
HYDERABAD – Joint Meeting ICANN Board and Contracted Party House
Sunday, November 06, 2016 – 11:00 to 12:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

STEVE CROCKER: Good morning, everybody. The joint meeting of the contracted party house --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: No. It's contracted parties, isn't it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: There's multiple parties.

-- and the ICANN board. As always, we strive to jump right into substance. We don't regulate content on the net but we do try to deal with content here.

So dispensing with formalities, let's jump right in.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Paul, this is really you and your colleagues' meeting. Introduce, organize, and proceed.

PAUL DIAZ: Thank you very much, Steve.

Thank you, everyone, for being here. We shared with staff the issues we wanted to raise and staff shared your key concerns. In the interest of spreading the wealth, our vice chair, Samantha Demetriou, is going to introduce our issues, which tie very nicely with the questions that the board presented to us, so let me turn it over to Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you, Paul. This is Samantha Demetriou, FairWinds Partners. As we all know, this is the first meeting that's taking place after the IANA transition, and after that very significant undertaking and that large body of work, the community is starting to get back to the regular business of ICANN work.

And we see that there's an opportunity now, with the post-transition world and under new ICANN leadership, to be even better than we were before and to work better than we have before.

So the board presented us with the two questions that basically consisted of: What do you as the board and the ICANN organization need to do to make the transition work for us? And secondly, what do we collectively -- the board, the ICANN organization, and the community -- need to do to advance trust and confidence in what we do?

So as Paul indicated, the topics that we had wanted to bring up and discuss with the board map actually very nicely onto those two topics, so today what we're hoping to do is divide the session into two halves where first we address the first question and secondly we address your second question. Okay?

So to kick off the first half and answer Question Number 1, we'd like to cover a few key topics. Namely, the role of cross-community working groups in policy development and in the ICANN community, the allocation of resources between cross-community working groups and policy development process working groups, and finally, the manageability of work that we collectively undertake and the issue of volunteer fatigue.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. So you listed three things but the -- in my mind they group into CCWG issues and volunteer things, and I think we want to deal with them -- separate them in that way.

I think a few of us will want to speak on the cross-community working group, but I'll just start off with a covering statement.

The cross-community working group concept came into vogue a few years ago and is being exercised multiple times and is a -- basically an advance, a positive step forward, and at the same time, like any of these things, it raises the kinds of questions that you're asking about.

The cross-community working group on accountability was a -- perhaps a singular and unique arrangement that went on for a very long time, cost quite a lot of money, and sort of took over, in a way.

We are now looking, and -- engaged with the community at looking at what the role of cross-community working groups are with respect to the established organization of supporting organizations and advisory committees.

The -- despite the enormous size of the revised bylaws, I don't believe cross-community working groups are mentioned, much less chartered and authorized and so forth, so this is a kind of -- from that point of view, an ad hoc mechanism, a good one, but when we now look at what the authority structure is and so forth, it really rests back on the chartering organizations, which are the SOs and ACs.

And one of the other things of great concern, of course, is the cost structure, and the basic posture that we have is that the costs of running a -- I'll call it an ordinary or -- you know, a CCWG ought to come out of existing resources unless there is special action taken to identify a need and go through a budgeting process for that.

So with that as a sort of foundational statement, is there any- -- anybody else who wants to add to that on the board? You were pointing at --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Steve? It's Jonathan. I'm prepped to speak a little on this, but not -- I'll defer to board colleagues first.

STEVE CROCKER: I think you got it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: All right. Thanks.

Well, I mean, the points you made resonate with the kind of discussion we've been having earlier. I mean, I think I picked up

two points there, structure and resource, and when you look at the kind of thing we were -- were prepared to say and think about, there's some consistency there.

I mean, clearly there have been some very high-profile examples of CWG work recently, and the community -- we -- have worked very well, I think, to define some standard procedures by which these CWGs work. So I think we should have confidence in them in their appropriate role. And in fact, the board's recognition notwithstanding, perhaps a unique recognition in and around the bylaws, but actually, generally the board seems to be cognizant of the value of this output and prepared, subject to your -- there not being any conflict with your fiduciary or legal constraints, to be at least respectful, if not, you know, accepting of the requirements of these CWGs, of the outputs of these CWGs, so that's been good.

But from our point of view, from -- from a contracted parties house point of view, I mean, we -- we feel it's very important to sort of highlight the primacy of the GNSO PDP, which again goes to your point, the structure, the bylaws, the appropriate place for where -- where policy development is as it pertains to the contracted parties.

And as you know, there's a very specific and ICANN bylaw defined role for the work of PDPs and we of course bind ourselves to those outcomes.

So I guess it's just we remind ourselves, we remind you that, you know -- to be -- that -- of the specific and distinct role of the GNSO PDP and that that is the place for the GNSO policy development process.

And obviously you've got people -- you know, Bruce, Becky, others -- at your historic and future disposal who are very familiar with all of this, but really it's about coming back to putting policy work in PDPs as first and foremost in our minds, doing it properly and taking those through the proper process and, in a sense, getting back to normal in the post-transition environment where significant resources have gone into other areas, but actually when we think about our primary purpose, it's about focusing in on PDP policy development.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. Let me -- let me just bolster that, in a way.

You were talking in terms of reminding the board about the role of the thing and I was thinking, "Well, those are the words that I would want to say to the CWG, to the cross-community working group, and say, you know, 'don't -- don't to your work and think

that that's done because our primary channel is through the policy development process."

The CCWG was -- the idea was intended to cut across the sort of siloed nature and I always think of this as a constructive process for generating a proposal, as opposed to imposing a decision, and that a proposed dispose model, if you like, is absolutely essential.

So I think CCWGs are a great idea for constructive thought process, for brainstorming, putting together proposals and so forth, but it still has to pass through the -- all of the slots in the process, and, you know, we could go on about that, but I think that's the basic idea.

One practical small detail is that as we've written many messages and documents about CCWG, we find that sometimes the term means the general idea and sometimes it's referring to a specific working group, and so we'd like to gravitate -- this is just a small clerical thing for everybody -- like to gravitate toward the idea that a specific working group should be CCWG, dash, XY, and if necessary, we'll have a registry of XYs. So one that you and I are most familiar with is AP, for auction proceeds, for example, as opposed to for accountability.

A small detail for clarity. Yeah.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Just, I guess, an observation of -- of the benefits of the recent CCWG and then trying to see how you replicate that in the PDP.

I think one of the benefits of the CCWG is you got buy-in on the scope of the work from the GAC and ALAC, in particular, but also some of the other advisory committees, you got buy-in to contribute members to the working group that did the work, and you got buy-in to endorse the output, and if we look at some of the other instances where we haven't had that, it's been problematic.

So let's say, for example, you don't involve the GAC early on in understanding the scope of a particular piece of policy work. The GAC don't feel like they need to provide any resources to that policy work. You complete the policy work and then they read the final document and then they go, "Oh, great, now we're reading this for the first time and we don't like it" and then they'll -- they send advice to the board saying, "We don't like it. You need to do something about it." And that's clearly dysfunctional because it tends to waste a lot of the time that had been done early on.

So one thing to think about with a PDP is what mechanism can you do to get input on the scope. In other words, the charter and what the work's about. What mechanism can you do to

encourage groups like ALAC and particularly GAC, to put people into the PDP. And what mechanism can you do to actually get them to endorse the output of the PDP before it comes to the board.

So just sort of think of about -- to me it's almost top and tailing. You know, getting that input early on so that we're agreeing on the scope and getting that endorsement at the end when you complete your process rather than, you know, clearly some groups just not engaging at all until it's done.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'm conscious -- I'd just make a very brief reply and then -- I mean, those are -- I think those are three very good structured points but I would just remind you of the work that we did with the GNSO/GAC consultation group and all of the structured and detailed work on early engagement of the GAC in the PDP and the fact that the GNSO and I believe the GAC are both scheduled to endorse those outcomes at this meeting. So we should just be cognizant of that.

BRUCE TONKIN: Cherine?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. Just to add to that part, I think we need the board's help in some of that, Bruce, and the IGO/INGO situation is an example of that.

If the board won't back up the GNSO policy development process, then there's no incentive for the GAC or anyone else to participate if they feel like they can get their desired outcome by going around.

So I hear what you're saying and as -- as a PDP chair of the subsequent procedures, we've been doing everything we can to try to get input from all of the advisory committees and other supporting organizations, including even at the charter stage, and so we understand that.

But unless we get the appropriate backup from the board, when the GNSO goes through its process, it's going to be meaningless.

BRUCE TONKIN: Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. I -- Jonathan, I want to really understand the comment you made because it's a very, very -- very important comment.

So the bylaws clearly state the PDP process and, in general, the expectation of the board. It's a process that's comes up through

the multistakeholder model. You know, it is not for the board to just go against it and reject it. They're supposed to accept it.

The cross-community is a new phenomenon that turned up in the last, you know, couple of years. But there was also a presumption that the board accepts -- particularly on WS1 accepts the recommendation, almost, you know, because it's a community-driven process.

When you say "go back to normal," what do you mean by that in regards to the -- any CCWG work that comes up? Is it just you see it as just a proposal that the board could evaluate, pass back, or -- so we need -- I don't think we have reached some very good -- we're very clear on the PDP. There's no doubt about that. We were very clear on WS1 and I think we have some clarity on WS2, but I don't think, going forward, we have absolute clarity on what to do with a recommendation coming out of a CCWG, other than it's just a proposal for the board to evaluate, accept, reject, or there's an expectation because it's a cross-community bottom-up process that the board also takes that to the same value as a PDP.

So I'd like to continue a little bit that discussion and maybe we don't get a full answer today, but it's something that we ought to really clarify. Otherwise, there will be a mismatch of expectation going forward.

Do you care to respond to that or...

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I think I'd love to defer to others to respond as well, but just to be clear on the "back to normal" remark, I think that has less to do with how the board evaluates a CWG, which I agree is a valid and interesting concern, and it's more about recognizing the primacy of the PDP, the clear structures, and that that in many ways is the -- first and foremost the focus of the volunteers in -- in -- in and around policy development, and over the last couple of years we've seen CWGs trump everything in resources, in focus, and so it's really -- that's what I mean by "back to normal." Rather more simply a focus. But I'm not -- I'm -- and clearly with the PDP, as you say, we have -- we have a well-known and well-defined structure. I'd love to hear what others think about the role of the CWG and the board's capacity to take on those recommendations and so on.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me just reiterate, the CCWG on accountability I think is a -- a unique experience and it's very natural that it would color everyone's perceptions about CCWGs in general, and I would counsel that there have been CCWGs prior to that and there's obviously ones going on, and that it's important to remove the CCWG on accountability from the -- from the set in terms of

thinking about it as a pattern and thinking about things. It's really a very special experience and successful, quite, but at the same time not the normal way in which things are going to proceed.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Paul. And -- just to level set a little bit, I may have misheard but I think --

So let's be very clear. This is not the first time we've done this, so it doesn't matter what you call it for a minute. I'll get back to what you call it in a second. There was a -- back in 2001-2002, there was a process by which we came up with a -- what we called at the time ICANN 2.0, and I can't remember what it was called but it was, in effect, a cross-community working group because -- because the whole of the community got together and worked out how we were going to restructure ICANN. Which is, in effect, what we've just done, albeit for different reasons, but nonetheless, we've done it.

When it comes to -- so I agree with Steve that I think it's very important -- we have talked at some stages about changing the name of what -- what we've called the CCWG and CWG to something else for historic -- for history so that we don't get confused, so that every time somebody says "CCWG" we don't

immediately think of a huge life-changing across-ICANN structural thing.

CCWGs have been used for policy. The ccNSO's IDN fast track is probably -- probably a good example of that. That was, in effect, a CCWG. The ccNSO ran it. They chose to turn it into something that was cross-community because they felt it was critically important that -- that there was -- you know, everybody was involved.

So I think you can -- they can be useful from a policy point of view, depending on what you're working on, but I agree that we need to be very careful to ensure that we do not end up with a sort of rule of thumb that says the place for policy for ccTLDs is no longer the ccNSO, it's actually a CCWG, and the place for policy for gTLDs is no longer the GNSO. We have to -- we have to make sure that we remember and guard that the SOs are the place where policy is done. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman, and I think I have two points, one which is a response to that, and then the second kind of dovetails and transitions to the next subject on there.

And the first is that with -- that's a great message, Chris, that should also be delivered, I think, to the GAC. In some of the discussions that happened over the last few days in terms of geographic names and, you know, why we -- the desire for the GNSO to have those discussions within the PDP on geographic names, I was approached by several GAC members who are trying to get -- rather than putting it into the PDP, trying to get a cross-community working group on geographic names. And when you ask them, you know, why they want that, it's more of an emotional response that, you know, they feel like a CCWG can be jointly controlled, it's not under the, quote, control of the GNSO, they believe that -- they have the perception that because ultimately in a PDP -- in a GNSO PDP it's the GNSO that ultimately votes on whether to accept the recommendations and the GAC is not necessarily -- not necessarily comfortable with that. I shouldn't say "the GAC." The couple members that I spoke with were not comfortable with the notion of any work that they're doing to ultimately go to a vote of the GNSO.

But it really does need to be re-established that the GNSO is the appropriate place to develop policy with respect to generic top-level domains. That is key. And I think that's a message that the board needs to, again, reiterate to the GAC, that that's where policy of generic top-level domains are -- or is developed. And

then I'll wait on the second point because I think Becky and others might have some comments.

GRAEME BUNTON: I think we have -- Sorry, this is Graeme. We have Edmond in the queue and then Becky.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Edmon Chung here. So what Cherine was asking actually, Chris pretty much brought up the exact part that I want to bring up as well. And in relation to PDPs, so the answer to that question is really "it depends." It depends on what subject matter it is about. So if it's about gTLDs, then it should defer to GNSO PDP. If it is a matter about ccTLDs, then it should defer to ccNSO policies.

So then what happens is that in building on what Jeff was saying actually, when we were preparing for this meeting, part of what Jeff was saying is that it is possible that, you know, it may be possible that even beyond the early engagement with GAC and everything else, during the PDP, there could be mechanisms that spin up just like what the IDN ccTLD fast track created to invite -- more formally invite other SOs and ACs in the participation of those discussion and deliberations whether it becomes spin-off in a full-fledged CCWG or some other form, whatever

mechanism. But, ultimately, it should come back to the primacy of what Jonathan said is primacy of the GNSO to create policies for gTLDs. I think that's something that is probably important.

But we do hear what Bruce is saying, that during our PDP process, it's important to not only invite but also document, I guess, and make sure that we document some kind of input, what input we did get from the different SOs and ACs. And that mechanism probably hasn't been quite created yet.

Is it going to be a CCWG? Is it going to be some other mechanism? That's probably something the community needs to think about, too. So...

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Edmond.

I have Becky.

BECKY BURR:

So I just want to be -- Jonathan mentioned the CCWG on CCWGs, and I think it's a very helpful document for being clear about the fact that these things are not to be used to route around the PDP process, that they have to have sort of specific and limited goals and time periods and that kind of stuff and clear charters and that nothing comes out of a CCWG in and of itself. It always has -

- the outcome always has to go back to the SOs and ACs who are the chartering organizations before there's any further movement on it.

So, you know, it's going to take some time for people to begin to understand that we can go to this and -- this report and look at it and say it doesn't work here. It is not meant to say you can't ever deviate from it again. But I think with respect to the policy development questions, it's very -- very clearly laid out and we need to really keep referring to that.

And I do think that the other part about it that's very useful is it talks about what CCWGs have been successful and what have not and what are the characteristics of those that are successful. And that also plays into this in terms of limiting and avoiding routing around things.

So I just want to commend it to everybody. It's not the most earth-shattering document, but it does talk about best practices that will keep us honest on this.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Becky. I have got Jonathan and, then I think we kick back -- Jonathan, Bruce, and then we will kickback to Sam.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Three very quick points. One, I think Steve dealt with the naming issue earlier. It's not a difficult problem to deal with, naming of these things. Simply call it CWG something, and we deal with that. We put that aside.

I think we've done some good work, as Becky said, on process formalization. I think that's come through two key mechanisms. One is primarily the work that was done on CCWG process formalization. But, secondly, we've actually learned from experience. And so we've got -- I think we're a long way forward.

And the third point I'd make is just to remind everyone that PDPs -- GNSO PDPs are wide open to participation. Now, we might have reticence to participate. There may be issues. But there's no reason why anyone can't join. They are as open as a CWG to participation. Thanks.

BRUCE TONKIN: I guess I'm thinking back to your original introduction, Jonathan. It sounded like there's two different points going on here. One is: Where is the place for policy development for gTLDs? And that's actually set out in the bylaws, and it is the GNSO. And any change to that would require a change in the bylaws. I'm hearing a second thing, mainly looking at the heading there, a little bit from what you talked, which I guess is: Where does the organization put its resources?

So for the accountability, we spent several million dollars on external legal advice. We've probably spent several hundred thousand dollars on travel. Is that also part of your question? In other words, which might be your second point up here. But where does the organization allocate its resources?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Someone else will speak to that, Bruce. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Bruce. This is Jeff Neuman. That's a perfect segue. I couldn't have done that better myself.

But, yeah, in terms of travel funding and resources, you know, especially with respect to travel funding, the purpose of providing travel support is to provide resources to those who would otherwise be unable to obtain funding absent such support but also to increase a diversity of participation amongst the Internet community in the activities that are performed by ICANN.

But for the past several years, it appears that all extra funding for travel to ICANN meetings, other than what's generally available to the SOs and ACs, really has only been made available to those participating in the ICANN transition and the accountability process. Yet very little funding has been made

available for those participating in ICANN's policy development processes. That's one of the core activities of ICANN.

In other words, ample funding has been made available for those that seek to justify why ICANN exists or improving ICANN's accountability but not to supporting the actual mission of ICANN. And that seems completely backwards.

As just an example, even though the transition has already happened, but for the current meeting a request was made for funding for participants in the subsequent procedures PDP that were otherwise unable -- the people were otherwise unable to attend for lack of funds.

Two of those persons were actual work track co-chairs that are relatively new participants to ICANN and have dedicated a considerable amount of resources to volunteer in their endeavors. We were told in theory, well, they could receive one night's funding to attend but not full support for the trip. They couldn't get airfare, they couldn't get the rest of their hotel stay, and they couldn't get per diem for the entire stay. So obviously due to the inability to get a sufficient amount of funds, they were unable to attend.

But then subsequent to that, we found out eight people received full funding for the CCWG on accountability, four people achieved partial funding which accounted for eight full airfares,

54 additional hotel days and 53 extra per diem days. And of the 12 people that got that funding, all of them -- and I repeat all of them -- are frequent ICANN participants that have -- for other ICANN meetings have gotten full funding from their -- either their supporting organizations or from the At-Large Committee.

So I don't want to diminish the importance of making sure that ICANN is accountable. But, you know, does it really matter if an organization is the most accountable organization in the world if we can't get adequate support to carry out the mission?

So we're not asking for additional funding to be made available but, really, to reallocate the funds to reflect the core mission and activities of ICANN. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Jeff.

I have got Rinalia and then Bruce.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Jeff, thank you for raising this concern. It's also a concern on our part, and we've started looking at how resources are being allocated across the ICANN community. And at the moment, staff has been gathering information so that we have the necessary data to look at it comprehensively. And I think what

we want to do in moving forward is to essentially ensure there is sufficient capacity focus in the policy aspect. We acknowledge that there are gaps, and we want it to be enhanced. We would like to prioritize more participation, diversity, and in moving forward in terms of resource allocation, I think that we would want balanced and fair allocation which may not necessarily translate into equal. We want to have balanced interests representation in the ICANN system based on our multistakeholder model. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you.

Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, I think you raise a very good point, Jeff. It's one of my concerns as well because if I look at the collection of accountability mechanisms we have numerous reviews about to kick off as part of the bylaws and also as part of the Affirmation of Commitments that we had with U.S. government. And we have the accountability work so that if you actually look at the proportion -- and a good thing would just be to track where the travel funding goes.

I think you have actually probably a good indicator where are the travel slots sitting. You probably find the travel slots sitting in review versus the travel slots sitting in actually work that helps end users is probably significantly out of proportion of what you would ideally want it to be. And I think something we have to be very careful of is how we're weighting the use of the volunteer pool because I think we have a finite pool of volunteers available to do work.

Volunteers in many cases chase the travel slots. So if there is a travel slot to be on the Nominating Committee or a travel slot to be on the competition and review committee, then volunteers will put their name forward for those roles.

But then if there's a case, we need somebody to participate in the PDP working group and there's no travel slot, you are not getting the best people.

So I think we really got to think that very carefully, is where are we actually allocating our travel funding and is it actually leading to improvements for end users or is it really just becoming very bureaucratic. And, as you point out, Jeff, let's have a review to review the review to review the review. And it feels a bit that way.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Bruce.

Stephane?

STEPHANE van GELDER: Thanks, Graeme. This is Stephane van Gelder. I'm the vice chair policy for the registry stakeholder group. As we can see, these topics are all linked together. So what we just discussed in terms of CCWGs and resource allocations also link to volunteer burnout and volunteer fatigue. And we wanted to bring this issue to the table and discuss it with you, not with an approach of asking the board to solve the issue. It's an issue that's as old as ICANN itself, I think. And it's one that we've discussed many times in the past but just to look at it together as a community because it is a community -- it's an issue that impacts the whole community. And it impacts the whole community in one very specific way, and that is that the more volunteer burnout and fatigue there is, the less we are able to do service to our communities by tackling these issues that we have in front of us in our workload with the right amount of detail, attention, and quality of work that they require.

So we did want to discuss it. We are preparing a document that I believe Paul and Graeme will be sending to the board that will have much more detail on these issues and perhaps suggestions on how we could tackle them. But I did want to bring to the

table a few of those suggestions now. We're all familiar with the issue, what can be done about it. We feel there's an element of training, of working group chairs and co-chairs and leaderships - leadership teams of groups that could be done to make sure that the groups work in a more efficient manner.

We feel that there's some type of mentoring that we should continue to work on to enable the people that are experienced, ICANN community members to pass on some knowledge to incoming ICANN community members so that the threshold to participation is not so high. We feel that there is a lack of realistic estimates as to the workload and the time frames of this work that is given to participants which makes it very difficult, for example, for companies behind these participants or the participants themselves, if they're self-employed or just unemployed or whatever they're doing, to be able to participate because they can't estimate the workload. So they don't know exactly what they'll be called to do and how much time they'll be called to give to ICANN.

We feel that there are some technical solutions such as better Adobe support perhaps that would enable these groups to work better and to be more productive in their work.

And without going into the full detail of all our points, just a couple more. One is language. I think -- I mean, that's a

personal favorite of mine. I think it's very important that we continue to push for better language support. It is impossible -- it remains impossible for people to participate in ICANN work if they're not relatively fluent in English. Other organizations do it. Why are we unable to facilitate participation for people in their native tongues so that they are able to both communicate with others and understand what's going on and participate?

And one last point would be that we need to try and break up the work that we have into shorter slots, shorter blocks, so that we are not looking at workload that is stretching into years but perhaps only stretching into months. And that would be more manageable for everyone getting involved.

These are just some of the ideas. We're trying to be constructive. As I said, we'll be sending out -- our chairs will be sending a document as a follow-on. But we felt it was important to start the conversation at least. Thank you very much.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Stephane.

I have Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Stephane. Your comment reinforces our understanding of the challenges, and I'm glad that we have constructive feedback from you on moving forward.

I just wanted to know whether there has been a connection with what they call the stakeholder journey initiative that staff is working on to help with the problem of sustainable volunteer pool. Do you have some reaction to that?

STEPHANE van GELDER: Short answer is no.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Can I encourage there is a connection with that? And I will ask Sally Costerton and her team to follow up with you. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thank you.

Anyone else on this topic before we pass back to Sam? Great. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay. Thanks, Graeme. This is Samantha Demetriou again. So everyone made my job pretty easy by going between the topics pretty seamlessly. So thanks, guys.

And we're almost right at the halfway mark, so I think this is a natural point to shift gears towards the second question that the board put to us which just as a reminder is: What do we collectively, the board, the ICANN organization, and the community need to do to advance trust and confidence in what we do? And I'm assuming here "what we do" refers to the work that ICANN does.

So I'm actually going to turn the floor to my colleague Stephanie Duchesneau who is going to speak to this topic.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: So I'm going to speak to the topic of ICANN staff engagement briefly and how it fits into both the overall question of getting back to good and what Sam indicated because I do that think this is one of the factors that right now is seriously diminishing trust at least within the contracted party house.

When we had our new CEO join a few months back, we heard a lot about how one of his key goals for the first part of his tenure would be to clarify the roles of the ICANN board, of ICANN staff, of the ICANN community, and also emphasize this vision of ICANN the organization as being a facilitator and just one part, one voice amongst many. And that was really exciting and really refreshing to the registry and registrar communities both.

But I think we are still seeing a serious gap between what we're expressing as the vision between ICANN the organization's role and the reality of what we are experiencing in a lot of our ongoing work. And there's a lot of examples where this gap manifests itself.

But to speak to a couple, on the one side, we see issues where staff's interpretation of how something should be implemented, even where the policy text itself is silent on it contradicts with the intent of the policy. And an example here is right now we're talking about how to implement the consistent labeling and display requirements that came out -- I'm sorry, no, here we're talking about the change of registrant process on the registrar side.

And on this -- and specifically for registrants that are using privacy and proxy services, there's two ways that this policy could have been implemented. On the one hand, you could trigger the process which was intended to provide additional checks and balances in case -- in order to protect against domain hijacking. So you could trigger it in one of two cases. One where the actual customer information, the actual registrant information is being changed, which in cases wouldn't necessarily be the information that's reflected in WHOIS. Or you could trigger the process only when there's changes to the public data.

And we understand that the latter is easier to monitor by ICANN staff. But the community and the registrars -- and we've discussed this with, I think, other factions as well and there's strong agreement that in order to uphold the actual intent of the policy, it would be the former recommendation, that what matters is when you are changing the actual registrant information and not necessarily just the private data.

Now, while the policy is silent on it, staff has pretty aggressively in its communications with the registrars pushed the alternate interpretation. And this goes against what we think the role of ICANN as has been -- as has been defined through the recommendations of the policy and implementation review team, what it should be within these IRTs, within these policy development processes.

And then we see another category of interaction where there's areas of serious work that the community hasn't necessarily asked staff to engage on and in particular we've seen now in the consistent labeling and display policy that there's two requirements, one that registries be implementing the recommendations that came out of the thick WHOIS working group. And separate from that, there's a requirement in the contract to implement the RDAP protocol when it's finalized.

Despite not having been asked, staff spent extensive work developing additional requirements that go on top of the RDAP profile and that there's not actually a contractual requirement to implement these additional ICANN-developed items on top of the protocol itself. And this would be one thing if we were doing away with WHOIS and there was an expectation that the same information should be available, but the expectation is that we're going to be running the two systems in parallel. And it's not -- it's not that staff has developed this as a resource. There's actually been aggressive pushback by staff that registries will additionally have to implement these requirements, even though they're not coming from the community, they're coming directly from staff. And they weren't requested by the community.

And to kind of tie this in also to the topic of volunteer fatigue, we're all tired, we're all busy, and it really feels like the last stretch is continuously not a battle -- whether it's intracommunity work or work within the stakeholder group, it's not actually a battle within the community. We're battling with staff, and that really goes against what we perceive to be like the role of staff as a facilitator, as a mediator.

GRAEME BUNTON: Rinalia, please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I'll take a shot, Steve. I think we've been -- awareness in the board has been raised about these kinds of issues, and I'm just going to speak about it generally and not about a specific case. I think that there are instances where staff are having difficulty with implementation because there may not be sufficient information to guide them with regards to how implementation should be done. And in the past there hasn't really been a process to deal with it between staff and board. And I think the CEO has made a proposal that whenever he encounters that kind of challenge, he would come back and raise the problem with the board and then we would somehow facilitate the process of how to address that in terms of the challenges that you're experiencing with the ICANN organization. At least that's how I understood it.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. I've got Chris and then Jonathan and then Donna.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Stephanie, can you -- so what I think Rinalia is talking about is the gap that sometimes exists when policy comes up, there are gaps in it and we've accepted the policy and it moves on and it's described as implementation. And sometimes -- if we do what

you want, you're fine with it. And if we don't, you're not. But you're also talking about, if I understand it correctly, and I'm being specific about this RDAP thing, what you're saying -- I just want to make sure I understand. You're saying that this is a -- appears to be an ICANN organization-imposed -- staff-imposed thing that there is nothing in the policy about and it seems to be being tacked on to something else which isn't -- which is policy. So what would be -- so in your eyes what would be the correct way for that to be dealt with? Would it be that that -- we'd pass it back to you? How would we -- how should it be done? If I -- if I'm right about the way I've explained it.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Sure, so from my perspective on this, and I'm sorry I'm cutting in just to respond directly. There's a lot of ongoing policy work that's happening right now for WHOIS, and one of the things that we're actually considering is how can we take advantage, how should policies change, whether they should change in order to take advantage of the new features that RDAP is potentially providing. And until that time, registries and voluntarily registrars may implement the protocol, but they should do so, as long as they're running WHOIS in parallel and meeting the contractual requirements for WHOIS, through a model of their choosing, as long as it corresponds with the actual requirements developed through the IETF. When the time comes that the

community has developed policies, most likely through the policy development process on registration directory services, those are likely going to define the requirements for how to implement -- additional requirements for how to implement RDAP.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: May I just respond? But if I understand correctly, you don't want to have a discussion today about specifically that. That is -- you're using that as an example of a problem that you're describing as ICANN organization, staff, imposing stuff, policy, on things where they should in fact be coming to the GNSO and saying, this is policy, you work it out, that's the issue.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: Correct.

GRAEME BUNTON: I've got -- Goran would like to respond. Please.

GORAN MARBY: I was asked to get back in the room. So I have a slight feeling what you're talking about. I think when it comes to the policy work it's extremely important. One of the journeys that I've been engaging together with the board and my team is to kind

of clear out roles. And I think that goes to the heart of the new bylaws that we have to have clear roles. And that's how we ended up in what I try to describe sometime when I talk about ICANN I talk about the whole thing. And I -- but we have different roles. The community writes the policies and decides upon them, the board tells me to go and implement them, and my other role is to support the community. You have to know there is doubt. In addition to that, on my and the board's initiative, for the first time ever in ICANN history, we will now next week take a decision -- the board will take a decision on a paper that actually describes what the board tells the CEO to do. It only took 18 years. And so I think we're getting there. I think that a lot of people have different views on the different roles. But writing them down and talking about it, I think that's important.

I think that -- just when I came in Rinalia also raised a very important point. I call it a process for failure which is more has to say my sense of humor than anything else is that when something comes to the board and through the board and it turns out the -- the community has not really reached the whole conclusion or consensus and we go into the implementation phase and it turns out there are different parts of the community that has not really agreed. Because I know that you know as well as I do to take something with policy, for instance, and put that into some sort of contractual arrangement or agreement

could sometimes be a little bit difficult. So we need to figure out our process. And I think there are several of those processes we have to go forward.

I instructed my team going into this meeting, and I have done that, that we are going to be neutral in any discussions because it has to be the community that draw the lines on how to agree. It's -- and I don't say that we haven't done that. It's just that I think by drawing that line that it will become clearer for everybody. My intention is that my job is to implement the policies that the community decides upon. The side effect of that is that the policies has to be implementable and agreed upon when they are reached -- when they reach us. And I think that that is something we together as a collective have to work better with. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. I've got Jonathan and then Donna, then Jordyn in the queue.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Two quick points. One, I mean, I think we should acknowledge that, Goran, your staff did meet with the registry stakeholder group X.com at this meeting and notwithstanding the seriousness and the validity of Stephanie's points, we may be

facing some form of timing issue. These may be legacy points that don't link in with your and your staff's current way of working. So there's -- there may be an issue there.

But I specifically wanted to highlight something -- Stephanie made reference to slightly inaccurately policy implementation review team when we meant -- we mean working group. And I think that's a group that Chuck, if I recall you chaired, and that was some significant work to deal with some of the kind of potential gaps that might have come -- that we were all aware of post new gTLD program. So I think all of us owe it to ourselves to be familiar with that work and the outcomes of that group because that is a very helpful step forward in bridging some of these issues. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jonathan. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Graeme. Donna Austin from Neustar. So I think in terms of practical solutions, and we recognize that we'd have to say between the Registry Stakeholder Group and staff we've had a somewhat adversarial relationship, which is unfortunate and not necessarily one that we're -- both of us are comfortable with. We had some discussions this morning about, you know,

possible solutions, and I think one of the possible solutions is that when we get at loggerheads there might be some value in having mediation between the two groups to try to -- even just getting an independent third party in the room might help to push things forward, so we can actually tease apart what the issues are and get to the heart of the problem and then solve it and move forward. So I think that's, you know something could consider. We also, you know, thought that mediation is a good idea, but we also, in relation to the role that some of the GDD staff have, they tend to be jack-of-all-trades to some extent and that can create its own challenges. So to the extent that somebody has to lead, I don't want to call it a negotiation, but discussions between the stakeholder group and staff, it might be helpful to ensure that they do have the skills necessary in materials of potential -- you know, that they can actually mediate the situation and, you know, perhaps we can be a little bit better in the way that we communicate as well.

And I think the third thing is, it goes to something that Goran said in relation to documenting expectations up front. I think it will go a long way to improving the relationship if we had -- before we got into these discussions, we understood the roles and responsibilities of everybody involved and when we started to get off track we could actually go back to that and use that as a basis for discussion.

So we don't like to hold up these discussions because it's not in the best interest of our businesses to do so, but we do get very frustrated at the length of time that it takes to get issues off the table. You know, we've got three or four issues that have been going around, not necessarily in circles but not making a great deal of progress for the last two years. So we want to find -- you know, we want to work with GDD staff to find better ways to communicate because I think we tend to talk across one another. It will be good if we actually spoke to one another and understood where both sides are coming from. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Donna. Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, thanks. I'll keep this brief because I think Jonathan and Donna have largely expressed the points I'd make. But just to build on Jonathan's point in particular, looking back to the policy implementation non-binding PDP but still a PDP that whose work the board approved, I think one of the important things to take away and to reflect back on what Goran said is that sometimes there are gaps, and that work gives us a way to resolve those gaps and that is generally to return back to the policymaking organization. Not to have staff impose its judgment as to what the right way to interpret this is. And

particularly, I think, when we see examples as Stephanie's pointing out where there's significant agreement between the community and the staff about the intent and direction of the policy implementation, that's a flag of a problem, and we should get back to the policy development body as quickly as possible in order to figure out how to make sure that we're clear on the community intent as opposed to dragging it on for a long time going back and forth between some of the contracted parties and staff as to what it means because that's just not productive, I think, and, you know, when we talk about issues like volunteer fatigue, none of us should be spending our volunteer time trying to have a bat with the staff to figure out what the interpretation is when we have a clearly-defined mechanism to resolve that when it comes up.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Jordyn. I've got Stephane and then Goran.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER:

Thanks. Stephane van Gelder. Very quickly. Just -- I think there's an element of discomfort with one of the things that Chris opened up with -- I'm here. One of the statements you made, Chris, when you started addressing this was that it was a case of if you do what we want we're happy with it. If you don't, we're not. There's an element of discomfort with that, and I

don't think this is -- as you've heard from the last three speakers, I don't think this is at all about that. I think it's about improving the end result. Not at all about childishly getting what we want and throwing out the toys.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Stephane. Goran.

GORAN MARBY: I just want -- you know, I see this from a very practical standpoint, and I think that some of the things we have -- we have to sit down and go through the different steps of the process. And in a -- in a typical ICANN we-trust-each-other way. Because what we need to do is to figure out how we actually -- what does the process actually mean and what are the causes for different problems. I will come back to the fact. It's very hard for my team, and I believe very much in my team when they get an implementation, get an order for implementation. They actually get an order from the board to go and implement, which means that that's the order they have. So they take that and realize there are things that we now have to address. So what do they do? They have to engage in the community and it turns out maybe sometimes the community hasn't really addressed all the issues that comes up. And you can see that from different points. And I think that we can work together to

figure that out. And what I engage with -- because this is a discussion that the board, of course, has to engage this as well because nobody wants this circle to go around. So we -- we will - - what we're doing very practical right now is that I've asked that we're going to write a manual how to do this to share with the community and also with the board, how to handle those occasions where the -- for instance, implementation doesn't work. So you know it, which means that we can actually do it together and make sure that we don't spend too much time doing things in circles. But I'm really positive -- I think -- I was actually hoping for this discussion here now. I'm sorry I was out of the room. I'm actually giving a speech at the same time. But I thought this was so important I want to go back because this goes back to the heart of how are we going to be slightly more effective in the policymaking process. And if you -- if you think that we should have different competence in the room, if we should engage in -- I'm open for any discussion because we have to address this. But with a small, small thing. I don't think it's going to be changed overnight. This is something that we have to go on doing. And it's also very hard to change history. I tried a couple of times and it hasn't worked out so far. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thank you, Goran. I'd skipped Edmon earlier, so we're going to go to him, and then I've got Cherine and then Jeff.

EDMON CHUNG:

Edmon Chung here. So on -- building on what Goran earlier mentioned, I'm very excited to hear that a paper is coming out next week. But I wonder if -- and I want to build on what Jonathan and Jordyn said about the implementation and policy -- the outcomes of that working group and how it relates to it. I wonder how that paper would relate to that work. And on -- especially on -- want to draw out one interesting observation now. We seem to have a process for policy and then now have created a process for moving from policy to implementation. But I guess what this conversation is driving towards is -- and what Goran is really driving to is that there's still one gap from implementation to execution. And there seems to be a -- an opening there, and I'm wondering if that paper Goran mentioned that took 18 years to create would address that and whether the manual that -- that Goran mentioned would address that and also whether those -- that paper and the manual is actually coming out next week will go to public comments or is this -- how would this work?

GORAN MARBY:

A clarification. The paper that comes out that the board is taking a resolution on is actually what I -- my mandate. So you get a clarification for the first time ever what the CEO is

supposed to do, which I'm very thankful for, by the way. Makes my life tremendously easier. The other thing we -- that's the thing we're actually started on. And we already said that when we write these things down is, of course, something we have to work with the community and the board with. Because this is something should -- I mean, this is something that we're going to work on together. And I think that we're going to find opportunities for improvements going forward when it comes to the structure from decision of a policy back to how we actually implement it or what you call an execution. And it's not because we think we're going to change any procedure things, but we engage together with you how to make this as effective as could be. Take into account it is the community-driven process with different -- and that's the whole point of this, with different interests going into the discussion. But it is, of course, an open and transparent process because it wouldn't really work if I sat down in my office and wrote something and then tried to impose how to do it. I don't think that would work anyway.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Goran. Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: I want to make my observation based on the experience we've had during the first new gTLD -- the last new gTLD round

because really this is -- all this problem of policy and implementation was clearly manifested during that period.

And I think that there are three reasons why that problem occurred.

The first reason is that the applicant guidebook, which is a result of a PDP, in my view wasn't sufficiently detailed to take it from policy all the way down to implementation. There was a step missing in the middle which we, as an organization, do not have, which I call from policy to design to implementation, and that step was missing.

So a lot of stuff had to be fixed during implementation that were not in the applicant guidebook, so that's the -- that's the first source of why there was a problem.

The second source is that we did not go through the discipline of saying, "We're not clear on how this policy should be implemented. We should stop the work. Stop the work, give it back to the GNSO, and say sort it out."

There was an element of almost good intention of let's move at a faster rate and let's try and resolve things as much as possible and try and fix things along the route, see it as implementation, and yet the GNSO saw it possibly as policy change rather than implementation. So that's the second reason.

And the third reason, which was mentioned earlier, there's no -- there wasn't a body, a mediation body, in the middle where you can actually go to and say, "Look, the policies say that but the policy is not complete. We want to implement. We're finding difficulty in implementation. How do we sort this one out without necessarily halting the whole thing and blocking the whole progress?"

So I think we need to work on those three elements, and if we worked on those three elements, the problem will go away.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Cherine.

I've got Jeff and then Jordyn.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman.

I think I have a simple solution. It's kind of an epiphany. You know how we ask the GAC to participate early on? Why doesn't the staff that is responsible or will be responsible for implementing it actually participate early on? So it's not as if a PDP takes a month and then it's done. These PDPs go on for at least two, three years, and then you add additional time if there's an implementation team that's created.

I've been participating now in the ICANN world since the beginning, since 1998. This is my 50th meeting, by the way. I've never had --

[Applause]

I don't want -- no, no, no. That's not the point. No.

[Laughter]

The point is that we -- I've been asking for ICANN implementation staff to participate, so that they know, so it's not just the board gives staff an order to -- to implement something. It's that they're actually involved and can raise issues at the time the policies are being developed.

I -- so as an example, I'm co-chair of -- one of the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures PDP. We're talking about registry service provider accreditation. Forget the example. But the point is that the person who's going to be tasked with drafting the implementation of that should be not only listening on Adobe, but should then ask a question and say, "Hey, wait a minute, I see this as a potential issue going forward." That would speed up the process. It wouldn't be adversarial. It would be actually taken as cooperation and would actually be a model for what we're asking the GAC and others to do to participate in the process.

If we do that, I feel like we can cut off a lot of time.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jeff. Jordyn, Donna, Goran, and then Jonathan.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Cherine. That was -- that was -- I think your insight is correct in that the AGB or the execution of the new gTLD program presented a microcosm of many of these issues, although when I hear you talk about it and you say that the AGB wasn't detailed enough and that maybe we favored going fast over getting things right, I think, my God, are we ever going to be able to do any of this, because that guidebook was hundreds of pages long and I think no one was particularly happy with the pace that the work moved with either.

So I do think that third point you made, though, was exactly right, in that sometimes when we know that these things are going to be complicated, we need to recognize the fact that we might not get it right in the first words that we write down and there needs to be a self-healing mechanism and that just wasn't anticipated in the AGB. We had a lot of hubris, I think, in thinking that we were going to be able to write down some words and have that be the perfect implementation of the program because one of the values that came out of the GNSO was

predictability, and so we said, "Let's write down everything in advance and adhere to that no matter what," and it was just impossible. I think too many issues came up in the implementation to make that a realistic expectation and we should have acknowledged that and built in a mechanism in order to correct it as part of the guidebook itself, and that probably would have dealt with a lot of the issues.

But reacting to something Goran said a minute ago, I think he's exactly right in capturing some of the tension, which is that the staff is -- the board resolutions on implementations of policy generally say, "Hey, staff, go execute this," right? And it's not a hundred percent clear, you know, where the community fits in in that board resolution, right?

And so part of that is the role definition that we talked about earlier, but I think part of it, as well, is recognizing that there's really two big phases following that board resolution. One is, because we work through this contractual framework, is figuring out like what's the language that's going to guide that implementation. Like what are the words that are going to change the contract or, you know, what's the exact mechanism that the staff is going to use. And that process, I think, needs to be largely driven by the community as well and that's what the policy implementation PDP expressed and reflected and I think

that's where we need to expect that the community's going to be very involved.

And once we get those words worked out, once they're inserted into the contract, then the roles change dramatically. Then there's a separate role of staff actually executing the day-to-day changes that have been implemented, and there, I think the posture changes quite a bit and we should be expecting staff to really own that going forward.

And so I think maybe just clarifying those two phases a little bit more clearly and getting a stronger expectation that in the first phase, the staff's really acting as mediators and facilitators, and in the second phase the staff's the one that's actually driving the work I think would be an important distinction.

And the last point I'll make, you know, to Goran's point about expertise and making sure we have the right skills in the room, when I look at the -- at this policy staff versus the GDD staff, they do have very different skill sets and the posture around the policy development process is one that's generally facilitative, and so we may just want to make sure for that first stage of execution, where we're still defining the language, that we get some of those same skills into the GDD side as well. Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jordyn. I've got Donna, Goran, Jonathan, and then Chuck.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Graeme. Donna Austin. I guess this is a response to Jeff's suggestion and I want to flip it around a bit because I think there's a real resourcing issue if you've got, you know, policy staff supporting the effort and then you've got GDD staff following it as well. So perhaps if you flip that round the other way and just have somebody from the policy team, you know, work closely with the implementation in that first initial period that Jordyn was talking about, that might be a better use of resources.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Donna.
Goran?

GORAN MARBY: I have to leave after this one, so please agree with me.
[Laughter]
I want to make one very important statement, that we will do what you ask us to do. If you invite us to come up with -- if you

ask us the question that, "Please look through this policy and see if you feel any gaps," we will do that. But only if you ask us.

We will not voluntarily come up and say that we don't think this is good, because there's a fine line in the sand because we are not part of the community and therefore we shouldn't be -- involve ourselves in the policymaking process. I -- that is a very hard line -- you know, it's very soft. How do you do that?

So we talk totally about the mandate. If you give us the mandate somewhere in the process to go in and do something, we will do that, but we will -- but it's on -- it's your counsel, not because we should be part of the process, because it's your process, you figure it out, you solve the issues, and that is very important to me. Because otherwise, I would kind of be a part of the community which I don't think is a good thing. I can stay for one more minute.

[Laughter]

GRAEME BUNTON: Is that a direct response or are you just in the queue?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

GRAEME BUNTON: We've got Jonathan, Chuck, and then Stephanie.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I have a very brief point.

I think certainly one thing from my experience of the CWG stewardship is that we rolled relatively seamlessly from the work that we did on the policy side into the implementation and there was, to the -- there was a degree of continuity of staff, so maybe -- you know, I guess what I'm hearing of more effective bridging between the two seems to make sense and I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jonathan. Chuck?

CHUCK GOMES: Is this -- it's working. Good. Okay.

First of all, thanks, Cherine, for reminding us why we formed the policy and implementation working group and it was the new gTLD issue. There was a lot of confusion on that. And that group worked -- I don't know, I can't even remember how long we worked. I was a co-chair. I wasn't the only chair. J. Scott Evans co-chaired with me. And the recommendations that came out of that were approved by the GNSO Council and they were approved by the board. Unfortunately, that's been a while since that happened. I want to suggest that everyone that's not up-to-date on those, look at those, because a lot of the questions we're -- and problems we're talking about are dealt with in that -- in those recommendations. They talk about staff's role. It talks about the GNSO Council's role. It talks about impacted parties' roles.

And so I'm not to go through those now. We, as contracted parties, would be happy to refer you to particular sections, if that's helpful. It's not a terribly long document. But I really encourage everybody to look at those. Several people -- and I appreciate the fact that they've referenced that. That work was done to deal with most of what we're talking about here.

Now, it's not super rigid. There's flexibility built into it. But it does deal with everything we're talking about on this topic here. Let's use the work that was done and we can work together to use that and be glad to be helpful in any way I can on that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Chuck. That's a good reminder. I've got Stephanie.

STEPHANIE DUCHESNEAU: I guess this is sort of a follow-on to Goran's comment. And you mentioned that once the policy development process completes there's still some role of staff to identify what some of the gaps are, and I think that is a useful function. But we're seeing that staff sees itself as like the primary party for not just helping to figure out what the gaps are, but for defining exactly how we're going to fill it, and oftentimes it comes off more as a directive than as a conversation about how the gap should actually be plugged.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Stephanie. Jordyn?

PHIL BUCKINGHAM: I'm just going to briefly steal a line from Edmon earlier today, which is that staff has a really useful role to play, I think, sometimes in coming up with straw men, but it feels like sometimes they turn into iron men and there's just no way to actually perturb it once it gets thrown out there.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Jordyn.

Thank you, Goran, for joining us.

Do we have anyone else in the queue? Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. I just -- I just wanted to add, because I just want to make sure that this is -- that my comments were not in any way putting down policy staff, who I know tries to coordinate the efforts of those that implement and the PDP.

I'm just saying that to me there shouldn't be large gaps in the policy and implementation. It's ironic to me or it's amazing to me that these PDPs can last three years and such a huge gap exists in implementation.

I guess it could happen on a rare occasion, but it should be rare.

So my push is that, you know, if there is coordination -- and I know there's coordination going on in the background -- then there should be active participation to try to identify those gaps earlier, so that it's not at a stage where the board has already directed implementation and now it's a matter of time -- you know, there are time constraints.

So I hope -- and, Donna, I wasn't really suggesting that, you know, policy staff wasn't doing its job or that they should be, you know, coordinating any better.

I just think that the -- it -- like I said, it's amazing to me that such large gaps could exist when this process takes so long and should have better participation.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Jeff. I think Donna has a quick follow-up.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. So Jeff, we're not disagreeing. I think we're saying continuity is important from the policy through the implementation, so regardless of the way that you cut that, I think we're agreeing.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Donna. I see no one else.
Is Steve's hand on the microphone?

STEVE CROCKER: I've been listening to the back-and-forth here and I think you've done a very solid job of identifying the -- where the sensitive

points are in the interaction and it obviously bears close attention.

Goran had to go, but I'm sure the message has gotten through and I think we'll carry the message and continue to carry it to have a good look at it.

I think there's some constructive ideas. I need to be careful here not to say -- not to make a commitment prior to having the discussion, but in my view there are some things here that we definitely need to follow up on and try to understand the dynamics, or if we don't want to plumb those ourselves at the board level, to make sure that they do get looked at.

So thank you very much for that. I -- I would look forward to a much more collaborative and trusting, if you will, relationship in which there's clarity of the roles and an appreciation for the parts that all of the parties are playing, as opposed to a sort of fearfulness or resistance or resentment that seems to be the case now.

So I'm actually hopeful out of this. We'll see where it goes. We're going to get together in Copenhagen, and I would like very much for us to at least have -- take the temperature -- again, I'm being careful about how much gets done in what period of time, but at least take the temperature of where we are on this discussion and hopefully be in -- at least the point of the

discussion will be in some different state. We'll see what we can do about that.

So with that, we have a -- we have just a couple more minutes if we need to cover anything else. On the other hand, I think everybody would be just as happy to have a minute or two, but...

GRAEME BUNTON: Donna I think has a quick follow-up, and then I think we let Sam close it up.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah. It wasn't a quick follow-up necessarily, but are we going to acknowledge the work of the person sitting beside Paul publicly?

GRAEME BUNTON: That seems like a very sensible idea. Bruce has been the -- on the board from the contracted parties house for a very long period of time and I have learned stuff from him and it's been very appreciated. I know many others have as well. And I believe there's a reception tomorrow night --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

GRAEME BUNTON: Tonight. Sorry. For those who have been invited.

[Laughter]

But on behalf of the registrars -- and I'll let Paul speak for the registries -- we thank you very much for your efforts.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, guys.

[Applause]

Thank you. It's been a pleasure to serve.

STEVE CROCKER: I can't let you go just with that.

[Laughter]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. I've been on the board for a good long time and watched from the moment that -- well, watched Bruce before, when he was chair of GNSO Council, and from the very moment that he

showed up on the board it was evident to me that we had a strong player, a real winner.

And over the years, I've had the pleasure to work closely with him. He was vice chair with me for several of these years, and his counsel has been wise, balanced, thoughtful, and enormously knowledgeable, and he's been just a pillar of strength across everything.

And speaking personally, I have had enormous admiration and respect for him and he will be sorely missed.

We have a -- we have a quite good board with very strong people. None, I think -- none of us come close to the strength, experience, and poise and measured balance that Bruce has brought to us.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, sir.

STEVE CROCKER: Thanks.

[Applause]

It's lunchtime.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]