

**Transcription ICANN London
Joint GNSO ccNSO Council Meeting
Monday 23 June 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>

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

Byron Holland: Welcome, everybody to the Joint GNSO/ccNSO Council meeting and subsequent to that social. The meeting is officially - we have the room until 6:30 for the official meeting and then after that we will have the opportunity to have a social here in the meeting where we can have the informal business take place.

So welcome everybody. As you can see the agenda is on the screen behind us. It's certainly a fulsome agenda and Item Number 4 will be open discussion overall.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Byron, Just, I mean, I think I'll just welcome everyone. You can see the agenda. We've got some - a nice opportunity to spend some time together both formally and informally. And we are also going to try and take the opportunity to gather together whoever is available and (unintelligible) forward for the drafting team for the cross community working group which we'll come to later.

Byron Holland: Thank you, Jonathan. So first up on the agenda will be Roelf Meyer who is the Chair of the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group. I think everybody is probably very familiar with that working group and the work that it has produced over the last number of years.

If there's anybody who's been holding ICANN to account when it comes to finances and operating plans I think it's safe to say that it's the SOP and the good work that that entire team has done. And their most recent work is going to carry on that tradition. With that, over to you Roelf.

Roelf Meyer: Okay. Thank you, Byron. Good to be back. On a positive note I think finally as the working group we have the idea that the energy we've been putting into this process and into filing comments on previous plans is finally having effect.

Both plans are a big improvement from the plans we have had in the previous years. If you look at the strategic plan there is a very clear distinct line between objectives, portfolios, projects and budgets are related to those projects.

If you look at the operational plan and budget there's a very logic structure. It's clear to follow the thinking lines so - and even their activities and budgets are well explained and interconnected.

On the other side, and I'm sure most of you are aware of this, because Fadi has announced this earlier, we have five years strategic plan now but the present or the FY'15 operational plan and budget is not yet tightly linked to that strategic plan so as from FY'16 we will see if all goes well (unintelligible) connection between strategy, annual goals, budget, portfolios etcetera. This time and therefore the 2015 plan the connection is still a bit weak.

But on the rest - on the strategic plan maybe first what we - I think is missing or what we feel is missing is the IANA stewardship transition. There is no mention of that yet. We understand because this is - is time problem maybe. But I think that ICANN - or we feel that ICANN should use the time between the draft and the final version to make an entry of that because it will be - over the coming years it will be an important subject.

What we are also missing is a reference to global domain name market trends. I think it's not news to you that on a global scale growth rates are declining. I think on a less positive note than maybe many people - I think that sales in new gTLDs are not as promising yet as we thought they would be, or as many people thought they would be. And there's no mention of this in the strategy.

And if you take the same to the financial plan and budget there is even a kind of a contradiction that has a negative impact. We see a 25% growth in expenses and a very optimistic forecast of 2015 domain name - new gTLD domain name sales, \$30 million which is way from what we have at the moment.

And those two things, I mean, if you have a strong increase in your expenses and you don't get the increase in your revenues that are you budgeting that's asking for problems. So that's an important comment we made.

On a general note, and we've been commenting on this very many times so far. And I think what we feel that with the operational plan even better than with the strategic plan. But still ICANN has problems in adhering to its own planning and deadlines which in the end leaves constituencies that want to file comments in a tight schedule because the draft come later with the end of the comment period is very often kept at the same date.

And we now had - the operational planning procedure and the FY'15 operational - and the strategic planning procedure coincide so as a working group we had to deal with these two things at the same time while the comment periods were reduced because ICANN didn't meet its own deadlines.

So that's also something that we submitted to ICANN at the time now has really come to make sure that these plannings are strictly controlled and that the community can expect deadlines that ICANN sets itself to be met.

I think on the overall level these are the most important comments to make. We submitted our comments to the SO and AC chairs so - and of course they're publicly available so if you're interested it's good reading stuff I think.

Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thanks very much Roelf. And I would just echo the comments that he made that it's good reading assuming of course you're interested in budgets and operating plans. But, like any organization, you know, I think the old adage, "follow the money" certainly applies here because how the resources are allocated certainly gives all of us a good indication of priorities and planning. So I think the SOP has done a great job in sort of teasing out some of those issues. Thank you, Roelf.

We'll open the floor to any comments or questions that people have but first maybe I could just ask one which is, were there any particular line items in the budget this year that stood out to you? Was there anything in particular that was of concern other than the \$30 million domains as an assumption? Anything that really caught your attention or was concerning to you?

Roelf Meyer: Well on a general note if you look at the budget there's - I think the most important thing that stood out first is this strong increase in operational cost even without the new gTLDs. With new gTLDs included the cost increase is 27%; with out it's still 35%.

So - and although we understand that part of this increase is due to professionalization of the organization and for that very often you need more or better staff, the steepness of this increases the most worrying bit that we saw in the budget.

And the 25% increase is relative to the present budget. And the present budget had something like similar increase in expenses from the previous

ones. And there are not many companies that - commercial companies that live very long with such a cost increase.

So there has to be a similar increase in revenues. And then still that has to be a very stable revenue. And the market doesn't seem to be very stable at the moment. And the forecast on new gTLDs, like I said, is very optimistic. So this is something - that's the most important observation that we made.

Byron Holland: Thanks, Roelf.

Roelf Meyer: Are you looking worried?

((Crosstalk))

Byron Holland: Anybody who wants to make a comment or a question if you could just state your name to begin with. Jonathan, did you have a question? You certainly look like it.

Jonathan Robinson: I certainly - I have a couple of questions but I'll defer to Thomas. I'm not sure if it's worried or shocked but I'm digesting that information, which is very helpful. So I'll just thank you for the moment and I'll come back with a question or two after Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Jonathan. I'm Thomas Rickert, NomComm appointee to the GNSO Council. And I would like to thank you for your hard work on this. I mean, you've been doing this for years and years which is much appreciated.

With regards to the increased expenditures of budget, and the, in your view, overly optimistic projection or expectations for new gTLD registrations have you done any projections that you think are modest or adequate to give some guidance in terms of what an appropriate budget increase, if any, could look like?

Roelf Meyer: There's a short answer to it. No, we didn't. I could but then I would like to be paid for that because I would be making ICANN's budget. No, I'm just kidding. No, we don't go that far. So we point out the things that we think should be reconsidered by ICANN or we think that are not correct. But we don't do any recalculations or rebudgeting. There's also time constraint.

Thomas Rickert: Sure. Let me ask a follow up question. Have you been thinking of a threshold that you might tolerate? I mean, certainly 25% looks like an awful - awfully big increase, right? But is there something where you would not frown upon?

Roelf Meyer: Well first of all, of course, I mean, a cost increase is not bad by itself but it has to be covered by an increase in your revenues or it has to be temporarily and then you use your (unintelligible) or something like that to cover this hole that you have between your expenses and your revenues.

But it seems here that there is not a good relationships between a sound forecast of revenues and the forecast of expenses. In general - but that's, I mean, I'm not a financial person either but I've been on Board and any increase in total cost in the year over than 10% really gets my attention.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks.

Byron Holland: Any other comments or questions? Okay, well Jonathan and then John.

John Berard: John Berard from the Business Constituency. You know, it might be - I realize that there comes a point where people have written so many letters that they have absolutely no effect anymore. But this might be an instance where a letter signed by either the chairs of the two councils or perhaps all the councilors of each Council asking for a presentation and the opportunity to have a Q&A on the matter of the budget and strategic plan might be a pretty interesting session to have.

There are a lot of questions that we don't have. I mean, I don't know that ICANN has ever run into the red in the 10-year run up from \$6 million a year to - what are they projecting now, \$200 million a year? And I don't think we can look at it as a corporation. And I do think that the domain name revenue is awfully close to being recurring.

So, I mean, I don't know the answers to a lot of questions that I might have. I'm sure that collectively we have more. And I'm just wondering if there could be a - would be a compelling case made to staff if the two councils were to combine in asking for such a session?

Roelf Meyer: I suppose I'll make a comment, John, but, I mean, to the best of my knowledge ICANN has frequent - there are relatively frequent webinars and presentations on the budget and on the development of the strategic plan. I mean, it's not that it happens in isolation and (unintelligible). So, I mean, I'm not saying we shouldn't ask for information but there are presentations on the budget and the financial planning.

John Berard: Yeah, no I understand that. And I have listened in and participated in some of them. But this has been a recurring subject for the GNSO Council in its own work, certainly in the BC individually and I know that the ccNSO has been pretty close - kept a pretty close watch on these matters.

I'm just wondering if - and yet questions still persist over time. So would there be value in a collective conversation as opposed to a webinar or - I'm not suggesting that be some kind of tribunal but I'm - it might be that the collective presence of everybody might tease out answers to a lot of questions that seem to be recurring.

Byron Holland: Any thoughts on that, Roelf? I mean, I know that - so it's an interesting idea. And I think just by the nature of having both Councils make that kind of a special request that in itself would send a signal. I think that perhaps it wouldn't be - if we were to engage in something like that, and I'm undecided

about the merit of actually doing it, but what would be most interesting is referencing two back to back 20-something percent increases and getting an understanding of the future two or three years of the budget to see, okay, when does that end and why?

And perhaps that's the more interesting question over time is not to grill them on the past two years but get an understanding of what can we expect in the next two or three?

Jonathan Robinson: So I'm conscious that Chuck wants to say something. But and, Chuck, you'll probably remember this point. It's Jonathan Robinson speaking. But I have - and, Roelf, this is a question I was going to ask you and it may be relevant to what you're going to say, Chuck, as well.

But I have a very clear memory of something striking that Fadi said when he talked about a decrease in the increase in the budget. But what I thought I heard you say was not - didn't correspond with that. So that -that may be the trigger for the kind of conversation that John's talking about if indeed the budget doesn't fail to - if the budget increases more substantially than we were promised.

Because essentially we've had a significant increase and then a significant increase but the recent most increase was supposed to be less dramatic than the previous increase. And Fadi made very clear statements of figures, he said, you know, last year we increased by 15%, this year we propose to increase by 10% and next year - I mean, these were not the figures that I recall, these are example figures. But maybe, Chuck, you remember that and I'm sure you have other comments on this since you track...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I was going to comment on other things. First of all the Registry Stakeholder Group is - has comments for both the strat plan and the budget

and operating plan that are still under review by the group. Hopefully by the end of the week we'll have them ready.

But one of our comments was the whole concept of cost control, cost management, cost benefit analysis, some things like that because we also noted, Roelf, as you did, the huge increase and an increase much greater than the increase in revenue and commented on that as well.

So - but with regard to your idea, John's idea of requesting a session, I would find it - and Roelf can chime in on this too because we've both been on these budget groups for a long time. I can't imagine Xavier not honoring that. I mean, I don't think they're trying to hide anything.

The problem with the budget, and it's getting a little bit better, but it's still got a long ways to go, is that there are still big buckets of money with no detail in it. Now they're trying to solve that problem but when you have a \$5 million bucket of money and there's no detail associated with that that's a problem. And there are certain ones that affect us, you as ccNSO as well as the GNSO, where you really need to see more detail.

Sometimes going down to the project level, which they did on some things this time, helps. But sometimes you have a project that is worth - that is budgeted \$5 million or more and without more detail and especially if it's something that relates to either one of our groups we really still need that problem.

Now I think Xavier and his team is really trying to solve that. They did add more detail this time around. But it's still got a ways go to. So I think that he would honor that request. Now - but, I'll add a qualifier to that. If nobody - if very few people in both of our councils even look at the documents I'm not sure it'll be that useful.

Roelf Meyer: Well, Chuck, yeah, I agree. And Fadi would definitely honor it. And with all respect to - Xavier would definitely honor it and with all respect to Xavier, his role is then to explain what the money is spent on. But he will not explain why the money is spent on those issues.

And so I think instead of having a discussion with Xavier on what the money is spent on it might be interesting to have a discussion with Fadi why it is being spent on that to get some of the feeling behind the expenses.

And, yes, there are big buckets that are difficult to really look into. And I think one of the examples, and it's maybe, Byron, a response to your question as well. If you look at the new gTLDs as a goal there's a \$29.5 million budget there but \$16.9 million is spent on professional services. That's a big bucket.

And of course we all know that a lot of the new gTLD processes are being outsourced to specialists. But still one of the questions we asked ICANN is is it any conscious decision to get all - to keep all that expertise outside the organization, to pay consultants to do all that work? Is it so temporarily that we don't need it inside the organization because we are recruiting and raising expenses there that were also spending an incredible amount of money on consultants.

Byron Holland: Maybe we could just take a temperature of the room. It would be a serious thing for us to request, and obviously putting the names of both councils behind it would be something that gets ICANN management's attention so we would want to make sure we were doing it in a very serious and intentional way. What is the appetite for making a request such as that?

I'm not going to take silence as consent. This would definitely be a - we are interested or not. While perhaps we could just, you know, have some conversation. I mean is there support for something like that? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I don't really have a say on this so I'm not going to comment other than to say - if I had commented I'd say yes. But if we're going to make a request like that you've got to load it with at least a half a dozen examples of the kind of questions you want answered to demonstrate you're not just doing this pro forma and you don't want the same speech he gives tomorrow in an open session.

But you want to identify the kind of problems you're having with what's being presented.

Jonathan Robinson: And I agree. And that was very much the point that Chuck made to some extent. We need to know what we're talking about. And personally I don't feel well enough qualified on the matter. And this is one of the conundrums we've had especially as a Council, you know, because you're - the ccNSO Council has done substantial work on this in the past which is why we're so appreciative of the update and the insight that you give us.

There is some detailed work done in the parts of the GNSO, like Chuck referred to in the Registry Stakeholder Group, for example. But whether we're equipped as a Council to do that I - I mean, the one option is that the Council requests the meeting on behalf of the two organizations. But still we would have to be sure, as you suggests, I think, Alan, that we have substance behind that; we have detail and specific questions as to why. Otherwise we run the risk of simply being given a standard form presentation.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. It's a dangerous path to tread because there's - the chance for perception that you're identifying the five things that you want answered and they can answer those, I'm sure. But you're really trying to highlight the fact that these budgets are not - are not complete enough for us to really understand. And if financial transparency isn't there how can we say we're transparent?

Byron Holland: Roelf, you look uncomfortable with that.

Roelf Meyer: Well, yeah, I don't think it's a transparency issue because it's very easy to get the data and to get an explanation. So that's not the issue. With regard to your question, Byron, maybe it's a good idea to see what the reaction on our comments is going to be. And I think the Council is meeting the Board also tomorrow, the ccNSO Council.

I'm possibly you have some comments there and see what their reaction is. And we can always scale up if we want to.

Byron Holland: So perhaps - given some sensitivity to the time that is 5:30 and we're still on the first item, I think that that perhaps is the best path forward. I mean, this is an issue that we can bring back to both councils and probably have some discussion in our respective council meetings.

But I think we've seen good progress; we're certainly not there yet from ICANN, but we've seen good progress in the linkage between strategy and operations and budget and the overall process and depth of content.

But there's clearly work to be done. Perhaps what Roelf has suggested is the right course of action. We will review the comments or the feedback on comments both from the GNSO community - or the inputs from GNSO as well as ccNSO and depending on the comments we can have a further conversation about whether we should ask for a special meeting with senior leadership to be determined and the joint councils come the LA meeting.

And it's not to kick the can down the road, but we have seen progress; we should acknowledge that and see what the feedback is on this round of comments. Does that make sense?

Jonathan Robinson: I'm good with that, that's great.

Byron Holland: Okay so that did - was there some - okay so with that I think we will close out that topic and move on to progress on CCWGs.

Jonathan Robinson: So, as you can see from the agenda, we've got this and then move on to the hot topics. We've got a couple of - from memory the use of names of countries as TLDs has three co chairs and I think Heather is here to give us an update and on the Framework of Principles for CCWGs, I think John, you're in a position to give us...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...yield to Becky. Okay so, Heather, welcome. Thanks. Let's hear from you first on the work of the use of names of countries as TLDs.

Heather Forrest: My pleasure, Jonathan. Thank you very much. As Jonathan said, I, along with Ching Chiao and Paul Szyndler are co chairing the newly established, or newly formed, Country and Territory Name Working Group. We've had two meetings by phone prior to London. And that was really just baseline meetings, getting things established.

We have, I'm sorry to say, a bit of bad zen when it comes to scheduling this week. Our meeting is on Thursday at 8:00 am. And I encourage you all to attend. We will be setting the parameters for, let's say, the process of the working group, how often we'll be meeting, how we'll be meeting, time zones, and this sort of thing.

And I think we're all quite determined to have - we understand this is an issue of great sensitivity. It's an issue that leads on extensive work that was undertaken over a period of roughly 18 months by a study group of which Paul and Ching and I were all members.

We're happy to provide some context at the start of the meeting on Thursday although we did that in a call - an open community call a few weeks ago. I

think we're all conscious, if I might say this, of having clear milestones and objectives that come out of this. And certainly I think keeping our respective supporting organizations updated along the way. Again, we understand this is an issue of high sensitivity.

If anyone has questions or concerns I encourage you to get up early with the crows with us on - 8:00 am on Thursday. I'm also happy to answer any questions now. I don't have the benefit of the other two co chairs but if anyone has any questions I'm happy to answer them.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Heather. Any immediate comments, questions, thoughts? Anyone going to be there at 8:00 am on Thursday? (Unintelligible). Bart, you're going to be there, okay. You don't have a question or comment right now but you're going to be there. Great.

All right thank you very much, Heather. So the next update is to be delivered by Becky Burr from the ccNSO on Framework Principles for CCWGs. Over to you, Becky.

Becky Burr: Thank you. Notwithstanding my valiant attempt to only be the interim cochair, John and I did so well or so badly that we are now the semipermanent chairs of this working group.

We have the first in person meeting today. There were lots of people who are not formally part of the working group but who came and participated and that was actually really great. It is clear that this is a topic, notwithstanding the joke that I make every time I think about the Cross Constituency Working Group on Cross Constituency Working Groups, it's clearly a very timely matter.

People are very interested in it. It's clear that what we are going to be producing is sort of guidelines and tools rather than a set of one-size-fits-all rules because we have to be not only respectful of all of the different sort of

working arrangements that each of the constituencies has and brings to it the different perspectives on how many participants you have, the different perspectives on quite consensus is or is not in any particular case.

But I do that we have a lot of energy. I think we are still at few members short so that if there are other volunteers, am I correct on that that we could use a few more volunteers for this?

The first assignment for the team is we have created the - secretariat, the staff has put together a very detailed chart on the cross constituency working groups that have operated in the past and some important information about how they've been arranged, how they've been staffed, whether we - whether - by some measure they were viewed as successful or not successful and what kinds of elements contributed to that.

And we'll be continuing to work on that and continuing to fill out the kind of here are all the phases of a cross constituency working group from sort of concept to final report and what are all of the issues and things you need to think about in between.

John, do you want to add anything?

John Berard: Only that we're trying to get people to call it CWG squared so as to avoid the humor of the Cross Community Working Groups on Cross Community Working Groups.

But, no, I was quite pleased, in fact one of the advantages - one of the questions raised yesterday when we were told that this was the largest number of registrants - largest number of people registered at an ICANN conference was whether that would translate into working group participation. And I would have to say that in this case it translated at least into an expanded set of people who were in the room and contributing or participating.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So you had actual participation, it wasn't simply people were there turned up and willing to contribute and be involved?

John Berard: Yes, indeed. It was a pretty good back and forth. And many people who had experience at both the successful and failed past attempts.

Jonathan Robinson: Did you pass a piece of paper around or electronically to capture the names. Sign them up for the working group. Any other comments or questions on that? I mean, it's clearly an initiative that's - I know Chuck pushed me to try and make some progress on it a long time ago. I think he saw this one coming down the road. And, anyway, it's good to see that it's making progress now so.

John Berard: And I will give the ccNSO far more credit for surfacing members of the working team than the GNSO so we'll see if can't reach parity at some point.

Becky Burr: Trying to stir up a little competition.

Jonathan Robinson: All right thanks for that. I think that gives us an opportunity to go now into the hot topics, Item 4. And I think Byron is going to lead us then into the first of the hot - if not the hottest topic.

Byron Holland: Well I'm sure we've all been overwhelmed with the amount of information flow on this particular topic. I thought that - one of the things that would bear mention within our communities is the different pieces that I think are going to be facing us between the coordinating committee, cross community working groups, whatever ends up being in place for the accountability side, potential cross community group there, cross community working group on Internet governance, related but separate.

And all of these things are going to be happening in parallel so I think in both of our communities, in particular, it will be important to have a holistic view of

at least those five potential entities as well as any selection processes, which may be their own committees, to put people onto those as well as any potential drafting teams for charters of said groups.

So when we look at all of that activity, you know, there's literally half a dozen work groups, committees, etcetera, that need to be populated by members of these communities. I think we're going to have to be pretty conscious about making sure that we're properly resourced across all of them.

And while we certainly want to have a bottom up process to get people there I think we also need to be conscious and intentional about making sure that we deploy the resources that we have in the most effective way possible for both of our communities.

And that's, you know, something that in the back of my mind is this sort of cautionary note that continues to be there, just how are we going to make sure we get the right people in the right place over this 15 plus month journey at least, if not longer?

And, you know, we're - in the ccNSO we're certainly working through how we, in the short term, going to ensure that we are able to best select our members of the coordinating committee? And we're working on the structure of a selection committee to be able to do that as efficiently as possible. But it just gives us a sense of, you know, how many people we need to actually make this progress go and this process successful over the long haul.

One of the elements that has been - that is part of that mix is the formation of a cross community working group around the IANA oversight transition. And that's something - the genesis of which was a number of the registry-oriented stakeholders, so C-Registries, G-Registries, as well as a root zone maintainer and root zoner operator.

Those of us on the naming side having conversations in and around the Singapore meeting trying to make sure are we going to have an appropriate voice as the directly-affected parties of the IANA services or the IANA functions? Just wanting to make sure we have an appropriate voice into the steering committee or whatever the final shape ends up being.

And that was sort of the genesis of how this came to be but that being said, as the conversation has evolved it seemed important that on the naming side potentially other communities were involved too because on the numbering side, that's, you know, they have their own processes and are conducting them as they see fit and same on the protocol and parameters side.

But on the naming side how are we going to make sure that the voices were heard from the ICANN community with the core directly affected parties theme still being essentially a preeminent theme but making sure that there was an opportunity for other members of the ICANN community to have voice.

And that's where the notion of a cross community working group really came to be. And over the course of this week Jonathan and I and a few others have done the initial shepherding in consultation with many members of the people in this room and beyond and have also invited the - through the chairs of the other SO and ACs their participation in a cross community working group on the IANA oversight transition.

So that certainly is going to be one of the key areas of focus over the coming months for these communities and others. And I think that will be definitely one of the key topics for our communities and for ongoing discussion over the next number of months.

It's in its initial formation stage to be sure. It will start with a drafting team that we hope to have some initial - some, you know, very initial conversations this week potentially with some initial discussion during the social period.

Both ALAC and SSAC have already surfaced a couple of candidates to be part of that so we've started to see some preliminary contributions from the other communities. So I think there's a real opportunity here for us in a real bottom up multistakeholder way to give voice to the community with some core themes around the directly-affected parties of the IANA functions to feed into the broader process. And that's still a work in progress as to how the coordinating committee and the CCWG would interact.

But that's part of what we anticipate the drafting team will have some voice in. Hopefully that will be something that happens over the relatively short term. You know, ideally over the course of July. And then the CCWG itself could take flight later in the summer, you know, not prescribing anything here but, you know, I think we would imagine that members of the drafting team there'd be a high likelihood that a number of them would roll over into the CCWG itself. But of course as it takes flight there would be a broader call for participation in the CCWG.

I hope that gives a little bit of the lay of the land on the overall picture and some of - and certainly at some of my thoughts as well as setting some context for the CCWG that Jonathan and I and other members of the community have been trying to shepherd along.

Jonathan, did you have any other comments on that?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Byron. Just to note that a couple of things really, one that we jointly presented more or less that sketch outline that Byron's just given you to the GAC. I don't yet have any clear feedback as to how that went. I hoped that we have presented it clearly and it was evidence how it fitted in. But I think there are multiple perceptions, deliberate and accidental, of how this whole model, the structure works.

I think it's all pretty confusing for a lot of people. So I'm not yet clear how that's gone down and how well that's been understood. So one of the key things that I've been thinking about and we've talked about is it would be great to get any feedback - initial feedback.

Has anyone heard anything? Anyone got any of their own comments? Any thoughts about either - any of - any issues in and around the CCWG and this initiative, any comments, thoughts, input would be very, very helpful. And things you've heard, they may not necessarily be your own. Becky.

Becky Burr: This is not my own, this is something I heard at the GAC afterwards. There was some - there was a lot of confusion about what the relationship between the CCWG and the coordination committee itself was whether there was - it was duplicating work, whether it would somehow undermine the work of the coordination committee.

And I think part of that is because we've had some confusing and mixed messages about what the role of the coordination committee is. I mean, if the role of the coordination committee is essentially to receive, you know, sort of packaged up here's what we, the, you know, who are concerned about protocol parameters are like - we're like here's what who are concerned about numbers would like, here's what we who are concerned about names would like.

Then the role of the CCWG is pretty easy to identify; it's to put together that baseline. But I don't think that the GAC is absolutely clear. And I think that they are thinking of the coordination as being a more fundamental, more creating body than might otherwise be the case.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. And a question on hierarchy I suppose as well. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, the ALAC met with Theresa just before this and the issue, not surprisingly came up. They're of course not - they're of course not assuming

that there is a CCWG below the coordinating committee. And moreover the coordinating committee is supposed to be taking in input from groups other than ICANN.

So the implication was that the coordinating committee is indeed responsible for trying to package together something that is cohesive based on what is fed to it from the various comments that will be solicited. She did point out, however, that part of Thursday's presentation will try to make clear just what this group is supposed to be doing.

It sounds like it's all fitting together in a semi-reasonable way at this point but still far from clear. And when you add in what this yet undefined group that's going to look at accountability and transparency somehow in parallel with the other one it gets even more confusing.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. I think we ought to take Fadi at his word. He said that staff is not driving this, they're just supporting it. And so I think we ought to stop being so passive and start driving it ourselves. If we like the coordinating committee concept and can fit that into a cross community working group fine. If there are changes we want to suggest to that let's build it into the charter for the cross community working group.

But if it's really going to be a bottom up process we should be driving it and not just assuming that what staff put forward is the way we have to go. Now maybe that's good. Let's decide that ourselves and if it needs tweaks let's change it.

We're the community. Us, plus others, I'm not saying we're all here. Understand that when they designed this revised process that they ignored some really key community comments that happened. Theresa confirmed that in the meeting with the GNSO earlier - on Sunday.

They ignored the comments that the scope needed to be changed; that it should not be limited. I made the mistake, I didn't ask why. Because you guys as well as us submitted comments that the scope should not be limited. They have not changed the scope document one iota.

In other words, they ignored the input that they received from the community. So let's drive this; let's not let them drive it. Let's work with them, let's be cooperative. And maybe a lot of their ideas are great. But we should be driving it, not them.

Jonathan Robinson: I was going to ask for thoughts or reactions but that's one. Any other comments, thoughts or - yes?

Man: Hi, (unintelligible). I'm from Northwestern but I'm a newcomer here. And just to piggyback on Chuck's comment, I think another area of interest which we should drive more is this whole process seems very hasty. I know the issue of deadlines and timing has been one that I've heard in a lot of different discussions.

But it just seems to that this is all - for something so important this is happening really fast and it deserves more time for consideration.

Byron Holland: Thank you. Becky.

Becky Burr: So I've heard the process is hasty a couple of times. And I - although I'm inclined to be quite sympathetic to that I think we also should get some sort of reality testing mechanisms on the ground here. First of all, essentially we've wasted three months from the time that this announcement came out, three months have gone by and we really haven't moved the ball forward.

Second of all, although September 30, 2015 is not a drop dead deadline, I will tell you, as a United States voter, January 18, 2016 is the Iowa caucuses. We

can't - you know, we don't want to be in the next election cycle. We don't know what the next administration will be so I would strongly urge us to take the fall of 2015 deadline very seriously.

And not, for any, I mean, you know, I would love to say it's not a rush but I know, I wrote the transition paper for the Obama administration on making this transition happen in 2008 and in 2008 there was a massive recession. It was not, you know, at the top of the list.

It's just not - so I want to - I just want to make sure that, although I'm always saying we should go slower, I really do think we have to take this deadline seriously. And like Chuck I think we have to take control of this process and make it move.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Becky.

Dan Reed: I just want to echo - Dan Reed, the NomComm appointee to GNSO. I just want to echo that I think it's really important - and I live in Iowa so I know what the craziness of those caucuses are and if you're not from the US it's a sight to behold.

But, yes the political change of winds in the US can have huge impact on the whole viability of this process. But beyond that I think another caution to bear in mind is what's fast and slow depends on where you come from, right, and I don't mean that in a national sense but, you know, whether you're thinking about it from a business perspective or you're thinking about it from a civil society perspective.

Timescales are different for those because there are different hard constraints for different groups; there are different hard constraints for governments. They move at different timescales. And it's important to realize that we've got moving parts moving at different rates and that there has to be - that's one of the other issues about finding common ground is that

sometimes what seems short for one group seems like an eternity for another. And that's just one of the realities.

But I think the date that's been thrown out there should be viewed - if not the line in the sand, pretty close to it. We as a community have to come up with a credible plan by that date; it's really important.

Byron Holland: Thank you. Any other thoughts or comments on this subject? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Just a quick question Byron. Chuck again. When are the ccNSO and the GNSO going to pick their representatives on the drafting team?

Byron Holland: My expectation - so this is very early days, we're just climbing out of the primordial soup here on the drafting team. My sense is there's going to be some discussion immediately after this meeting. ALAC and SSAC have put forward three names to participate already. So we at least now have other communities participating.

And for the initial stage I anticipate - while I speak for my friend here that he and I - Jonathan and I will be on it to begin with at least make sure that it keeps going and we'll be welcoming other applicants to the drafting team. That we're going to have a conversation about it immediately following this meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: So my closing remark, I mean, I think we've got to take the remarks we've heard pretty seriously, Chuck, Becky, Dan, sense of urgency, sense of leadership and pick the ball up. Otherwise, I mean, we have (adjusted) a little; we've been sensitive to the issues to pull various people together.

And anyone who participates we're going to need them to participate with sleeves firmly rolled up. So it seems like it's time to sort of pick this up and run with it obviously in a collegiate way with those that join us but nevertheless to drive it somewhat.

Please go ahead.

Byron Holland: Dotty, go ahead.

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: Hi. I've noticed that's one of the things that holds back the sort of getting started on this whole process is the emphasis on bottom-up participation because I agree with Chuck that we should get charging and those people who have passion about it should be the leaders because that's what makes things happen.

And so does anybody have some rationale for not staying at the bottom's up too long because I guess you don't want to be accused afterwards of having ignored it but it becomes a drag on the timing.

Byron Holland: Thanks, Dotty. Well, we're going to kick off a drafting team - I think this was your phrase, around the bar and literally in a few minutes so we will get that part of it kicked off. I certainly hope that from - and this is just for information for GNSO colleagues, we anticipate that we will be shaping a small selection committee to forward on our candidates to the steering committee during the course of this week.

John.

John Berard: John Berard. I know that I'm often viewed as an apologist for ICANN. No, okay fine. But I would not want to overlook the progress that has been made in the three months. I mean, the spotlight on accountability - I mean, you know, initially what the community did was say, look, you just cannot jump into the INS stewardship transition; you have to link it to accountability because if that contract gets shifted perhaps to ICANN then where's the outside lover of making sure the behavior continues to be conducted properly?

And so I think that the increased focus, the fact that enhancement of ICANN's accountability process is number two on this agenda is evidence that in the three months we've had an effect on the shape of the debate, you know, the mechanics of the coordinating committee, I don't know that moving it - getting it changed from steering committee to coordinating committee was much of a success but it was an acknowledgment that they had overstepped in a way and that language is important.

But I do think that we have been moving forward. And I do believe that the next few steps will happen quickly and quickly enough for us to meet the deadline and also satisfied that community participation.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, John. Nice potential segue into our next topic and no apology taken. Keith.

Keith Drasek: Thanks, Jonathan. Keith Drasek, VeriSign and Registry Stakeholder Group Chair. My personal comments, I'd like to build on what John had said and also some of the other comments, obviously Chuck and Becky and others.

I think it's really important to look at this - we have a really unique opportunity, we the community, those of us who are committed to the multi-stakeholder model to really make some meaningful changes to the current structure and to prepare ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model for the next 15 years.

I sense, you know, that there's been discussions of sort of an adversarial, you know, community versus staff, community versus Board on this topic a little bit. But I think if we all take a step back and look at the big picture that in fact we are all trying to accomplish the same thing and that's to protect that multistakeholder model, to advance the multistakeholder model, to protect ICANN in the big world as there is a disengagement from the one government that's provided stewardship.

Not just focused on the IANA functions operations but generally speaking in the big picture. And so I think we need to seize this opportunity and frankly accept the responsibility as the community, as those who participate in the multi-stakeholder process worked very closely with staff, leadership, the Board because frankly all of us, our legacy in large part will be determined by whether we get this right and whether we seize this opportunity.

I mean, Fadi is, you know, he'll be here for as long as he's going to be here. But the ICANN that remains 5 years, 10 years, 15 years from now is really going to be our joint legacy. So I think we ought to seize this opportunity. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Keith, I agree with you it a truly strategic opportunity and we should take advantage and seize the moment. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I think one of the important messages that I took away from this session is that both groups seem to be committed to the deadline or having results by the deadline. And it, you know, this is just speculation but I think that maybe the reluctance to change the scope document is that the question of who, for example, should be the responsible organization shall not be tabled in order not to delay the process and expedite the process.

But I think we want to get this right and not have - presume a certain answer for those that are against the whole transition but then say okay, you are stating something as a fact that should have been part of the evaluation.

So I guess that's when putting something together we should be firm with the statement that despite asking for review of the scoping document we're all committed to meeting the deadline in order not to jeopardize the success of this.

Byron Holland: Becky.

Becky Burr: I just want to clarify two things. What I said we had wasted three months I didn't mean we haven't made progress, I mean, it just took us three months to get here. And I think that ICANN did make some concessions in the revised transition team. And I think that we ought to just expect that they're going to make the same kind of back off, hands off, let us run it so now the test is, can we grab it and run it.

And my view on the - they didn't change the scope document is a little bit of well, that doesn't mean we don't - we can't assume that - we don't have to assume that they're right and we can't push on that as we are moving forward. So, you know, my view is really we need to just grab them, given there. To the extent that they haven't fixed the scope document let's fix it ourselves.

Jonathan Robinson: Really only dealt with the first bullet point on the hot topics. I mean, clearly one of the critical themes that's emerged is the link between that and accountability. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. That's exactly the point I was going to make. One of the comments that I get when I talk to both the folks at ICANN and the folks at NTIA is that you take care of the scope document, as it were, in the accountability process.

Now people have argued quite validly that there may be things in the scope that can't be fixed and accountability and we should still look at those. But the whole notion, you know, the issues of separation and all those things are issues that can be dealt with in the accountability.

So that has been - certainly the pushback I've gotten from people in NTIA and also the pushback I've gotten from people here is that no, the scope of the transition, yes, that is what was put down there that the accountability is set up as a parallel process. And yes, we have to force that and yes, we have to make sure that they basically are end dependent so that one, you know,

that basically the transition does not end before the accountability has dealt with all the issues.

But that that is one of the places where that scope gets pushed around. So I tend to believe that I think sort of what Becky was saying is that there's a lot of control that the coordination group and the accountability group, however that gets formed, will have enforcing that scope issue. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: One of the challenges for us is going to be - it's all very well picking up this ball and running with it in a way that we've talked about with more determination and more drive and so on. But as yet we haven't got a bottom-up answer to be accountability side. And that's the question of how those two fit together.

I'm mindful of the time. It's 10 past 6 according to my clock on my computer and we've only got this room until 6:30 and there's a table of refreshments in the corner. So perhaps we should, I mean, have we aired the issues enough in and around transition and accountability at this point? We can continue over some drinks. Go ahead.

Byron Holland: Young Eum.

Young Eum Lee: Thank you. Young Eum Lee. I just wanted to mention that the groups that are most affected by the IANA transfer or of the stewardship are actually the ccNSO and the GNSO as registries and that is exactly why we have more than other groups in terms of representation in the coordination group.

And so, I mean, I echo the sentiment of every one who said that we should take this into our own hands and actually be even more active than we have been. And I think that's a very important goal that the GNSO and the ccNSO should keep in mind. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you. So with that perhaps we'll wrap up the comments on Agenda Item 4, Bullets 1 and 2, and just make mention of the fact that there is a Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance which has specifically carved out all things IANA transition related.

And that working group was really formed in Singapore. Had a couple of challenges along the way but it has really reformulated and created a charter and I think is being primarily driven - primarily driven by ALAC that certainly requires participation by the broader SO AC community.

And I know we have a couple of ccNSO members on it. I understand there's GNSO members on it. But it will be another one of these interrelated CCWGs that I think we need to participate on an active waiting as these two communities. Are there any questions or thoughts on the IGCCWG?

Of course there don't have to be but given the number of different activities we thought we would make sure that it got its due here. All right well I'm not going to force the issue so I guess the final note there is we just need to bear in mind that that is one more thing that needs to be resourced by these two communities.

The one that - maybe I'll just make a final comment on timing. There is a time, September 2015, that we do have to bear in mind. And there shouldn't be much discussion about do we have to make it or can we just take our own time.

And I think, you know, my personal sense is we have to make sure that we do this right and that's first and foremost. But we shouldn't - we shouldn't forget the fact that we do have a very specific timeline in front of us; it's 15 months.

We certainly have the opportunity to get this done in that time. And we should be very intentional and very conscious that if we don't make it in that timeline

the landscape is going to change on us. And that may be okay that we should be very clear that as we step over that date it will be a different path that we are on.

And in a sense, you know, for us as different communities and going back to a comment that was made over here, you know, different SOs and ACs are going to work at different paces and government works at a different pace, etcetera. I mean, to me it's a little white mechanical watch, right, all those little and larger and smaller cogs inside are spinning at different paces but the movement as a whole works.

And I think and I hope that the ICANN community can work like that and work at the paces that each community needs to work at in order to try to achieve that date. We need to do it right and I think we can do it on time particularly if we work together in a collaborative way.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. Can I just add one thing to that? Keep in mind that what I've heard this week from a lot of different people is that the IANA transition shouldn't happen until the accountability piece is solved. That means we have to things to get done to meet that timeline.

John Berard: John Berard. That assumes that the IANA transition is to ICANN. I mean, that's not part of the - right.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, I think that's a wrap for today. It's great to be able to meet together and we seem to have found a format which works particularly with some hot topics that got us a little excited so that's great. Look forward to having a drink with you now and just catching up more detail on any of these or any other topics we need to cover. We're done. Thank you very much.

Byron Holland: Thank you.

END