

---

KOBE – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 2 (4 of 4)  
Wednesday, March 13, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 JST  
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Good afternoon, everyone. Hope you had your coffee, cookies, fruit, anything that you wish to have in your coffee break. Now we are going to start with our final session. Here with us is Becky Nash from ICANN. And shortly, we'll be joined by Xavier also from ICANN. We are going to discuss a little bit on the invoicing process from ICANN. We've had a couple of sessions regarding this matter in the past, and ICANN has listened to what we had to say. And now, what will address in this session is how we can contribute to have more clarity and a more improved process on the invoicing process. So please do pay attention to the presentation, and we expect from you to contribute to how we can make this better. Please, Becky?

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Becky Nash from ICANN org finance department. I have a couple of slides here just for discussion points, and then we're going to have some Q&A where we want to hear from participants about overall billing at ICANN.

---

**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.**

---

The agenda is we're going to talk a little bit about the overview of the billing process, talk about our current fiscal year FY19 process and then future years and a proposal for the timeline for the future. We always like to talk about contacts, and we'll talk a little bit during his presentation that the billing contact information is very important to us at ICANN org just so that we can make sure that we are in contact with the right parties to send invoices. We'll have Q&A and then we just have a slide on how to contact us because we want to make sure that everyone knows how to contact the billing department and the finance department at ICANN.

The first slide is an overview of the status for our FY2018-2019 billing process. Seventy-seven percent of the ccTLDs that contributed for 2018 confirmed already their FY2019 contributions and have been invoiced. So that's good news, meaning that each year our fiscal year ends in June. But when we talk to the ccTLDs, we like to talk about calendar year and fiscal year. After our fiscal year end in June at ICANN org, we always publish a report of all of the contributions for the year. That report was published this last fall. And I know it was circulated to the membership and we had several inquiries. So one of the statistics that we are presenting here is that 77% of ccTLDs that did contribute for 2018 also confirmed their next year contribution.

---

In addition, point number two, is we have three CCs that contributed even though they had not contributed by the last publication of the report. The reason we're mentioning that is that we send out the report prior to publication just so that we can ask CCs if they had intended to contribute. And we're hopeful to get that information so that we can publish it for the annual report.

We also had a CC, .MX, contribute retroactively in addition to the FY19 contribution in February 2019. So again, that's one of the reasons why we like to distribute the report.

The next item, although I can see that it's not coming up on the screen very well, it's just that we do have from time to time trouble with the billing contact information that we have. This is something that we mention every time that we have this opportunity to meet with you here is that our challenge is to make sure that we are informed of the right contact for e-mailing an invoice or getting information. So we have received returned mail or e-mails from ten ccTLDs that four of them contributed in 2018. So I know that's just something that we mention each year or each meeting we have an opportunity to meet with you is if we can organize an e-mail list through the help of the ICANN or team here – Bart, Joke, Kim – we do try to make sure that billing is informed of the correct e-mails.

---

The last point here as a status of the current year contributions is that through January 2019 we invoiced already \$1.4 million for FY19 contributions. Second reminders have been sent out already in February. And subsequent to the second reminders, we also received some additional contributions for 2019, \$362,000. And in fact, we even received another contribution back for 2108.

In summary, this interaction of publishing the report, having the right e-mail contacts, it all helps us make sure that we're e-mailing the right parties on time and getting those invoices issued.

This next slide is just talking about our objective for the billing process. One key objective is to make sure that the contribution process is more predictable for contributors and for ICANN org. What we'd like to make sure is that this is a schedule that we get agreement to, that we are listening to concerns, that we are able to provide a timeline just so that it can be more predictable of a process. That seems to be something that we've been asked for in the past, and we wholeheartedly agree that we want to make this a process that works for everyone.

The second point that we're making is, again, that we do have trouble staying in contact with everyone. I'm just going to keep saying that, that from time to time we find that we just don't have

---

the right e-mail or the right contact name and we are asking for your help on that.

In addition, what we've been doing over this last calendar year is reaching out even within our own contacts within ICANN org asking parties like our global stakeholder engagement team to help us reach out within the particular regions in case we don't know who to invoice.

As part of the process this year, we sent the first e-mail in November to confirm contribution amounts on multiple year pledges. (That was November 2018, not 2019.) Then the second reminder was sent in February 2019. We're also, as I just said, reviewing internally the contacts and making sure that any returned e-mail to our billing department is something that we're able to follow up on.

Going forward for this process for 2019, we'll be sending third reminders in April. And then we will have a draft publication scheduled for a preliminary view to the group just after the closing of ICANN's fiscal year. So by the end of July, we will start that process of being able to circulate a preliminary report. And then the final publication of the annual contributions will be scheduled for 31 August. That's similar to our targeted timelines in the past. And again, any of the amounts not paid by then are not reflected on the report. So we hope [you] communicate early

---

on just to make sure that we do get all of these contributions in prior to that final publication.

When I talk about the publication, I just want to make sure that everyone realizes that we do have an annual report that's published on our website under the finance pages, and it does show all of the contributions over the last five years.

We wanted to talk about some of the past challenges. We've heard frequently that the invoicing process can be challenging from your members here. We've heard that there's no documentation of who contributes, the what, the when. And a documented process is something that we want to talk about today.

Again, from ICANN's billing department, from myself and my team, we just want to continue to say please reach out to us directly with contact information because it helps us have the accurate parties.

And we have heard in the past that communication happens late or sometimes that we're not responding to e-mails. We do have a commitment. This is something that we've worked on a lot over this last year to make sure that we're acknowledging all e-mails within a specified time and that we're easy to communicate with. And I hope you have seen the improvements that we've seen when reaching out to your membership here.

---

For this next slide, we're looking at the future. We understand that there's a need for documentation for each ccTLD's intent to contribute. That's something that I think in the past we've heard, why does ICANN e-mail us if we have the intent of contributing for multiple years? Just from a billing standpoint, we do need to confirm via e-mail that there is a contribution that needs to be made. And it's only after we receive that confirmation do we issue the invoice. I hope we can hear some feedback about that from you today.

We do ask that you please respond to our e-mails when we request a confirmation prior to us issuing an invoice. And that's because the invoice is actually something that gets posted into our tracking system. We follow up on it, and we just want to make sure that it is your intent to contribute before the actual invoice is issued.

So at this time we just have some questions prior to the Q&A of just what issues is everyone facing. We do want to hear open dialogue. That's what we're here for today. What are your expectations going forward? And we do have a process outlined for a timeline for this next year that we've talked about a little bit here. But we really would like to hear if there are any specific comments or challenges with the ICANN org billing department.

Please come to the mic, Patricio.

---

**PATRICIO POBLETE:** Hi. Patricio Poblette from Chile. First, you have trouble contacting some people. I suggest you look at the list of attendees of the ICANN meeting. I'm not going to name names, but some people whose mail bounced, I saw them in the coffee break.

Also, I wanted to mention that in our case your timing doesn't really work too well with ours because in February, for instance, that's our summer. My institution, the university actually closes for the month of February. So it's kind of hard to process the e-mail that you send in the middle of February and even harder to get the ball rolling for the payment to be processed. That only happens in March when it reopens. So I understand that you work on the calendar that suits you, but I just want you to be aware that some delay on our part may come from that fact.

**XAVIER CALVEZ:** Thank you, Patricio. I just wanted to take advantage of your point to remind everyone that we are setting up our reaching out to you at those dates simply to try to have a process. But remember, this is a voluntary contribution. You can contribute at any time. We simply try to help this process by sending information, reaching out to you by e-mails. And we start that in November/December and then February is the first reminder. But we can start communicating at any point of time. We could start in July of



---

every year, for example, if that would make it easier. That's not an issue for us.

**PATRICIO POBLETE:** Yeah, I understand that. It's only that because of our own internal processes, we cannot begin processing the payment until we get your invoice.

**XAVIER CALVEZ:** And so this is another point about the process. There's a variety of needs across all of you as to invoice, no invoice, what the invoice says. You and I need to have a conversation. And what format the invoice comes in, does it need to be mailed/e-mailed. Which is completely understandable. Which is also why the point that Becky was making earlier about the need for documentation. That need is actually for us. We need to know what you want or what you don't want.

I want to point out, for example, that some of you do not want to receive an e-mail from us asking for contributions, right? So there is a variety of positions. Some of you want to receive the e-mail in order to trigger the process. Some of you think that we should send an invoice without any kind of communication otherwise, which is also fine except that we need to be able to have a little bit of predictability of that process. At the very minimum,

---

documenting the preferences or the needs of each of you so that we are able to address those needs [and] to those preferences. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thanks, Xavier. It's Bruce Tonkin. I'm with .au. Just a couple of things. One is having an escalation process, I guess. Normally, when you're managing contacts, it's quite common with business contacts that the billing contact gets out of date. And I think someone else mentioned that just come to an ICANN meeting and you can probably just talk to somebody at least from that ccTLD because they're likely to be here.

But it's maybe not just saying there's a billing contact but having a bit of a structure to it and a bit of an escalation process because I think you mentioned you had a first notice and a second notice. You're first notice might go to the billing contact but if you haven't had a response, I'd be saying send it to the IANA contact, for example, that's in the IANA root zone or send it to the CEO or any other contact you have actually. Because I know these things get lost. And they had in the case with .au, we didn't get it. It got lost in the system, so to speak.

The other thing too is currencies. I guess it's probably a problem for both of us in that you're trying to work in U.S. dollars to put in your accounting system where in our case we're working in

---

Australian dollars for our accounting system. Easiest for us [inaudible] the currency in Australian dollars and then we can pay in that currency. But either way, I think that's probably something that's going to vary, and that's probably why you need an e-mail first to say just a reminder that your payment is due. How would you like to receive that invoice? And then we can agree the right currency, etc., to put on that invoice that works for both of us.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you very much, Bruce. The escalation of contacts is definitely something that we can organize. I think that simply we need to have that contact information. If there's more than one contact, then we can use that escalation process. I think that makes complete sense. Thank you for that.

Regarding the currencies, since these are voluntary contributions and that basically they simply have guidelines offered by the ccNSO that can be followed or not followed, you contribute [in quotes] whatever you want in whatever currency you want. We will receive any way U.S. dollars on our bank accounts. We simply need to make sure that understand what you want to contribute, and then we will translate that information into U.S. dollars to be able to send you an invoice. We can handle the adjustments to currency conversion by reissuing a corrective invoice possibly once the amounts have arrived so that there is exactly the

---

amount that you have contributed. And we can even put the local currency information on the invoice if need be. So those logistical challenges are relatively easy to address if we need to.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Anyone else? Remember that now what we want is to know what they need to know to make this process more efficient and more adaptable to ccTLDs. [inaudible]?

XAVIER CALVEZ: [inaudible]

ROELOF MEIJER: If I have a question? Well, I was thinking about a question, but I had decided not to ask it. But then since you're confronting me this way.

XAVIER CALVEZ: [inaudible] chocolate.

ROELOF MEIJER: There's a chocolate to gain by asking a question or by not asking a question?

---

XAVIER CALVEZ: [inaudible]

ROELOF MEIJER: Oh, all right. It's related but maybe slightly off topic. And if you don't want to respond to it, then just let me know. But while you were talking, I was thinking that years ago when I was negotiating this voluntary contribution to ICANN, I entered the negotiations with the target of getting a contract with service levels and an involuntary contribution. So paying for a service. And I was wondering if this is going to be something that you will be reflecting on in the future now that we have service levels for IANA, etc.

Because still I consider ICANN or the IANA services to be the most critical service that my registry is receiving, even more important than electricity because that we can make ourselves. So I would one day like to pay for that service with a guarantee that I'm getting it at a certain level and also with a guarantee that something nasty will happen to the supplier if he doesn't deliver according to those levels.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Did you say a contract where you can voluntarily contribute for the service that you receive?

---

ROELOF MEIJER: No. Involuntary. I'm getting a service and you're not providing it to me, I hope, on a voluntary basis. So I've always had a bit of a difficulty with a voluntary contribution for a service that I need to be guaranteed to get.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I'm very happy to entertain that conversation.

ROELOF MEIJER: Good.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Are you?

ROELOF MEIJER: Let's see if we can set an example.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Honestly, I was going to check with you guys if you wanted to talk about that topic because, do you want to start making your contribution not voluntary? It's for you to decide, but I'm very happy to talk about and see what that could look like.

---

ROELOF MEIJER: But there's two sides here. So I didn't mention it for nothing. If I don't get service levels and a guarantee, then I won't make it an involuntary contribution.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Of course.

ROELOF MEIJER: So the two things are related. Like a proper contract with a supplier, you get this service, you pay so much. You don't pay, you don't get it. You don't get it, you don't pay.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I think this conversation is easy to have today with the formality that there is around the IANA services and the IANA services performance and the measurements and the KPIs and so on. So it's probably easier to document and establish. I think the other question, and I'm putting as a question and not as an answer, is whether you will consider that your participation in the ICANN multistakeholder model is reduced to the IANA services and that your contribution would be effectively "only" the compensation for those specific services. Because today, we look at your contribution – and when I say we, it is we together because those guidelines that are in place since November 2013 have been developed by Roelof, Leslie, Byron, Bart, and I – on the basis....

---

ROELOF MEIJER: No, no, no, by the community.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Proposed to the community and approved by the community, but have been developed on the basis of a value exchange model that is more than simply the IANA services but also the platform of engagement that the ICANN multistakeholder model offers, which you may or may not see value in.

So I think that the only challenge I see with these [tracked] IANA services compensation for services would be that it may get reduced to that topic. But in essence, having a contract, having an involuntary or a contracted, committed contribution on the basis of a service level, why not? Let's talk about it. I have no problem with it.

ROELOF MEIJER: And I'm not suggesting that this should be something that be forced upon everybody, but I think it would be good if this could be one of the choices. Because I realize that there are registries that are unable or unwilling to pay, and they have a completely different line of thinking than mine. You pay, you get the service. You don't pay, maybe you don't get it.



---

But even when we were discussing the present system that we use, we made the distinction – IANA costs, other things. So if we would in the end come to a situation in which there was an involuntary payment with service levels and a contract, there would still be the possibility that there is a voluntary contribution for the other things that we are using.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Absolutely. For example, we have the contribution from the RIRs which is \$823,000. What happened at the time of transition is that they wanted to specify that \$650,000 out of that \$823,000 would be used by ICANN for the purpose of funding the IANA services. So there is that duality. There's a contract. There's an agreement that specifies the \$650,000, but the contribution has a voluntary amount total to it.

So I think this is absolutely a possibility and we can offer it to those who would want to have it. We can maybe have a standard type of contract. I'm very happy to try to develop that. There are a couple CCs that have a contract with ICANN for their contribution, so it's not voluntary. It's involuntary already on the basis of that contract. I think we have....

---

**BRUCE TONKIN:** Thanks, Xavier. From the Australian perspective [inaudible] what Roelof was saying in that, and I know we do actually have an agreement with you, but terminology on invoices that use words like “voluntary contribution” causes a couple of issues in Australia. One is we make a fairly substantial contribution, and therefore it’s above the thresholds for reporting for international money transfers, basically, and it can look like corruption which is also monitored pretty heavily in Australia. So if we’re doing a large banking contribution to some other party overseas and it’s some voluntary amount for a large sum of money, it’s like, what is that? That’s a reportable transaction and we need documentation to say there is some service provided. We haven’t just given money to someone we like. So the terminology is important.

**XAVIER CALVEZ:** Thank you. That’s important feedback. Bruce, if I may, would you then consider that it would be easier to have a contractual relationship that supports that contribution?

**BRUCE TONKIN:** [Sure].

---

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay, thank you. Am I to force anybody else to provide comments?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, please.

PAULOS NYIRENDA: Paulos Nyirenda from Malawi. Maybe just following up on the same issue. Malawi is one of the few who have a contract at ICANN. And when we receive an invoice and it says “voluntary,” it does raise a lot of questions.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you for that feedback. [I’ll be sure and] make note of that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Anyone else? Any issues you have faced that it would be good to know so they can fix or adapt it? Yes, Leonid?

LEONID TODOROV: I am very much sympathetic with this call because I am to some extent on the same page as you as we at the APTLD, of course, have to go to our members and remind them of the annual membership fees. So I just want to share very quick observations.

---

First of all, in that ideal world to which probably we all wish to travel, imagine all the contributions are to be paid by all the ccTLDs. But here is the problem because for many being government agencies it's really hard to imagine how they can have contractual relations which are not specified. That I certainly agree. And also to have contractual relations in principle because they seem not to be aware of ICANN at all. Or if they are aware, then they do not quite understand why a small department in this particular ministry requests certain allocation for that particular organization. So this is a big problem which probably once again gets us back to the issue of communication and outreach.

Secondly, would you entertain for a moment an idea of receiving payments via PayPal? Cash?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Cash is possible but not desirable.

LEONID TODOROV:

Same with us, but here is the grim reality. Or for example, a payment from a ccTLD from a jurisdiction which is under sanctions, and then payment might have come from an absolutely different organization. I mean, whichever corporation in whichever country. Then are you ready for that?

---

And finally, for example, that was a recent experience. One of our members requested a contract about nothing but there should have been contract. And in addition to that contract, there should have been a nice plaque like a certificate of acceptance.

These are just very minor issues, but they certainly are those challenges we're talking about. The culture is way different, and we've got to get adjusted to that.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Absolutely, and this is why we welcome the communications when those specific requirements, Bruce was mentioning one, many others in the room have more also specific requirements on having stamps on invoices. I mean, sometimes people are telling us, why did you send even to the contracted parties invoices by mail instead of by e-mail? Well, some people need to receive the paper. I don't know why, but that's the way it is. So sometimes there's a stamp. Sometimes it actually needs to be embossed, meaning engraved not just stamped. I'm just pointing out to the fact that the requirements are very different. We welcome the communication with the team that Becky leads so that we are able to accommodate those requirements that are very specific to a particular country or location.

Regarding the methods of payments, we are looking into having a portal – let me rephrase – having on our website the possibility

---

to provide a payment including possibility by credit cards. Today, we don't accommodate PayPal, but that would be another nonetheless mechanism to pay.

I also wanted to come back to another topic that you reached out earlier which is we don't do outreach. When we send you an e-mail, we simply ask do you want to contribute or not on the basis that you've contributed in the past. But we don't do really outreach fundraising activities to try to raise more contributions from all the CCs. We could try to do that, but I think that with you, we should determine really how much proactive we want to be considering the fact that it's a voluntary contribution or are we simply stepping back and simply saying we'll get money when you want to give it and we'll wait until then?

But we have a bit of an intermittent approach right now which is to reach out to those who have contributed in the past to ask, do you want to contribute yet again? But I think your views as to should we do more outreach, should we do outreach would also be welcome because that would help us organize what we do or what we don't do. Thank you.

LEONID TODOROV:

Just a very quick final comment. Of course, I realize that I blurred the issue a little bit. It's not about the fundraising outreach. It's

---

basically that general communication and outreach which so far has been lost on many, for example, members across APTLD.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay.

LEONID TODOROV: So ICANN the org.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: Peter Vergote, .be. Thanks, Xavier. Going back to the payments based upon contractual obligations instead of voluntary contributions. I find that a very highly attractive area to explore further, and I'm absolutely on par with Roelof that the idea of having fixed kind of contractually agreed payment for a contractual service does have appealing elements in it.

But I want to be absolutely sure that everybody in this room and ICANN org is aware of the potential consequences so that, let's say, within five years from now that we are not going to spend hours and hours in a dark meeting room about finances. Suppose that a majority among us says I'm going to move toward a situation where I pay a yearly contractually agreed sum of money

---

for the deliverance of my IANA services and the rest is up to me as a ccTLD operator to pay voluntary. Now that creates a risk that you might have more revenue than now based upon contractual engagement [but that] total revenue is ultimately getting lower because a substantial part of it is voluntary and you cannot exclude that registry operators will say, well, I paid my contractual stuff and the voluntary stuff I'm going to put it to zero.

So is ICANN org fully aware and willing to take that risk? Because I do not want us to be in a situation within five years that we say, oh, God. What have we done? We have to go back to the ccNSO to discuss this matter. Thanks.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. Since we started talking about it five minutes ago, I don't yet have a position of the ICANN org on it. But I think your point is very valid. And it touches very fundamentally on the relationship of the CCs with ICANN and of the various aspects of ICANN's work. So I completely agree with you. This is a little bit why I was telling to Roelof earlier that does the relationship of a ccTLD that participates at ICANN limit itself to the IANA services or not. I think the contractual aspect of this versus the voluntary aspect of the contribution creates that type of risk exactly that you've described. And I definitely agree that's a risk, and I don't



---

know how we would address it either in communication or in contractual arrangements. But I agree with you this is a risk.

And also, if we all agree with that model, how do we ensure that there is the definition of the service? What is the service with that service level, etc.? So I think that – because I look at it also from the perspective of we have agreements with the registries, the gTLD registries. And I would want to start thinking about it in the sense of “same service, same fee” or looking at this at least from the perspective of what is the consistency or the lack of consistency between what is the service provided to the various TLDs in the root whether they are CCs or Gs and what is the fee paid?

So my point is simply there are more implications to the idea than what we have yet talked about. So I think that’s a very interesting topic. I’m very happy to talk about it more and see if there is a solution to it that would be mutually agreeable and that doesn’t create more challenges down the road to your point.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Hi. Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK. We don’t have a contractual relationship with ICANN but we do pay them a lot of money. And from a legal perspective, I think I could in the circumstances that though it is stated to not be a contract, it looks and feels like a contract because we’re paying some stuff and we’re getting some

---

stuff back. So if we could improve that position, then I am totally on the same page as Roelof and Peter. Obviously, [the] lawyers [are] in the room, and so watch out, everyone. So that would be a better and more elegant solution.

But I'm aware that the process whereby we came to our non-contractual arrangement with ICANN was basically a decade of negotiation and this is not a five-minute, four-minute, or 30-second conversation. So it's going to need some quite careful reflection, but I totally agree. It's very unsatisfactory that I am [inaudible] with the option of "voluntarily" paying more than getting close to [almost] a quarter of a million dollars on the basis of something voluntary. And that is very awkward for me, and it doesn't feel right to me as the legal counsel for Nominet when I have to do that.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Appreciate that, and I'm hoping your colleagues are hearing that because the voluntary aspect of the contribution is what led the guidelines of it was the case before. But we reconfirmed that principle in the development of the guidelines that were proposed to you and approved by the ccNSO in 2013 and that are in place now. But they don't necessarily address everybody's perspective or Bruce's in Australia for example for exactly the same type of concerns.

---

And I know that simply the fact that a country may have contributed several years in a row could be looked at just from that perspective of the existence of a contract. It doesn't have to be written. I'm not a lawyer, but I know that there is that concern for sure.

So I'm taking the action [inaudible] to look more at what we could do, but this is not just ICANN org. By definition, that would be a contract, and therefore that would be something we develop together.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

So sorry. We are running out of time. But please, do always write to Xavier with whatever you were going to say right now. Sorry to cut you off, Roelof, but I think it is time. We have had some very nice conversation. I think it's time to do a summary of everything we've heard. So what I can tell you is that from the finance section in ICANN, they are very flexible and very willing to accommodate the needs of each and every one of us, but they need to know our needs.

So first thing is communication and to write them an e-mail. Can we put maybe that slide here? There. We have an e-mail that you can contact them with your specific needs or how would you like to be invoiced, when. If now the timing that it's being done is not appropriate, then say when this could be most appropriate. Also,

---

if you would like to change the sort of relationship that currently you have, that's possible too. And if I understood correctly, it does not need to be an exact contract but it could be a written agreement also.

There were some suggestions that there is a need to be an escalation when the contacts you already have, it would be better to see if the contact that is registered with IANA maybe works or seek some help as you have already done with the regional organizations or that might be a new point of contact besides the regional engagement team.

Also, currencies are useful for some to have them in their local currencies. That's something that we know now.

Also, different possibilities of payment besides transfers considering, well, yeah, I know cash is not desirable but maybe PayPal or something else.

And in short, what we should look forward then is maybe to have a documented process as in something we can actually see, read, and refer to in the future. So is that a possibility maybe soon?

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much. Yes. We will prepare documentation of the process as we're recommending at this point, and we'll have that ready before the next ICANN meeting for sure. And we would like

---

to post that on our website just for clarity of the process that we are following at this time. Of course, if there are other needs, we need to hear about it. And we do acknowledge that sometimes the milestones that we've listed in order to be more predictable about invoicing may not fit the individual needs of the organizations, and we hear that. This is just a suggested process in order to be more predictable about how to communicate the invoicing process. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Becky. Thank you very much, Xavier, for being here. Please, round of applause.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: You're welcome. So now we continue with our session with our ICANN board members, please.

JORDAN CARTER: Hi. There are five of you, and there are only three chairs. So I guess we'll let you sit at the table. And I won't sit at the table. I'll walk around and I'll aggressively keep you all awake by coming and

---

asking you random questions. Two proper directors and three pretend ones? No? I don't know how the math works.

Anyway, good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jordan Carter, .nz. It is great pleasure to not be talking with you about an ICANN accountability session today for the first time in three years in my case.

This is our chance to interact with our ccNSO appointed board members and some board members who are ccTLD associated I think would be the fair way to say it. Hangers on, as Becky is calling it. And we've got 45 minutes or so. We've got 43 minutes in fact. And we did a little brainstorming to come up with some questions. So what I thought I might do is just kick off with a question and then just do a bit of a chance for each of you to offer some thoughts to that and then invite you all to engage with that topic or whatever other topic you like. And I will just go on to the next question if it's getting a bit quiet. So none of these will be very difficult or possibly even surprising questions for you given the earlier discussion we had with the board.

But the first one we had was, how will the board make sure the new strategy truly guides all of the work of the organization and of the efforts of the ICANN community? So how are we going to embed this strategy thing? Familiar topic. Nigel, do you want to start?

---

**NIGEL ROBERTS:** Hi, guys. From my perspective, it's kind of simple. I'm going to study it. Because I'm going to talk about being a freshman board member later on. There's a lot to learn and a lot to pay attention to, and this strategy is something that's quite large and fundamental. I think I'll defer to one of my more experienced board members now.

**JORDAN CARTER:** All right, thank you. Who wants to go next?

**CHRIS DISSPAIN:** So the key with any strat plan is you don't just put it in a cupboard and then come back to it in four years' time when you need to redo it. You asked, how do we embed it? I think just think we keep talking about it. We keep referring to it. And in fact you, Jordan, came up with a really good suggestion whatever it was. It seems like yesterday, but it may have been three days ago. I have no idea. Which is that at the moment in our board resolutions we say this resolution is pursuant to ICANN's mission because.... What I think we will do, and I've already sent a note to ask if we can do this, is to put and it is in respect to Goal 7.3.6 of our strategic plan. So I think each time we do something, we shoot it back to the

---

strategic plan and it becomes more and more embedded in our DNA and your DNA and so on. That's my contribution so far.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. Becky?

BECKY BURR: In addition, we're also doing this five-year operating plan and the two-year budget. So those are all reinforcing tools that are going to be tied to the strat plan, and we're going to have the ability and put some procedures in place to make sure that we have the discipline to go back to that over and over and over again. But I think it's not – I mean, I think the notion of putting this in reminding ourselves every time we take an action about how or whether it is furthering a part of our strategic goal is right. But it's got to be embedded in the DNA of just the way we operate, not just board resolutions and actions.

JORDAN CARTER: [Fine]. Lito?

LITO IBARRA: Thank you. As has been said, I think one of the best ways to accomplish what you are asking is to repeat the strategic objectives in a manner that we can even learn them by heart. I've



---

done this and I use them. For instance, Monday we had the LAC space, Latin American and Caribbean space, and I talked about it, about the five strategic objectives. Well, in a word I say security, governance, unique identifiers, geopolitical, and financial. Which comes easier to remember. And then focus all of our actions or try to find for each project or initiative that we come along, where does it fit in this strategic plan. I think that's a good way to do it.

Also, we are using other means like public relations means. A few days ago, the report for the year 2018 in the ICANN LAC space came out. And also, I wrote a small article saying that this year, 2019, we will be focusing among other things on the strategic plan. And again, I mentioned the five strategic objectives. Sometimes I can mention an example for each one of these strategic objectives. An example of an action that we are trying to accomplish in the [inaudible].

JORDAN CARTER: Cool. Thank you. And Danko?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you. Actually, it's nice to be the last to speak. But being a new board member, I first have to say that my view is that we have to be thankful that we have Cherine to chair the board. This is his last year, and he's a really strategic visionary who is really driving

---

this move toward strategy and also toward five-year budgeted plan. And I think we as a community have to recognize his very important contribution. At least, that's how I see it.

Speaking of strategic plans, I as a manager [view] it's very important that for any plan you are making you actually really include the people who have to execute those plans into making of them. So in this, I think we are really coming together. And as Cherine has said, we as the community, the org, and the board have all our roles in that but we are also working together to create this plan into something that we really feel that is our plan and then it can be really executed. So I think we are on the right track. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you all for those thoughtful and erudite responses. Has that inspired any questions or follow-up thoughts from anyone among the ccNSO members here? Leonid has got a thought. Go for it.

LEONID TODOROV:

Thank you. I'm curious. Since Göran has become CEO, I keep hearing this very strange troika or whatever it's called. So we have the community, we have the org, and we have the board. Of course, my knowledge of corporate governance principles is

---

limited, but at all times I'm a little bit embarrassed. How come the board comes like a different element of this structure or just a distinct element of this structure? Could you elaborate on that? Why are you just outside of this environment like a separate body? Very separate. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

There are distinct roles that a board plays a distinct role within a legal organization and it doesn't do all of the same things that the CEO and the operating team does. So I don't think we think of ourselves as separate and outside of the community or separate and outside of the corporation. We are the board of the ICANN corporation, but our role is distinct from the CEO's and our role is certainly distinct from the community's role which the community [as] the authority with respect to policy development here.

So there are legal explanations for it, but there are also I think any of you who have boards know that you wouldn't want your board micromanaging your ability to operate your business on a daily basis. That would probably drive you crazy and also not be good for the business. So we refer to those three pieces of the whole of ICANN to recognize that the board has a separate, distinct, and nonoperational role with respect to ICANN.

---

JORDAN CARTER:

Anyone else want to chip in on that from the directors on the table? No? Okay. This might be blasphemous, but sometimes it reminds me of lessons as a church kid in the Anglican Church in Canada being told about the Holy Trinity. Fortunately, ICANN isn't a church, though it does inspire strong passions in quite a few people.

All right, what else? Any other questions on that? Because I've got another one if no one is leaping up. Which is some of you are brand new directors. Some of you are not quite so brand new directors. And I'm really interested in your different takes, if you've got different ones, or same ones about what the biggest challenge facing you as a director on the board is. And I don't mean one like learning stuff. I mean issue, biggest issue facing the board that you're coming to grips with. Shall we do the line in the opposite direction this time?

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

It's nice to be first. It's a good question. Well, this is actually my first ICANN meeting that I'm in the board [draw], but one of the good situations for incoming board members is actually the time when you're selected you already joined the board meetings and e-mail list and everything, so the learning curve is a little bit more easy in that.

---

But for me, the biggest challenge is to understand the board's position and how can board do its fiduciary duty and at the same time to very much respect the heart of our DNA of our multistakeholder, bottom-up process. The board is the only part that actually makes the resolutions, and the org – the Holy Trinity – the org has to execute that. But we are not doing policy. Everything is coming from the community. [At the end], we have to accept the budget. We have to take care about costs and everything.

So in that way, it's a very specific position of ICANN and anyone, including of course myself who has been in this community but in different role, has quite a challenge to learn the ways and to do that well.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: I've been in the board for one three-year term, and I'm starting the second term. And I think one of the things that we all see in ICANN is that challenges are always changing. They're renewing themselves. If we have at some point the transition, then the GDPR, we still have that. But we're coming with new challenges. I will say that for this year or the coming years, the budget thing,

---

the costs, the expenses is one of our big challenges. We have to devise a new way of working taking into account the limitations that we will probably be having regarding the financial resources.

So that is one of the biggest challenges. And we need to, all of us, the community, because regarding the trinity I think that even we as members of the board, I for sure and I'm sure my colleagues as well feel part of the community because we are, we were, and we will be part of the community. So we all need to be aware of these new challenges regarding the financial requirements.

And that has to do with things that previously maybe we didn't question about do we have enough resources to do this project or this recommendation or this new function or this new operation that we need to put in place. Maybe we didn't ask about the resources because we thought we could have them or we can move them from one place to another. Now we have to be more careful about that type of issues, and I think we all should be aware of that.

And we certainly at the board have started to discuss new ways of doing things more efficiently. Like the multistakeholder model. We want that to remain in place but be efficient and effective. And we also need to look at the budgeting and the spending of our resources as an organization. So I would say that's one of the main challenges.

---

JORDAN CARTER: Cool. Thank you. Interesting. Becky?

BECKY BURR: I think that the challenge of being in a place where the budget is not increasing year over year, the revenue is not increasing year over year and it looks like it will not increase. It will at least level out, and it may decline. Both of those things Danko and Lito have cited. I think what's really the challenge, obviously, we have to live within our means but we also have to develop the mechanisms by which we do that while preserving the authority of the community with respect to policy development. So it is building the mechanisms in which we address and figure out how to interact with the community on prioritization and efficiencies and those kinds of things. So it's structural with respect to finances.

And the other I think is security and particularly embarking on this new relationship with the root server community that is critically important, and important in a security way, but we are going to have a new and changed relationship with that community. It's very important, and it's going to be a challenge to get it right.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Becky. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

The finance piece is very important, and I agree with everything that has been said. It's critical. The security aspects or the new relationship with the root server operators is also incredibly important and a major change. And security generally is an issue that we need to do some work on getting clear what our role is in respect to the wider view of the security, stability, and [resiliency] stuff. We need to be clear whether we're supposed to lead, convene, facilitate, etc. It's not an Internet governance issue that we should be setting up a NETmundial. This is a serious, flatline, absolutely ICANN major part of it, but what should our role be. So that's critical for us I think. We need to work on that.

The only other thing I would say and the board is already thinking about this is the future of the DNS generally. Becky talked about income may just [go] flat or it may go down. And if there's a move away from the relevance of domain names, then that has an effect on what we do and how we do it.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Chris. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Yeah, thanks for that. When you started this question, I thought you were going to ask the question which I've been expecting,



---

which is what it's been like on the board. If you want to hear about that, we can talk about that later.

I think the biggest challenge that's actually facing the board, and it's one that the board has faced since the beginning of ICANN and it's one that I think the board is meeting very successfully, is to resist the temptation to use a football metaphor run around on the pitch and start kicking the ball. What I mean by that is it's the community that is the policy development [team]. We should resist the temptation to get in there and say, oh, you should move that policy that way or that policy that way.

I was warned before I joined the board that I would be lobbied by people [pushing] for one outcome or another. And those people, Chris is one of them, who warned me about that were absolutely right. But I think the board is doing quite well in that regard, and I hope that the ones who have just recently joined, and Danko said it's our first public ICANN meeting, but it somehow doesn't feel like that because of the support we've been given so far. So happy to talk about that more if you want.

JORDAN CARTER:

Cool. Thank you, Nigel. Over to you, ladies and gentlemen. Anything sprung any thoughts? Encouraged? There's a race to the microphones. Who's going to win? Byron was running faster. Let's go to Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Byron Holland, .ca. A couple of questions. You touched on it because you touched on finance. But the whole domain space has seen declining growth, and actually in the last couple of quarters relatively rapid. I [note] that the top 25 ccTLDs have gone from 2.4% average growth to 1.3% or thereabouts. That's pretty material decline in relatively short order. The legacy Gs are in the same kind of space.

That's the driver, the income for ICANN is the outcome or the output of that. I'm wondering at the board level, how are you looking at that when you look [inaudible] in general from a growth perspective, substitution effect, maturation, whatever? What are the conversations there? Because that does dictate to a great degree what your revenue picture is going to look like over the coming years. So I'm wondering about that question.

And it rolls into my next question which is around risk. You touched on related topics already, but I'm curious about how the board evaluates and considers risk to the organization both at a strategic level as well as an enterprise level. What are those conversations like? And what are you seeing for ICANN as the primary risks that are most concerning to you in the coming year, years, or certainly as you go through the strategic planning process, you're thinking about in the strat plan?

---

JORDAN CARTER: Byron, interesting questions. How are you going to self-organize? To answer that, Chris, have you got a [view]?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think Nigel wants to start, but I think risk is Lito’s thing because he’s on the board risk committee and Danko can talk about finance as well. But Nigel wanted to start.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, just let me make a comment on the first half of that question. I think one thing that’s extremely important is that we set expectations. Because [as] you said [there’s] declining growth in legacy Gs and the effect that might have on ICANN’s income, then we need to set the expectations to the community that the pot is no longer unlimited. We’ve been looking at various things saying, why aren’t you spending money on this, why aren’t spending money on this? I mean, it’s trite to talk about fiduciary duty, but the pot isn’t unlimited and the people who are saying this particular thing we should be spending money on is the most important, prioritization is going to be important as well. Chris?

---

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Nigel. Who wants to go first out of you two? Do you want to talk a bit about finance, Danko?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Well, I can try to answer your question but I'm afraid a bit incompletely because of how long I have been in the board. But there is a few level of processes that are actually looking into that. On the top, there is the strategic process. And this is currently being prepared. So we are now during this meeting talking about strategy. The vision has been formulated. The mission is there in the bylaws, and it has been enhanced during the IANA transition period. And now for the first time as it was mentioned, we will have a five-year plan with budgeting numbers in it. Of course, for five years it is more imprecise and it's the nature of such a plan that it has to be revised every year.

So of course, we see the leveling of funding. And ICANN org has a very detailed process of forecasting funds for the next period, including longer terms than next year. This morning we had a three-hour session about budget, and it was rather well presented how they do it, including their getting information for the publicly listed companies [they're looking at]. But most of the money, of course, is coming from registries and registrars. So looking at top by the number of transactions. And this was with an expected level, best situation, worst situation. And this was

---

quite on the mark for the last periods. So we're looking at that and to also board finance committee and board is taking care of that.

In the longer term, we are now in the process to go back to the ICANN org and to ask them to prepare the information about a five-year plan that will be budgeted. So we will hear more information on that in the later stages.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. How about the [enterprise and strategic risk], please?

LITO IBARRA: Yes. I would like to – first, I'm the chair of the board risk committee. I would like to address the question in two ways. Because I think there are overarching risks as you have pointed out that relate to the market and to the technological and marketing trends that we find regarding domain names. So that's one issue that we reflect upon that.

In some we call them special sessions we have in the board that we call strategic thinking, not related necessarily to the strategic plan but trying to see ahead in time or trying to reflect on the trends, the market, technological trends in order to see what is coming in the future for ICANN.

---

But we also have these more operational or analysis of risks in the board risk committee. We have strategic risk that relates to the strategic objectives and goals that we all have defined. We also have the operating risk and unexpected risks. So those are the types of risks that we deal with. And we have been trying for some time now, and I think we are getting more successful there, to create a risk culture along the whole organization. So we have risk liaisons, if you will, in each [functional] department in ICANN that they are alert to report any risks that they see, more in the operational or unexpected or even strategic types of risk.

We have another category of risk that we deal with that I would like to call specific risk. Like for instance, the ones related to IDNs. Those are specific risks that once we have these IDN variants going on, there will be some risks related to that specific topic.

So we try to provide or to have an oversight of the risks in a holistic manner, starting with the [existential] risks that we can foresee in the market or in the development of technologies. But we also take a look at the risks that may come the next day or the next month or so on. So we're trying to do this as an organization as a whole, both the staff, the ICANN org and ICANN board, to be alert and to be ready with mitigation measures for each one of these risks that we see.

---

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you very much. Tackled Byron's questions. Go ahead.

IRINA DANELIA: My name is Irina Danelia. I'm with the Coordination Center for ccTLD .RU. And I'm also a member of Strategic and Operational Planning committee of the ccNSO.

I have heard already at least twice the word prioritization here. With regard to the five-year strategic plan which has five objectives and over 15 goals, I assume that it cannot be that all these goals have the same priority. Moreover, these priorities may change from time to time. So my question is if there is any mechanism to evaluate priorities of these goals and probably reallocate resources assigned to achieve these goals.

JORDAN CARTER: What a great question. Apparently the answer is yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: The simple answer is yes.

IRINA DANELIA: Could you explain a little bit more?

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

We are well aware that we need to prioritize our own. We're talking to everybody else about prioritizing, and we need to prioritize our own. Now we have a whole system in place that deals with the board priorities that exist on a year-to-year basis. Once the strategic plan is signed off, then that will sit above that system and each year the priorities will be worked through going back to one of the five pillars of the strategic plan. And we're governed by the same budget constraints that everybody else is governed by, so we can't do everything that we might like to do in the same year or whatever. We have to work through it.

So we have a committee of the board that actually works each one of those five. I'm going to get this wrong if I'm not careful. Each one of those five priorities has a lead person or persons on the board, and they are responsible for working out what happens, what action items sit under each one of those. And they see them through from meeting to meeting to meeting.

And the five things are of equal importance. But of course, some parts of the year there's lots activity in Column 3 and other parts of the year there's lots of activity in Column 1. But overall, those are the five pillars of the strategic plan. And part of one of those is, of course, the governance model that we're talking about tomorrow afternoon in a session that Brian Cute in leading and which I asked you all to come to when we were with you yesterday.



---

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks for that answer, Chris. Do you have a follow-up there, Lito?

LITO IBARRA: Yes. I would like to add that regarding the changes or the possible modifications that we will be facing year-by-year, this is a [rolling plan]. We have five years, but then we have to review. The next year we will have to review and again do the five years for the 2022-2026 and so on. And also, we're trying to get an agreement if possible to have this budget for two years, a two-year budget instead of one. All of those, the operating and budgeting plans, have to be aligned with the strategic plan. And we are going to be reviewing that strategic plan year-by-year to take into account any possible changes that [inaudible].

JORDAN CARTER: If I could just take the naughty step of intervening as chair with a member hat on just to add two thoughts on this. One is that in each annual operating plan and budget that you produce each year, you might want to just have one page that says in this year we're more focused on these goal areas as shown by this allocation of money.

---

The other thing that you could do is consider whether you do actually want to prioritize those goals. Because five equal priorities between the five pillars of the plan is one way to do it. When you try and prioritize those, it's quite hard but it gives quite a lot of focus if you do decide, for instance, that security might be the most important thing given ICANN's systemic role in the DNS.

Just a few thoughts. And there are some other speakers. So, Young-eum, go ahead.

YOUNG-EUM LEE:

Thank you, Jordan. This is Young-eum Lee, .kr. I heard from a couple people that since the transition, the atmosphere at ICANN seems to be much more amicable and more cooperative because all the communities necessarily have to cooperate. And that's good.

However, recently several issues have come up in which two of the most involved communities, the ccNSO and the GNSO are involved in the day-to-day operation of these registries, seem to have certain different viewpoints on certain issues. Some are very clearly split, for example, in terms of the Work Track 5 issue of the names of territories and country names. I don't know how that could be resolved, but there clearly is a very different viewpoint with regard to that issue in terms of the ccNSO and the GNSO.

---

And also, for example, the issue that the ccNSO is trying to pass the bylaw change in the composition of the IFR with the non-ccNSO member requirement. When that rule was established, we had about 140 members in the ccNSO. Now we're up to about 170. And if we consider the number of domains that have been registered by the ccNSO members, I would think that they would comprise a majority or it. And especially in the IFR, if we consider the fact that representatives of the GNSO, there are five members and from ccNSO we only get three. And even that, if we can't fill the non-ccNSO member requirement, we can't have our third.

So my question to you is, as a board member who has very much close to home knowledge of the CC matters, if these issues come up, what role do you think you could play in trying to get the ccNSO and the GNSO to cooperate a bit more or try to – well, maybe not that – but try to resolve this issue with special attention to the ccNSO viewpoint? Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Young-eum. Who would like to have a go at answering that. Becky is going to go first.

BECKY BURR:

I'm just going to talk about the issue with respect to Work Track 5 and policy issues that affect, that really have an effect outside of

---

the GNSO where other parts of the ICANN community like the CCs, like the GAC have an interest in it. It was a very interesting innovation to turn Work Track 5 into something that felt more like a CCWG than a PDP, and that was a great innovation. I don't think it has gotten us all the way there.

And I think that in a really general way when Cherine spoke about this in Barcelona and spoke about it again here in the opening and we're having the session tomorrow on how do we evolve, enhance the bottom-up, multistakeholder mechanism in a way that gets people out of their corners and provides incentives to compromise and get at solutions.

I think one concern that we have is not just in the PDP area but with reviews and CCWGs, it is very easy for people just to stand in their corner, say my position is X, I'm never moving from that. And we don't have the incentives properly aligned to bring people into a real conversation to be in a getting-to-yes mode as opposed to I'm staking out my territory and I'll win if I just stand here.

In the GNSO context, they've issued this PDP 3.0 in which they're going to spend a lot more time with the GNSO Council paying attention to PDPs. And they've called for more training in chairing and dispute resolution kinds of skills in getting resources into the community that enable the community itself to increase the

---

likelihood, obviously don't guarantee, the chance that you actually have a real conversation and get to a solution.

So we don't know the answer to that question. We have identified it as a very serious issue. PDPs here take forever, and we just have to get out of the I'm going to stand in my corner and yell until I get my way mode. And that's an incredibly important part of the work that is going to be kicked off tomorrow.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Becky. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: On the IANA [functional] review, we have – I mean, we discussed this the other day, right? We've got [Keith] going back to the GNSO to ask them if they will consider or whichever part of the GNSO will consider it. We've got an intention to change the bylaw. We're asking you to tell us which bits you want changed. And really until we get that sorted out and you've got the option to still go and try and find someone, so one way or another we'll get it sorted out. But it needs to be sorted, and we are here to support you in making sure that the ccNSO's position is dealt with and maintained.

In the overarching picture, Young-eum, when you ask about what do you do with conflicts between ccNSO and GNSO, the board's

---

role is really to facilitate I think generally speaking. Just if we can see dysfunction, if we can see part – it doesn't have to be the CCs and the Gs. It could be the GAC and the At-Large. If we see parts of the community that are not functioning properly, our role I think is to try to help to facilitate, but ultimately we can't fix it. But we can certainly work really hard to get people together and talk through their issues.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Chris. Over to Nigel. Were you going to say something?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes, absolutely.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I just wanted to pick up on one of the specific parts that you said which is to do with cooperative tone. And yes, it is true that since the transition finished, I guess everybody has been a bit more relaxed. You talked about different parts of the ICANN community having radically different views. Well, I mean, I'm shocked. And I think I've noticed when joining the board, the incredible collegial, cooperative attitude that exists on the board that we've got at the

---

moment. I think that’s due in no small part to the example that’s set. What we call “tone at the top” from Cherine. It was mentioned earlier, and I think it’s quite important that as Cherine is term-limited and will be leaving the board later in the year that we make sure that the people in place are the people who will continue that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I just do one more thing?

JORDAN CARTER: Mm-hmm.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Because I’ve just checked and I wanted to – we have a public board meeting tomorrow and one of the items on the consent agenda is the next steps regarding the composition of the IANA naming function review team. So there is a resolution to be passed tomorrow, and currently it’s on the consent agenda which means that there is an assumption that everybody will agree.

And the resolution says – it goes through all the stuff about whereas this and whereas that – and then it says finally “all appointing organizations have made appointments, but the current composition does not meet the requirements of the

---

bylaws. The ccNSO has informed the board it has not been able to identify qualified volunteer” blah, blah, blah. “The GNSO has objected to the ccNSO’s proposal for the interim appointment. Resolved, the board directs the ICANN president and CEO to not start the review team’s work until such time as one of the following conditions is met: agreement among the appointing entities to the ccNSO’s interim proposal or finding someone or there’s a change in the bylaws.”

So basically, tomorrow the resolution we’re going to pass absent somebody taking it off the consent agenda and having a fight about it is effectively to say you can’t proceed with this until one of these three things is done. Obviously, the bylaw thing needs to be done anyway. That needs to be done. But that’s where we are with it right now.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you. And we didn’t get to hear your story, [Nigel], about what’s going well for you on the board, and I’m afraid we’re not going to have it now because we’ve run out of time. The meeting finished a minute ago.

So thank you all for your contributions, ICANN directors. Thank you to the ccNSO members who asked questions and made comments. That’s always excellent.



---

And I don't know what I need to do now. Do I hand back to Bart or Katrina? I hand back to Katrina who will formally close the members meeting, I believe. Our current and future chair maybe.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Jordan. Thank you very much, board members. It was, as always, a pleasure to meet you and talk to you. Thank you. And, of course, as always, it has been a pleasure to be with you, share thoughts, discuss, tell you more, hear your views and, well, actually have two fantastic days.

We are going to have – well, we're not done yet. We're going to have a ccNSO Council meeting, but this is going to be in a really room. Well, because apparently this room is too big. But yes, it is in another room. It's in the room Emerald. It's downstairs. You go out and downstairs. So if you're interested, you're always welcome. If you're maybe not so interested, you can later read minutes.

But I really would like to thank you all. If you're leaving, then have a safe trip back. I hope to see you all in Marrakech. And yes, as I said when I opened the meeting, this time we tried a new setup. Therefore, when you're going to fill in the satisfaction survey, and I'm sure you are going to fill it in because otherwise how can we know what you think, please also tell us what you think about this

---

new setup. Did you like it? What else would you like to be improved?

Thanks a lot again to JPRS for hosting us, and see you in Marrakech. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**