
KOBE - ICANN Public Forum 1
Monday, March 11, 2019 - 17:00 to 18:30 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

BRAD WHITE: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the first public forum. Allow me to introduce ICANN Board chair, Cherine Chalaby.

CHERINE CHALABY: Good afternoon, everyone.

Thank you, Brad.

And thank you, all, for joining us for the first public forum of ICANN64. I would appreciate it if you can take your seats as soon as possible.

On behalf of the Board, I encourage you to take advantage of the opportunity and the audience in front of you to ask questions, make comments, and share your thoughts. These public forums are very important to us. We cannot do our job well if we don't hear from you. It is our responsibility to act in the collective interest of all stakeholders and to hear directly from you about what's on your mind.

For newcomers in particular, this is our open mic session. Wherever you are, here or following remotely, I encourage you to

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.

ask questions to the Board. But please remember that comments made here are not replacement for public comments that ICANN seeks on various issues and policy.

If you want to weigh in on a specific issue that is up for public comment, please use the online system. It is the only way your comment will receive proper consideration from the appropriate committee, supporting organization, and staff members.

Today's session will run for about 90 minutes, and then we have another one on Thursday which will run for about an hour and 45 minutes. So there's a lot of time for you to ask your question or give us your comments.

Finally, I encourage you to make use of the talented language services team we have here supporting us. If you so desire, you may ask questions in Spanish, Russian, French, English, Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese in addition to English. The interpreters in the room will give us the English translation.

Let me now hand over to Akinori Maemura to walk you through the format and rules for this public forum.

Akinori.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Cherine. I will proceed this part in Japanese. Then you will need a head set to hear this part in another language. Otherwise, you can refer the captioning.

Okay. Here we go.

First of all, as Cherine said, I would like to stress what has been said with regard to public forum 1 and also public forum 2 on Thursday and also the conversation from the ICANN executive team. There's going to be a total of four hours for receiving questions and comments from you. Therefore, if you could not make any comments or question today, you have another opportunity on Thursday.

After my talk, Chris Disspain will explain about the Board's priorities. And after Chris' remarks, we will be receiving questions and comments from you. As Cherine said, both questions and comments will be accepted but we would like to receive questions more. We prefer questions. And we would like to respond to you as much as possible. But if there is any question that we cannot respond to today, we hope to be responding to them on Thursday.

And, also, there's going to be a simultaneous translation. Therefore, I would like to ask the Japanese participants to also raise questions in Japanese as well. As Cherine said, Japanese or

other languages are available, so we can receive questions in one of those languages that are being interpreted.

And I would like to explain about the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, to all of the people, please make any statements and raise questions with respect and with respectful behavior.

And, also, I will hand it over to ICANN's complaints officer Krista Papac who will be explaining to us the importance of the following expected standards of behavior.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Thank you, Akinori.

Hello, everybody. My name is Krista Papac, and I'm ICANN's complaints officer. For those of you who are not familiar with my role, my job is to receive complaints about the ICANN organization, research the facts, and work with the members of the organization to transparently resolve issues where it's needed.

In fact, you can think of the complaint's office as somewhat of a problem resolution office. People come to me with problems they're having with services and work the organization is delivering. From there, I examine the issue with the relevant teams to see if there's an opportunity for improvement and then

where it makes sense, the org teams implement those improvements.

The complaints office will be two years old this Friday. And in those two years, nearly every complaint I've received has been respectful and constructive.

These kinds of complaints enable open communication which leads to thoughtful consideration and meaningful results.

Today I have the honor of kicking off this public forum 1. In preparing for today, I'm reminded of the purpose of the public forum, which is to provide all of you with an opportunity to share your thoughts, insights, frustrations, suggestions, wants and needs with the ICANN Board.

With this in mind, I want to remind us that participating in a public forum also means we must all adhere to the expected standards of behavior. But more importantly, I want to remind us all from the progress that comes from listening, understanding, assuming the best in others, and having impactful but kind conversations with our colleagues.

We should always strive to work this way, not just during today's public forum but in all of our interactions with each other this week and in the months and years to come.

I wish you all of you a productive, engaging, and kind ICANN64. And with that, I will hand it back over to Akinori. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you, Krista.

ICANN is open and also, we have to be respectful to each other in order to create a sound and healthy environment. And for that, we have to respect this expected attitude and expected standard of behavior.

Like the other public forums, there will be a remote connection. And they can provide comments and questions as well. Engagement@icann.org, please send your email to this and the public forum producer, Brad White, seated in the front will read your questions. He's seated over there.

The questions via email or questions from the audience, when they are accepted, the Board facilitator will decide who might best afford to give you the answer. If we cannot answer to your questions right away, we will try to get to the responses as soon as possible. And, also, with regard to the rules, let me explain.

As you can see, we have a microphone -- we have a microphone or microphones at the center of the room. And so if you have any questions, please line up in front of the microphone. And please be aware of three things: Speak slowly and clearly. Second,

please give your name initially. And also, thirdly, please who you are representing, if anyone.

In order for the Board to hear from you as much as possible, we would like each one of you to raise your questions in two opportunities at the most. And we will give you two minutes for your first comment. And we will use the countdown system for that.

The Board response will also be limited to two minutes. And if there is any follow-up question, the two-minute rule will be applied. There will be a timer used for that, too. And, also, there will be a limitation of two minutes for the Board to respond to the second comment. So that is all from myself.

And before starting the question and answers, Chris Disspain will explain the important matters.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Good afternoon, everybody. I'm going to briefly talk about the Board's priorities for this ICANN meeting. It's unusual for us these days to be up on a stage, although I realize that actually that puts us on a level with most of you because you're on a -- in an auditorium setting.

So we're here obviously this week to do our usual stuff, to do our Board workshop which we've done, and to listen. And the things

we're listening about include the response to the EPDP on GDPR. And we had a very interesting session just before the start of this public forum.

As Cherine said in his opening remarks this morning, the strategic plan and the five-year operating plan are also topics for us to talk to you about. But for Constituency Day tomorrow and for some of you on Wednesday, we asked a number of questions of each of the constituencies. And they were mainly focused around the issue that Cherine also covered in his opening remarks, the governance model in looking at ICANN's governance model. And we asked some questions about that.

And I just want to take the opportunity when we are talking about our priorities to remind everyone that on Thursday there is a session, it's a session that's being run by Brian Cote as a sort of independent facilitator to help us start the process, to start the process that was outlined this morning. And it will be absolutely fantastic if as many people as possible could attend that session.

Other than that, as I said, we're here to listen and the first opportunity we get to do that properly is today in the public forum.

So that's -- that's it from me on the priorities. And I'm going to pass it across now to Avri, who I think is running the first session.

Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. And I would like to start by welcoming people to the microphone.

Thank you. And first person at the microphone, please.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm going to make a statement, and then I'm going to ask you a question. And it's probably in an area that you're not expecting because I wasn't expecting the change.

At every ICANN meeting, from many years ago, the business constituency spends considerable time -- I'm the chair of the BC outreach committee. The BC constituency spends considerable time and effort and we pay for a designer, ICANN supports the printing, but we prepare a very professional-looking brochure. And in the middle of that newsletter is an up-to-date chart where you can find head shots of the Board, any changes in staff and the organization, and the officers and councilors of the GNSO.

We also do information that we think is useful to the community about the business constituency. We use the information and outreach desk, the newcomer's booth, to distribute usually

between 150 to 200 of these. Sometimes I end up hand carrying them, or Jimson ends up hand carrying them. They're heavy. But we count on not just handing you, a Board member, a copy but on the community being able to use them as a resource.

To my amazement when I got to Barcelona, that desk was so poorly placed that of the 200 newsletters I left in it, less than 100 were picked up. Here I arrived. That booth isn't even called the same thing, and it's not even open full-time, and nobody knows how to find it.

And next to it is a very important booth that is about universal acceptance. There is no other region of the world where that topic --

[Timer sounds.]

-- is as important as it is here. Yet, both of those booths are totally out of place and can't be found.

I am extremely disappointed, and I'd like to know why a decision was taken to change the name of the booth, not advise the community. And if you're going to make those kinds of changes, can you please give us timely notice, so we don't rely on you to be a resource.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Marilyn.

I do believe that this is something we'll have to look into and get back to you. I don't think any of us here really know why the booths were set up as they were, but we will get back to you on it. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Next person in line, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Merci, Avri. This is Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I'll speak in French.

I thank you for having started the meeting in Japanese given that we're in Japan. And I would like to encourage all those who wish to take the floor to use their mother tongue if it is translated as this is part of the diversity we have here at ICANN.

I have approached the microphone to ask a question. I might not have followed what was going on very well, but I would like to know regarding what was presented this morning where we're at within the community with that vision that was presented.

Was the vision a part of the strategic plan, or is it perhaps a subject that is still to be discussed? In order to understand what was discussed properly, could we have a brief explanation, a one-page document explaining why we switched visions, what the elements considered were in order to be able to intervene as smartly as possible on the matter. And I have a last remark. Given that I thought the public forum wasn't merely a match between the community and the board, but it was actually a match where there were several players and where we could also address our colleagues from other constituencies.

At any rate, that's how the working group on the evolution of the meetings, ICANN's strategy meetings working group worked. But I see we have once again begun to work as a one-on-one meeting. So I would like to know what you think. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Sebastien.

In terms of the first question, the vision, if it's okay, I'd like to pass it to Cherine to respond to that.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Sebastien, thank you for your question. I'm going to answer in French.

All the trends indicate that the security and protection of the single open Internet was an important and primary consideration. When you looked at the current vision, it is a vision that most of its objectives have already been achieved by the community and by ICANN org, for example, becoming an independent. That current vision was designed primarily to sustain us through the transition, past transition. Imagine what is ICANN's life after the transition being independent and global organization. We've achieved all of that.

That vision was not sufficient anymore for us as an organization, given the forces that I mentioned this morning, the five forces in particular regarding security and regarding cyber sovereignty and so on.

So we felt that from what the community is saying, everything pointed towards a newer vision to really give us a renewed sense of purpose. So that vision was really derived from what the community is saying through the strategic objectives. We put it in the strategic document that was published for comments last December. We received very strong support for that overarching vision. But below that overarching vision, there were a lot of -- some bullet points that the community made quite good comments on them. And this morning, we had a session, and we told the community that we are going to incorporate all the

changes that the community have made to the details part of that vision.

So that vision has been out now for -- since December. There's been quite a lot of supporting comments. And I think it's time to move forward with it.

So that's the process we went through.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Cherine.

On your second question, Sebastien, I really don't remember a time when we had the leaders of the other parts of the community here. But maybe someone that remembers the history better than me would be able to address that.

I want to go to Brad now, who has an online question, and then I'll come back to the line. Thank you.

BRAD WHITE:

Thank you. We have a comment from

Syed Iftikhar H. Shah in Pakistan.

The IDNs program was launched by ICANN in 2008. However, it has not progressed so far in terms of use in the global community, particularly the business community, to include in their online

systems. So there is a dire need to promote IDNs and their awareness.

ICANN may take the lead. As a start, the ICANN board may discuss IDNs in all public forums.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you for the comment.

Would anybody like to -- please, Akinori.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much for the comment.

We are seriously working on IDN and its promotion. And your suggestion is really great, and I am really happy to accept -- receive any discussion or comments in the public forum.

Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Next person in line, please.

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. My name is Michael Karanicolas. I'm with the NCUC. We have a wonderful turnout, I think, here in Japan. I wanted to comment

briefly about some folks that don't seem to be with us, namely, the indigenous ambassadors.

And I think that that's a shame, because these communities are not just underrepresented. I think that in the ICANN ecosystem in a lot of ways, they're not represented at all. They're not --

[Applause]

They're not represented by their governments, they're not represented by civil society. So, you know, I think that -- I don't have complete information on what happened with regard to that program, but if it's been suspended or terminated, then I think that's a shame, and I think that ICANN should maintain avenues of engagement with these communities.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Michael, for bringing that up. And very much agree with you about the importance of the indigenous ambassadors.

Is there anyone else that would like to add another comment on that? Otherwise, I'll certainly be sure to basically pass the -- the message on as much as possible to see what can be done about it, because I do agree with you about the importance and the

value that they present when they are here. So thank you very much for that.

Next person in line, please.

AJAY DATA:

Ajay Data from India. Two points, one is related to IDN, which someone from Pakistan just said there's a dire need to promote IDNs. And the simple solution to start with is to walk the talk and start adopting IDNs for ICANN. How about having an IDN domain names for icann.org and then start promoting them? It's the simplest thing which we can have as leadership and start promoting them. And then everybody starts getting into.

And a small suggestion related to the technology here. ICANN Learn, I subscribed. So I had to use another ID. And then registration, I have to use another ID. And then the schedule, that's another ID. And it doesn't make sense. Does it make sense to either? I'm sure there must be reasons to have these three IDs requirements. But I guess somebody can look into. And I talked to a few people, and a lot of people are frustrated because of that. And I thought it was only me who is getting this sense of getting three IDs for three -- on one site, three IDs are required. So maybe somebody can look at and try to facilitate that simple problem.

And these registrations and everything, I guess we can get more people on app. I see very small percentage of people get on app. And it's very difficult to search a person and meet somebody whom you would like to otherwise and he's there at ICANN and you can just find him. So it -- some way we have to find out what the apps are promoted well and used well. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Ajay, very much, for an interesting proposal.

Goran, were you going to give an answer, please?

GORAN MARBY:

First of all, I -- you know how much I feel for this. And I -- the IDN project and the -- and those projects are now officially a pet project inside ICANN, which means that I follow people around who works with us, and acceptance, which is the bigger thing. And comment for the former speaker as well. Yes, we have to walk the talk, and we have to do things better.

That's easy to say. The problem is that right now, we're in the process of the biggest investments we've ever done of rebuilding the whole site and building a documentation management system, for instance, to make it possible to search in our languages, the U.N. languages, which is impossible today. That's

an investment that is currently on about \$8 million. And we have to sort of wait for that before we take the next steps.

But when it comes to this, when it comes to I.P. version 6 and all of that, that's something should be very natural. And I really, really like the fact that you always come up to those microphones and you always put a torch in my whatever.

[Laughter]

And keep this. Because it is important in ICANN to be able to have more people going online, to work with IDNs, to work with local scripts, to work with universal acceptance, it's actually in our DNA. And sometimes we forget. So thank you for reminding us.

AVRI DORIA:

Yes, thank you, Ajay, for your persistence.

Please.

EDMON CHUNG:

Edmon Chung here. Your and my pet project, IDNs, again, seem like the topic of the day.

So I really want to bring the attention to the board on one particular issue. I have to first apologize for missing the public comment period for a document that staff created on the implementation of IDN variant TLDs.

There's a couple of specific issues that I really want you to take a look at and see what your view is. One is the -- one of the recommendations is that we treat each IDN variant TLD as a separate application for a TLD. I think that is a bit absurd, and it's basically throwing out all the work that we've done in the last 15 years on IDN variants.

IDN variant TLDs should be the same application. It is one application for one top-level domain but that happens because of the linguistic and technical issues to have to have multiple top-level domain delegations. So that's one very important aspect of IDN variant TLDs.

The other part is, the suggestion is to have one registry agreement for each variant TLD. That is -- this is just a bit ridiculous. I think there should be one agreement for one top-level domain and the variants would probably be some addendum of some sort. So having multiple registry agreements for each IDN variant TLD is just strange to me.

I really want to know whether the board has been aware of this. And if not, you know, I hope you can pay little bit of attention to it and resolve this issue before it gets too much out of hand.

And one of the -- of course, it's not just about money, but it is a little bit about money. Think about it. If a tiny top-level domain needs to come in and needs three versions of the IDN variant TLD,

that means over half a million dollars, over half a million dollars just to apply for the TLD. That doesn't make sense to me. That's not really putting IDN as a priority.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Edmund.

Akinori, please.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

The IDN -- as for the IDN, if I may speak in Japanese, if you have a receiver, Edmon. So thank you very much, Edmon, for your suggestion. IDN, you're a wonderful promoter and you have variable insights, and I do appreciate your appreciation very much, as you know well.

At the board on Thursday, the TLD variant management and the recommendation for implementations, we are trying to resolve that on Thursday at our board.

And this recommendation, the IDN variation management schemes that we've conducted on cross-community basis has a recommendation of -- from ccNSO as well as the GNSOs. We would like to have them consider them from here onwards.

There are some specific recommendations in these documents, therefore. But all of them, the ccNSO and GNSOs, in that process, all of them as specific policies will be implemented going forward. And therefore, as Edmon, in your policy process of CC and GNSOs, please discuss further then in shaping these specific policies going forward. And we'd like to endorse the participation to further policies.

Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you.

Next, please.

KENNY HUANG:

Kenny Huang, co-chair of Chinese Generation Panel and also CEO of TWNIC.

I have two questions. The first question -- thank you, Edmon, already mentioned the first question, because we have been working on IDN for several years already. And, initially, we know all the IDN application process and registration fee would be separate from the IDN registration rule. But eventually, if you realize this, the staff recommendation based on if IDN variant will be based on different application and different process and

different registry agreement, that would ruin the entire effort from the IDN working for several years already.

And the second point for my suggestion is, because since we still have a strong discussion working on the IDN consensus, what if we couldn't reach the consensus, especially for the CJK area. I recommend all the CJK variant core points would be prohibited if the next new gTLD comes out, if there is no consensus for a new gTLD variant table, then older CJK core points should be prohibited. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

I know the IDN Working Group is looking at these things, and I'd like to, I guess, go back to Akinori again.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much, Kenny.

First, about CJK variant, the Chinese character sharing scripts, there are variant definition works which is progressing. And I appreciate the members' work.

Language rule of the variants CJK will continue to progress. But in the council this week, resolution will be made, and we move forward. Without LGR, until LGR is ready, you cannot make

application. So during that process, we need to solve whatever the issues.

Regarding other points Kenny mentioned, I think that it is the same as Arimoto-San's. So my previous answer I think is also valid for this question.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you.

I'm going to go to the next person in the queue, but I'm only seeing one person in the queue. So I encourage anybody that's saving your questions to get in the queue and start asking them. Please.

JIANKANG YAO:

Okay. My name is Jiankang Yao, from China. I am from my personal.

This year, I see IDNs are a hot topic, because several people have talked about IDNA. My comments are also related to IDN.

IDN is -- was standardized in 2003. Also EAI was standardized in 2012. So many years have passed. So IDN, the environment -- the preliminary IDN (indiscernible) very low. But with USG help, many email service providers, many software have been upgraded to support EAI.

So in future, I think ICANN's I.T. system will be upgrade to EAI, too.

Also, ICANN's board to support IDN-related issues the last five years.

So my question is to ICANN, when will ICANN I.T. system be upgraded to support EAI and IDN? This is my first question.

So the related question is, after ICANN's I.T. system to be upgraded to IDN EAI, I suggest the tools, every board member, every staff will have to have IDN dummy names and an international email address. For example, so a board member from Japan, then we can locate him with Japanese email address. So if I have some questions for a Japanese board member, I will send to the user's Japanese email address.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Love the applause. Before passing it on, I do want to say one thing. With all the questions on IDN I'm hoping we'll have a very full session on universal acceptance to talk about all of these issues in detail, but now I think I'm passing this one on to -- to -- is it to Akinori or is it to Goran in terms of the ITI and the solutions? To Akinori, please.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you for your question. As is mentioned, for ITI, ICANN Internet system multi-languages supporting ITI -- I mean, Information Transparency Initiative will be facilitated so that many information can be accessed in multi-lingual manner. And that's the first step we will take. And then for EAI, if it's necessary as the next step we will also address. That's all. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Next in line, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Avri. Donna Austin from Neustar. I want to draw some -- make some observations, if I could, please, about the EPDP and the work they've achieved in the last seven months. And I understand that the team is exhausted, and I understand the reasons why they are exhausted.

I've been a member of the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group for the last three years. I'm exhausted, too. We went into a meeting yesterday, I think it was, and I was really surprised to see a timeline up on the screen which indicated we should have a final report or we were working towards a final report for the middle of this year, but in the event that we decide that we need an extra public comment period, we may not have a final report until the end of this year. So that's another 12-

month commitment from the team. Jeff Neuman and Cheryl Langdon-Orr have done a tremendous effort in leading this group. There are also a number of other members of the community that are supporting this effort as well and making an enormous contribution in terms of their time. Christa Taylor, Michael Flemming, Robin Gross, and a number of other names that I just can't recall right now.

We need to find a balance and the -- understanding that I've just spent four years on the GNSO Council, so I understand this is something that we're working on, but we need to find a balance when we get into this work to -- I know the Board can't set a date.

[Timer sounds]

I know that's beyond your remit. I know that it's a community responsibility. But if something happens to the leaders of this team in the next six months, it's going to be very difficult to find somebody else to lead it. And I can understand that if, you know, Jeff and Cheryl decide that at some point enough is enough, they have to move aside, we need to find a way to find a balance. We can't have these open-ended projects.

Neustar makes no -- you know, we want to move forward to a next round. We're very open about that. So, you know, we -- we are concerned the potential -- you know, something we just discussed in the council that there may be delaying tactics. But

we need to be respectful of people's time and the effort they've put in to these other working groups. And we need to find some way that we can make the process more manageable, not, you know -- it's a little bit of a quandary with the multistakeholder model that I think we're facing.

So thank you very much to the EPDP team and all the work they've done in the last seven months. Thank you very much to the PDP working group that I'm a member of and the work that we've done over the last three years.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Donna. And I totally acknowledge the amount of work that those folks put in, and I think it is truly amazing what goes into especially the PDP and has been going on for years. I think part of this is in some of the work that's being looked at in terms of strategy of how we deal with the scaling problems that we are facing. But I'd like to pass it on to Chris that would have perhaps more to add to it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

As a fellow exhaustee, I agree with you. I guess this is in part what the discussion we've started about the governance model is about. We all deal with this. Those of us that have been around for a very long time will -- I hope this will resonate with you which

is that we get to a point where we think we can only just cope with what we've got and we cope with it and then more comes and we cope with that and more comes and we cope with that, and I have lost count of the number of times we've said we've reached a point where we can't cope with any more and then we managed to keep going. But that doesn't make that the right thing to do. And I do think we need to look at some fairly radical ideas because radical ideas compromises come that can make real changes to the way that we do our work, and quite frankly the way it's happening now is not conducive. We had people sitting on this stage an hour or so ago who are in the EPDP and Leon and I were there most of the time not doing work, but just liaising, saying, you know, how exhausting it all was and it can't continue, and I think that's right. I asked for the microphone to respond to this, Donna, for two reasons. One was to say that, but secondly to say, and we have a tendency to back away at the last minute from actually doing something to fix the problem.

So I can remember a couple of times when we have been -- I've been in SO and AC leadership discussions where there's been complete agreement in the room that X needs to be delayed, whatever X may be. And everyone goes yeah, you're absolutely right. If we could delay X and Y, then that would be brilliant and that would give us some breathing space and we can deal with it. And we go out and the community people say (indiscernible) and

we all just collapse and say okay, then we (indiscernible). So I think we need all of us to recognize how tough it is, and I agree with you 100%. And I'm hoping that the work that we've started -- which in itself, of course, is a paradox because we need to do the work in order to make the change --

[Timer sounds]

-- will, in fact, make that change. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks, Chris --

[Audio difficulties]

A continued thanks to all of you that I recruited into doing that PDP work, and you've kept doing it even when I abandoned it. So I really very much appreciate that. Before going on with the line, and I appreciate how it's built up, I do want to go to Ron who has an answer related to the indigenous ambassadors. Please, Ron.

RON DA SILVA:

Thanks, Avri. This is for Michael. I think you raised this question. I think it's important to remember in the budgeting process there is a mechanism where the SOs and ACs are able to ask for specific funds to address new initiatives or pilots or new programs or projects, and the indigenous ambassadors' program was

something that came out of the At-Large where they had requested piloting. And I think everybody would agree it was a successful pilot. And we continue that rather than have it as an annualized exception, if you will, to the budgeting process, it was combined with the existing fellowship program. So the mechanism for the indigenous ambassadors to participate and have travel support to come to ICANN meetings is the same mechanism that is used for any other participants to come that need assistance in participating, and that's through the fellowship program.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Next person in line, please.

BILL JOURIS: Bill Jouris speaking for myself. I was in a session earlier today which touched on internationalization of domain names, and one of the folks at the table was speaking to the people who are working on one of the generation panels that said, I think with complete accuracy, your repertoire that you're developing is important because inevitably all of the registries will adopt that, not just for the top-level domains but for the second, third, et cetera levels. But I'm on one of the generation panels, and we have been told explicitly repeatedly no, no, you can't even think about things that should be in the repertoire for anything except

the top-level domain names which are much more restricted. Are we planning on putting together new generation panels to work on the higher-level parts of the domain name or is there some way to resolve that cognitive dissonance there? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Bill. Akinori, can I toss this one to you again, please?

AKINORI MAEMURA: I'm listening to your question in Japanese, and I fail to understand your question. Again, please.

BILL JOURIS: There are restrictions on what codepoints can be used to be top-level domain name.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes.

BILL JOURIS: And those restrictions do not all apply for the higher-level domains. But the generation panels that we have been told just focus on the top-level domains. Yet the point was made earlier today, the repertoire you come up with under those tighter

restrictions will inevitably be used by the registries around the world for all of the higher-level domain names as well.

AKINORI MAEMURA: So second level and third level. Okay.

BILL JOURIS: Yeah. So are we going to have new generation panels to work with that broader possible repertoire or where do we go from there?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Okay. We know that currently the language (indiscernible) rule activity is for the top-level domain name and then the natural assumption is that the LGR for the top-level domain names also are used for the second-level domain name. But I -- I may think about some cases where some registry want to set some other slightly different LGR to the second level, but that's -- that's -- from my sense, that's an exceptional thing. And then basically it is an independent problem from the -- the top-level -- the LGR making in the top-level domain name. That's my understanding. Is that helping you?

BILL JOURIS: Yes, but I'm less optimistic than you are that there will be a very small number of those cases.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Next, please.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. John Laprise, ALAC. I'd like to address an issue with EPDP, and that is that this was an avoidable EPDP. There was discussion about GDPR long before we -- and would have given us time to act, but for whatever reason, the community did not bring forth a policy to react to GDPR in a normal fashion. And it may be time to consider what responsibilities the committee owes to the Board and to ICANN org. And in that sense, it may be worth considering whether or not to give the org or the Board the power to ask the community to initiative policy. Not to actually create policy, but to initiate a policy process on an item that it sees in its strategic planning process as a material threat to the organization. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, John. Becky, please.

BECKY BURR:

Yes. So it is absolutely true that the ICANN community has been talking about WHOIS since October 30, 1998. And we've had 10 or 12 WHOIS efforts underway. And I would like to think that it would be avoidable in as simple a way as you put forward. The Board does have the authority to ask for an issue undertaking that would initiate a PDP, and I think in one case the Board did do that with respect to WHOIS.

What I -- what I think is important about this is we did have a forcing event that with the deadline and that moved us out of our corners because we had to come out of our corners. I think the work that we're talking about in the governance context and what Cherine spoke about in his speech this morning is we -- and what PDP 3.0 is also directed at is, how do we -- what -- what enhancements to our process are necessary to get us out of our corners when there's not a looming deadline because that's -- that's a change that we need to make. So I totally agree with you. I think the comments that we got on the strategic plan related to governance support that, and I think the Board has heard it and the GNSO Council has heard it in the form of PDP 3.0. So we just need to go forward, and with Brian Cote's help this week we will be exploring that.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Becky. Next, please.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Gunela Astbrink. I'm a Fellow and I'm speaking in my own capacity, and I wanted to talk about disability. 15% of the global population have a disability, and website accessibility for people with disability means people are able to participate in the digital economy. Happily the ICANN At-Large website seems to be accessible, based on the W3C website content accessibility guidelines. And it would be great to promote this. One way is for an accessibility statement in the footer of a website. I gather that next year, or in the future, the general ICANN website will be accessible as well. So another way to promote this, and hopefully more people with disability will participate in ICANN to increase the diversity in the multistakeholder process.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Gunela. Goran, please.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. (Non-English word or phrase).

GUNELA ASTBRINK: (Non-English word or phrase).

GORAN MARBY: Maybe we should do it in English. First of all, I actually would like to thank you very much for bringing this up. I worked many, many

years with accessibility for people with disabilities. And to be reminded of that in the ICANN community is something that makes me very happy.

As you know, we are working -- as we discussed yesterday, we're working on the Information Transparency Initiatives where we're redoing all the sets of how we present things on our web. I don't think -- I don't know if you agree with me when I say that the current web form that we're using needs improvement, slightly. And so that's a big and major thing. And I'm -- I actually want to make -- actually I would be W3 compatible, which is a good start, but I think we need to actually start thinking about it from another term, not only to achieve the standards but also bring into your hearts that the web tool we have should be accessible.

And you mentioned we have very few -- very few websites that is actually very good and accessible, and one of the things we can do in ITI is actually to bring in many different community sites in under one site, and which would make a more streamlined experience. So thank you. (non-English word or phrase)

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you, Goran. Before going on to the next question, I want to thank those that have asked questions thus far and pass the facilitation task to my colleague Danko. Thank you, Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you, Avri. As Avri said, my name is Danko Jevtovic. I am a new board member from the previous meeting in Barcelona, so this is the first time on this row, and next participant, please.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you. Welcome, Danko, to the Board. My name is Bruce Tonkin. Just listening to some of the comments in the last couple of days, starting with Donna's comment that she was struggling that she wasn't able to get the PDP finished on new gTLD's, that's a symptom of a lack of prioritization, I think. We also look at the schedule. Have a look at the schedule. Have a look at the full schedule. That's a classic symptom of a lack of prioritization. We're trying to run too many things at once and doing too many things poorly rather than making the actual decision up front as to what we want to prioritize and then do the few things well.

Examples of things that we have prioritized which I think have been de facto, rather than a conscious decision, but one of them was the IANA transition, and that was because the U.S. government essentially set a date that was outside of our control and we had to deliver on that. The other has been GDPR which has also been de facto. We didn't make a conscious decision to do that work, but there was an external requirement to bring registries and registrars into compliance with the law and so work had to be done. So we've yet to make conscious prioritization

decisions. And I recommend that, you know, perhaps the Board think about in its planning process that it really actually has a clear step in the planning process where we prioritize, we pick a few projects, and we all focus on doing those well. Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you for the question. I think it goes back to our strategic priorities.

Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY:

So I couldn't agree more with you, Bruce. I think prioritization is a key issue not just for the Board, but I think for the community as well. And if you recall, about a year or so ago, that issue was in discussion at the public forum about how are priorities set in ICANN in terms of community work and Board work and so on and so forth and that didn't materialize in anything.

However, in discussion about the effectiveness of our model, that issue has surfaced again, and I think some of the discussion we're going to have with you on Thursday will highlight this issue. And this is something we need to address because it will not go away just by looking at it. So I think we have to take a positive action.

So I do agree with you, and thank you for bringing this up. That will take an important priority as far as the work on the evolution of our effectiveness or the effectiveness of our model.

Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOMIC: Thank you for that. And I think we have an online question.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Kristina Hakobyan from Armenia. She's an ICANN64 Fellow and coach.

Today during one of the tech day sessions there was a comparison of ICANN and blockchains. Should they be compared?

DANKO JEVTOMIC: Thank you for the question. I think the term blockchain was very popular earlier, but it's difficult to compare such things. Who would like to comment?

Goran.

GORAN MARBY: Actually, it's a very good question. And it's easy because it's a very simple answer. ICANN -- blockchain is an application or a

platform on top of what we do. It's like anything else that happens on top. ICANN is about the underpinnings, the identifiers. So there is a very big difference.

Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay. Thank you for that. Next participant.

ELLIOT NOSS: Thank you. Elliot Noss with Tucows.

Yesterday I was in a session with the global commission on cybersecurity and ALAC, and I thought that after many years, I may be starting to see something that I have dreamed of, and I think a lot of people in this community have dreamed of, come to pass which is a little hint of potentially another multistakeholder process forming.

We were lucky enough in this community to be given ownership over a tiny kernel of the Internet. That is really an accident of history, and we can't count on things like that happening again. But without this community having ownership over a problem, we would never have survived the early days when this whole experiment was under attack from so many different directions.

The world right now is beset with global problems that we are continually trying to solve with national frames. That is simply impossible. There is no question that cybersecurity and cybercrime are one of them.

This was a very impressive group of people who have started down a road, and I think that we inside of this community should do everything we can to nurture them and potentially to help them get ownership over some small kernel of a global problem that is besetting all of us and is virtually impossible to solve.

Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you for the comment.

Next participant.

WERNER STAUB: Werner Staub from CORE association.

I have not contributed to the enormous work that took place on the WHOIS, and I was surprised, you know, that it was actually possible to get a report out, and this is admirable. And one of the striking features is that we reduced the number of roles that are of persons or contacts that are in the WHOIS, which actually opens the questions why were these roles there in the past? And

I think there is an answer. In the past, we had admins and technical and billing, and so on. They had an important role to play, and there were many services somehow associated with that. Publishing information was a good idea in those days. And we have now focused so much in this paradigm of putting information somewhere in the hands of a party that has not been selected by the user for certain effect, that we seem to forget that we have now solutions that would, in some cases, be alternatives and actually would be more roles that could be assigned to people selected by the actual parties as opposed to people who are imposed, essentially, for a certain role.

One example, for instance, that comes now in the phishing context very often, the emergency contact. You know, in the past, essentially there was an emergency contact. Yeah, I mean contact was the emergency contact. You could send a fax, and that would really work in the past. And nowadays, this, of course, is hopeless.

Now, putting the contact information out there is not a good idea, but in modern technology when everybody has a smartphone, I think we would be able to have services that can do that effectively with the same precision and even become easy.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you for the comment.

Anyone wants to say something about? No.

Okay. We will take that. And I think historically WHOIS was as you said that, but now the situation has changed because of the laws, so we had to adapt it.

Next participant.

COLLIN KURRE:

Hi, my name is Collin Kurre, and I'm with the cross-community working party on ICANN and human rights. I'm here to do a little bit of follow-through on a big success of the ICANN community, which was the work on enhancing ICANN's accountability in Work Stream 1 and 2 of the CCWG.

So I watched your January meeting with great interest, especially the session on Work Stream 2, and I appreciate that you're forward with all due diligence before implementing these 112 recommendations, some of which involve a lot of work and are very sweeping.

I also understand that not much has happened since that meeting, which is understandable because you were preparing for this meeting. So I just wanted to ask in light of a lot of other things that are coming up, such as the accountability review, this EPDP 3.0, you know, various elements of the strategic plan that could possibly influence or be influenced by the

recommendations in CCWG, do you have any timeline on the horizon for when the implementation assessment report will be completed or when the concrete stage of implementation will begin?

Thanks.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Okay. Thank you for the question.

Avri, do we have exact timeline? But I think it's -- the heart to the question is more related to the budgeting process of the implementation.

AVRI DORIA:

I certainly don't know of an accurate timeline. I know that the work on WS2 and looking through it and deciding how those things can be implemented and the costs of implementing those things is still being discussed and weighed. I don't exactly know where we are on that, and I'm not sure who else can comment. Perhaps Chris.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Hi, Collin. This is Chris. I think the right answer to this at the moment is we really just started the process, and so I can't, we

can't give you a -- it's a perfectly legitimate question, but at this stage we can't give you an answer. All I can tell you is that we are not -- we're not keen to do it slowly. We're keen to do it efficiently and effectively.

COLLIN KURRE:

I might add as a small comment that there was an initial six-month timeline from the submission through the SOs and ACs which I believe happened in November, so that puts us around the 6th of May on the original timeline.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Okay. Thank you for the question. But as I said, this also goes to the budgeting process, and the implementation is -- we are preparing to -- to start it -- to work on the process that has just started.

Thank you.

COLLIN KURRE:

I appreciate your due diligence.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Alan Greenberg speaking. I'd like to follow on the chain from Donna and Chris and Bruce onto Cherine's answer on workload.

If you look at the EPDP, at this point, and it's not finished yet, we've probably added another three to six PDPs onto the workload of the GNSO to do. Prioritization is fine. It may reduce the current workload, but it puts the estimated timeline for completing the work out towards infinity.

So I think I agree with Cherine that we have to think of how we're going to do this, and, you know, we have to come up with processes which will allow us to answer the questions that we have to answer to do our job diligently, but do them with far less resources than we're currently putting into things like PDPs or CCWGs that go on forever and ever and don't seem to ever produce the results we want in a timely manner.

One other comment. Goran has a number of times said he likes disagreeing with me, so I'll disagree with him. I think there's a great similarity between blockchain and ICANN. Try explaining either of them to a newcomer.

[Laughter]

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Good point. Thank you for the comments and especially regarding the strategic process that is very important for us. But at the moment we have another online participant. Brad.

BRAD WHITE: We have a question from Richa. When UASG is funded by ICANN, why don't they follow ICANN rules? Recently Chair Ram Mohan blocked several community members from the UA discussion and voting because they asked questions about UA ambassadors' misconduct, which includes Indian ambassador Ashish Modi, and about financial details of USAG.

Board, I am highly disappointed by the act of killing community voice and not listening to truth. Can any chair do that?

Also, the UASG brand ambassador program is totally nontransparent and decisions are taken on individual choices and not on candidates' merits.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay. Thank you for the question.

Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much. I think we'll just take that as online comment for now.

Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay. Thank you. Next participant.

HIMANSHU SHARMA: Hi, I'm Himanshu, and I'm watcher boy. This is the first time I'm in ICANN, so I went to some introductory sessions, and after that I landed with SN -- I don't know the name. The GNSO public, and I was thinking that why I'm here. I don't know.

And later on, we have a whole session about the introduction. So my suggestion is when a newcomer came in, we should have a booth available to them so we can exchange our ideas, what expertise we have, bring in on the table for ICANN and how we can contribute to the community. So we should have a dedicated booth where we can get all our answers, all our questions so that we can have a fair idea that what we are here for.

Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Welcome to ICANN, and thank you for your comment.

I remember the time when I was the first-time participant, and this also helped me.

But Goran is going to take the details.

GORAN MARBY: We have booths outside, also representatives from the different parts of the constituency, and we have programs. But I give you

that. It's not the easiest way to find your way around ICANN. I've been here for three years and I still don't know all the acronyms.

I would -- I mean, we can continue to discuss it that line. This is something that is very, very important to us, and when it comes to the actual meetings, we have several members of the team here who would love to listen to your ideas to improve it.

Thank you very much and welcome.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you, Goran, but I think Leon also wants to add something.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Danko.

Welcome to ICANN. And being a first comer is not easy at all. Whether you came here as a fellow or on your own, I definitely recommend that you go on the newcomer's tracks. They are very useful for newcomers. They literally take you by the hand and explain you all the composition of ICANN, what every AC and SO does, et cetera. So I guess that is the table that you are looking for. The newcomers track is the place to be if you are a newcomer.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay. Thank you.

Next.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Good afternoon. My name is Jeff Neuman. I'm not a newcomer.

[Laughter]

Sorry.

But I still do enjoy coming here.

So I want to thank Donna and others that have come up here and made comments about the PDP I'm working on. While I am a little tired, I'm not quite yet exhausted, and I don't plan on leaving in the next six months. So I will be hopefully around to continue working on this.

But I think what I wanted to raise was that I wanted to agree with the comments that were brought up on priorities and how it's very important for the Board and the council to develop the priorities and make sure they stick with them. There have been intervening events that caused the PDP to take a little bit longer than it probably should have and that's because the EPDP came up. Some members that we had in our group left. Times that we had scheduled meetings had to be canceled because of EPDP work. Face-to-face meetings had to be -- or sessions had too many conflicts with EPDP. So it really did cause a lot of problems.

And here's the question or set of questions, especially on the multistakeholder model. So how do we get stakeholders from many different perspectives to come to a consensus when each stakeholder has very different incentives. And if a default of, let's say, a policy development process is not to change a thing, then what incentives are there for those that liked or benefited from the way it was to compromise or move away from their silo?

For too long stakeholders have greatly benefited in ICANN from staying in their silos and not compromising, and we all need to change that.

I don't have any answers, though I'm actively searching for solutions, and I ask the Board to think about this this week and beyond. And I'm happy to talk to Brian in that project. But I think if there is a problem in the multistakeholder model, this is the biggest one.

Thanks.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you. And I would like to thank you and the other EPDP members for your work.

I think Chris has a comment.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yes, Jeff, I agree. I think we -- we seem to have -- for once, we seem to have got our timing right in starting a discussion on a subject. So kudos to us.

But we really do need to have everyone involved, and everyone needs to be aware of what's happening. And as I said to Donna, the paradox is that it takes work and so we end up getting more exhausted to solve the problem.

But I really do want to appreciate you and everyone else who is prepared to get involved and help with this. That's fantastic, and hopefully we'll see some speedy progress because we can have some small wins here on process. Process -- processes can be a reasonably easy fix. And hopefully we'll see those relatively quickly.

Thanks, Jeff.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Okay. We will have another online question, but I also would like to close the queue because we are nearing the end of this eggs is. So Brad.

BRAD WHITE: Question from Susan Marukhyan: Does ICANN have a formulated vision regarding artificial intelligence and its influence on data protection rights?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: No. Becky?

[Laughter]

No it does not is the answer.

Okay. Next participant, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Jonathan Zuck, for the record. And, I guess, Jeff, while not being a newcomer, is a new man. I had to say it. But -- and I think he left off the last part of his sentence when he said he's not yet exhausted. He means he hasn't yet exhausted his opponents on the subject of procedural working groups. But I know he will. I know he's determined.

No, but I wanted to talk to you a little bit about the CCT review, of which I was the chair and for which you have just replied, and I will admit at the outset I have not fully ingested your reply. But I do believe it represents a kind of might from an era in which every recommendation got approved by the Board and then it became an issue of whether or not it got appropriately implemented to an

era where functionally none of the recommendations were approved. And I think that's a big change and is raising an alarm among other people that are involved in review teams. And so what I would ask for you -- from you is a commitment, and I don't think it can happen here, maybe it's in Morocco, for us to have a session and get real about expectations of review teams, what burdens they have to understand budget processes and things like that so that they're not wasting their time in making recommendations that are the wrong types of recommendations or don't have the right follow behind them, et cetera.

And again, I haven't fully ingested this. I'm not trying to be histrionic or anything like that. I think a lot of the things are already happening in the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. Jamie Hedlund is doing a lot of work in compliance to deal with the things that are serious there. I think the real fatality from our review is probably going to be any future competition analysis. And it may be that we decide that that's not important. It's possible that it doesn't matter. If we limit the down-side consequences or something, it's possible that that competition analysis doesn't matter. But I want us to be conscious about that fact because that's probably the fatality of your resolution regarding the CCT review.

But all I'm asking for at this moment is a commitment to have a session so other review teams and us know how to respond to this

but so we have an understanding going forward of how we should handle these situations.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you for that. It's a very good comment and I think it goes to the strategic plan.

Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Jonathan, you bring up a very important point. Before I respond immediately, you said that none of the recommendations were accepted. I just want to make a slight correction. There were 37 recommendations. We accepted six. And I think there was some 13 recommendations that were really not in the remit of the Board to do, and the Board is passing those to the right section in the community. And then the other recommendation was about collecting more data, and there's more data generation. We ask the CEO to look into them.

So you are right, we have not accepted all of them. But it is also our fiduciary responsibility to make sure that before accepting something, we know that it's implementable. So we are working on that, and we respect all the effort and the work that the CCT has done.

The issue -- and that came on the WS2, the question before. Bruce mentioned it on priority, is the issue of prioritization.

You put yourself in the place of the Board. We're sitting here and then we receive a handful of very good recommendations from the CCT, 37. We -- someone mentioned 112 recommendations from WS2. None of them are costed. None of them are prioritized.

What do you want the Board to do? To say, let's adopt them all and implement them immediately? It is not possible.

So I think we have an issue as a community that cost doesn't -- and affordability and prioritization is not well-practiced. All of us together -- there's no accusation to anybody; but that's our history, is that things have normally grown like this. But we have reached the point now where we really need to address this issue because it's a real shame for a group like yourself to work over a year or so --

[Timer sounds.]

-- and really work hard -- I'm sorry. I'm going to continue on this issue a little bit -- and work hard and come up with a recommendation for them not to be all adopted. And you ask yourself, why have I wasted all my volunteer time and sacrifice? The same with WS2. The same with others.

But we need to find a way, we need to find a way where we bring prioritization and affordability all the way down to the community level so when a recommendation is coming to the Board, the community also has the right to make choices on what is their priority.

So this is a big, big issue for us. We need to fix that. It is not working at the moment and not working well.

And, frankly, please come to the meeting on Thursday. Please make those voices -- we need to find together a solution for that. It's not going to disappear. It's only going to get worse. So thank you for bringing this up. Really appreciate it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. I don't want to extend. I wasn't really trying to invite a substantive response. I really want a commitment to have a session specifically about that with review teams so that those expectations are set for them in the reviews they're doing because it's other review teams that are now coming to me asking me how I'm responding to this.

This is a big change in the way you have previously responded, and that's all I'm saying. I honestly didn't mean to get into the substance.

I would ask you to go back and read the language that you used in many places because this is the Board that has approved millions of dollars of expenses on various things that did not come from the community.

So it's tough when the community has asked for something, that money is somehow a problem. But somehow, it's less of a problem when the Board decides that it's necessary to do. And another thing that came up quite a bit is this might upset the registries. This might upset the contracted parties.

Go back and read your language because the language matters. Everyone in the community, especially the contracted parties, thought that this was a good idea. Therefore, we think that we need to make sure that this is worth doing. Read your words because words matter. And I ask that you read those words prior to this meeting that I'm asking you to have.

And I was trying not to get into a substantive discussion because I don't really believe that either one of us is prepared for it.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you for the question. It really goes to the heart.

Goran would like to add something.

GORAN MARBY:

First of all, you should know that this thing is something that we and the Board and the org has discussed endlessly because the CCT review pointed to some really interesting problems. You are just tapping into a discussion we've had for -- very seriously about how to make this better. The Board and the org, it's really important for us that the reviews like the CCT works. You and I have sort of talked about this. But you came actually up and said the same thing we said inside the org only yesterday in a Board workshop.

I can't promise you to do it in Marrakech, and the reason for that is because the SO and AC leadership has that power to do many of the sessions when we go into policy. But I would like to have it.

I would reiterate what Cherine said. We're having a session on Thursday where we start talking about many of those things. If I can decide we have a session about this in Marrakech, I would -- we would love to do it because we need to figure out a way how to make sure that the community with its reviews and PDPs can be built into a system where we make sure that we don't take away things we all think is important.

I said in many of the conversations about the budget over this year, next year's budget is going to be interesting because we have CCT, we have Work Stream 2, we have the same amount of money. We're going to have new structure. We're going to have

a new strategy. There're so many moving parts. How do we blend all that together and present that to you in the community, so you can make the final decisions?

Thank you. So thank you for bringing it up.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. I'm happy to pay for the airline tickets of myself and all the current review team chairs to join a Board meeting sometime if it is impossible to make something happen in Marrakech. So let me know and we'll be there. Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you very much. We'll come back for you, the next participant. But I think we have an online question, and it's the last one online.

BRAD WHITE:

We have a comment actually from Fabricio Vayra.

The community still needs a method to address the harms resulting from the lack of WHOIS access, see recent data from Piscitello and other cybersecurity experts. So phase 2 access discussion should be expedited. Active Board participation would be appreciated.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you for that comment.
And the last participant. Thanks.

TAIJI KIMURA: I'm Taiji from Japan. Individual question.
May I ask you a question in Japanese?

This is the first time for me to participate in ICANN meeting. And the philosophy of ICANN is well-reflected in each different session. And although this is my very first participation regarding the contents and discussion of each session or directionality that you are going to toward, it was quite understandable and very interesting for me. I enjoyed participating in the sessions.

And as a point I felt is that the meeting agendas -- just in the previous session, what kind of discussion made in the topics that handled in the session that I'm going to attend. If that information is available in advance, that would be more useful.

This is a big meeting. Therefore, it might be difficult for you to publish all the agenda in advance. But we have very useful online tool, so I would like to see some improvement so that the discussion status and the agenda to be discussed. Of course, I understand that it depends on the session. But if it could be more

understandable ahead of the meeting that's to be held, then I would appreciate it.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay. Thank you very much for the question. Akinori, I think you have the answer.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you for your question and thank you very much for raising your voice in Japanese. Simultaneous translation is available, so I wish other Japanese participants also be courageous to come to the microphone and make voices.

Concerning the prior preparation for the material information, I think that all the ICANN members are trying to do so. But having said so, still the material preparations necessary, depending upon the discussions held just immediately before that preparation timing.

So I appreciate your inputs and would like to improve the secretariat's preparedness for the meeting. So thank you for your comment. I appreciate it very much.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: -- for all comments and participants.

Cherine, back to you.

CHERINE CHALABY: So thank you, all. I think this was a very -- very productive session in terms of teasing out really some fundamental issues that we need to deal with as a community.

And the discussion mentioned by various people that came to the microphone indicates that the more -- the more we're open and transparent about our issues and the more we're willing to tackle and make changes, the better we'll all be. So the session on Thursday on the multistakeholder model effectiveness will be quite an important session.

Did you want to say anything before I close?

GORAN MARBY: Jonathan, are you still here? I just received we will have a session as you requested in Marrakech. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Good. Thank you, Goran.

So I know not everyone got to ask their questions, and I know not everyone who asked questions got an answer. We will come back to you on that.

But please remember there's another public forum, a second one, on Thursday at 4:00 p.m. which will last, I think, an hour and 45

minutes. I hope you can join us tonight for the gala. It should be a wonderful celebration to kick off this first day of our meeting.

Best wishes for the rest of the week. And I hope you have a productive week. Thank you, and this public forum is now closed. Thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]