

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
Strategic Substantial Discussion
Saturday 16 November 2013**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

(Jonathan): Okay, so if we could start the recording at this stage.

And (Ron) if I could ask you for your attention so we can start the next session.

Okay, so everyone this is an opportunity. We've really got two sessions.

And I'd quite like to think of them in some ways together although they are separate between now. Over the next two hours we've got two consecutive sessions.

The first one is an opportunity which we have - previously had first thing on a Saturday morning which is a so-called substantial and strategic discussion. An opportunity to think and look ahead and start to consider any issues that are coming down the track and just, you know, what some people might call brainstorming or think around, just talk a little bit around some of the bigger issues.

And then secondly, we have the opportunity to talk about either the substance or detail of our conversations with the Board, the GAC and the ccNSO to some extent.

Now those discussions have been - there are some topics already in discussion and I guess there's also that - our meeting with the CEO which is all linked together and so it's worth when we come to that to highlight exactly what the shape of those discussions already are.

The kind of things that I'm thinking about and I welcome your points on what topics we could take into this discussion now, are things like the kind of work we've been doing on continuous improvement, our engagement with the GAC and/or the GAC's early engagement in the PDP.

And then this sort of bigger picture issue of the impact of the changes that have taken place either where we felt that activities gone on outside of the GNSO when it ideally shouldn't have or where the global Internet governance framework and how to - I guess what we should be doing from within the council and the GNSO to establish or reassert our function and purpose.

So those are the kind of three thoughts I had. But in talking with Marika in the run-up to this from ICANN Staff, Marika from - Konings from ICANN Policy Staff, she tried to assist me by putting some of these topics on a series of slides.

So I thought it may be useful to capture the start of this by just running through a couple of slides with the sort of things that were on my mind and then see where - what your receptiveness is to discussing these kind of issues as part of our strategic discussion.

So Lars you're in control of the projector.

So I should qualify this and I don't mean this as any kind of undermining of the efforts that Marika has done. I haven't reviewed these and kind of gone back and forth with them. She did some work as a sort of a prompt, as a starter for ten or an initial point. And I've taken that.

And so I'm just going to run through some of the thoughts that essentially there's us and our work in the GNSO and at the council and our position in the multi-stakeholder model and how we present and position ourselves.

How stale are we and how open are we to bringing in newcomers to participate. How effective are we. How proactive are we. How good are we at commissioning and initiating things or how much are we reacting to events going on around us.

We've initiated this mechanism of work to make continuous improvements. We've been talking about improvements and streamlining the GNSO PDP. We've been proactively engaging with the GAC and trying to talk with them about responding to their perceived requirement for early engagement and the necessity for that.

There's been this rather difficult issue of the GNSO Review happening and not happening, if so how so and what's going on.

And we will learn a little more about that and think - and we still got to think about our response and how we intend to deal with that.

Marika's put metrics and reporting which is a slightly different flavor to it now having had our discussion in this morning's session.

But and then there's of course our work on the development work for the council in the later part of this week.

Lars?

So but all of this and this is to the point that some have made. And I think this is a really important point is all of this is in the context of us being visible in a broader ecosystem really that the work of the GNSO and the council within the GNSO is not - doesn't happen in isolation. There's - and how do we feel about the fact that there is - goes well with clearly the strategy panel. But one particular strategy panel looks at new models for international engagement, consensus-based policymaking and institutional structures to support such enhanced functions.

Now if that doesn't feel like banging right up against the sort of thing that we do, so for me that's something where we might want to have some discussion and this says others are watching.

But it may be that they're watching or it may be that our work is the - and the work we are either doing or intending to do to modify and develop what we do is - bumps right up against other work that's being done from a top-down or in parallel. The work of the ATRT 2, clearly we're going to come to that later in the week with our meeting with the ATRT 2 but there's fairly substantial recommendations on and, you know, it's on the PDP and how we handle that.

And again the prospect of a GNSO Review and what form and format that might take.

Okay Lars.

So the question is really I guess is what are we doing as, you know, thinking perhaps over the next - over the four kind of (period). I don't really want to put a time on it. I don't think we're probably - I wouldn't be thinking much more than 12 months ahead. But I wouldn't want to say well we should only be thinking about 12 months ahead. This might be just around the corner.

So that's some - that's it. And attempt to see the discussion if you like and we moved this discussion from the very early part of Saturday morning when some of us came in rather cold. We've had some I would say warm discussions. And I mean warm as in we've been engaged. We've been interactive. We've been challenging one another.

And so I'd welcome, you know, your thoughts on these or let's just capture the roadmap or the scope of the key issues.

And I think it's - this is for something for in many ways this is as much for the council or what - as for the GNSO as a whole. And any contributions from within the room as to - and I think this is a little bit no (holds back) conversation as to what we think we should be doing.

But I suppose in framing your responses to how - the key issues I would suggest that we think about what if any of these things we want and how we'd be wanting to frame those in our discussion with the Board.

And reliably I've got Marilyn stepping up to the mike. So Marilyn it'd be great to hear your contribution first.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I wanted to say a word or two about being really aware of how we use the word multi-stakeholder.

Multi-stakeholder globally is being adopted by a range of intergovernmental organizations including the UN, certain governments and others. In some cases what they really mean is multilateral advised by an appointed Board of different stakeholders.

At ICANN we built something very different. We're not the IGF which is multi-stakeholder on an equal footing. But we did build a bottom-up consensus-based model at ICANN that is open and participatory with the governments and an advisory, a critical advisory role.

So when we say multi-stakeholder I hope we will start using the terms open, participatory, bottom-up, consensus-based, multi-stakeholder.

And I make that point because it's really easy. I was at the Commission on Science and Technology for Development last week in Geneva when a certain government who is from a region of the world not known for their openness announced that they have a group of multi-stakeholder advisors that they pay and that that is multi-stakeholder.

(Jonathan): Thanks Marilyn. You could have taken the words out of my mouth. I agree with you completely. It's very interesting to see when and how these come in.

And you'll notice in Steve's blog, on Steve Crocker's blog that came out, I mean he specifically makes reference to bottom-up multi-stakeholder. And he doesn't go to include all of those phrases and terms you've mentioned. But I think that's an interesting point.

Any other comments or inputs as to - bear in mind that, you know, this is a theme I think this international Internet governance framework that's going to be specific at this meeting.

And I suppose for me what I would like us to be doing is thinking what does it mean for the GNSO Council, the GNSO and that's really the - in some ways where - and we don't exist in isolation. We are part of this - the ICANN model. So it can't be taken outside of that but specifically with reference there.

Any comments or thoughts as to what we could usefully cover in this session and in particular how that might then lead us into productive discussions with CEO, Board, GAC?

I mean personally I think we've - one of the reasons I highlighted our work with the GAC is I want to demonstrate perhaps a part of our existing way of

working and our model that wasn't working as well as it could be because let's try and be frank with one another.

I - my - well the signals I heard a year ago is that our relationship with the GAC, I mean the GAC didn't meet with us in Toronto, right. We weren't engaged. They were - for - regardless of blame they were disappointed with their ability to influence and engage with the policy process.

And we've subsequently been frustrated about their perhaps later involvement and the impact of that.

So that struck me as one key area that needed fixing in terms of fixing our model and fixing the work of the policy work within the GNSO.

But any thoughts, comments on in and around these themes and how we could usefully discuss them now?

We've got Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco with the BC. The - picking up on what Marilyn said, I think it's essential to represent that there's a positive trend on government engagement particularly with GNSO.

So it can't just take a snapshot. There has to be this progression. Use the word demonstrate and that you'd like to demonstrate an effective relationship with the GAC but it's more important to say that there's been a demonstrable trend where they get more engaged.

And when they get more engaged at a more detailed level, guess what, we all get better policy.

You know I think it's essential because one of the (multiple day old) principles, it gives us pause. There's the notion of accelerating the globalization of ICANN.

And if that really means governments having a significant role, you want to point to evidence that GAC engagement at a specific level is generating policy that's responsive.

And look at sort of safeguards. Look at 50 RP. There are things we agree or disagree with. But the engagement is there, right.

If we think we're going to make progress on IGO-INGO that ought to be mentioned as well. I mean even if they don't like what happens they have to recognize that (Thomas) and the group put an incredible amount of work into this for the past year. This is not something that was brushed off because the Board was given the IGO-INGO and when they passed it onto council I don't really think GAC thought that was appropriate. I don't think they ever thought that anything would come out of it.

So point to the work we have and you'll have a trend that's pointed in the right direction. That may not be enough to satisfy those who want multilateral forms of government. But stand on our record.

(Jonathan): Thanks (Steven). And that certainly - I'll come to you Peter as well. That's certainly in terms of linking it to our next discussion, I mean that certainly is my thinking that historically what we used to do when we discussed things with the GAC or the Board we said what do you want to talk about?

And they'd say well - or what do you want to - and it was this kind of thing we've talked about before where you throw two sets of topics. The drive in more recent time has been to - for us to set an agenda as to what the GNSO and the work of the council is doing.

So my proposal and suggestion to you is that we go ahead in both of those meetings with the GAC and the Board tomorrow and we set out half a dozen key items where we're making progress. We're doing good work. And we are demonstrating measurable success.

Peter.

Peter Dengate Thrush Well just coming back to the picture where it said are we waiting for the future or part of creating the future.

And just to say sometimes you can get this meeting from GAC that they (definitely) creating the future and leave us to wait for what they haven't created.

And I think that what's important to do in a clear but still (significant) correct way to show that we are two groups that are both creating the future and we have to work together and also be more open to each other to discuss not just general issues but, you know, to go down to the more practical issues to understand each other.

I sometimes mention the pre-informative small meetings we have in the small Nordic country or Sweden where I come from.

But before we go to the ICANN Meetings we have a meeting with - there are representatives from all different kind of groups that are going to this meeting. And these are very good because then we can sit down half a day and discuss more openly and inform each other and understand each other.

And I'm perfectly aware about that I mean going here it's not practically possible to do something similar. But as long as we can come close to that we can also understand and respect each other.

(Jonathan): Thanks Peter. Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thank you (Jonathan). From your presentations and from many of the discussion for this session or actually earlier today we are talking about internationalization. I - basically I think this group, I mean although we're dealing with multi, I mean actually many perspectives of the internationalization, I mean in terms of politics, in terms of business.

But I think this group we always talked about internationalized domain name. Everything that's related to the domain names, the technical part or the policy around the technical part of the - I mean the internationalization issue come to us. I mean the GNSO body that can help build the policy for the internationalization domain name - internationalized domain name.

I'm not trying to actually oversimplify all the dynamics and politics here. But I think the GNSO itself or the council itself has its limits or actually has its own kind of power, things can do or things cannot do. I think one thing is that we stick with our core function which is policy part for the domain name, just my two cents.

(Jonathan): Bill.

Bill Drake: Hi. Bill Drake from NCUC; I like Marilyn and a number of other people in the room have spent a lot of time in this sort of international organization, (you know) kind of Internet governance discussions.

And I'm constantly struck by how little the GNSO still is really understood by many government people. I mean it's quite astonishing.

We did a workshop actually in - at the IGF in Bali about civil society engagement in ICANN and in the GNSO. And we had a lot of people in the room.

And they came up afterwards. I remember people who said, you know, I never really heard a discussion about the GNSO and what it does before. And these are people who all had very strong views about the Internet governance generally and about ICANN generally.

And I think if you spend a lot of time talking to the government people, I had a very long conversation with somebody from a prominent government that Marilyn might have been referring to this morning, who's very surprised to - when they first started to come into the ICANN space to try to get some understanding what's happening. But it's still not clear.

So I think some means on the part of the GNSO to communicate more effectively exactly what its role in the process is and why they shouldn't think that the obvious thing to do is simply to go talk to the Board whenever they want something.

I mean this really has to be laid out because they - I think a lot of the - a lot of government people just look at this and go this is this really complex arcane internal thing. They squabble and it doesn't get anywhere so, you know, and it's too complex to follow. We'll just, you know, cut to the chase and go talk to the Board. We'll tell them what we want.

And this is a problematic thing. So I think you have to find some way of really closing that information and perception gap because it's - and it's deeper when you go outside the government or outside (unintelligible) actually participate in the GAC. I mean my God, I mean those people from the governments who actually do come here and sit through the meetings, they at least have some sense

But when you go and deal with the other bits of the government, people from other ministries or whatever, there's no understanding.

The one thing I was going to say (Jonathan) do you guys ever do meetings between leadership and the GNSO Council and the leadership of the GAC to talk in a little bit more detailed way about the perceptions and issues on both sides because the meetings that we had between the council and the GAC always - they do have that kind of stilted feeling, you know.

And maybe if there was more communication at the leadership level, maybe it's happening and I don't know, but maybe that would help us prepare the ground a little bit better and feed back into both communities. I don't know, just a thought.

(Jonathan): Yes. Let me respond to that on a couple of levels before moving on in the queue. I think that there's a - I mean there's lots of things you covered there Bill and some of that, you know, is around - in and around what I would - is the communication and the publication and the effective description of the work of the GNSO and the GNSO Council on policy work.

And it seems to me that that challenge exists at a small level even within the ICANN community which is exactly why I propose that we continually and repeatedly get that message out to the GAC, the Board and others, other colleagues in the community about where we are now.

But where we might have been or what you heard in the corridor we were, and what we're actually doing now. And then beyond that the challenge is to go more broadly.

In terms of actually meeting directly with the GAC, yes we have had various engagements. And to be honest with you it hasn't been - one of the challenge is it hasn't been that clear, who do you talk to, who actually - is it the BGRI Working Group.

And in a recent call we had with them it appears that the BGRI Working Group is actually the whole of the GAC which was revelatory.

So the proposal we've got on the table with the GAC this time at this meeting, but essentially I guess it's a draft proposal in front of the council. But this is what I would suggest we take to the GAC is that we come out of our meeting with them, with the wholes of the GNSO/GAC Meeting and form - I don't want to say task force because I think task force has a specific connotation in it but form a group which is likely the leadership of the council and one or more others.

But we want to keep it relatively tight and make constructive intersectional progress so that we can report back to the GAC in Singapore what we've actually done.

And I think the weird thing is when we talk about what we might be able to do, everyone's kind of nodding their heads and both within the GNSO Council and GNSO and in the GAC.

So it seems like we kind of invite agreement but turning that into something productive. We haven't been able to do as much as I would have hoped.

And so that's the proposal on the table going into the meeting.

There's a queue which is (Jeff) and Zahid, I think.

(Jeff): Thanks. And I kind of want to draw on something Bill said.

(Jonathan): Sorry. I'm going to put Wolf. Sorry (Jeff). I'm going to put Wolf in as well after you. I hadn't realized that I thought he was pointing to you but he was actually telling me that he wanted to be in queue as well.

Man: You go ahead.

(Jonathan): You go ahead (Jeff).

(Jeff): Okay, thanks. Just to draw from what Bill said, I think one of the asks that we should have for - we should be getting our voice out there as far as what we do in helping educate people of our role in the whole ecosystem.

But I also think that the ICANN Leadership being the CEO and the Board aren't doing a great job in helping us with that cause. You know when they - when the CEO goes around and creates these new panels and Expert Working Groups and, you know, over the year, I mean we could probably count up a lot of ways that he's not been doing us a favor in reserving these roles for the GNSO.

And that's a problem. When the CEO goes around and talks about creating all these Expert Working Groups and creates these panels which I'm still not - and I don't know if anyone is 100% clear on the roles of these panels, that is whittling away at what we do as part of the community and what our role is.

And so one of the messages I'd like to deliver to Fadi is basically saying, you know look, you talk about the multi-stakeholder, in your words, multi-stakeholder model and then, you know, sometimes bottom-up although I think as (Jonathan) and I were discussing or someone, the word bottom-up doesn't appear anywhere in Fadi's blog post. Multi-stakeholder appears a lot. But the word bottom-up never does.

The - you have to help us out here, right. The leadership needs to when they're evangelizing the model they talk about the role of the GNSO and what we do. Otherwise I wouldn't blame anyone for outside this organization from thinking that we're being marginalized and that they don't understand our role because nobody talks about it. There's only so much we can do.

And from within the council, the way I've always approached it is, I want to do our job which is do the policy work, manage the policy process. I don't think

we can be distracted as a council and getting the word out there. We need help from the leadership to do that, I think.

(Jonathan): So (Jeff) just to respond there, I mean Fadi took a very small step in that direction at the Durban Meeting.

And it's worth just locking that in and noting that he stood up in the public forum. And if you remember he said something along the lines of I'm tired of people being negative about the GNSO or the GNSO Council. As far as I can see there's really good work going on.

So in a sense the seed has been sown. But you're right.

(Jeff): But the actions aren't there.

(Jonathan): I understand your point.

(Jeff): Yes.

(Jonathan): And I'm not talking against it. I'm just saying...

(Jeff): Yes.

(Jonathan): ...we have a kernel from which to build (immensely).

(Jeff): I mean even with the - this - the translations and transliterations, no disrespect to Jim Galvin and the work he does and all that. But there's an Expert Working Group that's on (ID) and registration policies where we're trying to do that work within the GNSO. When you go around and you keep creating those things, and I understand that was asked for by the Who Is so there's more to that story - by the Who Is. But that was another group, the expert group on Who Is. That was a recommendation that came out of there.

The more you create these “Expert” groups under the direction of ICANN CEO leadership as opposed to us having to create those Expert Working Groups under - as part of our policy process, the more you’re not helping our case and explaining what our role actually is.

(Jonathan): I’ve got Wolf next and then Zahid.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thanks. Just before Mikey’s going to fade out because he’s going - getting frozen here actually and I would like to come back to Bill.

So good point about the communication and in fact on the external communication but it was said here that it starts with internal communication, the internal communication and being convinced and ICANN internally that this model is the best one we have here.

So and that’s - and that people understand from the management and senior level what the model is about.

So but I am saying that yesterday I - let me say I suffered from (Jonathan)’s absence and (unintelligible) absence. No. I was told, you know, that you were absence. Because I was on short term invited then to a meeting of (CSOAC) leaders. This senior staff level - the senior staff (Hardy) and (Isabelle).

So that’s one of these meetings, you know, (these rounds). There was Heather and there was SSAC and ALAC and I had to represent the GNSO in this regard.

And this is around, you know, which has been introduced by (unintelligible) who started it up to have kind of more informal conversations and to making others part of the community aware of the different problems of the part of the community.

And, you know, to me it was really very much surprising though to understand or to get the perception that really many people of senior staff do not know what we are doing, what the GNSO is about or they understand it in a different way.

If you look at such (forces) here, so which is from your community and see this complex GNSO structure here and say oh this is complex. I don't understand. So I would like to have one telephone number of the GNSO to talk with, you know.

And so what I say is we need internally continuously to convince those people on what we are doing and how we are working in order to make them - to put them in the position if they have talks to the outside world that they do the right thing.

Thanks.

(Jonathan): Thanks. I've got quite a queue developing. It's - I've got Zahid, (David), Jen, and then John.

I'll just say that the diagram that Wolf referred to is the BC Newsletter that comes out. And think that's probably the basis on which I first thought I understood the GNSO so I think we should compliment the BC for their good work on that one.

All right, I think it's Zahid next.

Zahid Jamil: Thanks (Jonathan). So what he said and what he said I agree totally. But I wanted to add something else.

It is a problem when you try to sort of - and when you're speaking to the GAC or anybody else really, give them a slide and say well this is how our process

functions and this is how we do things. After five minutes into that you've lost the GAC literally. That's been my sort of perception of it.

And maybe one of the things could be - would be an exciting case study to say here's a problem. You came to us. This is how we processed it. Don't go into the details. Don't go into, you know, exactly, you know, that there was a charter and, you know, the team. And, you know, they're more interested in the substance or what happened.

And I think maybe the IGO-INGO hopefully if this is a success and it probably will be. I hope so. Will be a good case study to present to the GAC and say look, here's a problem. You came to, you know, the ICANN and we're with it. We dealt with it. We came up with the result. This is how it functioned. This is the timeline. That's pretty fast.

And we'd like to repeat this. And then sort of open to them as a challenge and say we would like to work with you on future things that you think that you would like to see the GNSO. I mean I don't want them to sort of push and initiate work towards it. That's what I'm trying to say.

But basically the challenge should be right, so what does it - well there's an invitation to work on issues as they come along. That would be helpful to GAC membership because then they'd know that when they come to a GAC Meeting getting GAC advice out is one process. The only other thing they know is let's sit down with the Board.

But if they know how to start working with the systems within the ICANN structure that would be much more helpful especially when you sort of mess it out of the IGF and others well then because this thing is structured. It works and we did it. And here's the interaction, different case studies between the government representatives and the multi-stakeholder body.

And I think that might be one way to go.

(Jonathan): Zahid I have to respond to that and I think that there's two points. And I like what you say but there's two points. One, we have to get their buy-in to do that because they would be our allies in communicating that. And it's not clear yet that they will be.

In particular with that PDP I mean there are some at least within the GAC, we think we shouldn't have even done that work. It was none of our business going down that route to even do that work.

Now I realize we may - I mean there are all sorts of views how we come to that. But I just want to put that on the table when you make that point. I like what you're saying. And I would like to take that approach. And I'm responsive to it. But there are some challenges with it.

Let me now start the queue going towards (David) next.

(David): Yes. I just wanted to generally back up the point that's been made a bunch of times which is the GNSO does not - a lot of people don't really understand what we do. It's a problem within ICANN. We do get the GAC. I mean one of the things I've been struck with by the, you know, the GAC and the GNSO is they're - the GAC's idea about what is policy and our idea about what is policy are quite different and that we are - you know the GNSO is a real policy engine.

When we said we've gone for a PDP, produce something, we generally produce something pretty substantial.

And I think that just to quite - you know which we came to - when we're trying to explain the GNSO to people we have sort of talk about the council and structure and the top-down and that. It's well not really - that does not highlight what the GNSO does and what it's - you know the working groups

and the policy produced from them are the real engine of the GNSO and that is what we should be discussing.

And in particular, I find that talking to people outside ICANN is even worse. They have no idea. People - there's a lot of perceptions of ICANN that really do not accord with my experience. And people do not understand the, you know, our policy development process and so on.

So yes, that perception - I think what we're seeing is common theme about people outside the GNSO don't understand what it does. And I think sometimes we ourselves get confused about what it does and, you know, when people ask us about it we explain the council when we should be explaining working groups and the actual policy production process and the really impressive policy work that does get done.

(Jonathan): Well and the impact of that policy. That policy can have a binding contractual impact on operators within the sector (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

(David): Well exactly. Yes.

(Jonathan): All right, next in the queue I have - well I've got Jen.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thank you. This is Jennifer Wolfe, the NonCom appointee for North America.

It occurs to me as I've been listening to these conversations and we've had this similar conversation, you know, at meeting after meeting after meeting.

And I continue to hear concerns about the potential erosion of the impact of the GNSO as a whole and a lot of concerns about ICANN and the CEO and what's happening.

And it occurs to me that ICANN as an organization led by the CEO has developed a five year strategic plan and has developed committees to execute on those plans and has developed metrics and goals that can actually be tracked.

And that perhaps as a council we should offer the leadership to the GNSO to develop our own five year strategic plan that could include these topics like outreach, communication, engagement, process improvement, efficiency and review. All of those topics that everyone continues to talk about but let's actually create a plan with some goals and some metrics and some people who are charged with smaller pieces to execute on that.

(Jonathan): Thanks Jen. It's a good point.

I think I'll make a brief response. I don't want to respond to every point. But I think it's important to try. And I think my first step in all of that thinking was to try and get us thinking around what we might do on a 12 month basis. Whether or not it's a five year basis, I don't know. But it's a good point how we demonstrate a forward thinking, proactive developing group.

John I think you're next.

John Berard: Thank you. John Berard from the Business Constituency, I had settled upon what I wanted to say but then Jen's comments upset me, upset the process, not upset me; didn't mean to suggest that.

But first, I'll stick to what I wanted to say which is that I believe that we are undervaluing the work that the council does on behalf of the GNSO.

And one of the ways that I conclude that is the content of the action list that gets produced after each of our meetings and the project list that we maintain on the web site.

And it strikes me that we should think tactically, (Jonathan), about creating a single project or action list and use it to prioritize the work of the council and use it as a basis for input to the work of the council.

And showcase it on the gnso.icann.org web site as an essential tool for managing our agenda and community - and measuring community sentiment.

So I would make that recommendation moving forward.

The second thing is that anybody that has ever studied organizational behavior or who read Malcolm Gladwell's *The Tipping Point* appreciates that about as he said 125 people organizations get a little screwy. It's hard to manage them as a single entity.

Organizations tend to hierarchies. We still are dominated by this notion to create pyramids out of everything that we engage in.

And in the last couple of years we have seen the urge on the part of those on staff, senior staff position and other SO and AC organizations to project the GNSO Council as some sort of hierarchical entity when in fact it really is not a hierarchical entity.

And one of the things that Jen said that struck me is that I had been casually talking about this within the Business Constituency for some time now and that we are underutilizing the call for Issues Reports. I'm not suggesting that there should be Issue Reports with regard to the weather.

But my feeling is that if this truly is a bottom-up consensus driven organization then in each of the constituencies, in each of the stakeholder groups there are concerns that could be expressed at the council that could generate a report that could lend some insight, not necessarily leading to a PDP but could begin to showcase how the broadband of community

involvement leads to engagement at the council level and that council activity then can lead to policy development changes.

And so there are some tactical stuff in there, some FINRA in there and just so as not to ruin my reputation, not - I don't want anybody to think I am totally serious about everything.

It stuck me that when we talk about Fadi's blog I was struck that the word blog of course is a corruption of weblog which became blog. And then we had the corruption of video blog which became vlog and so now Fadi's blog strikes me as perhaps flog.

But I leave that for others to decide.

(Jonathan): So we're left hanging with the flog.

Man: Definitely flog. Yes.

(Jonathan): It - that runs the queue out. I'm just wondering if there are - I mean the sort of themes I'm hearing about are certainly one of the critical themes is this effective communication.

And I think to that extent we have done some stuff, right. I mean there's been with - there's been a whole lot of bilateral communicate, that's an overused word now but the communications with the different SO and ACs along the lines that Wolf talked about. There's things like updates on the web site, regular meeting base updates. There's video work.

I've spoken directly with Sally Costerton who's head of Communication at ICANN, Duncan Burns who works for her and some of that stuff comes out of that.

I think all of us as counselors are in effect ambassadors to propagate that message.

One of the themes I've been thinking about is when you go out there on the international stage and talk about the multi-stakeholder model and how valuable it is and how good it is, I think that relies on the GNSO in part and the GNSO Council, we end up being doing their job because we are in essence a critical part of that.

And so it's sort of built on us yet sometimes seems to bypass us. So how to make sure those remain connected is important.

John.

John Berard: And John Berard. But we can't get caught just with our - waiving our hands and saying pick me, pick me.

I mean the valuable work that we do should be showcased. The opportunity that we present to individuals in the community to be heard, to get more insight, gain some support for their point of view, that is really an important part of what we do.

So I would hate for us just to allow people to continue to see us as a hierarchical product of the GNSO when in fact we are a creature of the GNSO.

(Jonathan): And on that point and we do a pretty good job I would think of showcasing our work. Do we not?

Question, okay, so how could or should we do it better?

John Berard: Well that again that's why I suggest that we take what I view as serious evidence of the stuff that we do, the action list that come out of these

meetings, the project list that we have and we pull them forward. We make them more meaningful. And not just a method to report to the community as to what we're up to but an opportunity for them to comment on it and in a sense a parallel or supplemental public comment opportunity beyond what ICANN has in general.

So these - this is the work of the GNSO. This is the way we are prioritizing it. You know if you want to jump in feel free I mean.

(Jonathan): I think there's a chance that, I mean I don't know about you but I mean to me there's just an absolute deluge of information.

And I just wonder whether putting and the question is how do we make that - yes, and also not just one more piece of information.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I'll tell you what we do a good job of showcasing, how long it takes. Everybody knows that.

And I'm not saying it shouldn't take that long. To do it right it probably does with some improvements.

So if we're doing a good job of showcasing people wouldn't be so down on us.

It's interesting because if you look around, okay, the ccNSO takes just as long or longer. Look at the Expert Working Group. My personal opinion is they've done some great work and their latest report is really going in a good direction I personally think.

But they're going to take a year and a half. And they're a group of technical people that are, you know, compared to the GNSO are relatively homogeneous.

So I think part of the thing we need to do is point out if you're going to do multi-stakeholder and in particular bottom-up we need to help people understand what's involved in that.

And they don't. You know I see the ICANN Board today about where the DNSO was in the early 2000s. A lot of people were getting very frustrated because we weren't getting things done fast enough.

And so the council, the DNSO Council at the time, started to go in a direction of more legislative and let's do it ourselves. The Board's doing the same thing. It takes too long. And staff and I'm not talking about policy staff, I mean they know that, you know, if we do it top-down we can get it done a lot faster.

And it's true. It's absolutely true. But is that multi-stakeholder?

So I think one of the things maybe we need to resolve among ourselves first is you mentioned Steve saying bottom-up multi-stakeholder process. One of the questions I think we need to answer, how closely connected is bottom-up to multi-stakeholder because you can claim multi-stakeholder and not be bottom-up at all. In fact we've been seeing a whole lot of that in the last year.

So that - is there a critical connection there? I personally think there is. And that doesn't mean you can't have situations where you have to act top-down in certain cases like in an emergency security situation or something or that you always have to go back and get - go through a PDP to do anything. Not what I'm saying at all.

But how connected is bottom-up to multi-stakeholder in terms of what the ICANN community, bigger than just the GNSO is talking about. We have so

much lip service to it and yet we have a lot of stuff going on that's certainly not bottom-up.

It can be argued it's multi-stakeholder because I let you comment and then I made my own decision and so on.

So that's my response (Jonathan) to that.

(Jonathan): Thanks Chuck. Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I want to make an observation about some of the discussion that has gone on in here by noting that you guys are talking about how we improve the awareness and understanding of what the GNSO Policy Council does and the entities that work on policy and how the GNSO improves the understanding.

And I think that's really laudable. But I'm going to say that I significantly miss one of the opportunities when you did used to inform on what you were doing in a session that took place at every ICANN Meeting where every chair of an SO and AC gave a report.

Now very often I was the only person who asked questions. It was the honorary Marilyn Cade microphone that - but the point is you had an opportunity in front of the community. It was transcribed.

And I think sometimes we forget that many, many people rely on the transcripts to understand.

So I think you're missing an opportunity by not asking and looking at how does that information get relayed to the broader community.

I'm going to make an observation. Where's your Board today?

Do any of you know who your Board is?

How many of you see your Board, those of you who've been around for a while, how many of you see your Board in the bars in the evening as we used to?

How many of you actually see the Board sitting in the meetings when this work is going on? We used to. Why are they not with us?

How many - have you seen the agenda that your Board is meeting on today? Has two items on it, update and AOB.

So, you know, if we're going to talk about a bottom-up organization, we need to be thinking about how our Board is integrated into the whole process.

And I'm feeling a little lonely right now.

(Jonathan): And (Jeff) we'll come to you. I just want to get one point from you Marilyn just does anyone know, you or anyone else on that first point you made, why we dropped the SO and AC Reports?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

(Jonathan): Was there a motivation for it?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, I do know.

(Jonathan): Fire away, inform us.

Marilyn Cade: You may also notice that we no longer have real Board Meetings. The Board Meetings take place in - behind closed doors. And the rules you have. My concern is you have an affirmation of commitments that we worked hard on

and you have an ATRT 1 Report which requires the publication of the staff reports and documents upon which the Board makes its decisions.

How many of those reports are published?

There are no Minutes published about these closed Board Meetings. The Board is meeting on Saturday instead of Thursday in front of the community. You no longer have a lot of things that you had (Jonathan) which provided transparency and interaction with the community.

And those AO - those AC/SO Reports are only one small part of this. I can understand that some of the people thought oh this is boring. There are 25 people in the room. But there's a much broader community watching what we do.

(Jonathan): Thanks Marilyn. (Jeff).

(Jeff): Yes. I've got to wholeheartedly agree with Marilyn. And, you know, just emphasize as well that, you know, you talked about all the people that are "Watching" us, right, you have that slide or Marika prepared that slide, it's basically that there's the Innovation Panels, right.

So is anyone in this room on that Innovation Panel that's evaluating us? No. Is that a surprise? No.

So is anyone here other than the GNSO members of the ATRT 2? Is anyone here from that, other than people who participated in the GNSO (Alan), anyone else? No.

Anyone here from the Structural Improvement Committee that's heading up the whole GNSO Review? Is anyone here from that? No.

But each one of them is purporting to have expertise in what we do and who we are. And each one of them are going to review us, really? That's the message that needs to be sent to the Board tomorrow and to Fadi especially. You know don't go around trying to evaluate us and then none of you ever show up to watch and observe us. Yes, they can hold interviews after the fact.

And I was interviewed by the ATRT 2 and I'm sure others were as well. But that's not the same thing as evaluating us. I mean it's disrespectful and it's certainly...

(Jonathan): Yes. I respond to that immediately (Jeff). It does strike me because it kind of goes to the - and I hope I'm not going out on too much of a limb but I was asked a question this morning as part of the chair of candidacy interview which said, you know, what are you doing to reach out to the stakeholder groups and constituencies?

And I said that in a sense my view was that's definitely part of the job. But it also goes two ways. And my door's open metaphorically to doing that.

And in a sense I guess that's the message we should be saying. You know because we're kind of beating ourselves up about communication, outreach, effectiveness of what - and what we should be doing.

But in a sense we should emphasize that the GNSO and the GNSO Working Group Meetings, these are open meetings that anyone from the GAC, from the Board, from the Review Teams can simply come in and sit in and either listen in or participate in to the extent that they feel comfortable doing, to the extent that their primary organization permits them to do so.

So in a sense I think that door is open point needs to be made. Working Groups, weekend sessions, telephone calls, broadcasts of Council Meetings, etcetera. So good point and I hope I'm reinforcing it.

Brian.

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt in Social Property Constituency. Just coming back to your point (Jonathan) and I agree that we're inundated with information and we are challenged to figure out a way to communicate maybe in a better way what we're accomplishing at council.

I'm wondering if it wouldn't be helpful to do an Annual Report or perhaps something even more frequent in plain English kind of highlights what the council has accomplished.

I think a lot of times the information that we put out is very detailed and has all the language of all the motions and I think everyone probably glazes over and nobody reads them and so I think it might be helpful to help us communicate to the community in a more digestible way what we're able to accomplish.

(Jonathan): Yes, good point and I mean I think that may well be something we could do. I just want to again without any sense of appearing to sound defensive, remind us what we have done. I mean is this the work that Marika and (Co) have done on the policy briefings which I know all of us responded very warmly to in Durban and again now.

I think Lars you might, I mean we set up an ability for tweets to come from the GNSO Council Chair.

So there's been a series of - I don't have all of them on the tip of my fingers but it's important to know that we haven't been sitting still on this over the last year or so. As I said there's the video material on the front page of the web site. There is stuff going on that may not be comprehensive, may not be quite getting it quite right yet. You may be right. But an annual digest or a monthly

digest or a meeting digest on the way and along the lines of what the BC does. I'm very receptive to it all.

But I just want to emphasize that we have been doing some of that work already.

Steven DelBianco: For my members at (Net Choice), I've taken to realize they don't read long reports. But they do look at the cover and the cover is an info graphic.

So on the cover I always have histograms and to trend diagrams, (double) diagrams and four (Quadra) diagrams. Something that pictorial represents the sheer quantity of work that's been done in GNSO so it's really just translating the work that staff is already compiling and presenting it in info graphics with some color like a dashboard. And we really ought to be there by now in GNSO and surprising that we're not.

(Jonathan): Thanks Steve. I think my sense is that we can now turn. We're coming up to the top of the hour. And so it seems to me like a good point to draw a line under this preparatory and in effect theme setting discussions for plans for going forward but also what is effectively setting the scene for our conversations with the CEO, with the Board and the GAC tomorrow.

So I think I'd like to - unless there's anyone else has - feels there's a need to make a comment, I'd like to stop the recording now on this strategic session and then open it up in a minute or so as time to turn it into what we practically do about talking with Board, GAC and CEO tomorrow.

Right, so can we stop the recording on that session please and just pause proceedings for one moment.

END