SAN JUAN – Public Forum 2
Thursday, March 15, 2018 – 13:30 to 16:45 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

BRAD WHITE: Ladies and gentlemen, if you can please take your seats, public forum number 2 will start in one minute.

Ladies and gentlemen, allow me to welcome you to the second public forum at ICANN61. And I'm proud to introduce our board chair, Cherine Chalaby.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Brad. And welcome, everybody, back to the second public forum of ICANN61. For those of you who are new to ICANN, this is our second public forum or open mic session of the week. The first was on Monday.

This session will last two hours and 45 minutes .and we will take a break about halfway through. I hope you'll take the opportunity to make comments, ask questions, and raise issues that you have worked on or observed during the week we spent here in Puerto Rico.

I have a small announcement. For those of you joining remotely, we appreciate your patience and understanding as we navigate issues with Adobe Connect.

 My colleague Maarten will later detail how you can submit questions and participate.

 And please, remember, this is not a replacement for public comments that ICANN is seeking on various issues and policies.

 Using our public comment system is the only way your comments will receive proper consideration from the appropriate committee, supporting organization, and staff members. As I said on Monday, these public forums are very important to us.

 We need to hear from you. This helps us do a better job.

 Let me remind you to take advantage of the skilled interpreters we have here supporting us. If you wish, in addition to English, you may ask your questions in Spanish, Russian, French, Arabic, Portuguese, and Chinese.

 With that, I will hand over to our ombudsman, Herb Waye, to review the expected standards of behavior governing this session. I would like to note that Herb could not be here today and is joining us via phone from Glace Bay, Nova Scotia. Herb.

HERB WAYE: Thank you, Cherine. Thank you very much, And good afternoon, everybody. Members of the board, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to begin by apologizing for my hastened departure from ICANN61 due to a family emergency. I look forward to catching up with you all at ICANN62 or maybe before. I would like you to take a moment to look around. You will notice the room is particularly full of two things: People and technology.

 If everyone at ICANN treated each other with the same care we give the technology in this room, we would not need an expected standards of behavior.

 We should be treating each other with respect: Naturally, unconsciously, unconditionally. The same way we treat our laptops.

 It is only by treating each other with respect can we offer true service to the global Internet community. By fostering a culture of diversity, tolerance, professionalism, and respect. It's the only way forward.

 In closing, I would like to remind you all that the person at the other end of your email, posting, or comment is a human being just like you, so please be kind.

And, finally, when you leave ICANN61 and return to your daily lives, families, friends, and loved ones, please remember to give them a hug and tell them you love them. Thank you. And I wish you all a very productive public forum.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much, Herb. And wishing you well in your situation.

I would like to give the basic overview that you've heard before, how we engage with each other in this forum.

We have about four Q&A sessions, each about half an hour or 45 minutes long.

And during these blocks any questions of community interest are welcome.

Now, if you have a question or a comment, I would invite you to start queuing up at the microphone. And what you will find is staff taking a picture of your badge. This is just to make sure that your name is well-expressed by the scribes in the script.

So, as you're likely aware, the Adobe Connect is not available for this session.   But sessions -- questions are welcome also remotely via the engagement@icann.org email address.   If emails come in, questions come in, the public forum producer,

Brad White, who is seated there at the front, will read the question out loud.

The Board facilitator will decide who might best be able to answer this.

If we can't answer your question right away, we'll take it away and we'll get back at you with the best possible answer shortly after.

So, as a reminder, live interpretation is being offered during this session. And for those joining us remotely, more information is available on the schedule session page. For those in the room, interpretation headsets are available.

Now the rules governing this session: When you speak, speak slowly and clearly. Clearly state your name and state who you are representing, if anyone.

Now, the rules of participation: As you know, there's a time limit on questions and comments.

You have two minutes to ask your question. And that will be enforced by a timer that is projected on the screen behind me.

Board responses will be also limited to two minutes.

Now, one follow-up is allowed and also limited to two minutes.

We want to hear as many people as possible. And the timer is really aimed to facilitate that. So with that, and without wasting any other time, I'm going over to the first board facilitator, Avri Doria.

Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Maarten.

And welcome, good afternoon. I'll go to the first person in line, please.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. And thank you for the opportunity to speak here. My name is James Galvin. For identification purposes, I work for Afilias. I'm a member of the technical community. I've been an Internet security technologist for over 30 years, well before the Internet as we know it today. I'm an active member of the RDS PDP working group. And I've been with SSAC since its inception. In fact, I just recently stepped down as vice chair of SSAC last December.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

Something extraordinary happened two days ago. And I think it's essential and important that we take tack a moment to celebrate that.

ICANN the organization responded to a security incident in an exemplary way.

What I want to say starts with David Conrad, ICANN's CTO, who participates in SSAC. And he heard an SSAC discussion. An SSAC member identified a security concern with Adobe Connect.

It started at about 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday night. The significance of the issue was immediately recognized. It was immediately escalated. And about 12 hours later, ICANN61 opened on Wednesday and continued almost as if nothing had happened.

Now, I want to highlight that again. ICANN staff exemplified in a best-in-class way how to respond to a security incident. Not only that, the problem centered around a tech tool, technology upon which we depend almost inextricably to conduct our work. And yet 12 hours later the logistics of this meeting were re-architected and had been deployed. I have no idea how many staff it really took to do this, but I do know that many of them were up all night to make sure that we in this room, the ICANN community could continue our work.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

I do want to call out one person, Ashwin Rangan, ICANN's Chief Innovation and Information Officer, for his leadership with all of the team at ICANN for their honest, decisive, and exemplary handling of this issue.

There's a lesson in here for all of us. Thank you again.

[Applause]

AVRI DORIA: Thank you for the comment and thank you for the technical team for the work they did. And now I'll go on to the second person in line.

LOUIS HOULE: (Speaking in non-English language) ... Houle and director on the board of .QUEBEC and co-chair of the governance committee. Like many new gTLD applicants and probably most people in this room our expectations for total domains under management have not yet been realized. According to namestats.com this morning, only 61 out of 1,226 new gTLD strings have more than 50,000 domains under management. You will recall that 50,000 is a magic number for registry level transactions related to annual increments of domain registrations against which the minimum ICANN annual fee of 25,000 applies before even a transaction fee of 25 cents applies.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

This means that just under 5% of registries are currently subjected a minimum. These registries average about 3,318 domains under management and therefore are paying an average of $7.53 per domain. This is an excessive fee, especially when compared to the actual price charged by registries. Are these registries successful? I suggest they are. Success can be measured in different ways, and certainly domains under management is one criteria but need not be the only criteria.

In that context I ask the board on behalf of all the strings that may never achieve the arbitrary 50,000 transaction threshold that you consider changing the minimum fee to a tiered model that recognizes the broad collection of registries that have significantly less than the current 50,000 threshold. Doing so would create a more level playing field for smaller operators and also create a more attractive environment --

[Timer sounds]

-- for new applicants in the new round. Thank you for your consideration.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Do I have a reply from anyone at the table? Thank you for the comment. I'm sure it will be taken under

consideration. I do have a online question, so I'll go over to Brad, and then I'll come back to the line. Thank you.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you. We have an online question in Spanish which my colleague Alexandra Dans will read.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This question is from Alex Anteliz. Good morning. Hi, everyone. I notice that in most working groups during this meeting that it's a common denominator which is the creation or generation of capabilities. How can we relate ourselves and participate more effectively and in our own language this capacity building? And when will they be available in the new e-learning of ICANN. Congratulations for the new site. Greetings from the Internet community to those present in the meeting.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Thank you for the comment. I was missing the translation at the very beginning so I'm just reading up on it. In terms of -- oh, perhaps Sally could help us with an answer to that one in terms of the outreach and the capacity building? Is that possible?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Goran, can we ask Sally to answer that question, please?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you for the question. We're very well aware of the need to make ICANN Learn available in as many languages as possible and indeed the platform we are using has greater language capability than we have ever had in the past. As we launch new courses, we will communicate exactly which languages they are available in, and we will make sure, using our existing communications channels, as well as ICANN Learn itself, that we raise awareness as highly as possible about the range of options. I just wanted to use -- thank the questioner to use this as an opportunity to make that -- make that observation, that we recognize that wide language availability is an important criteria for take-up and that was part of our thinking when we were procuring a platform sedition. So there will be a lot more on this in the future. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Go to the next person in line, please.

FRED FELMAN: Thank you, Avri. This is Fred Fellman, and I'm an independent consultant. And I've just had the opportunity to sit through a discussion of the timeline for execution for a tiered access model

to WHOIS in light of GDPR at the GNSO meeting. And a timetable was placed on the screen, and it was quite worrisome in that it showed a gap between May, which is the date for implementation, and December, the date that which provision for access to non-public data would be provided to security interests to intellectual property folks who are engaged in protecting consumers and to law enforcement agencies. And I think we all understand that that is a little bit of a problem. We're in an unprecedented time at ICANN and we have an unprecedented responsibility to the public interest, as stated in the GDPR. So I would recommend, and I would hope, that the board would consider asking the leadership of ICANN to present the accreditation model that we presented a few days ago on the 23rd and not ask for a timeline but propose the model that is already in their hands that we presented them a few days ago. Because a gap between May and December, no matter how hard-hearted you could be, is not an amount of time that the public can sit with a gap of not being protected from the threats that are before them. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Chris, would you like to take that? Since he's asking the board, not --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think Becky should actually take it because --

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We could just pass it around the board until someone's prepared to respond.

BECKY BURR: So I think the timeline that was put up showed the effective date of the penalties phase of GDPR, which is May 25th, as opposed to the date on which access would be unavailable necessarily, and the point is that the date on which that would happen is still a question of discussions. I think ICANN has indicated pretty clearly that it is in discussions with the Data Protection Authorities in Brussels that expects to have further discussions the last week of May that there is some hope that -- that the DPAs would be able to communicate effectively with respect to their appetite for any kind of delay in the process and that we will all know much more after those discussions. So I would urge -- I think the -- the community -- the -- everybody's to be commended very much on putting together that accreditation proposal quickly, and I know that ICANN is looking at it seriously. I know that it's also part of the mix of things that we

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

certainly expect the DPAs would have in their -- in their toolkit here. It certainly demonstrates commitment on the part of ICANN and the community to move as quickly as possible into a robust accreditation model that we think is useful. But I'm not going to -- I think that what -- that before --

[Timer sounds]

 -- that we need more response from the DPAs in order to move to the next step.

FRED FELMAN: I have two sentences. I asked the question specifically of Akram, and his answer was quite specific, that there was no plan for May to December, and several contracted parties said that they would be turning off access on May 25th to comply. So that question was asked very specifically.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Goran, would you like to follow up?

GORAN MARBY: I think that I repeated that several times this week, that if we don't get strong guidance from the DPAs, our ability to enforce our contracts will diminish because local law always supersedes our contracts. And that will lead to a fragmented WHOIS. And

there is very few things I can do about it, or anyone on the board.

The other thing is that nothing prevents anyone, which we talked about many times, to actually contact the DPAs directly and send whatever models you have to the DPAs directly for their consultation as well. We are not and will not be sort of a gateway for those as well. And we have helped many of your parts to have direct contacts with the DPAs and the individual DPAs as well as the Article 29s. Thank you.

FRED FELMAN: That sounds like a very passive response for the public interest. I thank you for your time.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And that was two follow-ups. Next in line, please.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you. It is Claudia Selli, and I'm speaking on behalf of the BC. In our most recent comment on NomCom the BC supported process improvements to increase transparency to ACs and SOs while also adopting procedures to ensure confidentiality about candidate consideration. The BC recognizes that NomCom continues to propose process improvements such as outreach to

ACs and SOs, criteria to reflect skills and experience needed on the board, in-person NomCom review of all candidates, improved communication with candidates throughout the process.

We have been hearing talks this week about one NomCom member disclosing confidential information outside the NomCom, which would seem to violate confidentiality and integrity. We understand this incident has been addressed with appropriate measures, and we're always supportive when ICANN shows high standard of conduct by taking integrity and confidentiality seriously. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Chris, would you like to respond?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Avri. Just to say thank you very much for the -- for the comment.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Next, please.

ISRAEL ROSAS: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Israel Rosas, for the record, speaking on behalf of the steering committee of the use

collision on Internet governance, of which I'm an appointed member. And I'm going to switch to Spanish, so please take your headsets or read the transcript.

Considering this is the first public meeting of ICANN after having been appointed as members of the steering committee since the IGF meeting --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: ... coming out of the speakers at the back here in English while you're speaking in Spanish, which is quite hard for us to cope with. So can someone from -- sorry? It's the translation. Yeah, we're hearing the translation through the speakers at the back, so perhaps somebody from tech could see if they could come and fix that. I apologize for interrupting you.

ISRAEL ROSAS: No problem at all. Considering this is the first public meeting that ICANN has had since our appointment as members of the executive committee in the IGF meeting in 2017, we want to notice that we will promote and share with the members of the coalition all the efforts now being made in ICANN as an invitation to join your voices to the debate.

In this regard we want to invite any young person joining the coalition considering that the work of this coalition is part of the

activities of the period in between the IGF meetings and we want to highlight the significance of this involvement. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much. And having watched the work of that coalition, I do encourage people to listen and to indeed get involved because it is very important and has a great effect. So thank you very much. Next, please.

JOHN LAPRISE: Good afternoon. My name is John Laprise. I'm an NARALO ALAC representative, and I'm speaking today in my own capacity. So is the board, and specifically the risk committee, planning on issuing comments at ICANN 62 regarding the planned KSK rollover scheduled for October? At this meeting I've heard from SSAC and David Conrad that while the rollover is important, data on the potential effects of the rollover on service providers who manage resolvers and end users is noisy and does not align with expected models. This represents unquantified risk, and as such, I ask the board to issue comment prior to the scheduled rollover. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Let's see, Lito, would you -- Ram. Lito, I'm sorry. Please.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

LITO IBARRA: Yes. We have been looking at the data of the pro -- resolver that won't work, and we're trying to get more of that data to be ready to -- in case we have any problem when the KSK rollover happens. So we have been looking and we are continuously looking at that input to be in the best position we can when the -- when the KSK rollover happens. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Ram, you would like to add?

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. I would like to add. I'm Ram Mohan. One of the things that the board has planned to do and has given a heads up is to both the SSAC and the RSSAC that it plans to ask them for their commentary and to -- and their analysis, and that will be part of the analysis that the board undergoes before it provides a report and a readout of what's happening. So it's being taken quite seriously, as you noticed. You know, the office of CTO has a -- has a plan. There is a great deal of data that has already been collected. There's a little bit more to be done.

The focus of the Board is on moving that there's an appropriate risk management approach taken to this, that we balance the risk of potential breakage with also the risk of ensuring that, you

know, we've said we're going to roll the key. This is a cryptographic key, and if we never have the experience or if you don't have the experience of how to roll the key and understand how to be resilient in light of that, that poses other risks as well.

So -- But the Board is looking into that, and the Risk Committee is particularly focused on it.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes, Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Ram, is it also fair to say that there's no way of de-risking the rollover; right? That's it's -- There is always going to be breakage whenever you roll it. The question is when is the point in time you do that? And sometimes the risk of not doing it is higher than the risk of doing it itself. So there comes a point where we need to do it, especially when nothing is compromised because if you were to roll it when things are compromised, it gets more difficult, so we have to pick the right time.

Thank you for your question.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Any other Board comments? No?

Okay. Take the next one at the line then I'll be going to online.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. It's Steve DelBianco with the Business Constituency along with Brian Winterfeldt of the Intellectual Property Constituency.

BC this week really stands for being constructive, because that's what the BC tried to do. We worked alongside the GAC to organize a session in this room on Monday, and our best attempt to give an ICANN interim model for GDPR compliance, how do we assess it on a community-wide view.

We also have many members of the BC and the IPC who came forth this week in terms of being constructive with a proposed accreditation model. And Brian is now going to make a joint IPC-BC request of assistance from the Board.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Thank you, Steve.

I appreciate the opportunity for us to speak to you together. We thought we'd make it a little interesting at the Public Forum. Usually it's one by one. We appreciate Goran's offer earlier this week of resources to assist us in putting together hopefully an accreditation model that will work for the community that will

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

work with the interim model. We've affectionately deemed it the cannoli to go along with the calzone, and we know it's very important work.

We've asked specifically by email this morning to David Olive and Theresa Swinehart and we copied Cherine and Goran on the communication. We're hoping to get ICANN org support from the secretariat perspective as well as ICANN support from the facilitation, technical and legal support, so we can speedily do our work knowing that the clock is ticking and that having an accreditation model in place is really important for the entire community.

I know Fred spoke earlier about the potential dangers, and we want to have a strong interim model that has an accreditation model in place once things are launched, and we're hoping for Board support.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

I've got Goran and then George, please.

GORAN MARBY: I'm pleased to see you standing there together. So I actually have two questions for you. One question for you. Have you

reached out to the other parts of the community and talked to them about this potential accreditation model? Because I think it's important that everybody has the ability to be part of that; otherwise, it will just be a BC-IPC. Because -- and you don't have to -- you can just say yes, but we haven't received any communication from any other part of the community about this.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Yeah, so, Goran, we actually had a very productive meeting yesterday between the CSG and the contracted party house. We actually started getting their feedback on the model. Obviously it was just put out so they didn't have a lot of time but they actually had quite helpful feedback that they're already providing that we're looking to incorporate. And I think the goal is absolutely to have participation from all parts of the community so that we can come to you with an accreditation model that has the support of the entire community.

GORAN MARBY: So if anyone from civil society would like -- for instance, would like to get involved, they contact either one of you.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Absolutely.

GORAN MARBY: Good.

The other thing is just to point out, because there was a previous request as well, going back, we are trying to find a middle way between what's in the policies and what's in the law. And we appreciate all help with that. But we are not the negotiator and the Board will not and I will not take sides in this because we have discussions that we will have to bring to the DPAs. That's -- with that said, we are not going to lock ourself into one particular model. What we're going to do is take that model as well and we're going to moint (phonetic) them in and we're going to share with you exactly how we do this. But it's not like we're now going to say that this is the ultimate one, because if we are and we're wrong, we have very few alternatives, and you don't want us to do that. But we will bring in -- I think that we need some more guidance from the DPAs before we finally lock down the accreditation model.   But with that said, an accreditation model that is coming from the multistakeholder model -- that was model twice -- I think helps us in the dialogue with the DPAs. And I'm really appreciative of it.

I don't think it's time right now to go down in all technical details, because that will take time. And I think that everybody wants to avoid that our actions provides more insecurity for the

DPAs because that could lead to -- if we wait too long, because we want to be too detailed, that could cause a problem for the DPAs to take some of the more fundamental questions going on. And that's -- that's a timing balance that we need to do as well.

But I'm very happy to support it. I'm very happy to support the discussions between different parts of the community to come up with the philosophy of models.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Goran -- If I may follow up just a moment, please, Avri. Goran, the request made by email today was a request for the kind of community conversations and support. So it would be Adobe sessions once we get that working again, and it would include anybody in the community, just like the webinars you helped us host in January and February. All are welcome. But we learned yesterday that we have a lot more detailed work to do to even be able to answer the basic questions that the contract parties had for us on our initial proposal.

We're not asking for an endorsement. We're asking for support, administrative support, to host community-wide conversations, and we don't want to wait for DPAs to answer. We just don't have enough confidence that their answer would be specific enough about accreditation. And we'll take the risk that some of

the work we're doing could be throw-away. We'll take that risk, but we need your help to do that.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

I have George and then Becky.

GORAN MARBY: Could I -- I think receiving -- we have received multiple communications with you and some of them has been a little bit different in the details what we want to do now. But we're going to work it out together.

And for anyone else who is listening to this, take the opportunity to go with Steve and Brian, if you're other parts of the community, and talk to them about working together on an accreditation model. I think you're doing a fantastic job according to the multistakeholder model by that invitation. It makes me proud of being at ICANN. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Goran. Now let me go to George and then Becky.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you, Avri.

I saw your document yesterday. This is, by the way, a personal opinion. I don't speak for the Board. I saw it yesterday, and I think you deserve a lot of credit for getting something on the table that has enough substance and enough detail in it to be able to used perhaps as a starting point. Maybe it's not an end point, but it's a starting point and it makes the discussion much more likely to go further, whether people agree with it or disagree with it. So thank you very much to the business community.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, George.

Becky, please.

BECKY BURR: So also I want to thank and commend the business constituency and the IPC for being constructive and putting together a model and understanding that we're all dealing with this in urgency.

I just want to share my personal observations based on all of the conversations over the past week about where we are and the timeline and timing, because I know you guys are feeling this incredible urgency like we need to get off the block tomorrow.

I think what has to happen is that ICANN needs to spend the time in the -- in the run-up to the meetings it's having with DPAs in the week of March 26th getting into the best place with the best information that it has in order to make a compelling case to the DPAs that this community is working on this as an urgent problem and is committed to a solution, and that there are significant consequences of not having both clear guidance and some communication about the enforcement position.

To me, that -- If I were a regular, having been sort of in those shoes, what I would want is a commitment to accredit -- to a robust accreditation, a commitment to tiered, real tiered access, and a timeline for getting there in a way that minimizes disruption.

I think that that timeline, the creation of the timeline, requires some -- some thinking about engineering kinds of issues, and so I think that's the priority now, coupling it with the commitment on robust accreditation.

I think the timing on beginning to talk about the specs and the details of the accreditation model will come after that. It's not that far away. But I totally feel your anxiety --

[Timer Sounds]

-- but I think let's focus on the next two weeks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

BRIAN WINTERFELDT: Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: And now I'll go to the online comment, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Jamie Baxter, dotGAY LLC writes, first I'd like to thank and congratulate ICANN's tremendous effort for keeping the remote participation active over the past few days. Bravo. I would like to take a moment to address something with the Board that we feel important to clarify in the larger picture of our ongoing accountability efforts at ICANN.

To simplify things, the claim we have before the Board is that dotGAY was treated in a discriminatory manner during CPE in relation to other community applicants. Acknowledging that the word discrimination can be a trigger for many, we'd like to be certain that the Board is interpreting our use of the word properly. To be absolutely clear, dotGAY's claim of discriminatory treatment is not related to any belief that ICANN or its representatives are anti-gay or that discrimination has

occurred because we are gay. It is, however, directly linked to the promise of nondiscrimination for our application according to the ICANN bylaws.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Jamie.

Chris, would you like to take this one?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Avri. Jamie, thank you for the comment and for the clarification. We appreciate it, and I know that you have an outstanding question from Monday's Public Forum, and you're going to be getting a response to that shortly in an email.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

Go to the next person in line, please.

Sorry. Excuse me. My apologies.

Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: I just wanted to reassure Jamie and the entire ICANN community that we have the utmost respect for every community within ICANN, and we have no discrimination against any community. So please be assured of our respect for the -- for the gay community.

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Cherine, for that.

Now I have to remember to take a look around the table before I start. So, please, next person in line.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Dear board members, my name is Raoul Plommer, I'm from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group in the GNSO.

One of the hardest topics in this meeting have been the declining revenues of ICANN, and the resulting budget cuts. Around 11 out of 10 people warned me that questioning the rationale of frozen sustainable income streams is going to make me unpopular, but I've treated every ICANN meeting as my last anyway. The cuts aimed at the community of course hurt the civil society the most because we're pretty much the only ones here who don't get paid for our participation here at ICANN.

That's why I'm grabbing this mic once again, because the multistakeholder model's playing field is becoming more and more uneven. I think there are a lot of people here who have been under the false impression that the revenue coming from the new gTLDs is somehow sustainable. It never was. As far as I know, the only sustainable revenue streams are the annual fees of 25 cents per domain name and the $25,000 for TLDs.

My understanding is that the fee of 25 cents per domain hasn't been raised for at least a decade. The most compelling reason to raise that price is simply inflation.

The community is facing big cuts that could be -- to a large extent be offset by a raise of one cent per domain and would result to the tune of $3.3 million per year from the 330 million domains in existence. The industry will pass the cost to the registrants so instead of 9.99 the new price would be ten bucks.

ICANN has seen its workload increase dramatically in the last ten years and I feel we need to reflect that by increasing our sustainable revenue streams. The sales of new gTLDs was convenient, but it always was an extraordinary income and should be treated as such when considering the sustainability and the long-term survival of ICANN.

The common answer in the form of a question to this was: Where is the raising these prices going to stop? It has been

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

frozen for over ten years. My question is: When are we going to start talking about our increased workload --

[Timer sounds.]

-- and inflation?

[Applause]

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

Ron, would you like to take this one?

RON DA SILVA: Yeah. Thank you for the question and the sentiment regarding funding estimates and long-term projections on funding for the organization. They are very important, and we've certainly heard a lot of concerns with respect to funding and, of course, our expenditures.

I think it's imperative on us, not just the Board, not just the organization, but us as a community to realize that fiduciary responsibility is something we all need to own. And we need to be very intentional and deliberate about what we prioritize and what work we do before our other work. You know, we can't do everything. I think this has been a theme we've heard throughout the week.

But back to your question of pricing and what process can we put in place to reconsider other pricing models, this is something that's typically a community-driven process, not a board top-down driven process.

But I would like to defer to Goran to comment on how the community can move forward with any pricing questions or concerns.

GORAN MARBY: There is no discussion whatsoever within the Board or in the org to raise prices.

The discussions around future policy changing belongs in the community, and that's something that is there.

But let me point to something else. During this week -- and this has been, for me, personally a fantastic ICANN week again because we all start out somewhere and we end up in a different place. One of the things that has been discussed several times is this 85/15% where the budget I propose is only -- mostly about the 15%.

During this week, during several sessions, there have been discussions about 85% which we have to have the a dialogue between the Board, the community, and the org. So now, for instance, we talk about the cadence of reviews, the timing of

reviews, even length of meetings, even if I know you all would like to add one more day to this meeting and the amount of sessions during meetings. Suddenly something we didn't talk about three months ago is now on the table.

I think it's important to go back and look on those things. And I will definitely take on myself to give you suggestions, ideas, and even proposals for you to react on so we can look into what is really the prioritization of the costs we're having because that's the discussion you want to have.

And, also, to put on record, one of the things that comes up is that we probably need to change the cadence of the discussion as well. We're doing a very -- we almost like a company when we do the budget discussions. To have a two-year budget cycle instead where we have time to have those discussions within the community, that I think is important.

So even if I take your notion about increasing funding, we use the word "funding" to emphasize the fact that we are not a company. This is funding for something.

And that is -- I'm very happy, again, about being part of the ICANN discussion about this. So we will come back. And I bet that you will continue to ask questions about this. And I'm looking forward to answering them. Thank you.

[Timer sounds]

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

I have Cherine and then George who both wish to comment.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Avri. And thank you for the question.

Over the last ten years, our funding has increased and our expenses increase almost equally. And if you think about it, there's absolutely no reason to do that. We have reached a point where we -- it doesn't matter whether our funding increase or decrease, we have to have the right size for our cost base so that, in fact, we always should have our cost base less than our funding. And the funding -- the cost base must not increase all the time. There is no reason -- the most important thing is what is it that we need to do to deliver on our mission and to service our community. But it doesn't mean that every year we have to increase our cost base by 16%. There's no real reason for doing that, and we've done it. We've done it in the past, but now we need to really think going forward that we have to have the appropriate cost base to match our mission, which is the secure and stable operation of the identifier system.

So, please, when you talk about fee increase and all of that, don't assume that automatically fee increases that the cost will also increase. We have to come to a cost base that makes sense to all of us. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Cherine.

George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. This is a complex subject. And the analysis of expenses and the issue of inflation, the issue of additional functions that are being put on the -- on ICANN org as a result of increase in size need more analysis than we're going to give it here.

Goran is absolutely right, that this question belongs in the community. By intervening at the mic, you have made it visible within the community. Thank you for that.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Thank you, Raoul.

Okay. I will go to the next people in line and then I will go to online.

MONA ELSWAH: My name is Mona Elswah, a fellow from Egypt. May I ask the ICANN61 fellows to stand, please.

We are 53 people from 44 different countries representing these two comments on behalf of the ICANN61 fellows. To illustrate the engagement of former fellows continue here in ICANN, may I now ask all former ICANN fellows with us here to also stand.

From volunteers to board members --

[Applause]

From volunteers to board members, all are active participants. ICANN fellows are committed to the concept of "One World, One Internet." Please be seated. Thank you.

I'm here to ask the Board to define the fellowship as a discrete program with stated goals, metrics, and its own budget. Currently, the fellowship program appears as a travel line item in the FY19 budget. The Board should empower the fellowship to serve ICANN's mission by creating a diverse pipeline of engaged and form of participants from every corner of the globe. Genuine engagement can rarely be built without face-to-face intensive newcomer learning experiences.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

We ask you to operationalize success metrics, harmonize them with the organization's strategic vision and allow it to reach its full potential. We also ask consistencies to utilize a crop of talent and enthusiasm fellows offer.

The fellowship program is facing a 50% reduction both in budget and participation from 60 to 30 fellows. The purpose of these cuts is difficult to understand. The fellowship is not only a program; it's a flagship. It's encompasses the very essence of ICANN --

[Timer sounds.]

-- as laid out in its mission, statement, and core values. It's a global, multistakeholder, and culturally diverse. It goes beyond the borders, profession and constituencies.   It transits age, raciality (phonetic) and gender.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

[Applause]

You're going to continue on as before. Okay. Thank you.

KASEK GALGAL: My name is Kasek Galgal. I am a coach with the fellowship program. I also happen to be the only Papua New Guinean at ICANN61.

As the rest of the Internet governance ecosystem is ramping up the fellowship programs, from ISOC to the RIRs, ICANN is downsizing theirs.

We are deeply concerned that ICANN's cuts will negatively affect its diversity and ability to engage underserved communities which experience much staff limitations and demands.

Constituents who live on other side of the digital divide come here primarily through the fellowship. Many good and innovative ideas including business and economic perspectives have and will -- frequently come from them.

The fellowship is at its core an engagement program. A positive byproduct of it has been the incredible rise of several fellows to the upper levels of ICANN's leadership. However, that metric should not be the only one.

A detailed plan of how the fellowship utilizes the reduced budget should be based on yearly reviews sustained by clear metrics built on the stated goals of the program, compounded data over time, measuring return on investment in a way that takes into consideration more than just leadership numbers.

Therefore, operating on a measured budget should not mean cutting wholesale. Rather, austere times can be a perfect moment to evaluate what is excessive and what can be done more efficiently serve ICANN's mission.

We are fortunate to have been part of a rigorous and informative program that fast tracks local and global engagement with ICANN. Incredible and dedicated professional staff running the program, the fellowship program makes us feel welcome, allows us to express our thoughts and ideas in order to blossom into informed and engaged participants.

The fellows are the face of ICANN globally. In closing, I ask -- I'll ask you to let the fellowship program manage itself into its full potential as a crucial part of the ICANN family and Internet governance community. Free the fellowship from being a travel line item, allow it to be its own program with its own budget --

[Timer sounds.]

-- and its own metrics. Watch it and ICANN grow, thrive together. Thank you.

[Applause]

AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much for that.

Cherine, would you care to respond to it? Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Absolutely. Well, first of all, thank you very much for both points put forward and also very much for the show of hands and everybody standing up. That was a very powerful message, I have to admit.

So I want to make a couple of comments. First of all, these are not austere times, all right? And the fact that funding is -- appears to be leveling doesn't mean we should panic or we should worry tremendously. ICANN remains funded solidly.

The question here is that how effective should be in our spending, how, for example, the fellowship program should be made sustainable and strong and deliver its results.

So I do understand the concerns when you see 50% cuts, and there's been cuts in other programs as well affecting the communities. And I think I've said this in my opening remarks, that we are, the Board, my colleagues here, we are very cognizant of all of these concerns, right? And we are going to take all the comments, including those, into account when the draft budget is being revisited and adjusted, taking into account all the concerns.

The aim here, the aim here, is not only to strike the right balance between fiscal responsibility and other things but also to make sure that this community which is mostly made of volunteers can participate effectively in ICANN.

I also hear you and we hear you very clearly to take off the fellowship program from being a travel line item into a program in itself with its own metrics and with its own goals and stated goals so that's a very good -- very good suggestion. We will take that into account.

So we heard you. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

KASEK GALGAL: Thank you. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. At this point, I would like to go to an online comment, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a comment in French which, again, my colleague Alexandra Dans will read.

My name is Betty Fausta. And I participate for the first time as a fellow because of (saying name) and Daniel. I come from Guadalupe in the Caribbean.

I run a software business, and I'm also president of an association with 100 players that come from the digital side and the communication side. I'm also a teacher at university.

I really appreciate that ICANN let's me speak in French, and I am now in an absolutely different space. It's going to help me on a professional level.

I would like to -- I will absolutely inform the board of my University on the subject. I hope that the diversity of the region and the language will be maintained in the future. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

One of our French-speaking like to take an answer? A comment? Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you so much. I mentioned earlier that we allow the contribution within ICANN with six languages, French, Russian, Portuguese, Chinese, Arabic, and English and Spanish.

French, Russian, Portuguese, Chinese, Arabic, and English and Spanish.

So I think we will be following along these lines. And I hope that it will help everybody in the future communication. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Before we move on, this is the end of Block 1. And I'm going to pass it on to my colleague, Khaled Koubaa. But I also want to thank you all for my very first time at facilitating and the great conversations that's developed. Khaled Koubaa, please, to you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Avri. I can assure you you did it well. Thank you.

Next in line, please.

MASON COLE: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Mason Cole. I wanted to follow up on the joint BC comments and IC comments that were brought to you just a few moments ago. I just returned from a meeting with staff and contracted parties where we proposed incorporating the recently published WHOIS access accreditation model to be put before the DPAs and where I believe we heard from J.J. that this could be accommodated. Assuming this model moves forward, can we get the same

commitment from the Board so that WHOIS doesn't go dark and we can make the May deadline?

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. Instead of repeating my comments earlier, I will add something on.   We now seem to be concentrating on one subject, the accreditation, as if everything else is sort of done. It's not. We don't have a clear guidance. We have thoughts, which we have received from the DPA so far, to have a tiered access model.

We still have not ,to the ultimate extent, actually defined what's going to be inside that model. We have proposed that.

We have not decided because we still are waiting for more information which is going to be on the outside of the model as well, or the outside of the game, so to speak.

So the accreditation model we have to set this into -- it's very important we keep in mind there are some fundamentals in the GDPR discussion we have to really lock down, together with the DPAs and then as an accreditation model. So it's not like now we're going to focus on the accreditation model. If you go back and look at what's on the outside or the inside of the model we have proposed, there are many different views inside the

community about those as well. Anonymous emails, what kind of information, and so on.

 And we -- so we have to -- we have to make sure that we don't lose sight to think that, if we have to agree on an accreditation model, everything is going to be correct.   We still have fundamental things about what's going to be a tiered access model. What's going to be on the outside of that model? What's going to be on the inside of the model?   What kind of information can we collect?   How is that information moved between registrar and registries? How are we going to see that in the terms of, for instance, the retention and all those things.

 So I agree -- I have nothing more to say than I said before about it. Just don't forget the fundamental basis of it first. Thank you very much.

MASON COLE: Thank you very much, Goran. Can we get a commitment put forth on the accreditation model? There is one put before you now.

GORAN MARBY: I think we answered this question several times.   To do the shortcut again, if the community comes up -- the whole community comes up with an accreditation model, we would be

proud to talk to the DPAs about that. You still have the ability to talk to the DPAs yourself with your DPAs in individual countries or the Article 29 groups. We don't stop you from that. We are trying to take the fundamental questions to the DPAs so we can answer. Accreditation is one important part of it, but it's not a full part. We are not -- we are not negotiating. We are trying to get as many answers as we can from the DPAs in a very important question. And what we do is that you've seen that we -- with the help of the community, we requested a hybrid model where there are differences within the community. We have already, as you can see, printed them to the paper. We will adopt -- we will -- after this week, with all the information input we have, we will put that into the paper as well.

Many of those things we don't have an answer to. We don't have them until the DPAs has told us. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Mason. Farzaneh, please.

FARZANEH BADII: My name is Farzaneh Badii, chair of the non-commercial stakeholder group. I have two comments -- one is positive and the other critical. To be nice, I'll read the positive note first.

So NCSG had a policy writing course this week, and it was a true capacity building exercise. We thank you for the opportunity. And also we hope that the rest of the community benefits from it as well.

The second point: We would like to raise concerns about the conduct of NomCom leadership. They have been changing the operating procedures diluting the role of non-voting members in the process.

It has claimed confidentiality about every aspect of the operation of NomCom while mentioned that -- while the operating procedure mentioned that it has to operate transparently. And the confidentiality only applies to the deliberation about the candidates.

Thank you.

[Applause]

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Farzaneh.

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just to say that you might want to -- the Nominating Committee is currently being independently reviewed and you might want to provide that feedback to the reviewers. Thanks, Farzaneh.

KHALED KOUBAA: Please.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. My name is Jordan Carter, .NZ. I come from ccNSO land, more or less.

This is a kind of comment about the budget and the focus that you, Cherine, and you, Goran, put in your opening speeches on the need to address the funding issue and that we need to be talking about priorities. I endorse and welcome that. I thought they were a really good way to start the community having this conversation.

I wanted to make two specific points. One is about the 85%, 15% thing. On the planned FY19 numbers, the 85% is about $117 million. If we need to drive cost savings, we have to do it in the $117 million. We're not going to get the answers from the 15%, the 20 million that's left over afterwards.

So I think my encouragement would be to the Board to really work with the CTO and look at where you can drive cost savings in the ongoing operations. I know some of that is presented in this year's budget. With an organization like this that's grown so fast, so quickly, I'm absolutely confident there are more ways you can find value for money. So I encourage you to keep that pressure up.

The other point is about the enormous lift in staff spending over the three budgets from '17, '18, '19. It's gone up, as far as I can reckon, about 33% in three years. That is a very big increase in staff costs.

And staff costs are now getting close to $80 million in the coming year. That's a lot of money.

So what I would urge you and plead with you to do is tell the story about that increase.

The summary document has the numbers, and it has a graph of headcount for the last few years. And that's it. If I have to dig much deeper to get the top line story about what the driver is there, I think that's a problem of presentation. So it might be the globalization strategy that we doesn't cost before we adopted this. Might be all sorts of things. Please tell the story carefully, or the budget is going to run into heavy water. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Jordan.

                       Goran.

GORAN MARBY: On the first point, Cherine will -- the Board will give me an instruction to look through and give proposals for the community about reviews, cadence, and all of those things in the 85%.

                       I think I can openly commit to that right now.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you, Cherine.

                       The other part, when you say increase in staff, the staff -- we don't sit around in our office. It's actually -- FY19 is sort of a perfect storm, which we try -- communication exists when the receiver understands what you say.

                       And we have tried to add more information to this year's budget.

If we have succeeded, if you can't read it, I'm sorry for that and we will improve next time. I can say, that when I look at the FY19, couple of things that come to -- one of them is the previous decisions made by the community, for instance, the accountability measures that, for instance, comes out of succession. We went from 60 pages in the bylaws to 350 pages, including new accountability measures.

I don't judge from this. I'm just saying. Some of those things will cost money because we have to add on people. We have new -- I'm not pointing at them.

But things like Customer Standing Committee. We have a board for PTI. We have to have legal for that. And auditors.

The other thing we can also say that we can't -- the new gTLD program sort of meant that we went from 200 contracted parties -- I wasn't born then -- to 2,200 and something, which means we have an increase in GDD. We have an increase in compliance because of the volume of that.

And this time I would say FY19 is the year that we actually added on a lot of cost.

But I sit here, and you should scrutinize this. And we should be able to give you more information about it. But let's come back and talk about the projects that are decided. And we can talk

about them instead of saying it's personnel against outreach. That's -- I think would be much more sensible. So thank you, Jordan, for giving me the opportunity to say this.

JORDAN CARTER: That's the storytelling we need to see in the documents as well as here. So thank you for that.

I can say that this year, because of less funding, we've saved between $6-8 million internally. And, in the budget next year we have savings internally for about $8.6 million, which is about 6% of the budget. We increased the travel support for about 12% for the community. And we decreased it for staff with about 12% as well. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Goran.

Stephanie, please. Before we go to you, we'd like to have the online question.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Phil Buckingham, CEO Dot Advice, gTLD financial advisor, has two questions.

Question one: May I first thank Xavier ICANN's CEO and his team, for the huge effort and time they expended in putting

together the six documents on the draft FY19 operating plan and budget introductions and highlights. It runs to hundreds of pages. My company has been tracking the registrations of every TLD on a monthly basis and f the whole gTLD marketplace since the first TLD was launched by Donuts in October 2013. May I suggest currently ICANN's FY19 budgeted review top line worst case scenario, which has been heavily downgraded from FY18 actuals, is still very, very optimistic and needs to be reduced further.

There may be one saving grace. Google has finally announced the launch of .APP this month. They purchased the TLD in ICANN's auction for $25 million over three years ago.

Has the ICANN financial team factored this launch into fiscal year '19 budgets? Also, personally, I find it hugely disappointing that, after more than six years after application, that potential for very lucrative revenue streams for ICANN; namely, .WEB, .MUSIC, .HOTEL, and indeed .AMAZON are still unresolved and in dispute and not able to launch. ICANN has shot itself in its foot.

Question 2: As I understand it, the Board wishes to top up the reserve shortfall of $5 million by raiding the auction funds, which currently stand at 240 million. I totally agree with this approach.

In fact, I would propose ICANN raid it by the further $63 million required. However, I thought the auction fund is ring fenced in

this approach, not allowed, and a bylaw change would be required. Is this still the case?

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Brad.

Goran.

GORAN MARBY: Okay. There were several points raised. Maybe I'll take them in reverse. Certainly, there is a ringed fence around the auction proceeds. And that process is still under way.

I'm sorry. I was hearing shouting from the audience, I couldn't understand it. Come to the mic, if you would, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think Sebastien is suggesting that you should tell everybody who you are, Ron.

RON DA SILVA: I'm Ron, Ron da Silva.

Now I've lost my train of thought. It worked well.

So, yes, ringed fence around the auction proceeds. I had that. I was trying to remember what the other two points were now. Can somebody help me out here? Thank you, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Well, I'm going to address the question on the reserve fund.

We have issued a first consultation paper before Christmas last year asking the community what should be the right level for the reserve fund.

There were many comments. And the response at the end, the average response or the one we thought is the one that reflects the community's thoughts in general, is that they should be a minimum of 12 months. We then passed a resolution to that effect.

Then we issued a second consultation paper shortly before coming to San Juan where we said, well, given that decision, it means that the reserve fund ought to be at 138 million. But, given the level it is today, that leaves a shortfall of 68.

And we put something for the community to consider in terms of a replenishment strategy. And we said out of this 38 million, the 68 million, there should be some principles that we should follow and some guidance and some objectives. We said here are the principles. The first one is we cannot ask any money

from any sources before we ask ICANN org to make some savings to fund the reserve fund.

And we did say in the document that future adopted budget will have to be such that ICANN org finds savings so that these savings automatically feed into the reserve fund. So they also have to make their contribution.

And we said that that would be to the tune of about $3 million a year; i.e., 50 million.

Within the next source of filling the -- the reserve fund was what do we do with the 36 million that was spent on the transition. And those 36 million came from the reserve fund. We did put an idea forward for consideration by the community that perhaps the auction proceeds ought to make that contribution to the reserve fund.

If you add these two numbers and you extract them from the original number, that leaves 17 million remaining to be -- to be found. And we left various options for the community to consider, including taking money out of the new gTLD remaining money or go back to ICANN org for more or go back to the auction proceeds for more.

One thing we did say is that we are not going to ask the contracted parties to raise any money and make a contribution to this.

So, yes, the money is ring-fenced, and we did this deliberately so that --

[Timer Sounds]

-- it's not mingled with any other operational money or any other funds that ICANN has.

Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Can I have Ron answer?

RON DA SILVA: ...fairly close to our assumptions in the past, so definitely appreciate that input. And then I think there was another topic about some remaining strings in the -- in the new gTLD round. And that's probably best for Chris to answer.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Ron. Actually, just on the -- the question with respect to .APP which you just touched on, what we do is take -- in our

budget is take into account the fixed fee that is payable by each of the string -- each of the TLDs. What we don't do is factor in possible future sales in the sense of, gosh, this is going to be a good one; therefore, we must lob in a huge amount of money and on the auction proceeds, the answer is yes, the auction proceeds are still ring-fenced.

And I think that pretty much covers everything in the question.

Thanks, Khaled.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thanks.

Stephanie, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin from the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group.

I wish you could stop the clock while I offer a few mot de politesse because I don't want anyone to take this question as an attack on the Board. Just take it as an honest if somewhat naive question from a slow learner.

I have been wondering since I arrived at ICANN five years ago on the EWG why an organization so full of smart, capable people, that is well run, would leave GDPR compliance to the last

minute. And, yes, even five years ago, we knew it was coming. Nobody was paying attention.

That perception or that question has become even more acute over the past year, and I've been working away on the policy development committee that is looking at the WHOIS policy trying in good faith to have an influence.

And finally, it dawned on me over the past two days as I attended the meetings where the GDPR S.W.A.T. team was basically negotiating the interim solution with the contracted parties and the business community, this would be a negotiation in which civil society is not really participating in the same way as we do in the PDP. We've got 56 members in the PDP. And I've resigned from the PDP because it's my perception -- I finally got -- the light finally came on in there, obviously if the Board has the ability to impose an interim policy as an emergency measure, why would you get going on GDPR in the -- in a multistakeholder environment, because the policy will stick. Every WHOIS policy that has ever come in as an interim measure has stuck, and I'm not optimistic that we'll be able to change it afterwards in the PDP.

So I just wondered if you could comment on that. And please don't interpret this as an attack on you. It's just a stupid question.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, Stephanie, and I apologize. Can I just ask you very specifically tell me what the question is.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, the question is, is the reason that ICANN, as an organization, has not addressed GDPR over all the years, particularly -- remember, there's companies represented here who have been busy doing GDPR for the past four years. It takes a while.

If the answer to that is that the multistakeholder process ends in tedious head butting, and we know it does, then the quick way to do it is to leave it to the last minute and impose an interim policy from the Board, which doesn't have people like me on it, because we can be difficult. We know that.

Is that clear enough?

KHALED KOUBAA: Goran, could you, please.

GORAN MARBY: They just called me by my informal nickname, so I didn't get it was me.

You're right. We were late. Terribly late. How do we avoid that? How do we make sure that this community actually understands the implications of laws that is discussed in parliaments around the world. How do we get that? GDPR is really the first -- my understanding, is really the first law that has a direct affect on our ability to make policy. It is -- It is that. We can debate it, we may not like it, but that's the way it is.

And we see -- we see, when we meet governments and other ones, and speak especially to members of the community around the world, that there will be other ones, because there are many countries right now who discuss a variety of GDPR, ePrivacy, and we see them.

So -- And I don't have a simple answer to how to do this.

So -- what I want to do -- I want to do something, anyway. So one of the things we're trying to do right now is to assemble legislative proposals that has an effect in the privacy space on our ability to do policies.

[Timer sounds]

We're assembling that and during in the next month or two we'll send that information out without -- we're not a political organization. We don't interfere in the political process, but for you and the community to know what the trends are when it

comes to legislative proposals so we can maybe avoid. The other thing we're trying to do is engage more and more in conversations with you because I'm starting to think we have to be in the room, sort of, when legislative proposals are discussed. That means that we have to figure out a way from a nonpolitical perspective, if there are things that can have an effect, we should at least tell if there's a new legislation that can break into that, because the wording is bad, we should at least have the opportunity to say that.

So these are two of the thoughts that we're now having. We have not hundred percent done how to do it. We have to think about it and then come back in a dialogue with you. Maybe in Panama we can have a discussion how to do this in a transparent, open, nonpolitical way and how we can proceed from here.

Thank you very much.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Can I respond to his question, which is how do we do that?

KHALED KOUBAA: Sure.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, you have to have civil society in the room when you're doing these interim things because we're the ones that have been fighting to protect human rights around the world in legislation. We understand the legislation quite well, so let us come in and try to act in good faith in this drafting of the interim policy.

We do appreciate the full transparency. I really do. I mean this sincerely. But transparency is not participation. We want participation, too.

Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Stephanie.

[Applause]

Can I have Becky as well to comment on that.

BECKY BURR: I'm just going to be brief. Like, I never disagree with Goran, but I think -- I think there's something important.

I think the monitoring legislation and understanding how it impacts the policy development that we're doing here is critical. The contribution that that will make is -- hopefully it will focus the minds in the policy arena area earlier than otherwise

because there is nothing like a deadline, and usually it has to be a pretty imminent deadline to focus the mind.

Having said that, I just want to go back to what Goran said when he started this. Yeah, we should have started this earlier. You know, just as a compliance issue we should have started it earlier. And just to cut the community a little bit of break in terms of focus, we were sort of engaged in that big transition problem that kind of sucked the air out of the space. So not an excuse. We should have started earlier.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Becky. Michele, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Good afternoon. Michele Neylon speaking in my personal capacity as ever. And just a couple of things. More kind of comments than specific questions, but I do have a couple of questions as well. Unfortunately this has become the GDPR meeting. Everything we do is GDPR every day all day, so I'm unfortunately going to have to touch on that briefly.

The accreditation model has been present -- shown to the contracted parties. We did have a meeting with the commercial stakeholder group yesterday, but that doesn't mean that we endorse it. That doesn't mean that we've had a chance to really

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

dig into it, nor have we had a chance to see any updated change or modified version of the accreditation model that's being proposed. So while I personally have no issue with anybody sending documents to DPAs and talking to DPAs, I would err on the side of caution that anything be presented as being something on behalf of the ICANN community when in reality at present what is being -- what is there is something from one segment of the community and that segment of the community is not subject to the fines under GDPR. They're not exposed to that issue. We -- maybe we can work with them in the future. I think that is something that has been discussed in meetings earlier today, but what is there at the moment is not something that we have negotiated with them.

Secondly, with respect to the budget, some people are concerned about cuts to the budget, and I know that Cherine and Goran have both spoken at great length about this kind of balancing act. I am reassured that fees are not going to be raised. This has been said more than once specifically in relation to the reserve. Just to, you know, make people aware that if the fees are raised by 1 or 2 cents that has to go somewhere else, which means we as registrars and registries will end up passing it on to our clients. We will end up having -- it will have an impact on many more people than those who turn up at ICANN meetings.

[Timer sounds]

And I would have just one question for you. Could you please provide a detailed rationale as to where the fee structure that is being proposed for proxy -- the proxy and privacy accreditation is coming from because it is -- it is clear from the conversations we've had with ICANN compliance this week that there is no impact on their headcount, there is no impact on the number of complaints that they're processing, nor do they have any plans to increase their headcount, yet the fees that are being proposed would have a detrimental impact on those of us who are smaller operators. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Michele. Please, I would like to announce that the queue will be closed after the gentlemen because we need to go to repose in a few minutes, and I will ask Goran, please, to comment or answer.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you for the question, Michele. It's a fairly detailed question in some sense, and I'd rather come back to it. We have to continue the discussion about compliance as such and how we do it. And Jamie is doing an awesome job trying to make it more transparent, also together with the DAAR project and how

we can interact. And you and I have had personally several conversations about how we can improve this. I'd rather come back and continue the discussion about compliance as a whole. It's a very important function for ICANN. It's a part of our DNA, because it's a part of our how do we make -- it's a part of the policy set by the community. But with that said, we can always improve. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you. Brad, I understand we -- we have an online question.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Aaron Pace writes, hello, everyone. My name is Aaron Pace, founder of .LESS Web site domains. I am a telecommunications engineer who has developed the innovation ICANN needs for the gTLD program to be successful. As we all know and as you have seen the 2012 extensions have not provided any real innovations to improve the Internet across the board. Further, they're simply not producing any extraordinary numbers through sales or consumer use. .LESS Web site extensions is everything ICANN is looking for. My concern today is that I heard something about the next round being delayed until 2022. My colleagues and I find that unacceptable. If you are not familiar with the features and benefits of .LESS Web site extensions, I invite you to check out the Web site advertisingstandards.org. There you will find

the true innovation that is worth talking about. There should not be a delay in the ICANN process to develop true innovation.

KHALED KOUBAA: Who can comment on that? Thank you. Please.

LORI SCHULMAN: Hello. My name is Lori Schulman. I am the representative for the International Trademark Association, and I'm a member of the IPC. I want to thank the board and particularly Xavier who's not a board member but an officer of ICANN for really digging down and asking hard questions about the budget. We think it's long overdue, and we really appreciate the efforts you've made, particularly with the reserves this year.

But on that note, and on that note, I would like to make a request. It has come to our attention in the budgeting process and where to allocate pain in making cuts that there are some nonprofit organizations like ICANNWiki, for example, which offers a lot of good spirit and good will to the community, where that budget is being considered to be cut all at once rather than have the support tapered over a period of time. So what I would ask the board, and particularly the Finance Committee, to consider is that when you're making cuts to nonprofit organizations that are supported by ICANN not to make drastic

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

cuts if your contribution is more than 50% of their budget. They will need time to make out -- make up the funds. So while we support fiscal responsibility and we do support the cuts, we do ask that you consider tapering them in a way that would allow these nonprofit organizations to survive. Thank you.

[Applause]

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you. I will add my personal thanks to Xavier, and I will pass it to Goran to answer.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. I take all the cuts questions.

LORI SCHULMAN: Oh, okay. So will you consider that, Mr. President, CEO?

GORAN MARBY: That sounded like a song in some way. When it comes to -- on the 150 plus comments we have received, many of them has been about this particular issue. This has been a dialogue that we've had with that entity for a long, long time. That's been -- there has been -- that's been a long time which we -- we said we're going to phase out some of the funding for them. There's been a long time discussing about alternative funding models.

And we will, as Cherine always says, we will take all your comments into account for the next round, and hopefully then next time we can do this we can have a dialogue instead of throwing things at the chowder by having a two-year process. But I give you this, you are representative of many different interest groups and organizations in this room. I would say, please go out and talk to them and submit and help them with their funding as well. You -- in this room right now there are many different organizations that could help. And let's continue the dialogue over this as well. But -- and for their sake, as well as mine, let's help them. Thank you very much.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you. I would just like to respond that INTA is a sponsor of ICANNWiki.

GORAN MARBY: I actually know that.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you. We have another online question before the gentleman. Thank you.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Thomas McBride, domain name registrant writes, as part of the public consultation on replenishment of the reserve fund, one principle states the following: Over the five-year period the ICANN org should plan for operational savings in order to make a contribution of $15 million U.S. in total in line with principle 2. Does that mean that at the end of the five-year period the ICANN budget figure will drop by 15 million as well? So instead of 140 million per year, it will be 125 million per year. If not, why doesn't ICANN consider lowering its overall spending to lower the budget to help close the gap? Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you for the question. Two things. What we said in the consultation paper is that IGO org should find 3 million savings per year over the next five years, so adding up to a total of 15 million. That doesn't mean that the -- the cost automatically drops to 15 -- by 15 million at the end of that. It means that every year there's a contribution of 3 million. The more important thing we said that even after that going forward we should really aim at having our expenses always less than our

funding. We should optimize the size of our operation in order to deliver to the mission. And we should not automatically increase our cost of operation just because funding increases. So we have to find a way of continuously keeping the size of the operation just correct for the business and for the mission we're trying to deliver. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Cherine. Please.

DUSTIN PHILLIPS: Hi. My name is Dustin Phillips, and I'm the co-executive director of ICANNWiki. I just want to start off by thanking you guys at ICANNWiki for supporting us and allowing us to provide our service to the community thus far, and we've done so cost effectively and with love.

Now, we were disappointed to learn that ICANN intends to remove ICANNWiki entirely from its budget, despite the alignment of our missions, the amount of community support, and the concrete results that we've demonstrated in our reports that we've submitted to ICANN.

Now, the value of ICANNWiki was demonstrated in the outpouring of support in the public comments for the FY '19 budget. And first they said that ICANNWiki lowers the barriers to

becoming active in ICANN policy development and that the value of a trusted neutral resource that lays out industry fundamentals in a user-friendly way and is independent of the ICANN organization cannot be highlighted enough.

And second, they also said that at ICANN meetings ICANNWiki engages the community and contributes to well-informed participation and that our outreach activities bring stakeholders together to build a stronger community.

Third, they said that ICANNWiki provides outreach capacity development and localized content that is spread across all the regions and is even embedded in ICANN organization strategy. For example, we've been recognized and included in the LAC strategy renewal for 2018 through 2020 and clearly this project means a lot to the community, including us at ICANNWiki. The complete withdrawal of the funding from ICANN threatens the viability of the project as well as a loss of the valuable time and resources that the community has invested over the years.

I'd just like to end on a quotation that I think captures the --

[Timer sounds]

-- essence of the public comments. Ultimately the loss of ICANNWiki would be a loss to our overall sense of community. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you.

[Applause]

Thank you. We take note of your comment, and we appreciate that. I would appreciate we'll be having a few minute break. So please go ahead for 15 minutes exactly, and we will return by 15:25. Thank you so much.

[Break]

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

BRAD WHITE: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome back to the continuation of the second public forum for ICANN61. We'll now turn it over to Rafael Lito Ibarra, our next speaker.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Brad. Welcome again. We're going to start the second part of this public forum. And as we all know, ICANN62 will take place in Panama next June. And in order to know a little bit more about this beautiful country in our region, Latin America and Caribbean, I'll invite Rodrigo de la Parra, vice president for global stakeholder engagement group for Latin America and Caribbean.

Rodrigo.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Hello, everybody. I'm going to be speaking in Spanish. So if you don't speak Spanish, it may be a good idea if you wear your headsets.

Hello, everyone. I'm here to invite you to ICANN62 to take place in the City of Panama. This is our policy forum where the community focuses on working groups working on ICANN policies. Unfortunately, our hosts have not been able to be here with us. But recently I visited Panama and I was able to talk to them.

The Panamanian government will be supporting the ICANN meeting from an institutional point of view. We've also been in touch with the technical community through the ccTLD manager; of course, the Panamanian civil society who participates actively in the ICANN and other Internet governance processes.

Certainly, I should point out that in Panama over the last few years, very important meetings in the region have taken place for Latin America, Caribbean.

Last year Panama hosted the LAC IGF, the Internet Governance Forum for the region. Our hostess is here with us. You will meet her later. She's a member of an ALS that is part of LACRALO.

This year besides the ICANN meeting, we will also have the LACNIC meeting in May in Panama City as well. And together with the ICANN meeting, ICANN celebrates its 20th anniversary this year. And this sister organization of the LacTLD region that groups ccTLDs in the region is also celebrating its 20th anniversary. So during the -- close to the ICANN meeting, they will also have their celebration. So this is very important for the region.

It's also very important for the region for us to be back for an ICANN meeting to take place there again. As you may know, unfortunately we have to put off two meetings, one of them this

one where we are now very close to our region and from our point of view, from a geographical and cultural point of view. Different participants and stakeholders in the region are very happy to have us there and to have another ICANN meeting. And now they will welcome us in the city of Panama.

We're also preparing through our regional strategy the different stakeholder groups in Latin America and Caribbean so that they will be able to leverage this policy forum. That is, we are trying to get closer to our work. And as you may know, this meeting has an additional important outreach component and will also start working with other stakeholders.

Well, without further ado, I would like to tell you that we will be waiting for you on June 25th to 28 in Panama City. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Rodrigo. I will keep talking in Spanish.

For us Latin Americans and people from the Caribbean, it is very nice to welcome you in our region. We're happy to do that. And I'm also very happy now to make the following announcement about the ICANN62 meeting in Panama, just as happy as I was to announce this meeting here in Puerto Rico.

The meetings mentioned by Rodrigo have taken place and will keep taking place in Panama. By the way, personally, I myself was honored to be the first chair of LacTLD when it was created 20 years ago. And even though it's not part of the ICANN62 host group here at ICANN61 in San Juan, we have people such as Leah Hernandez, she's over there. She's Panamanian, and I'm sure she will be a good guide in the city of Panama. And next year, 2019, the city will be celebrated -- celebrating its 500th anniversary.

I hope that with this piece of information and with all these attractive issues, you will be supporting us in the Caribbean and Latin American region.   And we also be able to keep on discussing policies and all the areas of interest that get us together at ICANN all over the year. Thank you very much.

Having said this, I will now invite the audience to start the queues at the mics. And I will give the floor to my friend Kaveh to lead the public forum.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Lito.

So to start the session, please, if I have the queues.

So we have an online question until the lines are forming. I will go to Brad for the online question.

Brad.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Michael Palage writes: Can ICANN please provide any update on the potential security issue that resulted in the Adobe Connect service being shut down?   Will this disruption of service negatively impact the ICANN community's use of this service going forward? Or was the security issue related solely to this ICANN event?

Finally, if the security issues relate to the potential compromise of any personal data, has ICANN's chief data protection officer, Dan Halloran, been consulted?   And when will the broader ICANN community be advised of this situation and ICANN's remediation/resolution? Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Brad.

With that, I will pass it to Goran.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. We are continuing to work with Adobe and our cloud service provider on this investigation, including coordination with the SSAC members who reported the issue.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

We will continue to provide updates on this issue pursuant to our coordinated disclosure guidelines. This means that we work jointly with our vendors and the person who reported this issue on the investigation and sharing information about the issue.

On a parallel track, we will work on reviewing the available logfiles to determine whether this issue exploited to obtain unauthorized access to any information that was shared in the ICANN Adobe Connect session. Until we know more, ICANN'S Adobe Connect services will remain offline. In the meantime, we will be rolling out alternative coordination to communities. So stay tuned.

And to answer your specific question, Dan was in the room when we discussed those things. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Goran.

Please.

 Next.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi, everyone, we are here together to show support. This will not be the most popular comment. However, seeing how many

women have come forth for concrete solutions it is our responsibility to be vocal.

ICANN59 was the first meeting after the anti-harassment policy has come through with a new mechanism for reporting any type of inappropriate behavior or harassment.

Having seen no precedent of how the mechanism goes, as women are hesitant about using the mechanism, we are aware and acknowledge that this is a really new policy but we like the organization to be more clear and transparent about the mechanisms that the ombudsperson office relies on. Keeping in mind that some of us have had bad experiences of reporting incidents outside ICANN, when talking about harassment issues, we're normally rampant repercussions and marginalization for merely being vocal would be the result. Women like us in the community many times have been constantly faced with harassment. Several of us are even considering simply being engaged virtually as physical engagement through presence in the meeting has been faced with verbal harassment and even physical harassment several times. We have collected cases of harassment that have happened to us in which we will share in a statement to the Board by the end of the day. We would like a reply please.

And we will refrain from using names for now in order to keep the focus on the topic and not the person per se.

According to those testimonies, we set forth the following recommendations: One, there should be a woman ombudsperson for harassment reporting. It has been proven by several studies that given the sensitivity of the issue, harassment reports are more prone to be tackled and come forth with when the ombudsperson is, A, a woman; B, an expert in gender-related issues and mitigating harassment risks.

Two, there should be more efforts on the part of the ICANN organization to raise awareness on the anti-harassment policy to all participants. For instance, every ICANN participant should have entirely read and promised to commit to the anti-harassment policy prior to engaging in any ICANN meeting and not only ticking a box.

Two, there should be more visuals around meeting centers on what harassment is.

Last point would be we suggest amendments on the policy. The policy should be more detailed on the full process of the ombudsperson's mechanisms such as details on the informal discussions that happen in the reporting mechanism when the harassment incident firstly happens.

[Timer sounds.]

The policy should take into account not only offender's cultural background but also the victim/survivor's cultural background and the policy should have stronger wording on repercussions.

When no solid response from the community is done towards the harasser, there can definitely be an increase in aggressive characteristics of harassers as there would be no accountability to stop them. So we'd like a response. What do you think, and how do you think you can help? Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much.

[Applause]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much. So you are going to send us the note. And, yes, you will get a response.

And, also, I want to personally acknowledge the point you make about interfacing with someone in the ombudsman's office who has a clear understanding of the position that you are in. So I wanted to acknowledge that.

And I want to make a specific point, which is that we're going to -- the point you made about the harassment policy being new, et

cetera, so we're going to ask the ombudsman to do a report on the implementation of that. And obviously as I know you know, he can't put in any information that is personal. But we can at least get a feeling for how it's going.

But the critical piece is to say, yes, send in the -- not that I can stop you, send in the letter and we will -- we will respond. Thank you.

Anybody else?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Chris.

Lousewies.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Yeah. First of all, I'd like to say thank you for coming forward. It's an extremely important issue. And it's extremely everybody feel safe to fully participate within ICANN.

I've only been on the Board for 2 1/2 years, but I've been really impressed with the serious way in which the Board takes these issues up. Of course, it was late to have an outspoken anti-harassment policy. But it's there now. It's important that we know not only how it works in writing, but that especially we can all trust how it works in practice.

So thank you for taking the time and the courage to come up here and talk about something that affects a lot of people.

And I can assure you that everyone is committed to making sure that participating in ICANN is not only a very safe but also a pleasant and a good experience in which everyone feels included. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you very much, and thank you for raising the concerns.

Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: I also want to lend my support to everyone that spoke at the microphone and to my colleagues, Lousewies and Chris. It is very important that ICANN is a safe place for everyone. And I mean that, everyone. The more we raise awareness, the more it is safe and the more we all feel comfortable and enjoy participating in ICANN.

So thank you again and thank you for raising the issue. And keep on doing that. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you very much, Cherine. Yes, please. Next question, please.

AMADEU ABRIL i ABRIL: My name is Amadeu Abril i Abril. I come alone to the mic. I will speak in my personal capacity.

Who would like answering Stephanie, Stephanie in civil society as we have many of them. She asked the question before about how things work here.

I think that by design in this informational dialogue that you quite happily described this morning, sorry, or early this afternoon, we have always tried to balance interest.

The outcome of trying to balance interest so you have one person on this direction -- you need to add another person in the contrary direction -- is downlooked very often. It's not necessarily that. But the fact that we have equilibrium as a result instead of a decision is not an accident. It's part of the design.

Having said that, I disagree on the fact that in this concrete case, this is because the Board wants to do something, this or that the.

I also disagree with Goran that this is the first time that a law proposes or prevents policy. If we have the UDRP or the TMCH because of the direct influence of the (indiscernible) this is not bad. I was absolutely supporting that.

But I just want to remind that one of the first things we did, even before creating the GNSO, in the spring of 1999 was creating working groups. The third one, working group C, was about the reform of the WHOIS, not to publish tons of details of individuals. This is not something new. It's been there since at least '99. And it's been refused by especially the staff to deal with it in many different occasions not because they are bad or anything like that, simply because there are very relevant lobbies in government that didn't want this to be solved. And this is the reason. I don't think that in this configuration it is because ICANN board preferred to have an interim measure instead of the PDP or that PDP doesn't work. It's been the case in other situations. In this case simply because of the reality of the forces.

How much time I have left?   I don't see -- 6 seconds. Okay. So I will queue again.

One thing: Lito, I hope that you will present in Barcelona in Panama .because this year we have three meetings in a row in Latin countries. To me, Catalonia is a different part of the world, but we're still the brotherhood of Latins.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you very much for your contribution. Please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet speaking.   Thank you.   I think this is a conversation not only between the community and the Board but also within the community. I would like to go back to what was said before because it was a number of people who came to the microphone. And I would like to add to things, the first of which is that, under the new procedures, if a woman wants to talk to a woman, she will go up to the person who's in charge on-site of the ICANN staff, the person who is responsible of complaints.

And then there will be a coordination between the ombudsperson's office and the complaint officer on that matter.

And then my second comment is whether they should really read this letter before the ICANN board or whether they shouldn't read this to the ombudsman's letter or they should send it. Because, if we wish to have confidentiality and, if they wish to see something done, perhaps this would be within the ombudsman's remit.

And then, as regards the second part of the accountability of ICANN, there is a subgroup for which I am the rapporteur which has made a number of recommendations out of which one is that within the ombuds office, there be one man and one woman to represent everyone so that these kind of matters

could precisely be addressed with a person of the gender of their choice. That is what I wanted to add. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you very much.

Please.

JORDAN CARTER: Jordan Carter .NZ speaking this time as one of the co-chairs for the CCWG or the cross-community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability Work Stream 2, if you want the full mouthful.

I just wanted to use this opportunity to remind the Board and the community and the staff of two next steps that are coming up for the CCWG.

We are going to be putting out a consolidated set of recommendations for public comments hopefully by the end of March.

Those public comments are a chance for you to identify any inconsistencies or clashes between the recommendations. They're not the chance for new input on the substance of the recommendations.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

If you offer that new input, it will be gratefully received, put in a file, and given to the next group of people who some time in the future look at accountability issues. But there have already been public comments on all the substantive recommendations. And that was the opportunity to have substantive input. So it wouldn't get ignored. It just won't get dealt with now because of the second point.

At the ICANN Panama meeting, we're hoping to have a final revised draft report ready for community approval at least three weeks before the Panama meeting.

There will be webinars. There will be offers to SOs and ACs to explain in detail.

So, please, in your work plans whether board or staff or community participants, add some time, add some agenda time for the Work Stream 2 accountability stuff. This is not the dramatic big bang of Work Stream 1 and the transition. But, please, in the name of all that is good in the world, let's finish this phase of the process in Panama. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you very much.

Ram?

RAM MOHAN: Jordan, this is Ram. I just wanted to say that you are a great example to our community of just something that's working so well. Volunteers who care, who commit, and who spend a great deal of time, effort and energy getting deep into the details for the good of the community, for the public benefit. I applaud you and for all of the others who are working with you.

This is a massive undertaking. And there is something really wonderful and pure about what you're doing. Thank you very much.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you. Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Jordan, thank you.

I also wish to update the community on a meeting the Board had yesterday with the co-chairs and the rapporteurs of WS2. There were two purposes for this meeting. One is to talk about the recommendations ,and the other one talk about approach to implementation.

And I have to say we made good strides and very good progress. And, hopefully, I feel confident that we can wrap this up by the

time scales that Jordan has mentioned. Thank you very much, Jordan, for your intervention here. Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you Cherine.

Next comment.

AMADEU ABRIL i ABRIL: This is Amadeu Abril i Abril again. I represent CORE. But I came alone, but very often as you see.

Now, some comments on how we make the policy in ICANN. Let's take the example of the GDPR. Not a good example, just a model. There is something that we were proposing. And the comments we get were, oh, yes. This will work, but this is too much work for registries and registrars. Especially if they have very strange customers. Or yes, this works in this context, but this TLD has three or five TLDs or, I'm sorry, domain names. Yes it's very big, but it's not especially dangerous name space. And we have others that are much worse. So the problem here is how we treat externalities. And we've seen that we treat the externalities the wrong way.   That is, instead of designing policies that take into account those that, for instance, in this case with people who do strange things with domain names are not just trying to get them. But not even neutral but trying to

prevent strange people from doing strange things. (Indiscernible) We designed the policies with the registrars that are neutral or attract -- registrars that are neutral or attract bad actors. And then we designed the policy and so on. So doing these things is impossible, because then we have many cases. No, in many name spaces we know this does not happen. And it's not by accident. But let's imagine that there are accidents. How you deal with that is not just giving a premium to those that introduce externalities, because there are others. When there are accidents, you need to see who is in a better position to prevent the accidents. If not, you have to lower the consequences. Here we are creating an overblown situation designing on the idea that some registries and registrars will cooperate and there are bad actors in the domain name space. Let's have them pay for the excess caused to the community, not the whole members of the community. Because there's another case. Okay?

LITO IBARRA: Thank you very much. Next comment or question, please.

WERNER STAUB: My name is Werner Staub. I work for CORE, an organization that has been involved the objective of expanding the TLD space for whatever is created -- just before ICANN was created, actually.

Looking back now that we have this latest round, as it was called, almost completed, I find that we cannot really be proud of, you know, what we've achieved.

The expectations were certainly higher. And there is many reasons why we cannot be proud. Simply the quality was difficult to keep up because there were so many challenges. Many of these challenges, actually, were a consequence of some other objectives we found for ourselves such as making everything totally predictable, have a round that would settle every question.

Turned out that we tried to. And the opposite was the case. The only thing that happened was it took more time to prepare the rounds.

Now, after that round has taken place, it was initiated in 2011. We are now close to admitting that the next one will have taken 10 years to complete.

So, actually, not only did we make a big mistake overinvesting in precision that we could not uphold, but also now we'll be doing this again, again preparing for probably a poor way of introducing TLDs. So it may be a good idea to not just look at what insiders say if we have new TLDs. But, if we make available for the community a process by which an organic expansion of the domain name space can take place.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you very much.

                       Anyone on the Board wants to -- okay.

                       Hearing --

CHERINE CHALABY: I'll take that. Thank you very much for your comment. Your comment about 10 years is very striking. And I think what -- we will take your suggestion into consideration that we may want to consider various alternatives, including a steady process rather than a round type of process. We will consider all of the options. And whichever makes more sense to the community, we will consult and then adopt. So thank you very much for your intervention here.

LITO IBARRA: Okay. Thank you very much. Brad, do we have any online questions?

BRAD WHITE: We don't have any online questions in the queue at this point.

LITO IBARRA: Okay. This is unique. If there's no one else and there's no other questions, I will pass --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just call it the bingo cards.

LITO IBARRA: One second. I don't know if the gentleman is coming to the mic. No? I will pass it to Cherine to close this session.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. This is a first ever that we finish almost 45 minutes before the allotted time.

I'd like to say a couple of messages in closing. One regarding the FY19 budget. I want you to know that we've heard all your comments, particularly regarding the budget cuts to community programs and to request mechanisms.

We've also heard your comments about the cadence of the reviews next year. And we have asked our CEO to take all these comments into account. And I say all the comments into account. And come back with a revised budget and a participation with the community so that we at the end achieve a budget that we all -- I'm not going to say everybody is going to

be happy, but that one is sensible that have taken into account all of these comments.

The other one regarding GDPR, I want to thank the community for all the effort and the participation from every single constituency in the community. This is not an easy problem to solve. It's very, very complex. And, hopefully, we will make progress together.

So thank you again. And I declare this public forum closed. Thank you very much. We will resume in about 10 minutes with the public board meeting. Thank you.

[Applause.]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]