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://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson:     Great, we're good to go. Okay so this session is entitled – it's the preparation session for our meetings with the Board, the GAC and the ccNSO. We are, as I mentioned at the outset of the day, in good shape for talking with the GAC and the ccNSO. So I think with your support we should focus on our meeting with the Board.

And the – we'll see a slide up at the moment on the outline which is something that I sent to the group by the mailing list – to the Council via the mailing list. You would have seen this approximately – I think it was two days ago now, maybe it feels like two days and was only a day ago but you've seen it relatively recently.

So, Lars, have you got a couple of slides there for me? Yeah, you should have. I think they've been sent to you. I can double check. It's entitled – the title is GNSO Strategic Session. Sorry, that's the one – apologies, I may not have sent them to you. Let me just see, I'll send them to you right away. Bear with me.

They're on their way to you now, Lars. Apologies, I hope they've gone. So just to set the scene while Lars receives those and then brings them up, I met with Steve Crocker about – probably a little over – it was a week ago now – to talk about what we might talk about – the scope of the discussion at our meeting.

And you'll see that there's really – it's broken down into two components, something from the Board, something from the Council. Cleary what we're

concerned about here is the Council's input into that meeting. There's an opportunity to provide a brief update to the Board.

And this goes to the opportunity to focus on reality versus perception, highlight some of our effective work. But I don't want to dominate the proceedings with that; I think that should take no more than 10 minutes and just provide them with an update.

The substance of the session, from our point of view, certainly seems to me to be about questions we want to ask of the Board. And actually closely related to highlight any of the challenges we might have. And you'll see pertinent to this morning's discussion it says here, "This might include the pace of change, concerns about top down versus bottom up, etcetera."

So there you have it on the slide in front of you now. And if, Lars, if you could just flip briefly to the other slide and then we'll come back to this. And then the Board, I mean, some of the questions I've seen on list and in discussions with you is one of the concerns has been how does the CEO work with the Board? There's been a question of how closely correlated and what understood that is so there's an opportunity for the Board to provide that.

The issue – another issue is the Board advisory committees, the role and function they will play. And then this – what somebody referred to this morning as the elephant in the room, this – primarily this – what this globalization means in terms of ICANN, IANA and Internet governance.

Now this is a lot to cover in one quick session. But we have 90 minutes with the Board. These seem to be three key topics that would be useful for us to receive an update on. But before that the substance of this discussion right now should be on the previous slide which is – Lars, if it is really the specific questions we have for the Board providing they're not covered elsewhere on

this agenda so that's why I want to flag what the Board will be talking with us about so that we don't duplicate.

And I think these are interrelated these bullet points 2 and 3. And in some ways they arguably should be the other way around. If people feel they should be the other way around or we can easily swap them, in other words, we might set the scene by highlighting some of the challenges we're facing and those lead naturally into the questions.

So really I'm going to open it up to the floor right away for any – and just to let you know this has been seen you and seen by the Board so this is not going to surprise the Board. The only update that the Board is going to get is what's, you know, providing we can frame them sensibly is the highlights or the current challenges and the specific questions.

And then finally I think I'll be looking to councilors to lead on a particular topic. So I'm not saying it follows but to the extent that you introduce a topic and feel passionate about it it seems logical that you may well be the person to lead that in our meeting with the Board.

So that's not – as I say it doesn't necessarily follow. Feel free to raise a question and if you don't feel comfortable being the one to lead that topic then by all means say so. But let's throw it open and see, I mean, we've clearly heard some topics this morning which include concerns about top down versus bottom up.

So I think – I guess what I'd like to hear from you is, A, your concern issue or question, and, B, whether you'd be willing to lead on that. But, you know, when you lead on it it shouldn't be only your perspective, let's hear what other councilors have and build up a representative perspective of what the Council feels or would like to say about that.

John, your hand is up and then followed by Mikey.

John Berard: Sure. John Berard. I would eliminate the description of GNSO Council, GNSO process improvements. As you said this morning we are in the business of continuous process improvements. I don't think we need to belabor the time with the Board for that. They would expect it of us. And in terms of highlighting the – highlighting or work not just on early GAC engagement but I'd like to offer up what we think are the there most significant initiatives that w have undertaken so as to reinforce the message that we are busy at it.

And so the question I would first pose is, "What are the three things that we are most – that we most – that we are doing that we most want the Board to know?"

The second question I have relates to the second slide which is globalization. Gabby and I were having a conversation earlier about the definition of globalization. ICANN right now is a global organization. You can troll the hallways and find 10 people who represent every corner of the globe.

But it doesn't apparently qualify as a global organization because there's all this energy about, you know, globalizing ICANN. So my question is, "How will we know when we are a global organization?" It's, you know, fairly simple I think. How will we know?

And then third point is because, you know, it's my record and I get to break it, you know, what accommodation will the Board make to allow for community input into the performance review of the CEO and of the Board itself?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I've got Mikey in the queue but I want to make sure I get that first point understood. So, John, you were responding in your first point to Bullet Number 1.

John Berard:        Right.

Jonathan Robinson:    And you're saying we should strip out some…

((Crosstalk))

John Berard:        You know, truthfully, right, truthfully I'd get rid of the whole bullet and I would say what do we want them to focus on as what we believe are the most important things that we're working on? What reinforces the role and image of the GNSO Council in the work that we are doing?

Jonathan Robinson:    Yeah.

John Berard:        And I would offer up that the collaborative work we're doing with the ccNSO on cross community working groups would be – I would nominate that for one of the three things. But, you know, I'm already quite tired of my own voice. I'm sure that you guys are as well. You guys in the Iowa sense meaning me and women. And so, you know, let's hear a conversation.

Jonathan Robinson:    Okay so if I can focus the Council on that. I mean, John, from my point of view that's the intention of the first bullet. You may express it more elegantly than it is currently expressed. But nevertheless that is the intention, to provide a highlight in and around appreciation of, respect for, however one wants to frame it, the work of the Council within the GNSO.

So I'd like to see if we can't use – capture the moment here and see if we can't capture those three. I'll offer the work with the GAC, right? Clearly that, to me, is an important one. Any others? So, you know, our straw man picks out ccNSO and CWGs my thing with GAC. Mikey and then Thomas.

Mikey O'Connor: I'd nominate thick Whois which has now been approved by the Board and has completely changed the structure of the largest registries. So that would be on I'd vote for.

Jonathan Robinson: Just to help with formulating this you can speak for a new one or against an existing one or both. So I've got Thomas and James and then Alan.

Thomas Rickert: So I thought that the first topic should be brought would have been the NTIA debate which I didn't plan to – you're frowning.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, we're talking about the – under Bullet 1, what is the Council particularly proud of or wants to highlight to the Board?

Thomas Rickert: We're still highlighting…

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Thomas Rickert: Then I step in later. I have specific questions for the Board.

Jonathan Robinson: Fine. Okay so we come to that in a – main Bullet 1 here just to make sure we nail those key points. James.

James Bladel: Then I would submit the privacy proxy service accreditation initiative which is seeking to standardize an area that is currently operating outside of the – in the industry but outside of the ICANN environment and creating a new kind of contracted party and a new kind of stakeholder.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan.

Alan Greenberg:   Yeah, I'm not sure the last one since that one really was instigated as a result of a Board action. You know, or approving the new RAA which required us to do that so I'm not sure I would highlight that as one of our actions.

The one I would highlight however is the ongoing discussion we're having on improving the workgroup and the PDP process and getting people involved that's getting a jump on the ATRT issues, which we're going to have to work on anyway. But it really has been, over the last year, a continual subject of discussion and I think it needs highlighting.

Jonathan Robinson:   You're talking about the continuous improvement work? Yeah, got you.

Alan Greenberg:   Of the PDP process.

Jonathan Robinson:   Yeah. Yeah. Any other candidates for or against? So what I intend to do here, John, yeah sure, I'll bring you in just a moment.

John Berard:   Yeah. Okay.

Jonathan Robinson:   Just to highlight what I intend to do here is I'm going to put these into two or three slides that take up this 10 minutes – and – this initial 10 minutes. So this is – and I suspect that much of what's been said is on there already and it's question of emphasis, but, John.

John Berard:   John Beard. So at what point do we bring up the Cherine letter?

Jonathan Robinson:   I would think that's more in challenges and specific questions than things we're proud of.

John Berard: This is John Berard. I am quite proud of the slow, loud and messy approach that got us the recommendations of the working group. And I'm less proud of the waffling that seems to have followed on.

Jonathan Robinson: Quite so. Naturally then I would say I would take that as a suggestion to highlight the work of the IGO/INGO PDP and the follow on comes in the next two. So just to help you here, what I'm thinking of doing – what my thought here is rather than – and it depends, I mean, we've got to make this relatively efficient because of the use of the time, we don't want this particular component to dominate the meeting. But it may be that it's relevant to put these as a set of bullets.

Think about this presentation you'd say, Bullet 1, Mikey; Bullet 2, John; Bullet 3, Thomas and just a sentence on each and say that's why we want to highlight. Because 2 because I think it'll be quite effective if it's distributed around. And, you know, we've got James on privacy proxy, Thomas on IGO/INGO and so on and you just get a quick sentence say, we think this is a good piece of work because boom. And so that might be quite an effective way to present it.

Okay so I think that, yeah, John…

John Berard: Have you addressed Alan's point though that the privacy proxy work was a prod from the Board and not our own initiation?

James Bladel: I would like to respond to that.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: And it may be that is the most recent incarnation and what kicked off that particular work effort but it is now become a community-wide PDP. And it is, I think, just looking at the tip of the iceberg for all of the work that's gone on in

that area, you know, through the GNSO, through direct contract negotiations with registrars and through all of the, you know, the Whois studies and just – I mean, I agree with you in this particular slice started – was given birth by the Board and not by the GNSO. But I think that the GNSO has embraced it and run with it. And it certainly puts a, you know, a bullet point on all of the GNSO work that surrounds this area.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I must say my – personally I'm okay with that. It seems like just because it's initiated with the Board as long as we picked it up, ran with it and did something decent with it that's no harm done. So let's close off that first bullet unless, you know, there's something else someone desperately wants to get in on that because I think we've got more substance under the others.

So in terms of the next steps I think what we're talking about here is highlighting some of the current challenges and/or the specific questions that those give rise to. Let's go on to those. Yeah, sorry, Mikey I'll come to you on that then.

I guess I would ask you just to describe whether you – you know, it's a challenge or a question. You know, it's something we're facing. One might lead to the other anyway so go ahead, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: I just want to comment David Cake on getting the photograph of the week so far. This is Mikey. So the – it was challenges and questions, right? Questions. What was – I was so entranced with David that I lost your second word, it was challenge and something.

Jonathan Robinson: Two bullets on the slide there you'll see them there. One is do we have specific questions for the Council, specific asks – sorry, for the Board – that haven't been covered elsewhere on this agenda. And are there any current challenges that we're dealing with? Which may naturally lead into an ask of the

Board anyway but that's how it's framed on this – on the slide you see in front of you. And that's what the Board has seen, a close variant or exactly that.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so I have one for each. Under the specific questions I'm really curious about sort of the Board's strategy towards dealing with the whole series of SSR-related issues that have come out of the SSAC and us and so on and so forth so I've got a little story to tell there. And then on the challenges I'd like to keep the flame of preparing people for effective participation in working groups alive. Those are my two.

Jonathan Robinson:    Going to need some help here. One, from you – people like you, Mikey and contributors to be really specific. And also, to indicate whether you're prepared to be the one – the sort of sponsor of that particular point because it's hard for me to capture it. And I'll ask you, Volker, if you wouldn't keep a close eye on the queue so that we get things coming through – this is relatively tough to both capture it and manage the queue. So I think we've got…

Volker Greimann: Thomas.

Jonathan Robinson:    Well I wouldn't mind going back to Mikey and just making sure that I captured those two you've got – so if you could essentially repeat those two please, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Sure. So under the specific questions I think the – framing it is a question I would say, what's the Board's approach to addressing the SSR issue backlog that is in front of us. And I can clean that up.

And then the current challenges – is where can we look for the resources and support that we need in order to continue to prepare people to be effective participants in working groups.

Jonathan Robinson:    What specific SSR challenges – are you aware one specific – I mean, it's not just going to throw the Board our completely. I mean, we need to be relatively well prepared. Is there a specific issue that's…

Mikey O'Connor:  Well so let me reframe it. Another way to phrase that is a whole bunch of recent SSAC reports and other SSR issues have pointed to the need for ICANN to take a worldwide leadership role in informing network operators of SSR issues.

And examples would be, DDoS attacks using DNS infrastructure, name collision, there's SAC 64 and 65 and I can't remember the other one but I could come up – so it's two SSAC reports plus name collision. All three of those really point to the need for a massive outreach campaign aimed at network operators to let them know that those things are coming and things that they need to do to address them.

Now I'm babbling because I didn't write it first.

Jonathan Robinson:    Okay so, Mikey…

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson:    …is you need to put those two on the list for me. I think you need to really try and capture those so they're comprehensive and as usable as possible and think about whether you'd be prepared to articulate those in a way that we can both not – what is important is that we don't – we ask a fair question that doesn't ambush the Board…

Mikey O'Connor:  Right.

Jonathan Robinson:    …but that's a reasonable – it's reasonable, right. So who have we got next?

Thomas Rickert:   Thanks, Jonathan. I guess I'd like to address three topics with the Board all surrounding the success of the new gTLD program which will be evaluated at some point in time one of which was alluded to by Mikey, and that is name collisions.

So we've seen some geoTLDs, for example, who have found supporting companies, cultural goods or institutions that help to disseminate the message about this geoTLD to be successful. And most of them can't get their own domain name because it's on the reservation list.

So I'm asking myself whether the reservation list, as it's composed, goes a little bit too far if those that should be protected in the first place even can't get hold of their own domain name.

So, for Hamburg, the local football club, HSV, can't get their domain name and that is potentially because people are just trying whether the domain name is already functional. And they've ended up on that list. So I guess if we – that might be a danger to the success of geoTLDs in particular.

Second area would be the RAA and the data retention requirements where, for example where particularly for European registrars there are legal hurdles. ICANN has established a process which is the data retention waiver request procedure where ICANN said, you provide a legal opinion from an expert lawyer and if you can tell that you can't do certain things we'll grant the waiver and yet ICANN doesn't do that so ICANN doesn't follow its own process which keeps registrars away from offering new gTLDs in a compliant manner.

And the third area – so we have data retention, name collisions and I'm trying to remember the – universal acceptance, which is an issue still not only for IDNs although I think Ching might be the best person to lead on that in terms of substance.

But facing a situation where iOS 7 doesn't properly process new extensions. This is something that will ultimately or potentially endanger the success of the new gTLD program as such. So you might say that all these individual parts might not be good enough for the Board to take care of.

But during the evaluation if we see that certain names can't be used to – as advertisement projects, if we see that certain browsers don't resolve the names appropriately then I think that puts the whole project at stake. And that's at least something that the Board should know.

Jonathan Robinson:    I see our one attending Board member, if I'm correct, has just left the room on the back of that. I hope it's nothing to do with that question. But, Thomas, you did read my mind a little. I mean, I think the question you and we need to all ask ourselves is, "Is this a question appropriate for the Board? And if so is it appropriately framed?"

Given that we're going to meet with both Christine Willet in the morning and talk to her about the new gTLD program and Cyrus about the, you know, Domain Names Division.

So that's my challenge to you and to anyone, it's a question of do we – is this really on our agenda for the Board? And I understand your point, you're at a level of success of new gTLD programs so I'm not – I don't think I'm missing it but we need to make sure it's a relevant and appropriate – both in content and substance. So that's my question. I've noted what it is and I think we should just let others start to fill – populate it and then we can try and balance it out.

You want to respond quickly to that?

Thomas Rickert:    Yeah, I was offering the three because it may be worthwhile splitting if the Council thinks that they're important enough to mention. But otherwise I would just frame it in a sense that, you know, asking the Board whether the Board thinks that it takes sufficient action to guarantee a successful evaluation of the new gTLD program in the light of these three areas.

Volker Greimann: Next in the queue I have Maria and James.

Maria Farrell:    Thank you. So, Jonathan, I'm responding to your request that we look – we propose the issues that we think are kind of current, topical and troublesome. There are two; one is the strategy panels and the other is the – sorry, the – oh it's called IGO/INGO issues. On the latter I'm not an expert at all so I leave it to anyone else to see is it something they wish to bring up particularly in the light of Jeff Neuman's comments at the public mic earlier on.

On the strategy panels I would say that I think the issues that we might wish to raise with the Board are that they have been created and appointed in a top down manner but they represent an allocation of resources which is, I think, not consistent with the last year's strategic plan though I could be wrong.

But the status of their findings in terms of how, when and by whom it should be implemented is unclear. And also from specifically the viewpoint of a stakeholder that they have effectively doubled overnight the volume of policy response that we need to go to our communities and draft and come back with sensible answers on.

So I think those are some issues. And I think specifically on the GNSO points of view and the GNSO – well the GNSO broadly, not just Council, I think the multistakeholder innovation panel, while it's coming up with some really novel and interesting ideas I do take issue with what I see is a lack of will to engage with the reality of policymaking in the GNSO and then, you know, not seeming

to quite get what it is we do and not taking us up on the offer to observe what we're doing.

I've actually written all this down in really bad handwriting so if that's any use to you I'd be happy to follow up.

Jonathan Robinson:    So, Maria, just a quick question for you. I mean, I sense from that you'd be potentially willing to write it down in better handwriting and be the advocate or the presenter of that topic in the meeting with the Board? Yeah, okay so notionally, I mean, we'll have to see how many come out. But it's certainly on the table with that in mind.

And I heard you on IGO/INGO you're not necessarily volunteering yourself for that but you're saying we mustn't forget it.

Maria Farrell:    If I might just follow up? On the strategy panels those are just the points that I thought of. Obviously if I'm going to take that forward very happy to do so but if people want to email on the list and say what the topics and I'll kind of pull it together into something sensible.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Maria. Just to reiterate the queue we now have James followed by Ching and John.

James Bladel:    Thanks, Volker. James speaking. So let me just take this in order in terms of chronology. I would support the discussion of the strategy panels, in particular the – I think the underlying presumption that in order to properly inform and address and plan the community you have to go outside of the community to get that meaningful feedback. I think that's something that we should push back on directly.

I also wanted to support Thomas with regard to the EU data retention waiver. You know, as a US North American registrar I'm probably happy that all of my competitors in the EU are on the sidelines.

But in this particular case I think it needs to be understood that the – that ICANN staff is interfering with the market, the new gTLD market, by not acting, by not acting in a manner that they claimed and committed during the RAA negotiation process and put into the language of the agreement that they would act in accordance with this particular process.

So I think they are interfering with the – with the competitive market by not taking – by stalling on this action. It's been several months now, new gTLDs are live and ramping up and launching every week. And EU registrars are in a pickle on this one – or in a tough spot.

And then finally I just wanted to step back a little bit and say, you know, I don't – I understand we don't want to turn these into chaotic, you know, complaint sessions or forums where everybody just kind of unloads on the Board whatever is on their mind or whatever has got their, you know, got their hackles up that particular day.

But I also don't think we should self-sensor too much on this, Jonathan and say, you know, this, you know, is this specific for the Board? I understand we need to have a dialogue here. But if you – particularly with the data retention – if you feel like you've exhausted all of your opportunities by raising this and escalating this through staff where do you go next? You know, where do we take these issues?

Jonathan Robinson:    I'll pick up in response to that directly, James because I agree with you. But all I'm saying is put it through that test. Have you done that? Is it therefore appropriate to be raising it with the Board? And if you can answer that yourself,

I mean, I'm not expecting you – I'm not putting it through me to ask that question, I was suggesting we all ask ourselves that question.

James Bladel:    That's fine. I just think we should err on the side of, you know, if in doubt bring it up, you know, because let's say other structures and other stakeholders and SOs and ACs might not be so shy.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, James. Next is Ching.

Ching Chiao:    On my point – this is Ching speaking. I actually want to echo what James says and probably just give you some suggestion to maybe just to package – I mean, everything has been discussed right here in this room three – approximately three years ago.

We talked, we met with the Board on the GNSO – met with the Board and here in the Singapore exactly the same conference center the new gTLD was launched – I mean, the program was launched and six months later in – sorry, I mean, early 2000 we have the application so forth.

So I guess this brings back to everything we have discussed so, I mean, the program kind of – I mean, so evolve (itselves) with the number of problems ongoing, I mean, issues.

So I guess it's probably useful for us to maybe just to, you know, have this kind of – I mean, kind of – I mean, the (mutual) I mean, perspective on what happened this three years and how the Board is kind of feel about the process, I mean, I mean, do they feel they could have done better to – I mean, do they feel they, I mean, work through us in other ways than what has been achieved? So just like offer my 2 cents on this.

Jonathan Robinson:    So, John, you're next and currently last in Volker's queue. Just to let you know that we're going to see Fadi in five minutes so we might want to switch – a few minutes – but you go ahead and then I think we might want to switch to a couple of minutes and just check what we're expecting at that session.

John Berard:    Sure. This is John Berard. I am – my point has been adjusted a bit by what I've heard from Ching and from James and from Thomas. The question I would have of the Board, that I raised my hand for, is what exactly is the decision making process that will lead them to resolve the differences between GAC advice and GNSO policy? That's a fairly straightforward question. Should be able to be answered quickly.

So I would be interested in that. What is the – how are they going to approach to resolve the difference between GAC advice and GNSO policy? Right?  And that then opens the door to a number of other things that they, you know, if you want to get into the SSAC reports you can say, you know, what is the thinking on the part of the Board with regard to the proliferation of the SSAC reports?

Do you – are you concerned that they are misread, misunderstood, unevenly applied? And then in terms of the EU data retention requirements, again, how – what is the method by which you will resolve the conflict between the contract that ICANN seeks to deploy and the laws of certain nations?

So that's – for my mind that would help us get answers to questions on specific issues. But it would do it in a frame of how they approach the decision making process.

Jonathan Robinson:    We've got some substance. I suspect it's enough to fill the time we've got available. I'm going to try and pull that together with help of some other notes. We are a few minutes away from our scheduled meeting with Fadi. I have no idea if he – Marika, or anyone from staff, have you heard whether he's on time

or not? Do you know? Glen, you haven't heard anything? Maybe you could check if you're able to, Glen, to see?

I want to just switch to that for a moment because typically, like I said, you know, I would typically prepare for these sessions by taking the temperature of the room and understanding what's going on with you and meeting with Steve and/or Fadi or Theresa or whomever to do them the courtesy of preparing them for what we might be wanting to talk about.

In this instance I haven't so we're coming into this a little cold with Fadi. I suspect he's got more than enough to talk with us about. My sense is that we would like to create some time in that meeting with him for some Q&A. I don't want to create that time and then have a silent room. Have I got a sense that there is a series of – are there people willing and waiting with questions to ask and to talk with Fadi about? Show of hands anyone who's likely to have a question that they'd like to ask him? I see Mikey's ever-reliable in this context.

Anyone else? You can all fall – so we've got…

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson:    Got John and Thomas. So, you know, I'm going to, I mean, Maria, so there's some questions here that are likely to come through. So, you know, what does that look like, a 50/50 split between him giving us an update and Q&A? John and then Thomas.

John Berard:    How about we start instead of, I mean, we already know what he's going to tell us; it's all been canned, prepackaged. We're going to get it. So why don't we just ask him some things that are – that we're interested in?

Jonathan Robinson:    Up to you. I'm sure he'd be receptive to that.

John Berard:     I mean, one of the things that I would like to know is what's the – in the time he's been at ICANN what's the best advice he's ever gotten about being the CEO of this organization? And I'd like to know what's the greatest, you know, where are the misconceptions about what ICANN is as he travels the globe? I mean, what are the things that we need to correct in terms of public perception? I'd like to know that.

Jonathan Robinson:     Thomas.

Thomas Rickert:   Yeah, I guess we haven't discussed the NTIA thing so I think that going to substance of concepts might be difficult at this point in time. But I'd like to know from Fadi how he thinks ICANN should coordinate this effort because these 18 months are going to be over sooner than we would like it to.

Jonathan Robinson:     So from that would you and others like to carve out a section of the 45 minutes to deal specifically with the NTIA section at the beginning? At the end? At the middle? I mean, is that an opportunity for where he sketches something out and there's an opportunity for Q&A?

Thomas Rickert:   Yes, I would put these things up front. I think that your questions are good warm-up questions, if you wish. But I guess the NTIA thing is of so much concern for most of us that I'd like to learn how he's doing that in terms of project management to be ready on time.

Jonathan Robinson:     So you could – I mean, you'd like me to ask that question or would you like – yeah, well, I'll store that and we can try and make sure that happens then. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes:    Yeah, just a caution on what Thomas just said. And I'm sure Thomas didn't mean it as literally as he said. But I would suggest you don't phrase the issue

like, what does ICANN plan to do? It's us; we're ICANN. And if it's a bottom up process it's not a matter of ICANN staff planning what to do in that it's supposed to be us. They're supposed to coordinate our activities. And I'm sure you didn't mean it literally but I just want to make that caution.

Jonathan Robinson:    That's a really good point, Chuck. And it, in some ways, sensitizes how we ask the question of course because he could easily say well what are you going to do? You know, I've opened the door, now what are your plans to go through it? And so I think, you know, it's really, how – what are his thoughts maybe about how we approach the next 15 months.

Thomas.

Thomas Rickert:  And I guess maybe we should discuss this a little bit in preparation for the meeting but I guess this is not solidly a GNSO question, it's something that concerns the whole ICANN community and beyond. And I think that since the question has been asked to ICANN I think it's up for the CEO to coordinate the various efforts inside the community or at least help with that. You know, I just want to avoid we are 18 months down the line and nothing has really happened.

Jonathan Robinson:    Is anyone interested, I mean, there's clearly this topic. There's – the question that John was proposing to ask. There's also the balance, I mean, this isn't the only thing – or it may be – but maybe that's the question, is this the only thing, you know, what is the balance of issues that he's dealing with? How does this fit into that – anyone interested in that? What do the other two or three – Thomas.

Thomas Rickert:  Well I would rather sacrifice Fadi's presentation for the session because judging from experience there's a lot of duplication with what he presents to the community during the opening session. So I guess I would ask him to maybe

sacrifice a little bit of his time, if not all of his time, to discuss these issues with us.

Jonathan Robinson:     So you're, again, advocating that we go straight into a sort of Q&A type dialogue, I'm okay with that, that's good. Anyone else want to add – Glen, thanks.

Glen de Saint Géry:     Sure. Fadi will be about 15 minutes late.

Jonathan Robinson:     Well I think that – I would suggest to you that that gives us a perfect opportunity to talk a little bit more and without rehearsing it but to just get on the table some of the questions you might like to ask. I mean, we've heard from you, Thomas, and it was helpful to get an iteration from Chuck responding to that.

Are there any other, I mean, Maria, Mikey, anyone else the kind of questions you're expecting to ask?

Mikey O'Connor:  I was sort of nodding emphatically when Thomas was talking because that's sort of the tracks that I was running down. And I want to amplify what Chuck said, which is we know how to do this kind of stuff. We need a mandate that gives us a sense of what the expectations of the organization are in terms of, you know, okay, the NTIA has handed ICANN the job. What's the next move? Who starts? Who takes the first step? You know, are we – hopefully…

Jonathan Robinson:     Well, I mean, one – just, Greg, I have seen you in the queue. But just to play devil's advocate one thing he might say is, well we've got a session on Monday to deal with this. It's, you know, so I just, you know, we should be prepared for that that if it's up to the community that's going to be – they're going to deal with that on  Monday. There's a two-hour session as far as I recall.

Mikey O'Connor:     So I button-holed Fadi over drinks last night and said let's not do it the way we did it last time where we kick off a giant opening session and then sort of the let the chips fall where they may. You know, prepare the organization with some sense of what your expectation of the organization would be. Let us tell you what our sense of how we would like to approach it would be.

You know, I would much prefer that the next working group be better chartered than the last one. And so from a project management standpoint, you know, what's the scope? Who are the stakeholders? What's the expectation as to the major milestone? What are the big deliverables?

All that kind of stuff is something that it would be nice not to just throw that open to a room of 500 or 600 people but rather have some preliminary discussion, again, from a project management standpoint as to what the statement of work is.

Jonathan Robinson:     Let's go to the microphone. And bearing in mind that's – as is, you know, well emphasized by the people in the room; this is not just the Council session, it's the GNSO session, it's – this is as full a room as I remember us having for a while, which is great. Greg, over to you.

Greg Shatan:     Thank you, Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. The issue of the IANA transition is an issue of great interest to me but actually wanted to comment on a different topic, which I think actually comes around to the issue of how we as a community deal with the IANA transition.

And I wanted to pick up on what Maria said earlier about the expert panels and kind of their failure – at least the failure of the panel on governance to kind of engage or the panel, you know, on what we do here to kind of engage with us and to come in an in essence do field research on this.

And that goes really I think to a larger point which is the emphasis on global stakeholder engagement. There were two new hires made just in the last few days or announced just in the last few days.

What I see is that the emphasis on stakeholder engagement fails to support the existing stakeholder function; it almost takes place around the side of the existing stakeholder functions that are here represented in this room. So I think, you know, the question whether it's a question for the Board or for Fadi is how does global stakeholder engagement interact with support for the current stakeholder organizations?

And I think that goes back to the issue how we as a multistakeholder organization deal with the NTIA and the IANA function transition because right now it feels like ICANN, and Fadi by extension, isn't still quite sure what to do with the stakeholders who organize themselves into these stakeholder groups and are in the GNSO or in the ccNSO or the ALAC or the SSAC.

And instead they're kind of forming other parallel types of nodes for stakeholders. And I think that has a tendency to weaken the existing stakeholder function, not to support it. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson:    Thanks, Greg. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes:    Thanks, Jonathan. Chuck Gomes. I think we're being way too passive on this NTIA transition. We should be moving ahead, not waiting for Fadi, not waiting for anybody else. The GNSO should be talking to the ccNSO and the ASO and the advisory committees and coming up with a plan.

Now, you know, I agree with Mikey that there needs to be some structure, some form to this if it's going to happen in any kind of a timely manner. We've got a model, the ccNSO has a model. The ASO has their model. There's a lot of

commonality in those. And we should be putting our heads together now, not two months from now and come forward jointly, not just GNSO, with a plan to approach this thing in a way that will maximize the chances of success.

Jonathan Robinson:    Good point, Chuck. Any responses, comments? Thomas.

Thomas Rickert:  Chuck, this is a follow up question directly to your comment, which I think is an excellent one as one could expect. But Fadi being the CEO of this organization would be a paid person to take over a coordination role of that effort if need be.

You know, so I think from your comment one could sort of derive that there is the competition of the community being faster than ICANN staff but I think that the CEO could help with this effort. And I guess that's the idea behind my original question.

Chuck Gomes:    Yeah. Chuck speaking again. I'm not opposed to his help and he can help a lot. But I think we're just waiting for him to guide us. And I don't think that's the way the bottom up multistakeholder process should work. We should be already out in front of this thing.

Jonathan Robinson:    John.

John Berard:      This is John Berard. Chuck's point about being out in front, the importance of collateral – collaboration is the NTIA decision, the IANA contract whether on the agenda for the meeting with the ccNSO? We didn't talk about that, we sort of glided over that. Because that may be an interesting point.

You know, the ccNSO was pretty quick to sign on to or agree to sign on to that sort of flowery letter that the SOs and ACs were asked to sign on to. There wasn't much discussion about its content on the list. So there may be a point of

difference that if we have the discussion at our session might yield some real progress.

Jonathan Robinson:    I think it is now, John.

John Berard:        Okay. And then for the GNSO Board session – I was out of the room for a bit, have we decided who's bringing the pitchforks and who's bringing the torches?

Volker Greimann: We'll leave that free for anyone to decide. If there's only pitchforks, then that's the way it is.

Jonathan Robinson:    Maria.

Maria Farrell:      Yeah, just in response to Jonathan's question. The – so I put my hand up as someone who was going to ask a question when Fadi is with us. And I was going to basically try and wrap some of the concerns that we've been sharing over the sort of internal ICANN operationalization of the multistakeholder model.

That's a really ugly way of saying – trying to wrap in just some of our – the concerns including what Greg Shatan was saying there and just trying put them into something, you know, taking this whole multistakeholder thing that we need to do and present to the world and talking about some of the concerns we all have about doing – how it gets played out.

John Berard:        Again, this is John Berard. You know, look the point that was made is excellent. I mean, there was no field work done. You can bring in outside experts but, you know, even monkeys get examined by anthropologists, right? I mean, there wasn't any field work done.

Volker Greimann: Okay next I have Alan and he's followed by Mikey if we still have time.

Alan Greenberg:   Thank you. It's interesting – we're having a merging of a number of the topics. The earlier comment that global stakeholder engagement is not looking at the stakeholders who are around the table who are already here, us, for instance, fits in very well with Chuck's comment of we – if we're the stakeholders then we should start organizing for how to do the IANA transition. Those two statements exist in the same world.

The whole issue with the IANA one is it has to involve more stakeholders than are just within ICANN right now. And, you know, perhaps global stakeholder engagement forgets we're here at all and is only looking at those who are outside but somehow we have to get the two together.

Mikey O'Connor:  It's Mikey. I want to sort of merge my thoughts with Chuck's and that is it seems to me that we could either do this binary; we could either say, okay, the administration leads and we follow; or we could say we lead and the administration follows. And I'm trying to get us to kind of a middle zone that says how can we do this together?

So the administration and the stakeholder community, in terms of the NTIA work, which the NTIA has asked ICANN to take a lead on, how can we work together effectively? Because I think the last time we didn't.

Jonathan Robinson:   So, Mikey, just to respond – and just to remind you, again, what Larry Strickling said at the NCUC meeting yesterday, I mean, one of the clear bullet points – I wrote down notes as he spoke was – this needs to be done in a bottom up multistakeholder consensus way. That's almost a condition of the handover. In fact I did understand it to be a condition of the handover; that's the deal.

So it gets handed off providing the solution is worked out in a bottom up multistakeholder consensus-driven way. So in a way maybe that's our question

to Fadi, you know, in part notwithstanding Chuck's point is, you know, how are we going to do this in a bottom up multistakeholder consensus-driven way? So I know I jumped the queue there but it was a response to Mikey.

Volker Greimann: Okay. Next I have Petter and then Steve.

Petter Rindforth: Oh well, listen to the discussion here and all the proposals for Q&A. I think initially it was a good idea to start with Q&A and I propose that we keep on with that. Also counting on the short time we have so keep it on Q&A and Fadi will, anyway you have a possibilities to make comments during that.

Volker Greimann: Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco. Chuck's suggestion that we take the initiative should be coupled with a question that says that as we plan to take the initiative we'd like to understand whether that would be overwhelmed or overshadowed by two of the top level panels that are already addressing IANA transition; one is the ecosystem panel. There are several pages in there with normative descriptions, normative statements around how that ought to happen.

And there's another panel on preparation for NETmundial, that is another high level panel. Both of them, I believe, report directly to the Board so it's fair to simply ask will their recommendations to the Board overwhelm or overshadow what it is we would be working on since we are trying to organize ourselves to do a cross community working group that honors the bottom up multistakeholder approach.

And then a second technical question is, is the work of a strat panel that reports to the Board, in the CEO's opinion, is that satisifying what NTIA requested? That is to say a bottom up multistakeholder because it might just be a definition or a matter of degrees. Let's have that in open conversation.

Volker Greimann: Thanks, Steve. Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade:     Let me pick up on a point that I heard in both Mikey's comment and in Steve's comment. And that is doing things in partnership. But I made a comment period about the inverted pyramid and that is the job of the staff and the Board to support the community of stakeholders in achieving the outcomes that are necessary to make ICANN a success.

So I think you can ask questions about how ICANN CEO is going to organize the staff and the resources that the community needs to fulfill its responsibility to address this.

There is an important point here, as Steve has noted, there's a fair amount of top down activity going on that the community has not had a chance to digest in terms of these panels. And it's going to be difficult for us to digest that as well as launch a working group which is a cross community working group and to try to figure out how we're taking that into account as well as all of the analysis and consultation that we're all going to need to do with our own communities.

I think it's important for us not to jump into commitments to the CEO when we just got this information as we got on the planes to come here. And we all have constituency or stakeholder group meetings on Tuesday so I'd ask us to be a little bit cautious about too many commitments until we have a chance to talk about things a little bit further within our communities as well as here, you know, I will remind everybody you don't just have a two hour session on globalization; you have a two hour session followed by the cross community working group 90-minute session followed by another 90-minute session on globalization on Monday.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Next I have Brian followed by Avri.

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt, IPC. I just want to support what other people have said and what Marilyn just stated. I think that we – as the Intellectual Property Constituency we're trying to digest this information, we're trying to have a discussion not only with the folks who are here on the ground but also with our broader list. And we frankly do just need more time to figure out how we are going to approach and what our reaction is going to be to some of this information.

Volker Greimann: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Avri and CSG. I guess one of the things that I'm looking at – and I think this was one of the things that Mikey was driving at is that we really have to find a cooperative way to get this. Because not only does it have to be us and all the other SOAC it has to be our broader community. It has to be the community beyond us. And it's a broader effort.

So while I think we have to be part of the group that's organizing this we have to do it in cooperation with others including the staff components and Fadi and the NTIA folks and that broader community.

So I – us leading – I think that's fine if we're part of leading it. I think also when we're talking about our ad hoc cross community working group we have to sort of see that that isn't quite a bottom up effort yet; that's sort of an ad hoc group that a bunch of people got together and sort of couldn't figure out how they were working together and came out with something. And it's good but let's not consider that as being our, you know, the point of the spear here.

That's another one of the efforts but it really – we have to get to that broader community and it isn't just us, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson:    That's a point of information. And I wouldn't mind a question directly to Avri on this. And first of all Fadi's still running late and we should expect him in another 10-15 minutes from now. So this is great, I think, because it gives us an opportunity to chew over these issues in a way in which we haven't had and yet we wanted to.

Avri, I heard you mention that the ad hoc community working group and, you know, the – how the genesis of that and the ongoing work of it, I just wanted to understand if – and you may not have this understanding or if any – I'll pose the question not necessarily even to you but that community working group is really focused on preparation for Brazil.

Is it your understanding or anyone else's understanding that that is to do with the IANA transition as well? Or do we – how do we, you know, how are those connected in anyone's minds? And I'd just pose the question.

Avri Doria:    Okay, I'll take a first jump at it. I don't think you can separate NETmundial and Brazil from the IANA ICANN issues. They are all bound. Yes, NETmundial is broader than just IANA ICANN. And, yes, IANA ICANN is sort of somewhat separate. They're not completely overlapping but you cannot separate them. So the ad hoc group – and I think having a proper – and we saw earlier of the work being done to come up with a notion of how we properly create cross community working groups.

I think having one of those where we can focus our energy on Brazil and beyond to this 18-month effort. But we can't take NETmundial out of the equation. I think it's definitely part of – it's the next step after this one.

Volker Greimann: Okay thank you, Avri. Next I have James and then John.

James Bladel:    So I'm thinking that – just kind of taking in and digesting a lot of what we're hearing both the Council and just around the room I think that perhaps part of what we can discuss is just a – a bit of advice maybe instead of a complaint, which is that there's an – there is a sense of legitimacy that is offered to anyone that is claiming to speak with the community if the community is aware of these actions and has had an opportunity to provide feedback into these.

If you short circuit that process than you can go anywhere and say anything and make any commitment that you choose but you just – you are so far out in front of anyone that would be considered a representative community that you're really speaking for yourself at that point. So I think that maybe that's one approach or direction that can be taken.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, James. I note that Fadi has joined us and I would suggest that we cut the line at this point so we can get to the meat of the matter.