KOBE - Joint Meeting- ICANN Board and CPH
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 - 17:00 to 18:30 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

BECKY BURR: Okay. I think we are ready to go. Thank you, everybody, for joining us in this cozy environment.

Just so you know, the acoustics up here are terrible, and if you're having real trouble, using the mics make a big difference. Makes it a lot better.

We are going to start with the questions from the contracted parties, and I think we have questions from the Registry Stakeholder Group, and then we'll go to the Registrar Stakeholder Group questions.

But they will appear on the screen so that it's going to be amazing.

Okay. Who is going to do this? Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Hi, it's Jonathan Robinson for the transcript. So no pleasantries. Very nice to be with you all.

[Laughter]

Been looking forward to this all day and hoping you weren't exhausted and bored. We certainly see that you made it. I'm looking at -- looking for some eye contact. Some sort of engagement.

[Laughter]

Not getting the body language.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: All right. Well, I'll try anyway. Maybe I'll reach out to this audience here.

BECKY BURR: I think we're waiting for Goran.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah, I think Goran has got something else going on.

GORAN MARBY: I'm the junior one. I'm waiting for you guys.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Well, we're just checking you're with us. All right. So we -- we have appreciated the opportunity to put the input in the

EN

budget, and as you know, we've put something in through the financial planning process. And we -- we're very positive to the finance team about the sort of whole sense of fiscal responsibility that's coming through as a very strong message.

 And so we -- and they appreciated it, but we recognize that, and we hope you do as well because it seems we're well aligned there.

 One of the things we felt, though, and this is what this question really speaks to, is we'd like to understand more about what -- what measures are going to be put in place to really continue with that theme and make sure that -- and understand how key items of spend are tracked and measured, and so that the sort of -- that sense of fiscal responsibility continues and that it can be transparently measured. So I guess what we're looking for is to see some sort of goals and objectives in that and understand how those -- those all take place.

 And then you'll see the second there is that we've often heard from you that a significant part of ICANN -- and I forget what the figure is, but I think I've heard things like 80% is pre-committed. And to put it really bluntly, we're not convinced about that. We don't -- I mean, if I -- if I came into an organization in a senior management level and said, look -- and they said, look, we need you to make this organization more profitable or, you know, revenue is going to go down and we need you to cut costs, I'm

sorry it's all pre-committed, it's just not -- somehow, things are never pre-committed. Ultimately, one can manage expenditure.

And so I think we'd like to understand how -- you know, your thoughts about how an ongoing tight management and constraint across. and obviously the most significant expenditure is staff.

So that's really -- I hope that's clear, and we think we wrote it down fairly clearly, but I'm happy to expand on it in that way. So we'd love your input and thoughts as to those two sort of key points in that area.

Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Thank you.

                              Ron.

RON DA SILVA: Thank you, Jonathan. These are all topics that are dear to our hearts as well, especially with our fiduciary oversight responsibilities. We spend a lot of time at the Board discussing the finances of the organization. And, in fact, you see that reflected in the five-year strategic plan. There's -- one of the objectives is around our fiduciary responsibilities, and one of the

goals that have trickled out of that I think addresses the issue you're raising with regards to accountability, better transparency. And this is a theme we hear from all the different parts of the ICANN community.

In fact, we were talking about this just a few hours ago in our session with the -- the CSG, Commercial Stakeholder Group. That didn't want to come out right. But exactly the same topic.

And so measures and ongoing enhancements on reporting and accountability are what we envision will come next in the five-year operating plan. Specific goals on how do we chief that, specific goals on how do we continue to evolve into a leaner and much more efficient organization.

On the -- let's see.

You want to jump in, Goran?

GORAN MARBY: I want to focus a little bit on the second part of the question. So you say bluntly that the biggest cost is the staff, and that's, of course, true, but if you break that down, what do you think the staff actually does? Because you find immediately a correlation between staff and things that you asked us to do, if you break it down.

The reason why we mention that is because there are many things in the budget the Board cannot change from year to year. That's what we mean with the 85%. I know you know that. We do three meetings a year, $50 million; we run IANA, $12 million; we have your love, pet project, compliance; we have GDD.

So if you add all those things up with the programs we're doing, we're doing -- let me see. We're going to Bangkok for the GDD Summit, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And if you actually add all that up, that becomes 80, 85%.

And what we're trying to say, we are -- that is really -- we are not the senior management of the company that tries to provide profit, it's the other way around. We're a nonprofit organization, but the community has the last say when it comes to how spending of the money.

So I often for instance get why are you 382 people now where you were 325, something, a couple of years ago. When I look in, for instance, transition. After the transition many new accountability mechanisms was put in place and, therefore, we added people to do that. We sit on new committees, we do new stuff. And if you want to see what we actually do, I recommend to go into the accountability indicators where we more or less in real time actually go back and talk about how we work against targets.

So it's not like we're trying to say we can't change anything, but the thing is that you are a big part of that change. You make many of those decisions.

And I think -- I'm the first one to acknowledge that -- I don't know why I've said it a couple of times this week, is ICANN is like an onion. We added layer after layer, and if you start peeling into it, someone is going to cry, because the point of the -- the real fact is we have added a lot of stuff, and I think that in the five-year strategic plan together with the exercise we're doing on Thursday, you can question it. We can provide you with the facts, but it's a little bit sort of coming back and saying you have now many staff. There is a direct correlation between the things you asked us to do and the staff we're having.

Thank you.

RON DA SILVA: So thanks, Goran, for jumping in on that. Just to add a little bit more color. The reason why I hesitated, I was reflecting on the materials that came out in the budget cycle that we've seen now this year similar to last year where there's, you know, pretty large spreadsheet with all these different ways of slicing up the resources, including the headcount of who is working on which programs and which activities. That may help with some of the color you're looking for, I think, with regards to, you know, where

is the staff allocated. And then the other point of pre-committed program spends of that -- you know, the nondiscretionary 85% 90%, 70%, whatever percentage you want to put on it I think is less important than just understanding these are things we have already committed to. We can go back and change our mind and say let's have two meetings a year, like Goran was saying, instead of three. Well, that would free up $3 million or something on that order of magnitude.

So -- But I think -- back to the transparency, because I think that's a bigger thing that we hear, like I said earlier, from across the feedback and all the different constituents. And a key component of our five-year operating plan will have to address that with some specific goals and objectives around how do we get better, how do we make sure it's embedded in our regular discipline of annual budgeting or biannual budgeting or five-year budgeting. Whatever variations we're going to be presenting our estimates on funding and costs. That needs to be, you know, a continued focus of our fiduciary discipline.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Those are all helpful. Certainly Goran, one thing I have heard from the finance team a couple of times this week is you and others, Xavier, are signing off on each new hire, whether it's a replacement or a new hire. And I think that -- I think we should congratulate you. That's tedious but it's

EN

a very welcome and productive discipline. So I just want to acknowledge that.

And I think, you know, there are -- there are clearly -- notwithstanding the fact that there are a bunch of projects, one can always look at how to optimize or make efficient or work. And it's not for me to stand up here and say how the management of the organization should take place, but it's my opinion and our view that -- that one can always enhance efficiencies of operation.

And then to the point of how much of those things we asked to do, I suppose there are two dynamics there. One is when you talk to the Contracted Parties House, you talk uniquely to the one group within ICANN through which the revenues are channeled and work. So there is a -- and to the extent that ICANN -- so there's a sensitivity around where the funding comes from. All other groups are net users of that funding, not incorrectly. It's for very, very many valid uses. But I think in terms of your point, Goran, on things that we ask you to do, I think there's a much broader community asking you to do a lot of things. I'm not sure those are -- I mean, our primary engagement, our significant engagement is clearly with GDD, and there are other areas. Obviously the EPDP, for example, and the whole registry data is something which concerns us directly and very substantially. But many of those

other things that are being asked for are not necessarily asked for by this particular group.

And I have heard the finance team say a number of times again this week we get -- we get told to cut costs but give more. And there's clearly a sense that there's a contradictory message there. And that -- I guess that contradictory message is something you will hear naturally, but that is the management challenge.

BECKY BURR: So on this point we've had a very interesting experience in the last couple of weeks. I don't know if you have heard, but there's a significant amount of chat to the effect that the Board essentially turned down all of the CCT recommendations. That is not true. We accepted five of them. We forwarded about 13 that were really not directed at the Board and the prerogative of the policy development bodies. And then with a significant number of them, many of them related to the requests for data. We put them into a "pending" category because we had concerns that while additional data might be very useful to understand the impact of new gTLDs on competition and consumer trust, we didn't have a great deal of confidence that the data that was being requested was going to provide that insight. And so we asked the -- asked org to engage, to take -- look at this and engage

expertise that can tell us what kind of data really might be useful for that and whether it's available and the like.

But in the course of that discussion, we realized that the CCT recommendations, are 30 something of them, all had significant cost impacts. And, you know, we've kind of lived in a world where the reviews or the policy development processes produce a result -- the transition, for example -- and then we step them and go build them. And it's become clear that we're going to have to push some of the choices and prioritizations and funding down into the community.

So it would have been really helpful for the CCT, for example, to have information about what -- what the proposals, written recommendations would cost before they voted on a final report. We've just begun that conversation and it ties into the conversation that Cherine was talking about at the opening ceremony.

But I think we're really looking at a -- at, when we say the things that you ask us for -- you know, reviews, policy development processes -- the cost and tradeoffs conversation has to be pushed down into that process in a way that we haven't done that before.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah. And just very briefly on that. It's Jonathan for the record. I think we should acknowledge and recognize that that's a -- that's a productive approach to -- we simply can't have an ongoing wish list that's not costed. And as you say, linking this into the so-called governance reforms makes some sense.

GORAN MARBY: And to your point, if you look on the -- when we started talking about budget restraint which I started doing in Copenhagen, whatever number meeting that was, we -- you know, we start -- we actually implemented a program which you see the end result of. We have for the last three years put money in the reserve fund. We have the same -- actually, we're now on a lower spend rate than we were in the last year and we actually right now in this time -- this is more of a clerical thing -- are less people than we were last year. So we have broken down and sort of put a lot of restraints into, you know, cost.

And what we're doing is that we're financing things by cost savings. I won't say that we're effective.

I just got a note from another meeting that actually talked about the CCT. They say it's against the bylaws to look at it from sort of a fiduciary responsibility. And before the transition what the Board is did was to tell ICANN org to go and find money, but we don't have any more money to find.

And I said in the conversations with all the -- I think I spoke to you, Graeme and Donna, about the same thing, this budget is a copy and paste from last year, and, therefore, fairly boring. Even I think it's boring. Xavier may not think it's boring. But next year when we go into the budget process, we're going to have CCT, we have the Work Stream 2, we have a new strategy, RTD2.

BECKY BURR: It's ATRT3.

GORAN MARBY: Sorry. There's no way I can learn that one. I don't know why.

And all those will have budgetary -- budgetary implications. And one of the things we're trying to figure out now, how do we engage with the community because the budget process is a big process. How do we engage with the community, make sure that you can at least know about the things we're going to put into the budget. Because things that cost 10, 15, $20 million in total, we haven't done that, has to be taken somewhere. And these are community policy -- sorry, reviews set by the community.

So back to what we talked about, that's a mechanism we have to figure out together.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: It's Jonathan again for the record. One final come back on that. There's two points I would like to make. One is when we put our comment on the budget, the first thing we did is we acknowledged your fiscal discipline and the contribution to the reserve fund. And we genuinely recognize and appreciate those. And then third, to your point, Goran, we recognize that there's more work to be done, and we will work with you on that whole prioritization, optimization of spend.

So I think we are -- it seems to me we are aligned and talking with each other on how to move this forward.

GORAN MARBY: Xavier likes to talk to you. He reports back to me.

BECKY BURR: Any other comments on this question?

Anybody in the audience have anything to say in this intimate gathering here?

GORAN MARBY: As long as you don't ask for more travel slots, please.

BECKY BURR: There are microphones. So anybody who wants to join in should feel free to do that.

Okay. Shall we go to the next question?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky, Donna Austin.

Some of this has come up earlier in the week, particularly the session on strategic objectives and the strategic plan. I don't know what day it was. Yesterday.

So I guess the question relates to the -- the commencement of work on the governments model. And we -- I understand the rationale for it, and I've got no problem with that. But I think one of the things that we're concerned about is that -- and this goes to the prioritization and where you spend your money. So it flows on reasonably well from the last discussion.

But there are so many open issues that are being discussed at the moment that have time lines that just keep moving. And there's -- there's no discussion about, you know, some of this sits with the council. Some of these sits, you know -- the open IRTs, potentially that's with the GDD, because, you know, they're responsible for those. You know, you've just discussed the CCT. But there are so many substantive activities that are going on at the moment that it's hard to see where the end in sight is with those.

So I guess, you know, when -- when we heard about this new focus on governance, my reaction was, well, why now? You know. Why can't we finish what we've started and then move on to the next new shiny thing?

The rationale that you provided during the strategic planning update makes a lot of sense. But there's still that, you know, if we accept that it's something that's appropriate to do now, what can we do as a community to have a discussion around prioritizing some of these other efforts and making sure that we have the resources available to finish them in a reasonable amount of time rather than letting them, you know, drag on.

You know, the CCWG on auction proceeds I expect is going to be difficult to implement. It's going to be -- there will be political sensitivities around it.

Subsequent Procedures PDP, the -- I know that there's a suggestion that that planning work will start soon to get some idea of what that will be. But the implementation of that, I expect, will be significant as well.

So I guess it's a question of, you know, how do we start that conversation around prioritization? Where does that fit into the budget discussion?

So I guess it feeds into the discussion we've just had, or links into that.

BECKY BURR: I think Cherine was going to respond to this after he finishes eating his nuts.

CHERINE CHALABY: That's my lunch.

That issue of prioritization is probably one of the single most important issues that we need to resolve as a community. There's no doubt on my mind.

The other issue is affordability.

And if we're able to tackle these two issues, I think we're going to resolve a lot of problem, a lot of anxiety, a lot of tension that's happening now. Because everybody's feeling the tension, feeling the pressure. People are working long hours. People are tired. People haven't got the capacity to absorb anything new. So I think we acknowledge all of that.

The multistakeholder initiative is, indeed, part of the last bullet point. The bylaws mandate that the new strategic plan, new operating plan have to be in place 1st of July 2020. Inside that operating -- We finished the strategic plan, and we posted it, and

we had comments, and we met with the community. We're going to incorporate a lot of the comments. But I think the work on the strategic plan is pretty much done from a workload to the community. And we're looking at finalizing this by -- certainly before Marrakech.

In that strategic plan, there are five major objectives, and they're now being translated into an operating plan and financial plan.

One of those objectives is improving the multistakeholder effectiveness of the governance model. So this is a subset of that operating plan. But we felt that it is not proper or appropriate for ICANN org to lead the work in doing -- in this -- particularly to that particular subset of the plan related to the multistakeholder model. And I think this has to be a community exercise.

However, I just want to clarify, what is it we're looking for?

First of all, we're not looking for implementing changes, not now. We're not looking for a solution, not now. We're only looking for developing a work plan. And in that work plan, there will be a list of issues and who will be responsible for doing what and by when. That's all. We have -- and we're saying if we can do it in the next nine months, to integrate it within the operating and financial plan, so that by the end of the year, we can put all of this out for public comment. And by the time the public comment comes in

and we integrate all of that, it will be time for implementing by 1st of July.

So the timing, in a way, is mandated by the bylaws.

A couple of things on substance of this exercise.

We're not looking here at structural issues or structural improvement. There's a place for this, mandated by the bylaws. There's a mechanism, reviews to do that. So we're not going to do this.

We're not looking at duplicating work that comes from WS2 or CCT or ATRT. There's a place for doing that as well.

So we're looking, really, here at some ideas that we can, with the community, starting 2021 -- but if the community wants to do earlier than that, why not -- finding things that we can do that are not disruptive but could have a great benefit to take some of this anxiety out of prioritization, out of affordability.

And Becky mentioned the issue. I think it's unfair for the community to engage on projects, like CCT review or WS2, and spend two or three years, and then put those to the board, and then the board say, "Wait a minute. The cost is too high." Just -- I don't think -- there has to be a different way of actually bringing cost and affordability down to the community level so that when

the community brings recommendations to the board, they are informed of the implications of that.

So we're looking for ideas. And I don't think there are -- I don't want to belittle the amount of work, because I think when you're overstretched and overworked, any little drop becomes like an ocean. Yes. I can see that.

But I think -- I think this is part of this mandated by the bylaws. I think it's worth doing.

We have Brian Cute engaged pretty much on a full-time basis between now and the end of the year to help us drive through, identify the issue, and come up with a work plan.

I have in my mind a mental picture of what that work plan could be. But I think it's going to be more than that. But just to make the analogy, it's almost like a spreadsheet we need. And the rows are the issues we need to address, and the columns, who's going to address them. And the intersection is the date by when it could be. And the date would be -- it could be 2020, '22 or '21. It depends who can do what at what pace. And I think that's all we're asking at this staining. We're not asking for a solution. We're not asking for execution.

BECKY BURR: And just what -- we're also not thinking to supplant, replace, or ignore the work of PDP 3.0. That is -- I mean, that's a huge contribution to this. But there may be ways in which we can support the implementation of PDP 3.0 through this process.

So I just want to put that on the table. That's a huge sort of get us down the road a bit. And it goes across the organization much more than just the policy development, but all of the operations.

CHERINE CHALABY: I -- I don't know why I didn't mention it, because that was the first one on my list, not to duplicate the PDP 3.0. So I apologize for that.

BECKY BURR: Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Yeah, I just -- though I know I kind of get it, and I understand the issue.

Just an example of something that came up today which might -- it might be helpful to think of, so we were sort of -- we were bouncing the ball around about what sort of things would end up -- might end up on this list and so on. And, obviously, there are some things that would improve the way that we operate and the

processes that are -- that are fixes within a particular group, and so therefore they don't need this process. The group can just go, you know what? We're just going to all have the same thing, color pencils or whatever.

But to take a real example, I went to the -- I went to the leadership training thing that happened at the beginning of this meeting for two days. And I was there for the first day. And one of the things that they do in the leadership -- excuse me -- on the leadership training is, they have a conflict resolution session. And that's a role-playing thing, and it goes on for a couple of hours with various different scenarios. And everyone who did this said we should do this in working groups. Every working group should start with a conflict resolution session.

Now, that may be a great idea; it may not. But the point is, if you put this up on the issues thing and say would this help us get through our work better, more quickly, that sort of thing may be worth looking at in the discussions. I use it simply as an example. Because the goal is to make it easier and better. But as Cherine has said, the paradox is (indiscernible) that you need to do the work.

DONNA AUSTIN: So a couple of years ago, the contracted parties wrote what was -- became referred to as the love letter to the GDD. And one of the

things we recommended in that, because we were -- we were at a point where the relationship with GDD wasn't all that fantastic, because we kept butting heads on things, and neither party would move.

One of the things that I think we recommended and added to that was that mediation training be provided to, you know, potentially staff so that you could bring those skills into the discussion that might make us, you know, overcome some of those hurdles early on in the piece. I think mediation skills would be really helpful throughout the community. And perhaps a little bit of a better understanding of what we mean by consensus and how we get there.

And I think Jeff, you know, raised this as a problem yesterday during the public forum. But it is something that we don't do well, and we don't really know how to do well.

One of the -- one of the questions you had for us, I think what we have come to understand is that there -- a lot of these conversations happen in silos. So Xavier came to us this morning, and we had a discussion around the budget. And we saw his spreadsheet and responded to how, you know -- our comments. And I suspect he's doing that with all the different SOs and ACs. But it will be really helpful to have that conversation in this room with everybody in the room and perhaps having the

representatives from each group having a conversation so that we understand, you know, where the pressure is on the budget. So we don't take the opportunity to do that enough. You know, we're all here in this meeting, and we're all in our individual little silos, talking to one another, and bitching about this isn't right and that's not right. Well, why not get us all in a room and have that conversation? It's not -- it's not all that difficult.

GORAN MARBY: You and I talked about that idea before. We actually did an exercise last meeting where we put all the executive team up and went through the budget and went through all the different parts of the budget to create that discussion.

But you know as well as I do that even if we get everybody in the room -- and I have a suggestion, a former suggestion, next time we do this, can we add drinks to the snacks as well and sit around a fireplace as well and have a conversation?

But the fact, you have different interests. And when Jonathan pointed it out, there are different interests. And the board ends up sort of with this very, you know -- the board and the org end up with this really strange place where someone has to finally make the decision. In the end, it's the community that makes the decision for the empowered one. But someone has to make those

choices. And you distribute necessarily evenly, because no one is going to be really happy.

I think the strategic plan is one of the most -- Cherine said a strategic plan without a budget is like just a PowerPoint of dreams. And I like that one.

But -- So I think that this -- this now, the five-year strategic plan we're having is going to be a very good benchmark for the budget going forward. Because that is where the community actually tells which is going to be important for us to go on and that's where the money's going to go. And then we can always work on making us more efficient, making us better.

Give you one example. We now are going -- we saved $2.2 million by having the ability to plan where we're going to have meetings further down the road. So now we hire them and go back to the same places. We're still in the same format.

But having this thing that -- you know, I can just imagine a meeting where we sit all together and talk about the budget. We will not agree. Someone -- everybody has to -- someone, in the end, the budget -- the budget is going to be -- not everybody is going to be happy.

DONNA AUSTIN:	So, Goran, I take your point that we all have different interests. But what we don't have is a good upping of those different interests and why we think our -- what our issue is more important than somebody else's. So, you know, to Chris's point about having, you know, some kind of conflict resolution, we never actually -- when we talk about the budget, we don't actually have a conversation with the NCSG about what their priorities might be and whether they -- you know, there's a way that we could work together to meet our, you know, common objectives or something.
	But, I mean, the point that I'm making is that we don't have that opportunity to have the conversation, because in these meetings, I mean, you've been talking to the different constituencies all day. But we -- we've been sitting in our own room, having our own discussion, so we don't know what's happened here. But that's -- that would be useful information for us to have, to understand what that dialogue was and what the concerns are. But we don't have the opportunity to even get feedback on what happened here and what you've heard and, you know, how you intend to move forward with that.
	So I guess what I'm saying, Goran, is an opportunity to have a better opportunity to share information that will lead to a shared understanding of potentially what the problems are and how we

can work together as a community to fix it rather than putting the board in the position of being an arbiter all the time.

GORAN MARBY:

I don't disagree at all, if I may. We do have the public – we have the comments process, which means that you will see the different communities working together. And what the different parts of the community thinks when it comes to the budget. Some of them are doing lengthy one, and we are very appreciative of the comments from the contracted parties. Some of them do less.

And I'm not saying that you're wrong in any way. It's just that, in the end, there will be different interests, and choices will remain, which is a part of the multi-stakeholder model itself.

But I'm -- you know, we can also be creative in that sense. Why don't you invite them? I mean, you can sit down with different parts of the community and have those discussions and share that information. There's nothing that stops you from doing that structurally, to have that arrangement and discussions within the GNSO, as well as having discussions with the other ones. We don't always have to set up things. I mean, if you're interested with SSAC thinks those things, you can also talk to them.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just a quick response on that, Goran. And this isn't to attribute blame, but to -- The scheduling is obviously one of the other big hot topics. And I don't think -- the community's quite divided on the scheduling, by definition, because the scheduling is centralized within ICANN org. Personally, I think some creative work on the scheduling, kind of really taking a step back and saying, do we do this right? Because we're in a kind of mechanism where we do the sort of same thing, and it sort of expands, and we struggle, and people probably do the absolute best they can to meet all of these. But in the end, it sorts of feels to me like somebody needs to take a step back in the scheduling and perhaps try a couple of creative different options. Like, for example, the budget, having it in plenary so when items of the budget are discussed, various members of the community get to see how it's -- that's just an example. But some form of creative thinking on that may be an option.

GORAN MARBY: I would love to engage in a discussion about the 305 sessions we are having here, or the 340 sessions we had in Barcelona, or the 320, I think -- 290 we now are planning for the Americas meeting.

There's a lot of sessions. And I -- I -- I think me and my team and everybody would like to engage in that sort of discussion. Because as you said, it's become sort of -- it's become sort of -- all

the constituencies now get their this is the amount of sessions you get, because you're important and you get those sessions and you're going to have people in the room, instead of thinking what do we actually need to talk about.

I would -- because, I mean, it's like we got a question from Jonathan Zuck yesterday, can we have this particular meeting at the next meeting. I can't answer yes or no. So I'm all for it. Who should I talk to?

BECKY BURR: I think we have Danko, and then Chris, in the queue.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Speaking about the sessions, I just wanted to remind you tomorrow we have three-hours session in Emerald, I can see in the schedule, from 9:00 to 12:00, talking about budget update and comments. And having said that, I would also like to thank you for the very good comments we have received in the budget process. So we have gone further in the Board level and the Finance Committee, and tomorrow I'm looking forward for this discussion. And it's the community wide.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks. I'm just going to make a very brief response to that point. It's interesting. I mean, I'm very interested in finance. As you saw, I led the comments group on the registries. Currently I don't plan to attend that session on the budget tomorrow. Now I'm not -- I didn't say that to be provocative or difficult. It's just not in my schedule. Because I've already had a session with ICANN finance on the budget and I maybe have something else planned. So, you know, that's what I mean by the schedule. Something's not right when it happens like that. So I'm sorry to come in. I just thought it was a useful response to make.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I -- and I agree with that. I mean, the problem, of course, is that if you had one session that wouldn't work because everybody would say well, I can't be there. Therefore, it hasn't actually happened unless I'm there. And then if you -- and it varies different stages of the project, you need to have the sessions. But in talking of scheduling generally, I just wanted to remind us all that we did specifically -- and Donna and I spent a long time with a Meeting Strategy Working Group on this, we did specifically set out to create the ability on the middle meeting of the year to have -- to have you -- you able to call meetings in the afternoons on stuff. So you could say, I want to have a discussion about the budget and I -- I'm going to -- I want a room and I want the -- I

hand out an invitation to anybody who wants to come and talk about the budget.

Now, that's how it was intended to be. It's kind of got a little bit as usual with us. You leave an empty space, and rather than actually let it be empty because no one called for a meeting, we just think it's empty, so we fill it. But I think if we can get back to the concept of having those sorts of things so that you can call those meetings, that would be helpful.

And just to reinforce what Goran said, that is actually in the power of the community because the SO and AC leaders' group, or whoever it is that actually sets the schedule, could make that decision. In the same way that they make the decision on what the hot topics are and so on.

BECKY BURR: Any other comments on that one? Anybody? Go. Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: I don't want to talk about the session. I want to bring us back to the question, if that's okay. I know most of you thought we were done with it, but I think -- I think this -- this is an opportunity for walking the talk. This particular session that's going to take place on Thursday as well as this initiative. And here the Board said that this is going to be facilitated by a member of the community and

Board members would participate as individuals as part of the larger community. And I think that's important.

What do I mean by walk the talk. I think it would be a failure if as a result of working with the community on the issues that we have a laundry list of 200 issues. That means that we're not prioritizing anything. And I think the most important thing, if we exclude everything to do with structuring, restructuring, because we're not going to do that, if we exclude any duplication with PDP 3 or ATRT or -- then I think we should be left with a small number of issues that are really affecting our processes and our culture. And if we focus on that priority, on a small number, and put our energy into resolving those, I think we'll all benefit. And focus on those that also have the bigger impact and the longer -- longer term effect. And I think that's the way we should prioritize this work very, very carefully so that we'll begin, we'll begin to walk the talk in terms of prioritizing our work.

I'm going to make that remark in the meeting as an individual rather than as a Board member.

BECKY BURR: Okay. Comments? Questions out there? Okay. Do we have the registrar questions? Because we have them, but I'm not sure they're in a slide deck here. No. Okay. Oh, yeah, here we go. That's question 2. So -- no, that's registry. Okay. So for some reason we may not

have them here in the deck, but I have them. Do you want -- do you have them? You can read them?

GRAEME BUNTON: I don't actually have them in front of me. I'm sorry, this is Graeme. I'm going to pass over to Darcy and Sara who worked on ours.

I think we do have them in the slide deck. We just have to flip to that right slide.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Do you want -- Becky, do you just want me to read it or just as a starter point? I don't --

BECKY BURR: Yeah, go ahead. Those are not that --

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Okay, thanks. Darcy Southwell, for the record. We actually presented three questions, and I'm going to read the first one. I think we've done a lot of discussion about the budget and financial planning, so we can probably skip it. But I think it's probably worth reading into the record.

Similar to the Registry Stakeholder Group the Registrar Stakeholder Group is interested in better understanding how

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019
64

ICANN org and the Board will improve future financial planning and fiscal responsibility. While we recognize the extraordinary circumstances associated with the IANA transition, improved financial planning could have prevented or at a minimum mitigated the shortfall that led to the Board using the new gTLD auction proceeds to replenish the reserve fund at the Barcelona meeting. Please outline what specific measures the Board will put in place to ensure ICANN engages in a more accurate financial planning and responsible spend.

I don't think we need to spend a lot of time on that, given the conversation that we already just had, but if anyone does want to add something.

RON DA SILVA: Yeah. I'll add just one comment on it. I mean, certainly I think one discipline that we're doing as a Board that clearly wasn't demonstrated in the transition and that is we're getting leveled up, we're getting cost kind of identified before the Board is blanket making a resolution to go do something. So you'll see that in a lot of the resolutions now, that there's a -- usually a conditional, you know, need for the Board to know what it's going to cost before we say go do this.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thank you.

BECKY BURR: The other thing, just -- the other enhancement that was made as a result of the first part of the transition was an entirely new discipline for funding of CCWGs. So, you know, the budgeting discipline that has been pushed down to CCWGs' planning, getting a budget in advance, the initial IANA transition works, at least the CCWG had no budget, no planning, no real constraints on it.

RON DA SILVA: Let me talk -- can I just talk about the Work Stream 2 because I think that's a great example of we also, not as a Board decision, but we looked to the community to put together its own governance around managing a budget. For Work Stream 2 there was a planning team put together and a specific budget identified and that was managed, too. And I think those things also help and, you know, we commend the community for executing against that and participating in that. And those combined with, you know, the Board not making decisions without a good understanding of what the finances are, those combined really put some steps in place that prevent a repeat of, you know, such a large trench of expenditures without, you know, accountability

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thank you. That's very helpful.

CHERINE CHALABY: To my mind, the biggest change is going to be that for the first time ever we're going to do financial planning. When the question says, "improve financial planning," we've never done it, in 20 years' history. That's the first time we're going to have a five-year fully costed financial plan. And the community will be able to see those plans ahead of time. And hopefully we'll also move to a two-year budgeting cycle within that five-year plan.

And so the question will almost be, can we start financial planning rather than improve it, and I think we will this time. And Goran is very committed to that, and his team's committed to that. So that's a big breakthrough and a big change.

Is there a second slide with the next -- yes. Thank you.

SARA BOCKEY: Okay. So as you can see our next question, the first bullet point, and as you can see here, our question sort of dovetails into the previous conversation that we were having regarding the

strategic plan. We would be interested in hearing more about the Board's vision to improve the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model of governance as well as volunteer participation, noting the importance of prioritizing and the resources to produce effective and quality outcomes.

So how does the Board think that target outcomes can be achieved, what should ICANN be doing, and what should the ACs, SOs, SG&Cs be doing? What role can they play to improve meaningful participation?

BECKY BURR: So I'm going to take a shot at that. I think that we've been talking about this in terms of prioritization. That was the first question, that was the second question, that was the third question. And the prioritization, of course, has -- volunteer burnout is closely linked to competing priorities not being prioritized. And so one of the things that we're hoping to get through this consultation that's being kicked off is a better sense of what are the ways in which we can bring new participants into the ecosystem with the tools that they need to participate in a way that spreads the workload around.

One of the things -- I was talking with Heather Forrest who's doing very interesting things on the Fellowship Program in terms of looking at skill set requirements and really sort of pushing those

requirements to make sure that we get people who are coming who are going to really be able to thrive in this environment.

And then the next question is, what are the skill sets we can help with to create more people, give more people who are here the skill sets that are needed to do the work that we have.

So one answer to burnout is, what can we do to spread the work around and that means how can we grow a better cohort of people who pitch in and do the work. We know that there are huge numbers of volunteers, but we also know that the workload is spread pretty unevenly. And I -- and I know that's a -- something that everybody here is aware of.

The other issue is, as we push the -- the cost, the sort of responsibility for thinking about cost prioritization down into the policy development processes or the review processes, we can also start thinking about prioritization across the -- having those processes themselves provide some sense of the community's prioritization.

The bottom line is that the Board doesn't establish the priorities. We really depend on the community to do that. And we need to -- we need to give you better tools to do that. So I think that's really a critical piece of it.

But one of the things that when we talk about enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the multistakeholder process, volunteer burnout is -- springs to top of mind on that.

Other thoughts on this? No? So I guess we all agree that it's an important -- important issue to take up in the course of consultation. Make sure to tell Brian that when you see him.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky. Donna Austin. So you mentioned, you know, thinking about the tools that will be necessary to help with the burnout. So what do you mean by tools?

BECKY BURR: Well, I mean, you know, we bring -- we bring Fellows here. What kind of -- what kind of tools can we provide people in terms of sharing skills or writing up, you know, outcomes of policy development processes or participating in the -- I mean, the dispute resolution and mediation kinds of skills. I think that if our processes were more efficient and more effective the burnout would be less because we wouldn't be burning as many hours in unproductive ways. So that's what I meant by tools. But I'm sure that there are other tools as well that we could be thinking about.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Darcy Southwell again. So our last question is sort of specific to one of the strategic goals. I have to say that I think, you know, we were very pleased to see a draft strategic plan and the proactive approach that it takes. 4.1 in particular, I think, is one that's probably on the top of our minds because we've all been spending the last many months dedicated to GDPR and the effect it's had on our industry. And so we'd like to understand what the Board and ICANN org is looking at doing when you think about that strategic goal of better engaging in legislative and regulatory monitoring to identify things sooner and so we can be more prepared than we were for GDPR.

BECKY BURR: Goran, are you going to respond to that?

GORAN MARBY: I think we -- we sent out the charter two weeks ago where we opened the dialogue with the community about how to engage. But also setting the sort of standard that we're not going to try to do it from the political part of it but only to be in the room really to provide information from a factual basis, from a technical perspective.

You've noted, I talked about this before, but we've seen legislative proposals that, for instance, could disconnect users from the

Internet or prevent (indiscernible), and I think our role is to be there. But there is a fine line there to make sure that we don't, for instance, have an -- we don't have an opinion about GDPR as such, but thinking back, maybe we should have been there and told them there are two different parts. They seem to be looking into, for instance, social media which is a platform on top of the Internet rather than the Internet itself, and that could have helped us. So that is what we deal with.

And the reason for the charter is really to be transparent about our thinking, and we're looking forward to the comments. We've never done this before. There's no single answer how to do it. And we -- we want to start the discussion about it. We do a lot of the governmental work already, but we haven't done it with this preface.

The -- the other thing we've done is, of course, to try to figure out where there are proposals for legislation that have an impact on us, which you now see a list that we've been doing.

We can't work with them all. ICANN org, despite the fact that we are so many people that doesn't do anything, we don't have the resources to do that all the time. So we have to work this out. And I'm looking -- we have received many good comments about this over the last couple of days and there seems to be a genuine interest from many parts of the community also to work with us

and engage. Because one of the strengths of this is also that we can just walk across the hall and have a conversation with the GAC members who represents their countries. And that is something that we haven't utilized well either. Thank you.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks, Goran.

And I've her you say this before this week, I think it's important for us, at least for myself, to know that there's two parts to legal and regulatory change and that's just identifying it first and the legal advice comes second. And I think one of the challenges we certainly had with GDPR, and we're going to have with many others that come down the pike, is that legal advice is always very fact-specific.

And so what, you know, may apply to a registry in one country is not going to apply to a registrar in another country. And so, I know, I hope many of us will help contribute to this and try to provide ideas. We first need to build us some sort of system to be able to identify what's even out there. And I know -- I've seen the report. I think that's a great starting point of identifying the countries that have things coming down the pike and there's, I believe, a system to provide commentary back to that group so they can continue to evolve that process. But to see how we can contribute as a community to help get that off the ground.

GORAN MARBY: Please, we're in this together. And one of the things is it's not that easy sometimes to actually do understand if a particular law would have an effect on what we do.

I mean, take -- take the NIS directive in Europe, for instance, or the copyright directive, or the anti-trafficking in the U.S., there are legislations sometimes that are sort of -- it takes a while to understand because it's written in such a way it can have an effect on the DNS and the security and stability. So we are very much relying on you as well and your expertise to be able to do that.

And when we try to -- when we decide to engage in something, we want to do that in a very transparent way because someone -- I think it was someone during the panel yesterday said that the governments would like to engage sometimes unofficially. We will not accept to sort of do that unofficially because the ICANN community deserves that we are open in all our interactions with governments around the world.

We have not figured everything out because no one has done what we are trying to do before. We really have to work together. Your comments -- your comments and competence about this will be important.

MATTHEW SHEARS:	Matthew Shears. This is a great question. For the Board, this particular issue and particularly the issue of early warning systems of anticipating legislation is front of mind for the Board. So it's reflected in the strategic plan. It's also reflected in our Board priorities as well.
	So I think -- and I think there's a general recognition that more needs to be done, and I think -- so in that sense, I'm just adding to what Goran said. I think it's incredibly important to involve the community in that because you're very much a part of that, understanding what's coming down the road and over the horizon and very much welcome suggestions as to how you can engage.
BECKY BURR:	Okay. Do we want to turn to the next section? I know you guys provided wonderfully detailed and thoughtful answers to the Board questions. Can we put those up? Yes, okay. Here we are.
	I think it would be useful -- we did have these in advance. But I'm going to take a guess and say that the answers have not been memorized yet. So it would be useful to have sort of a brief summary of the answers, and then we can move into discussion.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Becky. I will try to be brief because we are interested in hearing your responses to this input but, also, we're very curious to know how are answers to these questions do or do not align with the responses that other community members have provided.

So on this first question about the different actors, the Board, ICANN or, and the community and what each should be doing to successfully implement the various plans that are in place, we believe that the Board needs to be the champion of the process. And that starts with effectively communicating the plans but also specifically explaining how all the different pieces connect and fit together. It can be a little hard to keep track of all the different threads going. But getting that kind of high-level overview and understanding how it all meshes together to achieve a specific outcome is something I think the Board is well situated to do.

We also think it's very important that the Board focus on keeping all of the projects within ICANN's very narrow remit and making sure that no initiatives go outside of ICANN's scope and remit.

So if you want to go to the next slide, we'll touch on what we see as ICANN org's role. We see ICANN org as the project managers, really, so ensuring that the projects are properly scoped in a way that's based on concrete data and then tracked via very clear

metrics and success measures as those projects, you know, wear on over time.

Making sure that the projects stay on budget -- "budget" is kind of the word of the day this afternoon -- but also communicating the progress against each of these initiatives to the community and where the community needs to provide specific areas of skill or expertise, making sure that's well-understood so that the community can make sure that we're providing, you know, that level of work to execute on these projects.

We also think that ICANN org needs to feel comfortable and be able to articulate when a project maybe needs to be abandoned. If it's not going successfully, how to get out of something if it's dead on the water.

And then, finally, on the next slide, the community -- you know, the community should be involved in prioritizing the projects. I was happy to hear Cherine speak to this earlier, the need for prioritization.

But it's also very incumbent on us -- you know, I think we have these sessions and a big part of it is us holding you guys as the Board and ICANN org accountable. But the community itself also needs to be held accountable and making sure that we're working in a way that achieves the outcomes that are needed when these projects or initiatives are working cooperatively, that we're engaging in good faith, providing the skills and expertise where those are required. And,

also, you know, being willing to work with facilitators, if that is what it comes down to.

And that's, I think, an area where the Board and ICANN org can be very helpful in providing those kind of facilitation tools.

That's an overview of the first question. I think maybe here we'll pause -- I'm sorry, I know I speak a little fast. I kind of ran through those pretty quickly.

BECKY BURR: It's entirely fair.

Goran -- not Goran, Cherine. I'm assuming you're going to --

CHERINE CHALABY: So can we go back to the previous slide, please? The one before that, yeah.

So I think we fully agree with you, particularly the Board needs to be a champion of the plan and the process.

The thing we also need to do is to ensure that the strategic plan in particular is a living document. It's not something that we put in a drawer and forget about it because I think what glues the community, the Board, and ICANN org are two things. One is the bylaws because we abide by the bylaws but also the strategic and

operating plans because those are the documents that we all agree on and we all work with. They provide the roadmap for us.

So I think the strategic plan, take that on its own, we all have to believe in the strategy. And the Board will champion, and you probably notice that we are championing this in a way, right?

And the fact that yesterday there was a session where the community came and discussed its comment and did not discuss its comment with ICANN org, it discussed its comment with the Board. And all the Board members were up there on-stage taking responsibility and answering questions directly to the community. And that is a change and that is good. And I think we should continue that.

So our responsibility is to ensure this remains a living document, that the community is all the time involved with us in almost -- at regular planned intervals, revisiting the plan and making sure that the priorities are the right priorities at the time we revisit. So that's important.

So 100% agree. And that's a very good suggestion. Thank you.

So the other thing are the plans within ICANN's remit. And I mean -- I think you mean here, is it consistent with our mission, right? So we were asked that question in other sessions, and the response was as follows. If you were to ask that question before

the transition, it would be a difficult question to answer. But with the new bylaws that came with the transition, the mission statement is so well-articulated, right, you could do even better. But at the moment, you can pick a number of criteria out of them.

And we have picked at minimum eight criteria and actually picked them line by line of the mission statement like the stable and secure operation of the unique identifiers, like the coordination and allocation of assignment of names in the root zone, et cetera, et cetera.

And we run the tests on, A, the new vision and, B, the five strategic objectives to see if they actually are within our remit. And each one of them actually does.

So, for example, to be a champion of the single, open, and globally interoperable Internet, that's our vision, and the steward of the unique identifiers. That fully, fully, is fully consistent with our mission.

The five objectives, the first one is strengthen the security of the Domain Name System. That is definitely within the mission.

The second one, improve the effectiveness of our model. Definitely within the mission.

Third one, evolve the unique identifier system. Within the mission.

The third one, address geopolitical issues impacting the mission significantly. This is.

And the last one is ensure long-term financial sustainability because without it, we can't achieve all the other objectives.

So we feel confident that the new vision statement and the strategic objectives in the strategic plan are consistent within the remit. So we thank you for the question, and we fully agree.

Do you want to go to the next page? So that's recommendation for the Board.

For ICANN org, the important thing here is the two things. One is improving the financial planning. You mentioned that before.

So for the first time, ICANN org is going to provide a fully costed plan to implement the strategy. Before we used to have strategies without costing. We never knew what it will take to implement our plans, but this is the first time we will know.

And the community will have an opportunity to participate on the affordability of the plan, and we will provide for an iteration later in the year once the plan is fully costed for us to come back and say, well, you know, we agree the strategy, we agree the main lines, but some of the goals, some of the details actually are too expensive or we can't afford to do them. So that's -- that's very important.

Secondly, there has to be a way of monitoring the progress and the implementation and the cost of that with key performance indicators and a clear reporting, okay? So that's -- so the point is something we do agree.

Where project involvement, community volunteer requiring specific skills from those involved, should communicate those clearly. I think we should.

But I think the key other thing you mentioned very clearly is prioritization, prioritization, prioritization because if we can resolve that, I think we -- we're going to win here. So we do agree with this recommendation. Thank you.

Can we go to the next one? The community should be involved in -- oh, of course. We do agree with that as well.

So I think they are three very, very good recommendations and we really appreciate them. And we concur with them. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Very encouraged to hear that you agree with all the recommendations. It sounds like we can go get drinks by the fire, like Goran suggested.

[Laughter]

So I do want to give our registrar colleagues a chance to also chime in on this.

But just quickly, are these lining up with the recommendations and suggestions you're hearing from other parts of the community?

CHERINE CHALABY: We're hearing similar things, I have to admit, right?

So the common theme coming across is, yes, the Board should take ownership and leadership on the strategic plan, hold ICANN org accountable for implementing the plan with metrics and reporting, and prioritization and affordability. Those are -- and the other thing is -- that came across is the word "flexibility," and I mentioned that earlier. And that is you got to keep the plan alive, the strategic plan, right, and that we have to have the ability as a community to look at the plan at planned intervals, let's say a year, every two years, and say: Are our priorities still the same? Right? And if they're not, is there a new challenge, something else we need to look at, and alter course a little bit?

Of course, we're not going to rewrite the whole thing because this is a five-year plan, but we have to be able to adjust as we go along.

So those are the four or five key themes that come across all the time.

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks. Darcy Southwell again. I think the registrar stakeholder group has very similar concerns, mostly about prioritization. And that's where the role that we see -- and that's for the community as well as the org and the Board to make sure we're looking at what we need to do from a prioritization perspective.

I think the other thing that we wanted to point out is that we're cautious of when we're -- or initiating work that is already taking place. We've seen a couple of those instances recently. One with the publication of the UAM for public comment, and now with the technical study group initiation, which seems to be somewhat -- they were both focused on things that work within the community was already taking place.

And so just trying to understand when we talk about prioritization, when we talk about resourcing, how are we lining those up and making sure that we're not either duplicating work or, maybe worse yet, doing work that ends up having divergent outcomes? And then we've got to go back and try to reconcile how to make that work.

GORAN MARBY: By speaking, I was actually here to thank you for the idea of the TSG because it actually came out of you.

If you remember in Barcelona, you sent me an email -- a letter requesting me to continue to work how to diminish the contracted parties' legal responsibilities.

You also pointed to several questions in that letter which I couldn't answer to. And my answer to that is just going back home to write them myself is to engage with several of you, set up the technical study group to answer those questions. And as you can see, many of those questions you had in that letter is answered by the TSG.

So it is, as you know, an attempt for us to figure out a way to diminish the contracted parties' legal responsibilities, which is one of the assumptions. So I was actually thanking you for the initiative.

BECKY BURR: Just a point, I think we all acknowledge that it's -- that it's -- that it's critically important to ensure that the technology doesn't drive the policy in this and that that is hard to do, to make sure that, you know -- that we have weighed the CODIS law outcome here. And so we're watching that carefully as I know the contracted parties are.

This is really an effort to get down -- to try to find a policy-neutral mechanism that we can put in front of the DPAs and say: What does this do to liability? Who's holding the bag in this situation?

And I think it's incumbent on all of us to make sure that what we're talking about is the policy-neutral mechanism while the community is developing the policy. But as you guys know, we've talked about there are some -- there are some important predicates to the policy, the rules that are being developed in terms of the sort of what are the roles and responsibilities for these data flows. And I think it's important that we are working together to try to nail those down.

So there's the technology process. There's a policy development process in the PDP. But there's also a way in which the contracted parties and ICANN org working together can work on the things that are within the remit of the contracted parties and ICANN and move the ball forward.

And I just think, you know, we need to make sure we're thinking carefully about articulating where policy begins and ends and where contractual relationships begin and end. Contracts are commercial agreements between the contracted parties and ICANN. And I think it's -- it's important for all of us to be careful about preserving the line there.

Anybody in our cozy audience awake?

GORAN MARBY: Donna and I spoke about this. We have spoken about this several -- is there a way we can make those conversations more interactive going forward? You and I have talked about this. I at least am very open to change the formats of the discussion to have less reading from PowerPoint because I want -- I think we all want interaction.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Goran. This is Graeme for the transcript. This is a perennial issue for the contracted party house that we want more out of this.

It was actually a question we put to the Board -- it was at least a year ago, maybe a little bit longer than that, to say, hey, let's all think about how we can rearrange this interaction.

And we haven't followed up on that, nor has the Board. But I think one of the conversations we were having in our joint meeting this afternoon was that we don't meet in Marrakech, but we'll meet again in Montreal. And we would love to have a new option for this meeting by probably September, so that everybody can be appropriately prepared for that change.

And so I have tasked my membership and I think Donna's on Board with that, too, to try to come up with some ideas. And we

would love some ideas from you guys on what would be amenable for you. But let's for real figure that out so we can --

GORAN MARBY: I think we're totally open for any suggestion. I think one thing to avoid, why do we sit like this? It feels -- So I will -- My first suggestion is let's change how we sit. What is your suggestion?

I lead now by one.

I would love to stand up, for example, and not be stuck behind this --

GORAN MARBY: Yes. We could have a cocktail party.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: To be fair, where we sit depends on where we are. Sometimes we sit in a square, sometimes straight. But it depends where we are. It would be great if it was always the same.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yep. So there are -- This is Graeme. There are some constraints on the format. Probably it needs to still be open and transparent, which is fine.

GORAN MARBY: Now you're being negative.

GRAEME BUNTON: But, you know, I think that's sort of it. And then we can figure out something.

                       So let's all take that back and work on it, please. And thank you. And maybe we should put a pin that we should have a plan by Marrakech so that we can have some conversation there about what that next thing is going to look like for Montreal.

GORAN MARBY: Let's -- Let's bring in the I.T. team as well because we sometimes put restraints in front of us that maybe don't have. Those screens, for instance. We all have computers in front of us. We can use -- you know, we can use it differently. Because those screens make it impossible to move the tables around. And maybe if we take them around, we can do it differently.

                       So if we bring in the I.T. team, they are very – they're often very innovative. Aren't you? They recognize that.

GRAEME BUNTON: I have one last thing of AOB, if we're there. This is Graeme, again, for the transcript.

So probably close to two years ago now, I think it was before a Board Workshop that was in -- it was before the GDD in Madrid, anyway, I think. So there's was a Board Workshop somewhere else. Contracted parties, so I think it was myself from registrars, and I think Jon Nevett from registries got the opportunity to have a bit of time inside that Board Workshop to talk about not our ICANN desires but strictly what the businesses look like. And that experience was great. And, you know, so it was what kind of registrars are there? What are the different business models? You know, is being a registrar most of our businesses? Really sort of nuts and boltsy stuff about who we are and what we do. And the questions that we got back were excellent.

And also highlighted that there were substantial questions on -- that existed within the Board. And I know we have a lot of new board members now, and so I thought that interaction was great and really important. And it -- you know, it seems pretty crucial to me that as the Board is considering policies and the implications of that that they understand that the contracted parties have a unique role within the community; that we then have to take these things and implement them and do them, and what that does to the landscape of our businesses and organizations.

And so I would -- So this is me saying -- and we tried to get this to happen in -- before the Vancouver workshop and it got canceled.

And I don't think it's landed on the agenda yet for this year, but I'm putting this out there, and I think Donna will agree with me that this is a really important thing and we'd love to see if we can bring that back.

BECKY BURR: I think that's a great idea, and I think it would be very welcome.

I don't think Bangkok is exactly the right place to do it because I don't -- I think we could have critical -- better critical mass somewhere else.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah. I'm not predisposed to where, but sooner rather than later, and let's just really make sure that happens.

GORAN MARBY: Or Bangkok. I think several of the board members are actually going to Bangkok as well. Some are.

GRAEME BUNTON: So I think -- sorry, this is Graeme. I think it's all from the CPH at the moment. Is there anything else from the Board?

GORAN MARBY: I'm going to cocktail party.

GRAEME BUNTON: So I appreciated this time up here. Goran left his mic on. There we go.

And always appreciative of the interaction. We're going to all take on board how to make that interaction better, and I look forward to that. So thank you to the Board for having us today and thank you to my members and members of the registries who participated in that discussion.

BECKY BURR: And thank you from us, very much.

GRAEME BUNTON: Good!

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]