

Transcription ICANN Singapore
Preparation for meetings with the Board and CEO
Saturday 07 February 2015

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/#feb>

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

Jonathan Robinson: And this next session that gives us the opportunity to prepare for the meetings with the board, the GAC, and the ccNSO. That's what it says.

In fact we are - I think we, that meeting with the ccNSO is currently scheduled for Monday breakfast.

We were relatively well prepared for that but I think that that meeting is unlikely to take place. You need to check. And I'm talking to (Byron) who's chair of the ccNSO about that. And I think it's unlikely that we'll run that meeting given it's too tightly scheduled. Typically we've done it on Monday evening.

We do have as far as the GAC is concerned we've at least got a detailed report from the Consultation Group. I just bumped into (Minault) and she tells me she thinks's a couple of other items Mason for that meeting. I don't know if you know what they are okay so we'll come back to that.

In the meantime what I'd really like to do is make sure we've adequately and properly prepared for a meeting with Theresa, Fadi, and the board. And mostly I think we - I suspect we'll be able to get a pretty good update from Theresa on the areas she's working on which will overlap with some of the other areas we know about.

But I think it's always useful to hear from her on key areas she's in because she's focused on things like the Transition and the Accountability Group which we will get other updates from on.

But I would really welcome your points on what we might talk with Fadi about. And I've got pretty much a blank slate as far as talking with the CEO is concerned at this stage. Typically when we come into these meetings there's at least a bit of structure to it.

I let you know what I've got with as prospective topics for the board at this stage and so I'd like your input as to whether those makes sense or not and any suggestions for other topics and/or with Fadi.

When you present a topic it's never a bad idea to think about whether you'd be prepared to be the topic lead on that as well.

So as far as the board is concerned we have recently exchanged letters with the board on the new TLD rounds. So it strikes me that we could give them an update on the work that's going on, just actually put a bit more context to that.

Brett would be the obvious lead on that one. But that's something to think about. I won't put you out for that yet Brett but that's something we could be thinking about.

So topic one I've got at the moment in my mind - and these are not I'm not saying I'm wedded to these is the discussion group and our recent exchange of letters on the new gTLD rounds on further gTLD new gTLD rounds.

There's a topic we're going to come to discussing now. But I think it would be a good idea if we have any serious intention on this to flag with the board our intentions regarding a CWG, Cross Community Working group on the use of auction proceeds.

Because I think the board needs - if that's where we're going the board needs to know that's where we're going. And they - we also need to know that they

either accept that position which I hope they will but they may push back and say no.

That's we've got plans for that money so I think, you know, it would - if we are going down that route we need to let them know as soon as possible.

And then finally that point that I made earlier which is our work I think we could usefully update with - update them and discuss with them our work with the GAC which that might be something - that could be something that is led perhaps jointly by myself and Mason.

So those are the three topics I've got. I've got nothing for our meeting with Fadi at this stage not that I remember. I probably have got some notes somewhere.

So board is working with the GAC CWG on auction proceeds known and volunteer to raise or discuss that, discussion group exchange of letters on future gTLD rounds possibly Brett.

Any thoughts, issues, comments on what we should or could be talking with Fadi about or - and/or the board? Any burning issues in your groups that you think should be brought up via this?

I mean this is a great opportunity to talk - only one other thing I thought about under - and this is an interesting one. I'd like to have any comment on this.

Under working with ICANN GAC which is my broad topic that I thought we might want to talk to the board about I've got three sub topics actually.

The GAC GNSO Consultation Group, the prospective processing of the communiqué and an area which I should be more familiar with but I'm not because I've been otherwise engaged this recent issue that's emerged of the two letter names.

And I don't know whether that's, you know, because that's broadly under (Susan).

So to be clear at the moment I've got three topics to talk with the GAC one of with the board I'm sorry, with the board. One of them is to update them on our latest working with the GAC.

And when we talk with them about our work with the GAC it feels to me like there's three areas we could talk with them about.

One is the GAC GNSO Consultation Group which is probably which will be led by myself or Mason. Two, the prospective processing of the communiqué with respect to policy issues.

And the third is this recent issue that's emerged of I think there's some GAC advice that's come out of sync with the policy development process on the use of two letter domain names.

And that seems to have caused a bit of consternation at very points in the community. And I wonder if we should be talking with the board about that. Because as I understand it there's policy developed in relation to this and/or underdevelopment. And yet this has come in as a piece of GAC advice.

Now I don't know how comfortable anyone from the board will be about talking about this at this stage. I don't know how comfortable anyone from this group is about potentially leading that topic or what support there is for that. I just - that's just an issue am aware of.

Thoughts comments input, Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan, Donna Austin. I can provide some context to the two character labels at the second level. So the Registry Stakeholder Group has actually sent a letter to the board yesterday on this issue.

What happened is that following the GAC communiqué from LA there was the GAC could not come to any consensus advice on the use of two characters at the second level.

Registries had been going through the asset process to seek the release of two character labels. This was very cumbersome. There was no - it was the asset wasn't really designed for that so we had a lot of consternation about the process that staff were adapting to try to enable the release of two character names.

Staff did release a process, a much more streamlined process for the release of two character labels at the second level for new gTLDs on the 1st of December and we're moving ahead with that process. Many registries had sought to use two characters at the second level.

On 26th of January the GAC sent a letter to the board saying we want you to hold those requests because we want you to take more information into consideration.

They didn't like the process essentially is the bottom line. So all those requests for two character labels at the second level are on hold so that the board can have a discussion around it so that - I can send you the letter that the registries have sent to board on this issue.

But it is - so it's a hot topic for the registries because once again this has been held up. Registries started to seek the release to use two characters at the second level back in March last year.

And there has been one registry I think that now has the right to use all two character labels at the second level which include country codes.

Some others have been granted the ability to use two character labels that aren't country codes. So we're going to have inconsistencies if the board agrees to change the process that's already been put in place.

Further a higher level we have an issue with the GAC being able to send a letter to the board which is not consensus advice and it puts our process on hold indefinitely. We don't know how long this is - it will take to resolve this.

So we have a concern that that can happen. We also have a concern that it seems that staff have interfered in a process on - without transparency.

So we don't have any insight into why staff made the decision to put some of the applications on hold in an intervening period between when two characters should have been related to some registry operators and the actual advent is a letter from the GAC.

So there was a period of about 20 days where some of the registry operators could have actually given the process that staff had put in place that some of the registries should have actually had the approval to use those two characters at the second level to move forward.

So I'll forward the letter that we've sent to the list to the council and that probably gives better context.

Jonathan Robinson: It gives more than a bit of context. It's helpful. Thank you. I guess the question then is is this an issue for the council do and is it an issue that the council wishes to raise with the board? Donna, Heather?

Heather Forrest: Thank you Jonathan. I actually wonder if it also is an issue - pardon me Heather Forrest for the transcript, if this is an issue that we want to raise for the GAC.

Because I understand the GAC is discussing this this afternoon and there are GAC members who have also injected to the disruption of process. So this may be an issue for our meeting with them. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So one of the issues with having with putting an issue like this on the list is it's been need someone to lead it. If - and we need to have a desired outcome from that discussion.

Now the registries have clearly sent the letter. Is anyone willing to lead this? Is anyone interested in leading it? Do we think - I mean I'm really surprised that there are no other burning issues out there that anyone would like to see or have or see be discussed with either the CEO or the board?

I'm - and one of the other topics that I had in mind for the board is possibly I mean do we want to talk about the sort of work life balance, the fact that, you know, the balance between what work is being done in a community in relation to the steerage of transition, is that something we want to talk to Fadi about, to the board about? Does anyone - is that an issue?

So I'm really fishing for topics, topic leads and support for or not for some of the topics I have suggested. So I've got I think I saw a hand from Donna, I've got Heather and Volker, Thomas.

Donna Austin: Donna Austin. So I think it would be useful to get an update from Fadi on the interactions that he's had with the SO AC leadership on I think it's been discussed a few times now on, you know, volunteer burnout and what the ideas they're having in trying to resolve that.

And I think there was also a discussion with that group about prioritization of workload as well. That would be good to get an update on where that is.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry Donna I missed the first part of that in which we talk to Fadi about that or the board?

Donna Austin: Yes, yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Next is Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you Volker, Heather Forrest. One of the issues that came out of the intercessional that could be followed up with Fadi is how to improve and indeed the board, how to improve the board's interaction with the community at an ICANN meeting.

That's something that Fadi said he would personally take on and it would be opportune of us to ask for an update. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Good point. Thank you. From my perspective just one thing that we should also raise with the GAC is that we give them a heads up of what we intend to do with their communiqué.

Just very brief information that we have to be of course very careful with the language that the council is intending to parse their communiqué for policy implications that would affect the work of the GNSO or past, present or future. And therefore it buys the board of the implications of community so the community can better deal with the communiqué and implement it easier. Next in queue is Thomas and Tony.

Thomas Rickert: Yes. I have to preface this by looking to the room whether Jeff is still there because he said that we shouldn't talk about the stewardship transition but nonetheless at least you've said that accountability would be somewhat in the remit of what we're doing.

So I think it's important for us to discuss the transition and maybe in particular the accountability implications with all three of them. And not - I think updates in terms of substance are given in several sessions during the week so we might not want to be too repetitive with that.

But what I think needs to be discussed and should be highlighted is the timing of all this. You know, we are a single organization of the, you know, two Cross Community Working Groups.

And once these groups have come up with proposals we need to make sure that not only the council but also all our groups react in a timely fashion. And the same goes for the GAC as well as for the board.

And with respect to Fadi what I think could be discussed is how ICANN communicates in the, you know, between now and whatever point in time the transition actually takes place.

Because I think we can't afford the disconnect between ICANN communicating about the transition and the community communicating about the transition and that, you know, we had - I think we need to make sure that the outside world sees ICANN meaning ICANN Corporation including its management as well as the community looking at this in a holistic fashion and speaking as one.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So they seem like some good ideas but need to just do a little bit more with it before we move on.

First of all working for Fadi is Theresa Swinehart as you know who's closest at kind of an operational level to these even though they - she's a strategic advisor to Fadi.

So the question is is any of what you suggested appropriate for our conversation with Theresa which comes ahead of talking with Pepsi?

Thomas Rickert: Well I would think that talking to Theresa would be more than operational side of things. Looking at you trying to get some feedback because I think that this affects, you know, I'm speaking a little bit from my CCWG perspective and I'm sure that you look at this from a CWG perspective as well.

I would maybe talk about, you know, operational issues with Theresa discussing the status, bringing that GNSO community up to speed and also maybe highlighting the legal advice issue with Theresa.

You know, that's a practical topic to be addressed well then with Fadi as well as with the board I think it would more the overarching concept, how we get to the final result and adopting recommendations.

But I have to say and as much as I would like to volunteer to lead on any of these subjects I have just received an email that I'm invited to make some remarks at the GAC session tomorrow morning which will likely conflict with Theresa's session so I might not be...

Jonathan Robinson: So we can ask Theresa for an update. I would if - I mean I've got you down provisionally to raise this point with the board presuming we settle on this as a final point.

So that's I think as far as Fadi is concerned I am not quite sure what we're asking him to talk about or not or the board.

So we do need to be clear what specifically because one of the consequences of having this discussion is we start to create an agenda. And we need to communicate to whoever's session that is what we intend - we need to get some kind of indication.

So we need to be crystal clear about what the intention of raising the topic is, what's within that and what we want to, you know, what the scope of the discussion is.

Thomas Rickert: If I may I think with the board I would like to talk about the process of getting a recommendation adopted. You know, that would be my preference.

And with Fadi I would focus more on communication because Fadi is the one representing the organization at the global level and I think we need to ensure that there is no disconnect between the understanding of the CO representing ICANN and where the community stands.

Not as a criticism but just as looking for a way that the community is closely aligned with the CEO when it comes to speaking to these issues.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Brett, sorry Volker's got the queue so...

Volker Greimann: Tony is next.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you, Tony Holmes. But just to add in response to Donna a point of clarity that may help. Now the work that the SO ACs have been doing or in terms of overload and burnout.

They're the issues that are going to be addressed with the high interest topics on Monday. And some of the work that's been done in those groups in fact all of it is going to be presented to the community for input.

So I'm not against raising it with Fadi but I think the answer you'll probably get from Fadi would be to point you towards those particular sessions.

Volker Greimann: Brett is next and then Jeff.

Brett Fausett: Thanks. This is less specific than some of the other things we've been talking about. But for conversation with Fadi one of the things we talked about in the Registry Constituency is that I understand that towards the end of January Fadi asked a rather big question which is what would good look like in 2015? Give me three bullet points about what good would look like for ICANN.

So this may be an opportunity for us to say, you know, at least from the council's perspective here are three going to be very high level things that we think would be measures of ICANN's success for this year.

So I throw that out as a topic. That obviously requires us to do some consideration around that topic before we present to Fadi tomorrow. But, you know, I - it might be worth raising.

Jonathan Robinson: So it's a good idea. I don't - I think I like it in many ways. It's a new. It adds something more. I'm just going to remind you of the time.

We are going to spend some time in this session talking about a prospect to CWG on auction proceeds. This session's due to finish at 4:00. I think we can probably run till 4:15 so which would give us a 15 minute coffee break.

That means we've got 45 minutes - well we've only got 30 minutes now to hone down these issues and work them.

So really I'm looking for issues, willingness to lead and scope of issue. So it's kind of on the rough list but let's think about whether we can - whether we've actually got time to develop it and do something with it? Jeff or sorry...

Volker Greimann: Jeff is next yes.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jeff Newman. I was actually going to kind of take almost the opposite view of Brett because Fadi is very good at asking the community how they would define good but he's the CEO.

He should be telling us what his strategic priorities are for ICANN as an operational entity, not on the transition stuff, not on the accountability and all this, the engagement stuff.

But Fadi tell us what went right last year, what didn't go right last year, what are you working on improving and what's your top five things that you need to do as the CEO of an organization for 2015.

And ask him what, you know, when he sat in theory it was probably a yearend review I would assume. And I'm assuming that at the end of the year he also set his strategic priorities for 2015.

And you'll hear from Theresa on the transition and accountability. But I would ask him on everything else put aside transition, put aside all that other stuff

what - how would you define for your own organization what is good and take it that way. Put him on the spot.

Because I mean he's very good at deflecting and asking us what we want but he is the head of an organization. So what is his top priorities? You know, what is he going to do better in 2015? What's his focus? So that's what I would ask of him as the council.

Jonathan Robinson: So Jeff I just want to play that back to you to make sure I've captured it. I (unintelligible) end of that what are the strategic priorities as an operational entity in brackets, not the transition, what went right last year and what are they this year?

Jeff Neuman: Yes kind of like a mini state of ICANN, you know, kind of the state of the union of this is how we did last year in 2014. This is what we did right. This is what we have to improve on and then what are the top things you want to achieve this year?

And I'm not asking from the very high level of, you know, this is our strategic plan for the next five years.

I mean what do you tell your staff? What are you holding? What are the KPIs you're holding your staff accountable to this year? Key performance indicators for those who don't necessarily know what KPIs are.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Jeff. I think this is an excellent topic that we should raise. Digging into that maybe just do something to throw out.

I'm not an expert on this. Maybe somebody else who has got more into the budget can say more about this.

I think it might be worth mentioning to the board and to Fadi someone alerted me to the fact that in the current budget only 5% of the budget are allocated to the policy side, supporting the policymaking of ICANN.

Now I think that's a really low number for a subject. That should be the top priority of ICANN as a multi-stakeholder body i.e., enabling that multi-stakeholder body to make policy, deliberate policy, work on policy.

I cannot confirm the number. I'm not too firm in the budget but I would like to see some discussion of the budget and the priorities the budget makes by someone who knows more about it than I do.

Jonathan Robinson: So I saw Fadi last night just to give you - put this in perspective and I said to him, "Look, I'm sorry we haven't got you any topics in advance of the meeting and are you still okay to come?" "And I promise we won't ambush you."

So I think we've got to be fair. And on the financial side I mean, you know, I mean I think we've just got to get the balance right between producing some topics but not throwing him under a bus at the last minute. So I'm just not sure whether...

Volker Greimann: Maybe it's not a question for this...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Volker Greimann: ...session but is something we should analyze for the next in the budget comes around for the next meeting and have a detailed discussion on this topic at that time.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Volker Greimann: But we should prepare for this as this because this is an important issue I think and we should be prepared and maybe not for this session but next time.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I think it's that's probably a good point. It's a good point. It's a really interesting point but possibly not urgent for this meeting. And second of all I just remind everyone that I think Volker put up questions related to these topics on the list quite some time ago.

And next time when it comes to our next meeting it would be really good to get this kind of feedback as early as possible because doing it last minute I don't feel comfortable doing it last minute.

And I think we're likely to get better interaction if we are better prepared and prepare the group we're interacting with better in advance. Volker, Stephanie's got her hand up. I don't know who else you've got. Edmon's in the queue.

Volker Greimann: Edmon's in the queue and then Stephanie.

And anybody else?

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I hate to be a wet blanket after Chuck was so positive. But I'm back on this whole issue of recruiting.

And if I was to boil that into one question for Fadi -- which I think is a good idea by the way -- it would be how do you motivate people who are not making money out of the domain name industry and therefore have no financial incentive to participate here, how do you motivate them to come and donate their time for the public good to help us solve such things as the giant EWG PDP that we're about to help solve because there's a number of obstacles in the way?

You can't see the end in sight. You can't lie to them and say this is going to be a six month project when you know darn well it's going to be a five year project right?

Funding is uncertain. If you do get funding it's going to be painful. And I'm - it's not clear how they fit into a multi-stakeholder organization. And yet our whole mission is to serve that multi-stakeholder organization anyway.

Volker Greimann: Thanks Stephanie. Maybe lying to them is the best way to motivate people. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Or is that part of the conversation we will have about the auction proceeds now?

Okay Edmon here. So I'm bringing up my favorite topic again. I - if there's time I think it's probably opportune for all three groups to bring up the issue about universal acceptance.

I think, you know, this is becoming more and more an issue. And with the ccNSOs especially we you have a report from the JIG that went to the board and we have yet to hear back from them.

It's one of the very few reports that are jointly signed off by the two SOs. So I think, you know, it merits some response at least from the board what's happening and probably good idea to bring it up as an issue with the GAC as well if we have time. And that's just a suggestion.

Jonathan Robinson: So two quick questions on that specifically. So we've sent the report and as far as you're aware there has been no response from the board?

Edmon Chung: Well the board has never resolved and say, you know, thank you for your report or, you know, this is what staff has, you know, and directs that. I do know however, you know, just to be fair I do know that there has been work, you know, on it and there has both publicly and both with the staff.

But I think at this particular level in terms of the council and I guess in the bottom-up mechanics of ICANN I think it's worth to bring up if we have time.

Again, you know, I don't think this is a top urgent item but it is boiling to a point where I think, you know, the entire community needs to take a look at it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Edmon. Next in line is (Keith).

(Keith): Thank you Volker. Jonathan I apologize. I just came over from the ICG meeting so I haven't been able to hear all of the discussion today.

But I have heard several references just in the last 20 minutes to the issue of volunteer burnout, community burnout, prioritization of workload.

Has there been an update based on the SO AC SG meeting that we had yesterday with Fadi and the ICANN senior staff or if not would you like me to give one?

Jonathan Robinson: You know, I think Tony touched on it and mentioned that it would be in effect coming out through the high interest (unintelligible), you know, a couple of (unintelligible) additionally.

I mean so the - just to be clear the purpose of the session is the agenda for meetings with Theresa, Fadi, the board, but yes.

(Keith): Understood, but it sounded like there were potential questions that were going to be posed to Fadi for example about how to address some of these issues. So...

Jonathan Robinson: So we're creating a long list at the moment. We haven't got the short list but still I think it helps get this off the long list in one sense if it's understood that it's being dealt with adequately elsewhere so...

(Keith): Yes very good. So and I don't want to, you know, reiterate what Tony has already said. But, you know, we had a three-hour session yesterday with Fadi where the SO AC SGNC leaders got together and discussed the issue of volunteer burnout.

It includes - it included the questions of work prioritization, being able to bring in volunteers and not just bring in new blood but to make sure that the people who do participate stick around and contribute.

One of the terms that I think Greg Shatan coined yesterday was from lurkers to workers. And, you know, so I think - and this is - this will be one of the topics or the topic for the high interest session.

So I think, you know, Fadi to his credit has given the community leaders in a sense the opportunity to come together and to raise these issues and to look for solutions and to work with ICANN staff.

So I would just note that there's I think good effort underway on this topic going back to the meeting that we had in Los Angeles, a good session yesterday. There was a continuation of that.

And, you know, I think this is definitely a topic that is ripe for discussion. But Fadi has given us the ability to work with senior ICANN staff on the issue and to try to advance this forward. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Keith). That's helpful. Any other comments or issues before we and try to bring this into some kind of shape?

Volker Greimann: Going first, twice sold.

Jonathan Robinson: What is the purpose of that button? Does anyone know?

Man: Call to order.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm going to start using that right?

Volker Greimann: You're the only one that has it though.

Jonathan Robinson: Wow that's power. Okay everyone put their seatbelts on.

Volker Greimann: I think that's summoning the...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay lead us through a safety demonstration.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so now that you've belted up there is a - so as far as the Generic Domains Division meeting is concerned there's an opportunity for some updates there. Volker's going to run that session in the morning.

We're then going to go on to our meeting with Theresa. And I think we are really looking for an update on areas of work under her purview.

And my suspicion and to some extent knowledge to having seen her working is that I would imagine she's almost entirely focused on the transition and related matters.

So I would expect that what we could hear is an update from her perspective as to how it's all evolving and developing? So that's what I would expect to be putting to Theresa.

And I'm expecting that you in this room will come back at me if you think that that's not an effective use of our and her time. But that's what I'm expecting to ask from her.

Then moving onto our meeting with Fadi I think we can ask him reasonably for any remarks on the whole volunteer burnout workload issue.

And I'm sure he'll be comfortable talking with that. And we can note in our request to him that this is being picked up in the SO AC leadership form. And also recognize that that's those are high interest topics on Monday.

We then - and these may need adjusting in terms of their order. But really I guess related to that is Stephanie's point actually. I think we can bring that in there into under the volunteers.

Because really the point that Stephanie made was what any, you know, and I'm not sure there's an answer to it yet but it's raising it as a point recognizing that motivation of volunteers from domain names are not an income source is kind of part of that bigger picture so that's something that we could potentially talk about as well.

The other thing - the other two points we talked about was Thomas's point on the transition and accountability implications.

And here Thomas you've raised the point as I understand it for Fadi is that really this is about communication issues and making sure we are coordinated and aligned with ICANN staff really, that the community work is coordinated and aligned. Is that what you wanted to talk about?

Thomas Rickert: Yes. I mean it's communication at all levels, not only Fadi speaking but also, you know, Fadi being the CEO of the organization ensuring that the Communications Team is liaising with the community when it comes to communicating about the transition.

Jonathan Robinson: And then there's another topic that we came to and it was really thinking about the point of what good would look like. We then said well, what about ICANN specifically? ICANN's putting the transition aside because everyone's clear that that seems to be a major focus for the year.

But what are ICANN's strategic priorities as an operational entity, not the transition? And some framing points on that, what went right last year and what are they and should they - should go right this year, and then what should staff be accountable to this year in terms of KPIs? So that's what we've got as a set of discussion topics.

It seems like a reasonable landscape. Then on with the - onwards to the meeting with the board and here we've got - I think what I'm going to do is probably bundle a couple of these into more ad hoc items.

And I mean there was Edmon's point that I think is really a reminder point on the universal acceptance.

There's a question saying look we're starting to think about budget in terms of the fact that what budgets and portion of the organization's budget is set aside for policy work? Because in a sense that highlights the level of priority that's given to it.

We're going to give an update on our working with the GAC, raise the point of CWG use of - and the use of auction proceeds, and raise the point about board interaction with the community.

And Thomas you wanted to do something on the transition and the accountability implications here as well. And I - this is really about the final adoption of recommendations. Is that right?

Thomas Rickert: Yes Jonathan if I may actually we do have two sessions tomorrow one of which is the CCWG meeting with the board which is also on our agenda right?

So this is something that we're going to definitely bring up as a CCWG. So in order to avoid duplication, you know, we might see whether that's satisfactorily resolved in that session and then...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Thomas Rickert: ...we can skip it for the meeting in the afternoon.

And then I'm more than happy to share the agenda points that the CCWG has planned to raise with the board so that the counselor is informed?

Jonathan Robinson: Can you do that right away?

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: That would be helpful to me certainly in terms of planning for that meeting.

So I'm going to look for some leads now. In terms of that if we do do that Thomas and I except we may not I'm going to put your name as a prospectively for that because you might want to say look we raised it with you with the CCWG but it didn't seem completely or satisfactorily answered.

And anyway the council is a charting organization of both of these. So that's one potentially there.

Board interaction with the community, I've heard murmurings about this quite often. Heather is that something you would like to lead on?

Heather Forrest: Jonathan, Heather Forrest. I am happy to do that. I think any of us who were at the intercessional are in a capable position given that that was a topic that very strongly came out of that.

I'm happy to lead but I would like for others involved in that discussion, I suppose it's one of accountability here really following up on a promise that was very clearly made. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Heather just to clarify is that board interaction with the community at ICANN meetings that's really what we're talking about?

Heather Forrest: It - Heather Forrest. It is Jonathan. One of the points if I offer maybe the 22nd version of context here is one of the points that came out of the intercessional was this notion of ivory tower that in fact a rather humorous comment was made if there were somehow some sort of overhead or underground tunnel

that the board could use to avoid walking in the corridors from room to room it an ICANN meeting that they would quite prefer to do that to avoid the overload if you like of interaction with staff.

And from the very logistical point that on the day that we all interact with the board rather than them sit in the same room all the time that one thing could happen that they came to us that they joined our meetings and engaged with the community rather than the community approaching them on high. So...

Jonathan Robinson: So...

Heather Forrest: Shall I put my seatbelt on?

Jonathan Robinson: Please do. You were get - you were getting out of your seat there for a moment.

So I think that's really useful. I think if they respond that could be a really interesting - it could be a topic that falls flat if we're not careful. They could just refuse to engage on it or it could be a really interesting opportunity to talk for a while about, you know, the board's role in the community.

So maybe in a sense that its board role and interaction, board role in the community and interaction with the community.

Heather Forrest: Jonathan may I...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Heather Forrest: ...ask to follow up on a very quick point? Heather Forrest again. One thing that interests me, just interests me personally is whether this made it back to the board?

Fadi was really quite enthusiastic about saying to all of us at the intercessional this was a great thing. And I'm looking at Tony I know was with

me at the intercessional really was gung ho on this and taking it back. And if the board hasn't found out about that frankly I'll be quite disappointed.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. And I take your point there and I don't want to be sort of thing I'm going to defend Fadi here. But notwithstanding whether he's done that or not he's a busy guy he might have forgotten.

I've heard this elsewhere as well. And I feel it here. You know, we used to have board members sitting in on our GNSOs sessions. Where are they now?

What does the board do during ICANN meetings and why is that more important than - so I think I'd be - I think rather than put Fadi on the defensive for his role as intermediary I think we could raise that it was brought up.

And from my point of view I'd rather get the board thinking that this is a broader issue. It's certainly not just a NCPH issue. I think many of us feel it and let's get them talking about it so yes.

And one final point here Jonathan apologies, Heather Forrest, is the links are discussions that we've had on this new meeting structure.

Really no acknowledgment in that new meeting structure of, you know, the only reference to the board there was board committees.

Where is the board engaging with the community in this new meeting structure and how will that happen? And now that we're moving into this new meeting structure this is the time to embed the board engagement. Thank you.

I know there's a couple of people Tony and (Susan). Volker's looking at the queue. I'm just going to make a note of that because actually that was something I felt that in the new meeting structured discussion I thought that there was something that actually that was something for the board.

Because it links to both budget. And I think what we can say in that is that we could maybe put it as a broad thing. ICANN meetings is the theme and it's the new meeting structure. We could say look actually we've got some reservations about that.

And secondly not only about the meeting structure we've got another issue which is about the board participation in meetings. So let me just try and capture that while we've got a moment there.

Volker Greimann: And maybe just as a comment now maybe we should phrase it not in the way that we say and accuse them of not appearing anywhere but just saying that the community does not necessarily have input on how the board works and how they use their time and maybe that the board could then provide us with information of why their schedules changed in such a way that they cannot participate anymore.

Tony is next I think.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. Yes just a follow-up on that point, I think the opportunity is there and maybe we should be presenting at that way. Because if it's a done deal and the new meeting structure is going ahead for that middle Meeting B which is focused on policy it's an ideal opportunity for the board to become engaged with those groups during that meeting.

Volker Greimann: Right. (Susan)'s next.

(Susan): So I just want to remind everyone what Bruce Tonkin said at our Friday meeting in LA where he was definitely frustrated with each constituency coming in and talking about the issues that are important to them and it's just repeated over and over.

So maybe we do the same thing that Jeff thought about with Fadi and say okay, then how would you suggest, the board suggests interacting closer with

each of the constituencies or the GNSO in general? So obviously they're frustrated with the interaction or at least Bruce Tonkin was. And so maybe they have a fix for it too.

And the other thing is I think they used to sort of troop around and go to each constituency and then they thought that wasn't a good use of their time so...

Volker Greimann: Thank you Susan. You raise an interesting point and I think that should also be picked up just as a reminder to the board when we speak to them that having Bruce Tonkin at this council session, informal council session was at least in my view has enriched the session.

It was very helpful for us for our work for our discussion. And that kind of interaction we would like to see more of.

Jonathan Robinson: This reminder we had - didn't we have - wasn't (Marcus) there as well or who else was there? Wasn't there - wasn't (Marcus)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Yes but he nevertheless he might've had pre-existing travel arrangements or whatever the case is. But we forget that I think (Marcus) as an incoming board member was a the two GNSO board member yes okay.

Volker Greimann: Okay. Next in line is Brett.

Brett Fausett: I think just also an opportunity to, you know, praise them when they do good things here as well. I - a few weeks ago I was at Domain Fest in Las Vegas. And there was George Sadowsky.

And I said, "George, why are you at Domain Fest?" And he said that the board thought it would be helpful if board members had some understanding

of the domain name business. So they sent him to Domain Fest. And I think that is a great thing.

I mean maybe getting the board to interact with us between these meetings at either our council meetings or something like Domain Fest I think I thought that was great.

And so if there's an opportunity to say, you know, tip of the hat, thank you for doing this, keep doing it I love to do that.

Jonathan Robinson: If you could park that and have that ready for that session I think it would be great to acknowledge that. I won't make it part of the agenda but if you - I mean I appreciate the point, think it's a good one and so let's bring that up.

Volker Greimann: If there's nobody else for the queue maybe just one comment I think. One thing that we should try to be careful of is make is too critical so ending on a high note and being - commending the board on what we think has been progress or advancement or changes for the better would be a good way for us to go out of this meeting.

And that's brought up Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yes. Maybe we could broaden the topic that Brett mentioned a little bit by also plotting the board for, you know, getting so involved in the CCWG for example and I'm sure it's the same for your group and that only at the Frankfurt meeting we had like four or five board members so it's not only Domain Fest that they show up but I think you see more good-faith attempt to be in more regular contact with the community at all levels.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so we'll make that a discussion item. You know, the board's relationship with the community and some examples.

I think Chuck let's go to you next.

Chuck Gomes: It will be real quick. I just want to add and the CWG. Steve Crocker has been participating very actively in the CWG and that's been good.

Jonathan Robinson: So again to Brett's point I think to the extent that anyone can individually that - and that's not covered please acknowledge that. I think it's great that individual contributions counselors anyway. As Brett pointed out it's great to have some positive contributions as well.

I think just beating up on the board or beating up on Fadi or whatever is not the way to handle these interactions. There's much, much more effective ways of doing it and we can do that so great.

I'm keen to draw a line under the session. I think we've got enough information. But there is one thing that isn't closed in my mind. And that is any discussion on do we want to have any discussion with the board on future gTLD rounds and or we not in shape to have that discussion at this stage?

One of the things I - one of the things I thought of discussing with the board is one of the themes that kind of existed in our discussion earlier was timing. You know, what is - is there any view?

I expect they'll just pass it back to us and say you tell us when you're ready. But it wouldn't, you know, Brett and...

Brett Fausett: Yes?

Jonathan Robinson: ...Brett when you respond to this and I think if you're prepared to lead any discussion on this?

Brett Fausett: I'm prepared to lead any discussion on this but if we're short on time I don't know that there's a lot to say on this right now except, you know, here's a report. We're - we thank you for the staff report. We thank you for the board

input. You know, it's in the sausage making pipeline and it's going to come out at some point in the future.

But I really don't know that there's a lot here to say. So I would support taking it off the list if appropriate.

Jonathan Robinson: So in response to that then I'll say it'll be either off the list or under the kind of ARB type items where we've got a couple of things that might be worth a quick mention but we're not - Avri you're not comfortable with that or someone else want to respond, Thomas and that Avri?

Thomas Ricker: Yes I think I would add a different flavor to it. And that is I think in order not to be criticized too much by the global public for talking about the new round of new gTLDs we also need to look at how ICANN approaches the global Internet community currently.

And I think that, you know, I would like to hear from the board what they're doing in order to approach underserved markets and regions because I think we would be looking extremely badly if we wanted to roll out more names without having really made a difference in Africa or in other areas where we have almost no registrars and, you know, where accessibility to domain names is more than difficult.

And I guess that, you know, is sort of the baseline for or the basic requirement also for another round. So if we could embed this talks about new gTLDs like, you know, as you know the council is working on this.

But we do think that it's important to be globally inclusive and actually be prepared for the next round and then ask the board for their plans in terms of being globally inclusive.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I guess I should probably challenge you and say do we think that? I mean you might think that but do we?

Thomas Rickert: I'm throwing it out there. But I think that, you know, there's - there will be reviews of the current round or the now new gTLDs.

And the question is have we succeeded in providing for more consumer choice and competition? And I think that that is closely related to accessibility at the global level.

Jonathan Robinson: But isn't there a comprehensive piece of work that's going to be done on consumer choice trust and competition which has got - which is a hugely developed piece of work that, you know, that I think the board will be waiting to hear the report on?

So I'm not sure I understand the value of doing that but I think that's in the pipeline. I'm just not sure whether again it's probably to Brett's point is it too early to be - is there or something unique that - Tony?

Tony Holmes: Well I don't think it is too early to ask that question and I very much come at this from the same position as Thomas.

I think it's a really appropriate question. And it enables us also to make the point that was raised this morning which is the work that Brett's reading is very much just ongoing work that fits in a parallel universe with some of the other activities. So personally I would support that.

I think it's a relevant question. And if it does nothing else it does raise the issue that the board may follow-up themselves and have some discussion on. And at the moment I'm not aware that they are having that debate.

Jonathan Robinson: So I've got it down as my point I've got down as any thoughts on this new gTLDs in underserved regions? Is that what we're saying?

Man: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes okay all right let's - Brett did you want to come - are you still in the queue?

Brett Fausett: Well I was actually going to jump on that and suggest that, you know, maybe we come at it from the point of view of, you know, rather than reporting necessarily just what we're doing which is to my point was that there's really not a lot to say right now but to bring it back into the bigger picture of the ICANN led reviews that are going on on have we succeeded? Have we succeeded on, you know, some of the metrics that we started off doing the first program?

So that's more of a board led issue and would perhaps give them an opportunity to talk about what they see and where and then the statuses of some of the larger review projects are.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay let's draw a line on that. Let's stop the recording there.