it even better. So we have consistently wrong - they're all wrong and they're inconsistently wrong. We're

currently working with a W3C. W3C have a field name in Web forms called email and it does a validation of email addresses and it does it wrong. But it does it consistently wrong so we're working with them and we expect the release 5 point whatever, of HTML 5 to come out later this year; should have it fixed. So, yes, that's a - just - there's lots of ways for people to do things wrong.

Samantha Demetriou: Okay, and a question from Crystal Ondo.

Crystal Ondo: Thanks I'm Crystal Ondo, it's more of a comment than a question. I just joined the (UASG) and spent Saturday with them and wanted to thank Don. The work is really tremendous, everyone should review the documents that are in there and then to (Dirk)'s point, anytime you get a comment or someone reports that it's failing, send it to ICANN. There's an email on this Web site. ICANN global tech support will do this work for you. We should be leveraging them. They keep a record of this instead of each of these registries doing our own effort, there's money and there's staff at ICANN willing to do that. I didn't know that until Saturday. So we should definitely use them as much as possible so we can track how many things are getting solved and at what pace. So feel free to reach out to ICANN for that stuff.

Samantha Demetriou: Do we have any other questions or comments? It's 11:29 on the dot, so we did it. We wrapped up right on time. Thanks Don, thanks everyone. We're going to transition to our working session which I think includes lunch. Sue you want to fill us in on where we are with that?

Sue Schuler: Hi, sorry. We were planning to do the GNSO updates before lunch. So hold your stomach yet.

Samantha Demetriou: Sorry guys, I'm just always hungry. All right, so moving on to GNSO updates which I think Stéphane is going to chair us through.

Stéphane Van Gelder: No, you can do that if you want to. I will take over for the working lunch part which is probably the one that will be the busiest.

Samantha Demetriou: Okay. Great then moving on to the council update, Donna, Keith, Rubens, who wants to start us off?

Donna Austin: Is that a council update or a (CSC) update? Oh, council. Sorry, I was looking for something related to (CSC) updates so I'm a little bit - wrong brain. So, on the council update, I think, I (thought) a few of you were in the strategic planning (flowing) session that we had on Sunday. The council is - came to maintain some of the momentum we had coming out of the strategic planning session in terms of how we can improve the management of the (PDP) process and what tools are available to us to assist the (PDP) working groups in doing their work.

And the conversations we had during the council strategic planning session, we are aware that in four of the (PDP)'s I think that are working at the moment, they've all missed deadlines that they've set at the outset and they're not missing them by a week or two, they're missing them by a lot so we think that's a problem and they're - you know, each (PDP) working group at the moment has its own set of challenges. So, the session that we had on Sunday was, you know, a brainstorming session with the rest of the community about how - what other options are available to us to try to facilitate some improvement in that regard. I think, and we'll discuss this tomorrow as part of the council session, formal council meeting, but how do we wrap all of that up and how do we move forward on implementing some of those suggested improvements that we can make.

I don't know if Chuck is still in the room. Rafik, (Heather) and I had a conversation with Chuck yesterday. You know, he's already thinking about some of the things that he could potentially do as a result of those conversations that we had on Sunday to implement for the (IDS PDP) working group.

So I think that was a good session. I hope those of you who were there thought it was useful and helpful as well but I think it's just good for folks to understand that it is on our radar and we are trying to do something about it. I don't have anything else particular at the moment to add. Keith and Rubens?

Keith Drazek: Thanks Donna. Keith Drazek for the transcript. Yes, great summary. I thought it was a very constructive engagement that morning, Sunday morning session. We had, as Donna noted, the co-chairs of the various (PDP)'s that are underway and I thought it was a good opportunity for the council and those co-chairs, those leaders of the groups to engage in sort of looking at some of the meta-issues that are across all of the groups, maybe unique to one or the other but it was sort of an overarching discussion rather than getting into like the specific problems that one group, and you know, potentially going down the blame game path, I think it was a really constructive higher level engagement. There were breakout sessions and white-boarding and sort of, I think, a really good engagement from the folks in the room to try to come up with the possible paths forward to find efficiency and effectiveness and to manage things a little bit more aggressively than maybe the council has done in the past.

As Donna noted, we had our strategic planning session in January in Los Angeles and one of the core sort of areas of focus was where can the council be more supportive of the (PDP)'s and where do we have an obligation to engage through our council liaisons to those groups where things appear to be bogging down or where there appear to be problems or the threat of timeline slipping. So, I think this was a really solid continuation of that, so I'm just repeating a lot of what Donna said there. But I do think it was really positive.

And then finally the council does not have any motions on our agenda for this week so there's really nothing to speak to there. Rubens, do you want to add anything?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl for the transcript. I just echo the (unintelligible) (PDP) efficiency (unintelligible) possibly going to do a very positive change in that regard but I will repeat one concern that I already sent to the stakeholder group list about the (five) timelines, about budget rejection. So your councilors really need clear guidance on how to (ask) that because you probably have to act sometimes before a stakeholder group call or possibly with just some days of making these consultations. So that's a critical point that (unintelligible) will require from us pretty soon.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thank you Rubens. Yes, just following up that point, so during the - one of the - we've heard a couple of rumors, one that came out of, I think, the joint (CCNSO) and GNSO council meetings and also maybe some chatter about (ALAC) maybe looking at raising concerns about the proposed budget for various reasons and I think in the (CCNSO GNSO) council meeting it turns out that that was - there was - it was being used as an example, not a threat or not an indication that the (CCNSO) or somebody was moving in that direction and I guess there's still an open question about how upset (ALAC) is about the fellowship funding and things like that but I think we've - that may just sort of be a rumor at this point. But Rubens point is a good one that as the participants in the empowered community, you know, the GNSO could at some point be put in a position of having to react quickly to another empowered community member voting or sort of invoking the blocking budget power. Right, so I think just as a general statement it's something that we need to be aware of, we need to be tracking and we need to be nimble enough that if the GNSO has to engage that we're able to - you know, that the registry stakeholder group is prepared and able to give its councilors direction.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Strategic planning session, we did spend some time on empowered community and process but I think Paul, I'm not sure to the extent at which you understand the process as well but it might be helpful if we circulate something to the stakeholder group just a brief outline of how that process would work in the event that the (ALAC) or somebody else does raise concerns about the council and then the timeline for responding to that because I think it's pretty tight if we're going to do anything about it. So that might be helpful for the group.

Samantha Demetriou: That's Donna that's a good note, maybe we can circulate that prior to one of our next calls after this meeting and then set aside a little bit of time for any follow-up questions with our councilors about how that process works for anyone.

Is there anything else you guys want to cover? Any questions for our councilors or any comments on stuff going on up at the council level? Go ahead Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: Hi, so I have two points; one is I don't know what - if we want to have a discussion now but I would discourage using the blocking or rejection for the ICANN budget and I would hope the (RYSG) would be able to give you direction to say that's our viewpoint going in. And this second point is about GNSO becoming more aggressive in managing the (PDP), you know, the past is prolog and years gone by, you know, the GNSO council managed (PDP)'s very closely and, in fact, they did most of the work themselves, the council did. So you might look back to those past examples for a way to shift the GNSO council role kind of back to where it was as opposed to where it is now.

Keith Drazek: Thanks Kurt. On the second point thank you very much for that, I think you're absolutely right and there are definitely lessons to be learned there and I think the council and our discussions recognizes that we don't necessarily

want to go too far but that there's I think a role for the council to engage more particularly through the liaisons but that we need to be a little bit more active in doing more proactive management.

On the first point, just to be clear, I don't think there's any discussion at the GNSO council level about invoking a blocking budget power. But there is a responsibility for the GNSO to engage if some other member of the empowered community does, right? So just to be clear. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Samantha Demetriou: Go ahead Donna.

Donna Austin: What do you mean by engagement? Sorry.

Ken Stubbs: ...responsibility of the council to engage to someone else (unintelligible).

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Ken. So, Ken's question was define engagement as it relates to the GNSO's council's obligations if another member of the empowered community triggers the blocking budget process and we can circulate the details of that Ken to the list in terms of the procedures that are pretty - they're laid out in quite some detail from the ICANN accountability and (IANA) transition process. I don't have it at the top of mind right now so we'll make sure that that's circulated to the list. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks and Donna Austin, just I know (GDPR) has been a focus for a few of you over the past month or two, we had a conversation with the board on Sunday and some discussion about (GDRP) in the context of possible implications to the (IDS PDP) working group. The council itself has had no (unintelligible) discussions about (GDPR) and we don't intend to. I think we respect that that's being done at the (SGC) level and there's no role for the council. We do anticipate that based on the conversation we had with the board that we might see some communication coming from the board once

there is some coalescing around an (inter) model about potential areas that that might impact the (IDS PDP) working group but that's the only discussion that the council has had around (GDPR). It's certainly not something that we are discussing actively. So I just wanted to put that on the record to folks here.

Samantha Demetriou: Just looking around the room. Any other questions or comments for our counselors? We've got Ken Stubbs coming up.

Ken Stubbs: I'm sorry, I won't take away from your lunch. I'm very concerned about the potential issue that could arise in discussions that I've heard. There may be a very high probability that one of the other organizations will attempt to instigate this budget refusal to accept the budget. I think we need to prepare for the possibility that that may arise. I don't think we can stick our heads in the sand and I think we need to have a plan that allows us to constructively discuss this on the timely basis because we're actually - on one hand we're complaining about the fact that ICANN spends too much money. On the other hand, ICANN says, well, we can cut the budget, we'll drop a hundred travelers and I think from a practical standpoint I feel we need to offer a consistent approach to dealing with that issue that matches our perspective in terms of how we view the budget and how we planned on dealing with it in the future. So, this may rise to the top very quickly and I think we're - I'm not proposing we do anything now, but we need to be prepared to engage within the constituency very quickly on this. Thank you.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Ken. That's good advice to keep in mind as we keep going down this road towards the budget. Anything - oh, go ahead Jim.

Jim Prendergast: Hi, good morning, Jim Prendergast. I've actually been with the board all morning so I can give you a little bit of an insight on what sort of the (pat) response is going to be on the budget. If you (unintelligible) is talking about 80% to 85% of the budget being locked in by prior community decisions. It looks like what they're really looking at for next year are capping the number

of reviews. There's nine bylaw mandated reviews that are supposed to happen so they're looking at that as a potential savings of anywhere from, I don't know, \$700,000 to a million bucks. So that's what they've been repeating all morning. So, keep that in mind.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, it's Jonathan. Thanks Jim, I think that's a helpful insight to give us and I mean it certainly struck me that when I heard both - I think the reviews, that probably makes some sense to be restructuring and organizing that but I'm a little worried about this 85% of the budget being baked in and 15%. I mean, I can't imagine any of our organizations saying that - it looked beyond the very - you know, people often talk about cutting the fat and the bone and they make these sort of meaty analogies and I think we haven't even got below the skin on this one. You know, I think it's - it's really a very - there's a little scrape on the surface which may be correct and I'm not suggesting it isn't, but I think there's a much deeper look and one of the things that I think is most striking is that when a little bit of forward-looking could have seen that there were some challenges with respect to the revenue generation for the organization and yet all existing hiring plans just seem to continue regardless. So I think we've got our work cut out for us over the next few years in terms of trying to deal with this and I'm certainly not buying the 85% rule up front, thanks.

Keith Drazek: Yes, just to respond, Göran was confronted with that somewhat and I think both the managers at the senior level within ICANN and (Uran) himself are hesitant to, as you said, fire people. Then the challenge is put directly to the board while, you know, what do you do to share in the pain? One of the things they talked about was eliminating one of the board retreats or workshops that they do throughout the year so that's one area that they're cutting, they're also looking at reducing the number of travelers from the board going to all of these different events. So, don't plan on seeing 12 ICANN directors at the (IGF) until this year, so things like that. But, it's - I mean, there's going to be - every community that meets with them today is going to have their own set of recommendations and I think the boards

position at this point is, hey, it's not to us yet. It's still dealing with (Zavia) and (Uran) and senior management and once it comes to us then we'll add our perspective.

Jonathan Robinson: It's Jonathan again. Not to turn this into too much of a dialogue, but, yes, I think that's good and it's great to know that the boards looking at limiting their retreats and thinking about travel and those are good and meaningful initiatives but in terms of the quantum, you know, clearly the staff costs are the big issue and what I haven't even heard is perhaps a commitment to stop hiring. So, nobody is saying necessarily going in with a massive knife and start making cuts. But at least, at the minimum, they could say is given the context we're going to work within existing staff numbers from now on and you're not even hearing that I don't think. So, there certainly seems to be further work in this area, thanks.

Samantha Demetriou: All right, Jim thank you for that update from the board and good discussion. How are doing? Any other questions, comments? All right, it looks like the food is here so let's eat.

Kurt Pritz: This is Kurt, can I rise to a point of order.

Samantha Demetriou: Is it going to interrupt my lunch? I'm just kidding, yes, absolutely. Absolutely you can Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: So a number of us were involved in Walk in a Registry's Shoes Presentation yesterday and I found out that when you give a - you moderate a session on behalf of the RySG it comes with Sue Schuler that helps you out and she was stunning in the amount of support she gave us. I learned that the biggest fib in ICANN is I'll have the slides to you on Monday, because nobody ever has the slides for it and at the end she just did my slides for me. So - and I stumbled back to my room, drunk at night, and Sue would be on email asking for presentations and stuff, working till midnight. So, on behalf of all of us, Gigi, Donna, Martin, Craig, Matt and Jason we have a little gift.

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane Van Gelder: So Stéphane here, so we have ten more minutes of our scheduled time. What we could do is start down the working lunch sessions and perhaps if Donna is waiting and I see Elaine. Elaine, if you want to come to the table I don't know if we could start with the (CSC) review and then break for lunch, perhaps give everyone ten or 15 minutes to get their lunch and continue down that agenda?

Elaine Pruis: Well, before we do that, just so you know, we do have a photo that we're planning to do before you get to eat too so...

Stéphane Van Gelder: So do you - I didn't know about the photo. Do you want to do the photo now and then does that make more sense?

Elaine Pruis: Yes, I'm afraid after they get their free lunch people will scatter so this is the best time to do it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: So we'll be under Sue's orders and then have lunch and then reconvene say at quarter past four? Yes, okay, so we'll break for a photo now, lunch, reconvene at quarter past. Thank you.

Sue Schuler: Okay, for the photo, it's looking like the best light is going to be behind this head table. So if everybody that's sitting here stays there and everybody else kind of crowd in behind them, I think that would be the best place. And while you're doing that, I'm going to give the directions for lunch. This is a boxed lunch, there were three things that you could choose from, it was the vegetarian wrap, the Puerto Rican triplet or the turkey. I'm going to trust you to take what you ordered. If you do not remember what you ordered, I have a list. So you can come and ask me. So rather than me just trying to hand out to everybody, I think it would go much faster if people that remember what they ordered just take what you ordered and then if you are in doubt - Okay.

END