LISA SAULINO: Hello, my name is Lisa Saulino. I am the participation manager for this session. Welcome to the Joint Session with the ICANN Board and the Country Code Names Supporting Organization. Please note this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic.

Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace. This discussion is between the ICANN Board and the ccNSO. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience. With that, I will now hand the floor over to ICANN Board chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Lisa. Welcome everyone to this bilateral meeting with the ccNSO and the Board. This is the last constituency meeting for today. We look forward to yet another honest and candid discussion. These have been very effective dialogues between the two parties, so we are looking forward to yet another one. With that context, I would like to turn it over to Patricio, who is going to chair this session. Patricio?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Tripti, and hello to everybody here. During this week, I personally always feel conflicted whether going to where the Board is or where the ccNSO is, so I like that I don't have to make that choice. In this case, we're all here. Before going into the questions, I don't know if Alejandra has anything to say.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, just that we are very glad to be here joining you and to have our discussion running, so thank you for having us here.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Good. So, there is one question from the Board and several questions from the ccNSO Council. Let's begin with the question from the Board, which I think is over there. Knowing that the ccNSO has a standing committee, the SOPC, that for many years have been doing good work on providing input on budget and related matters, and we are very grateful for that input, what does the SOPC and the ccNSO in general think about what ICANN is doing and should be doing about its current financial stress? Any thoughts about the financial future of ICANN?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Patricia, for reading out loud the question. For this, we have our SOPC leadership here, so I'll pass it over to Andreas, who is chair of the SOPC.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Good afternoon. Thank you for having us here. So, the leadership is Irina, vice chair of the SOPC group, and my name is Andreas Musielak. So, I would give a very, very short introduction about the SOPC. So, the Standing and Operating Planning Committee was created in 2008. So, we give regular updates to budgetary and strategic matters. And with that, we are exactly the right group within the ccNSO to tackle this financial stress, as you mentioned here.

And basically, we discussed on Saturday and also offline with our SOPC members what we can see, how we can help to reduce this financial stress, but probably also for the audience. So, for the fiscal year 2024, we see a deficit in the numbers, which is of course covered by the reserves. And also, the recent forecast predicts a deficit, so which is really something which is alarming for us. However, I think, and I want to look a little bit in the past, it's not a finger pointing or so. As I mentioned, we started 2008. So, we have a little bit of knowledge here in this field. And it's about the personal costs. So, we continuously warning to say, please adapt or allocate the staff members to certain projects. This is important.

I'll give some examples. When I started 10 years ago, so we have around 460 staff members now. It was half 10 years ago. At that time, only one third of the budget was for personal costs. Now, we have the level of 57% of the total budget. So, we need to have the focus on the personal costs if we want to somehow cope with this financial stress. Otherwise, it wouldn't be impossible. But it's not to reduce staff. But if you look in the future, we need to allocate.

I'll give you some examples which I experienced because I'm also representing DENIC, and so we were also in the new gTLD. And I know there was staff allocated for the New gTLD Program, which ended around 2014. But basically, the persons disappeared. So, you need to start from scratch with the new round. So, we need to focus on things. And I know when I'm attending many of ICANN sessions and very often, at least, this is my personal view. So, we talk about quantity. So, we increase the staff here and there. But it's very important also to consider quality in this field.

So, I think we need to have a clear focus to see the allocation of the staff members to dedicated processes. And with this, so, we have some other finds. I hand over to Irina, and then I'll come back with some other suggestions, general suggestions. So, Irina, please.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you very much, Andreas. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Irina Danelia speaking in my capacity of the Vice Chair of SOPC. And SOPC has provided multiple submissions as a part of public comment regarding ICANN's operating plan and budget and strategic plans. And there are a number of items that were repeatedly repeated constantly in these submissions relating the financials.

So, the first one is reserve fund. ccNSO has often stressed the importance of the reserve fund as a pillar of ICANN's financial sustainability. And noting that at the moment, the reserve fund is above the amount and equal to one year of operating expenses at the minimum target level. SOPC also welcomes additional discussion and consideration of an appropriate rather than minimum level of the reserve fund from one side to avoid excessive reserves when funds might be better spent on other activities, but also having enough reserve to ensure financial sustainability.

The second point is investment strategy. We know that funds which ICANN has are governed by investment strategy. But noting that current inflation has increased, we really wonder whether the gains from these investments overcome the expected inflation in these and foreseeable years. With regard to the revenue forecast, SOPC has always been supporting to use the base scenario and conservative approach for projecting the income. The assumptions about the growth rates usually were somewhere around our experience we see in ccTLDs, but we definitely are for conservative approach in this case.

IANA function. The IANA function is probably the most critical function for ccTLDs within ICANN. And therefore, SOPC believes that adequate resourcing of PTIs operation and IANA funding is the crucial part of ICANN financial projections and plans. And IANA function should be reserved adequately to ensure it is performed without any issues. Andreas already spoke about headcount control and expenses control has also been in our focus.

And probably the last point to mention is prioritization and reporting. Because the prioritization has been introduced in ICANN, but we see that there might be further improvements there to make sure that efforts and resources are focused on mostly important projects. And that the reporting shows us how ICANN and ICANN community make progress on these critical projects. With this, I will stop probably. Back to you, Andreas.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: So, this is basically a very, very short summary of this SOPC submission of the past years only. I think only the three to four years we went back. So, we see there's still more in our SOPC submission. And then we discussed some very easy probably things we should take into consideration. And one point is if we give contracts, external contracts, so consultancy, we should have more competition in this field. We know that there's a lot of money ICANN is spending for external services. I think here should be a clear focus and say more competition and probably you get better offers out of it.

And there are other things like probably we can build something like incentives for the staff members to reduce costs. So, we have discussed that within the SOPC group. And of course, you can have some bonus schemes. I don't know if it's possible, but that's what one or the other SOPC members are doing. So, if you reach this level and you have this savings, then you get a bit more salary. But on the other hand, you reduce the cost by, I don't know, 10 times of the incentive.

Oops, give me a second. So, I have to go into my notes. And as Irina mentioned, it's the implementation procedure. The thing here is, is really, and I could see that during the COVID pandemic, so it's like a bear and it goes sleeping in the wintertime and you wake up in the spring. Nothing changed very often. So, we need to be very, make progress on a faster speed. And there was a very clear point from the SOPC group.

If we work longer than expected on some projects, we need to review the projects. We need to say, okay, do we really need this project after three years? If not, then we say, okay, probably we need to reprioritize the project. That's really important. That's probably some simple facts.

But now I would like to end up with a question to the Board because we're sending, and I mentioned we were created in 2008, sending submissions every year and we get responses from ICANN planning. So, the question is, what we can do better so that our comments, our submissions get better taken into consideration, because we see the budget for the fiscal year 25 is already not valid anymore. So, that's my question. Is there another system so we can alert better what can be a difficult thing to avoid the financial stress you mentioned here? So, thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you very much. And I think Danko may have some comments.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you for a very interesting discussion. I think that Patricio will not be very happy if I try to answer all of your points there, because it will take too much time. And I see that the question was very nicely formulated in order that you can use Board's question to the community to ask Board many additional points here. So, I will try to focus on a few items that I see are the most interesting.

First of all, the finance committee of the Board and our finance org team extremely appreciates SOPC work for all these long years and improvements that you're giving. Even though sometimes we don't directly change the planning budgets based on that, we evolve the budgetary process and the way how we report to the community and how we report on finance, very much based on the comments we do receive. A couple of practical points.

The reserve fund was not used to take money out of that for the losses for the current fiscal year that is, if I remember, a bit less than 5 million. We did have a lot of money we put from the operating fund into the reserves and supplementary fund for implementation of community recommendations figure that is mostly used to implement community recommendations and a big part of that is used and will be used for the development of the New gTLD Program. So, the finance committee is very much focused on overseeing the level of operating funds. So currently we didn't need to go into reserve fund, and we hope that we will not need to, but we obviously see the developments and there are obviously investment policy on that, it's too detailed, I think, for this meeting.

On your great advice on operational things, as you know, the Board's role is oversight. So, this is not something that I can really discuss, but points taken. I personally think they're very well put. And as Curtis comes to his role, I'm sure he will meet all the most important stakeholders, ccNSO and the SOPC and you being one of them, so you can tell him directly your advice. But the Board's advice for Curtis was and needs to focus on priorities, to optimize the costs, to try to find more effectiveness in the way he works. So, this is something that we also can hear here.

Personal costs are very big part of the cost and personal costs are driven by work that needs to be done. We obviously understand the position of the country codes that have a specific role in the ICANN ecosystem and we know that most of work is allocated to the G side, but this is how the things work. And the level of work is there. We, the Org, Sally's team with the oversight of the Board implemented the strong cost savings team that also went into personal cost, as we know. So, this is something that is there.

Investment strategies are there, but we are also doing the review. We have started with the RFP for independent advisor that will help us to rethink our investment strategies. We do get investment gains, but as any investment, they are not given because past results are not predictor of the future returns. But we will rethink the whole of this set, especially because the New gTLD Program will have incoming funds. So, we need the timely effort that has been started by the finance team. So, with all that, I just wanted to add that IANA function and PTI, we agree is the jewel of our system. It is well-funded, it is taken care, and it is always priority of the Board. Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Danko. I By the way, a summary is prepared with all the conclusions that we get out of these meetings. So, you can be sure that this will not fall into the void. We'll examine all this very carefully. Okay. Before continuing, I would like for the benefit of my Board colleagues to mention that we have here in the room, Nick and Byron over there, I think. The two candidates for Seat 12. So, one of them will be sitting with the Board next time. As they say in the Ig Nobel awards, if you lose, but especially if you win, better luck next time. So now I'll ask Alejandra to be presenting each of the questions that the ccNSO Council has.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. Thank you so much, Patricio. We do have some questions for you. Let me check if we have the same order. Yes. So, knowing that Board members are active in various committees, working groups and caucuses and knowing that Board members step down regularly, either for the end of their term or for other reasons, is progress and continuity ensured of the smaller groups? This comes, of course, because we want to keep continuity and don't lose time on the groups. So, who shall I give the floor to this one?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Well, there is always times when some Board member leaves the Board and some incoming members arrive. And most of the time, that's business as usual. And there are a few times when that is unexpected. And so, I'll ask my colleague, Sarah Deutsch, to tell us how the Board is prepared for those situations, both expected and unexpected.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah, thanks for asking such a hard question. But this issue really, inside the Board, it falls to the Board governance committee to think about these issues. And it is an important one. And the BGC is responsible for slating all the different committees, working groups, caucus groups. We follow a special framework to get people with the right skill sets and interest into the slots. And we also fill vacancies. So, the issue you raise is an important one, especially when somebody with a lot of expertise leaves the Board. It can be very disruptive. But at the same time, we've thought about this and the work does not stop.

So, a few things happen. One is that we have a system where we've designated alternate chairs. So, if a chair cannot make a meeting, another chair will step in. If a vacancy opens, we immediately huddle to make sure we have the right person to fill that slot. But I guess the bigger issue you raise and something we do think about is that making sure that the Board has both a good mixture of people with longevity and expertise and new people. And how do we grow those new people skills? We can't have all the expertise in a silo or in one person. It's not healthy and not good.

So, what we do is we have a rotation policy for committees where we like to encourage people to move around and make sure that committees and expertise don't get locked up in one place. We offer training for Board members, and you know we have an example this year where somebody's taking on a new assignment and took some training. And then the third issue I would raise would be the Board liaison positions and would encourage I guess the whole community not just to ask for the expert on the Board but maybe to have a second person who can help learn. Because we do need to grow people with more expertise and it often takes a new Board member a full year or so to get up to speed. So, I'd start with that. Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you, Sarah. And Danko can tell us a bit of from his personal experience.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Yeah, thank you. I just want to use the opportunity because I'm rolling off the Board now being currently the vice chair. So, the vice chairs role are few. We mainly to support the chair obviously. But in my case, we had elections inside the Board for the next slating and Chris Chapman was selected by the Board to be the next vice chair. So, we immediately start also to work on that. So, it was a nice handover process. It's working in the leadership position but it's also working in the committees.

Key to the committees is the support of staff executives and subject matter experts who know the teams that we are talking. And usually, we have this process where Board members who are more expert in specific areas or have for longer time serving specific committees as Sarah has explained are there for this leadership positions. So also, in my personal example, I chaired the Board finance committee for some years because it's also part of my area of expertise. But it's a big Board. So, we do find experts always where are needed in case of finance committee. So, it will continue to be the chair as again slated by the Board. And this is a way of continuation.

So, we also work on this. All the processes are there. So, it is great financial expert. And I think he will actually improve the work of the committee by this rotation. You gain new perspectives and you enable people to contribute more and bring the work to a higher level. So, by signing off, I think that Board is in a very good state and this continuity process actually works. This is my personal experience. Thank you, Patricio for giving me time.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks. I believe Chris wants to add something.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks Patricio and Sarah and Danko thank you for the explanation which is which is great. The original reason for asking the question I think at least in part was the community facing liaison positions. And I think the idea of having us an alternate is excellent and we should certainly embrace that. I'm not sure how we do it, but we should just get it done and embrace it. I don't think there's any issue at all with having other than the fact that it overload it puts even more workload on Board members.

But leaving that aside for a moment. But I did just want to briefly go back to the to the committee thing. I suppose my question would be more about-- was a couple actually. One is with things like the Audit Committee and the Finance Committee, there are, if you're lucky, obvious people who clearly have expertise. And I suppose the same probably can be said to apply to Board governance. But things like the Organisational Effectiveness Committee and stuff like that, which actually play a really important role, even though they're not necessarily specifically defined as a sort of necessary committee to have in a business, but are a necessary committee to have at ICANN, is a little bit more complicated.

And the other point I wanted to make was, I appreciate that rotating people around is important, and it is important, but it's equally important to ensure that it's probably not enough to recognise that at the end of next year, X will step down, therefore we need to find someone to step in. It's probably X will step down in two years. And I just wanted to make that point, because I think what you can then do is you can say, Fred, there is no Fred, so I've just invented Fred. Fred, you are the sort of person that we think would be chairing the Audit Committee if you're interested in doing it. What we want you to do is bounce around to these committees over the next two years to then be able to bounce into the job on the Audit Committee. And I'm just using that as an example.

And I know what happens on how the stuff works, and I think it works relatively well. But that was the purpose, original purpose of the question. But what you've said, Sarah, sort of triggered that other point in my head. So, thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: So, Chris, actually, we do those projections. And we've, since you've left the Board, we have something called observers and members who might want to consider taking a leadership position in a particular committee, observe it very vigorously. And so, we do exactly what you suggested.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah, and I would add, just to be clear, that the rotation isn't some mandatory thing. So, we do need a good mixture of people on certain committees, like governance, for example, with experience and the newer people together. That's important. And on the organizational effectiveness, we have been encouraging people to join it. But it's an area where you do need much more knowledge and expertise. And it's a harder issue. But we have had good luck on the Audit Committee, for example, and finance. We have some very qualified people. So, that's not as much of an issue as it used to be.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Chris Chapman?

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Thanks, Patricio. The related, not unrelated to this, is the quality of the onboarding experience for directors. And the materials and preparation and investment that's gone into the next President-CEO is outstanding, absolutely outstanding. And the PACs, the information, the honest assessments, the constructively tough assessments are all in those PACs. And I wish that I had had that document when I was coming on board. And we've agreed that it would be a very helpful document as a living document. So, that's another element of it. And I think it's been a great step forward.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Briefly, Edmon? Very briefly.

EDMON CHUNG: I guess documentation is probably one good aspect. And thank you, Chris, for bringing this up. My personal experience, for example, I'm stepping off the Board like Danko. And I've been chairing the Board IDN and UA working group. And I ended up actually documenting all the things that we've been following in the last couple of years and pass it on to Martin, who will be taking up the position.

But right now, it's done not as systematic. So, I think probably making it systematic might be a useful thing. And today, even our main interface with the community is the working groups interface is with the UASG, the steering group. And in that meeting, I was able to pass the chair role to Martin as well. But documenting that is probably something that you're driving at as well.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Do we have time for me to ask something else? Is that okay?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, so this is kind of related to this. So, I can pretty much guarantee you that whoever wins the ccNSO Board seat, and whoever wins Board Seat 13, they are likely to be gTLD conflicted. Because both Nick and Byron have gTLD business, and the gTLD registry stakeholder group registrars ditto. You're going to have experts on the Board that are conflicted. And you can't necessarily on a broad, straightforward reading of conflict, they're out of the room.

I'd encourage a little bit of flexibility, especially around things that happen in conflict, sometimes about appointing Board members, as a subject matter expert, and having them in the room for discussion. And also, what we used to do on the Board, what we did in the first round of New gTLDs, was to draw the distinction about to draw a relatively broad distinction between being involved in discussion and being involved in voting. I get it. I get how complicated it is. And anyone who's on the Board with me will tell you that I was really tough about conflicts. But I do think there's a danger going forward with this New gTLD process that you're going to end up with a bunch of Board members who are unable to provide you with the expertise they have because of the conflict issue.

TRIPTI SINHA: Chris, history repeats itself. And you were there when the last round was launched, and we have encountered a similar problem. And we have created a conflict-of-interest committee that is being very disciplined and vigorous about checking for conflicts. And actually, Chris Chapman sits on that committee, and I'm going to yield some time to him so he can speak more on this.

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Thanks, Tripti. Chris, you must have been sitting in on the last session of the Board workshop the other day because Leon chairs the conflicts of interest subcommittee. And as a Board, we have recognised exactly the point you raised, that you need to take a more nuanced and calibrated approach to conflicts so they cascade and you can-- So, the challenge is to get the balance right between ultimate conflicts, timing as to addressing perceptions of conflicts, and at the same time, suck the marrow out of the brain of those experts so that is available to the Board. And it's a source of some frustration. We recognise it, and we're going to address it from first principles.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Should we move to the next question, please?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, please.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So, moving along, our next question is, what are the next steps for requests for bylaw amendments? As in, what are the milestones, timelines, what's the workflow process for request of bylaw amendments? Does it make a difference if the request is a result of a PDP, joint working group review, or requested by one SO or AC? This is because we want to understand the steps and people involved on what needs to happen from the request to actually having the public comment on the bylaw amendment.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay. Well, we looked at this question, and there is a well-defined process and even infographics for how all this moves along, starting from the point where it is decided that there should be a bylaw amendment. But from the point of view of where the idea is proposed of a bylaw amendment coming from the community or from various places, and there is the possibility that that may remain unacknowledged and that some time could pass before anything is done about it, if ever.

Okay. So, we recognize that there seems to be a gap in there, and we have decided that ICANN Legal is to prepare a bylaws playbook that will take care of providing clarity in that area. So, I don't know if Sam Eisner is in the room from ICANN Legal to help us explain a little what that playbook will look like. Yes, can anybody give Sam a mic?

SAMANTHA EISNER: Thank you. Thanks, Patricio, again. Sam Eisner from ICANN Legal. So, what we'll do in that bylaws playbook will be that time frame from when the group raises the issue to the point of getting it to the Board and having the Board initiate public comment. Because we recognize that there is, number one, there will be differences based on how it came up and the type of recommendation, was it from a working group, a policy development working group, a cross-community working group, an individual group, who is it trying to impact, etc.

So, there are a range of different options of what that will be, but then we'll also try to identify how it might interplay if it comes along with other recommendations that might be related as well, but try to give some visibility so that people can understand the points where it should be and identify those points of accountability if it's not happening. So, we'll be working on that. And it won't take too long to deliver, but it won't be next week, but we'll have that out for the community to have a lot more visibility on this and some transparency into our processes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you so much, Sam. Because one of the things that we would be very interested in is who is responsible for what and how much time should be expected to wait for a response on such a request, right?

SAMANTHA EISNER: That's really helpful and we'll make sure that we have some indicative timelines included in there.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Sam. Because our current example of what we are waiting for is the CSE review. Since the final report was sent in May, 2023 and we rescinded in November, 2023 and now we are in November, 2024, and we haven't heard back from this request on amending the review time of the CSE and therefore we had to defer this CSE review in August. So, that's why we are bringing that up not as a specific example, but we would like to know on all accounts what to expect.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Exactly, and we really thank you for this question because it's revealed a gap that we need to fix. These initiatives for bylaws amendments may come from different places in different shapes or forms, so this needs a structure or a little bureaucracy in the good sense, like for instance when you want to kick-start a bylaws amendment process you perhaps should fill the bylaws amendment request form, something that will make it visible and start the clock ticking for the various things that should exist. Anybody wants to add anything else to this topic? If not, let's move to the next one.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Perfect. And looking forward for the playbook.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: So, the next question we have is just related to the progress on Board considerations for the ccPDPs that we have handed over on review mechanisms and the IDNs. Just to put a little bit more context, we did send a policy, we got some questions. We sent the answers to those questions on the 27th of September, and we are looking forward to next steps on that if necessary to have a meeting to discuss the responses just to make sure that we don't go back and forth on more questions, more answers, more questions and be more efficient about it. Also, the ccPDP4 IDN Board report was sent in June and just to check where are in the timeline with that one. Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yeah, I'm a bit involved in both, although in the case of ccPDP3, the review mechanism, as you mentioned, once the proposal landed on the Board's plate, we had to organize a caucus that was at the time chaired by Katrina. And there are things that need to be done according to the procedure like a public comment period and asking the GAC for their opinion. All that was done.

And then with the support of ICANN Legal, there was a detailed analysis of the proposed policy and a number of issues were found where the clarification from the ccNSO was necessary to keep moving ahead. And that was the reason for the questionnaire that you received and we are thankful to the ccNSO Council for bringing some of the members of the working group back and some other new blood to answer and provide the detailed answers to many to all these questions. So, the replies, now we have them.

In the meantime, it happened that Katrina left the Board and unfortunately, Becky was unable to take that and continue leading the caucus. So, that's the point what we are at. We will, again, with the help of Legal, look at the answers and as you say, it's a very good idea that came together with the replies. Instead of continue sending letters back and forth, if it's necessary, we'll be very happy to meet with people from the ccNSO, the experts on this subject and go looking at each point where we need clarification so we can move ahead and reach our destination as soon as possible. That's what I can say about ccPDP3. I don't know if any of my colleagues may add anything perhaps. I don't know if, Becky. Becky was going to be late, but anything to add, Becky?

BECKY BURR: Thanks. I know everybody's been waiting for this. We picked it up. Staff is working on the analysis and we'll get it to you just as fast as we can. Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Patricio. I understand the document, the questions that were raised by Legal. I'm just wondering where you draw the line between asking a bunch of questions that actually may be implementation. It seemed to me that some of the questions that were being asked were actually implementation questions that under normal circumstances you'd expect an implementation review team to deal with.

I completely understand that lawyers, if you give them a document, are going to take it to pieces and try and bolt it together again differently and ask lots of different questions. But I just wonder whether perhaps on this particular occasion we might not have strayed, at least in part, into matters of implementation rather than accepting the policy. Thanks.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Becky, do you want to answer to that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: There is an equivalent. It's not called IRT, but there is.

BECKY BURR: Chris, having just taken this on, I'm not sure that I know the answer to that question, but I'll get it to you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yeah. Yeah. By the way, Edmon was asking if there is an implementation review team for ccNSO policy proposals. I was replying that not under that name, but there is something equivalent. Can you tell us about that?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, in the ccNSO we did develop a guideline to create such a, let's say, joint implementation working group just to make sure that the people who-- to avoid this ambiguity between what was meant by the policy and what gets really implemented, to diminish that gap. So, we do have it. It was done right after the ccPDP3 on retirement. So, it is now available and we are looking forward for our next two policies, at least, that are in your corner now, that when they get approved, that we can put this guideline into place and actually gather this team to follow up the implementation of the policy and make it as efficient as possible.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks. Does this have an acronym that we can add to our collection?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, I guess definitely it has one, but I don't have it right now with me. I just, I don't remember the acronym, but I'll send it to you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I just have one last question. Because I do understand that you mean well when you say as soon as possible, but sometimes that soon as possible seems like an infinite amount of time that could happen between then. And not to put anyone on the spot, but is there any timeline or a guesstimate on when we can see some of this happening?

PATRICIO POBLETE: I'm sure Becky will not let this take infinite time, but I don't know if she can say anything else.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Perfect.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Let's move to ccPDP4. ccPDP4 is done with the Board more recently. There is a caucus for that which I chair. It's been published for public comment. Again, the GAC has been asked for their opinion and we are at that stage now. We already have an organizational meeting for the caucus and after this ICANN meeting, we will begin our work meeting frequently and again, trying to have this done as soon as possible, if I can coin a word, a phrase. Now, I think Edmon, since he's our main expert on IBM, may add something.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you, Patricio. I just want to highlight one thing is that the Board's effort to make the process more efficient and effective is part of the ccPDD4 as well. One of the things that we've been doing with the GNSO policies is to have Board liaisons to those working groups and also bring Board questions into the working group ahead of time. This is something that we did actually for the IDN EPDP and the GNSO side as well as the ccPDP4, which deals with IDN variant TLDs as well.

I just want to highlight that there is a conscious effort and we understand that from the community that an efficient processing of policy recommendations is really important. And one of the things is to have liaisons and actually address some of the issues. We hope, but of course, as Patricio mentioned, there are certain aspects after the PDP that needs to go through, but at least one of the efforts that the Board is doing is to, for lack of a better word, front run some of the Board's issues that we need to consider in the policy development process as well. At least this time, at least a part of those considerations is actually included in that already.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much for that. And Patricio, I did find the acronym. You want to hear it?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It's ccNSO Policy Implementation Assistance Process, that the acronym would be ccPIAG.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you very much. Are there any other questions or comments about this topic?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Anyone? No, I think we've covered it.

PATRICIO POBLETE: We've covered everything that we had on our agenda, but since we have a few minutes left, does anybody want to say anything else, any comment, any message for the Board, just since we're here? Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I just want to acknowledge Danko, who's leaving the Board, and Edmon, who's leaving the Board, and thank them both very much indeed for everything that they have done. Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Well, with that, I think it's back to you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Patricio, and thank you. This was a good exchange, honest dialogue, and thank you very much, and enjoy the evening.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you for having us.

LISA SAULINO: Thank you, everyone. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]