

**ICANN Transcription ICANN61 San Juan**  
**Joint Meeting: CPH & ICANN Board**  
**Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 15:15 AST**

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

The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:  
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Becky Burr: All right we are going to start.

Woman: You're really at front row aren't you?

Becky Burr: Could we please start with a roll call at the table starting with you James?

James Bladel: Thanks Becky. James Bladel, Go Daddy registrar.

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan Robinson, Registries Stakeholder Group with Afiliias.

Karen Day: Karen Day, Registries Stakeholder Group, Treasurer with the (SASS).

John Nevitt: John Nevitt, Registries Stakeholder Group, Donuts.

Samantha Demetriou: Samantha Demetriou, Registries Stakeholder Group, Vice Chair with VeriSign.

Goran Marby: Goran Marby ICANN org.

Graeme Bunton: Graeme Bunton from Tucows, Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Paul Diaz: Paul Diaz from PIR, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Becky Burr: Becky Burr, ICANN Board.

Chris Disspain: Chris Disspain, ICANN Board.

Keith Drazek: Keith Drazek, Registries Stakeholder Group GNSO Counselor and VeriSign.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon, Registrar Stakeholder Group and GNSO Counselor.

(Gru Miscu): (Gru Miscu), Registry Stakeholder Group from Nick.BR.

Chris Disspain: Stephane would you like to introduce yourself?

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Chris. Stephane Van Gelder, Registries Stakeholder Group, Vice Chair of Policy.

Becky Burr: Okay I believe that we are going to start with the questions that we received from the Contracted Parties House. Do we have those up? If we don't it doesn't matter because I happen to know the Paul Diaz is going to present the first point if he's listening. It's just a really unruly crowd.

Paul Diaz: All right so where are questions? Yes we have...

Becky Burr: It was something about budget.

Paul Diaz: Something about budget indeed. So the first item I think is the - right budget and the reluctance to return the excess application fees. What we're talking about here is for some time now the Registries Stakeholder Group has had conversation with staff about what we see as double billing for the Trademark Clearinghouse. In the original application fee various services were anticipated and paid for. The Trademark Clearinghouse was a special fee levied on everybody as well. That \$5000 per application we feel should be returned back to the registry – or to the applicants.

The pool of funds the excess application fees fund is quite substantial. You know, as a cost recovery program it all costs a lot less than expected. So, you know, we've argued that the time is right that this is an opportunity for ICANN organization to work with the registries. And we wanted to bring it to the attention of the board at this time because in an era where finances are a big concern and we have agreement on the circumstances of this particular one. The funds are there. They are not part of the regular budget they are part of the - what would come out of that excess application fees surplus pool. You know, we're hoping that the board understands happy to go into more detail. At the very least, you know, if there's agreement to encourage staff to, you know, move forward with us and try to get this particular issue off the plate and resolved.

Becky Burr: So I can report that the board to discuss this in our workshop. The board talked about the question about the Trademark Clearinghouse the \$5000 allocation. The – and informed us that they have concluded that, that \$5000 excess or that \$5000 Trademark Clearinghouse would be considered part of

the excess fees and so it would be added to that pot. The timing on the disbursement, or allocation or whatever happens to that we are – we still have a couple of pretty potentially serious issues that have to be resolved. So I can confirm that we have agreement that the \$5000 per participant allocation goes into that fund and will be allocated as part of that.

Paul Diaz: Okay Becky. Thank you. I'd like to follow-up on the timing of that. That's the same argument we've heard for five years now. And with an excess application surplus pool of north of \$80 million yes sorry I misspoke three years now but, you know, with over \$80 million I really struggle to understand how staff can continue to argue that they need to have those funds in place just in case. I mean Lord help us if we have legal challenges that approach anywhere near that number we're all collectively doing something very, very wrong.

So I very much appreciate that we're in alignment about what happened and an agreement to try and reconcile it. But, you know, if we have to wait yet more months, years however long it's going to be it's very, very hard to reconcile. And would appreciate a little more clarity on why that argument about well we got to wait till it's all done continues to be used. We're talking in the area of \$6 million if all the applications were refunded that extra \$5000 they were charged. So I mean it's a small fraction of the pool the currently exists.

Chris Disspain: Paul, it's Chris. So first of all as a lawyer doesn't \$80 million doesn't sound that much it's entirely possible we could spend the very easily. And I'm only sort of semi-joking I mean it is quite feasible to spend that. Also as a lawyer the tail of these things can be quite long. And it is challenging to call a time where you say, you know, enough.

But I do understand and I emphasize that for us to continue to talk about maintaining the money for the, you know, for the tail can't - without any form of discussion about when that might end is probably not something we continue to do for very much longer. For what it's worth right now if you asked me I would say we need -- we haven't reached a point yet where I would be comfortable -- but I'm talking personally -- where I would be comfortable. With that said I acknowledge that it would be a good discussion for us to have to come back to you and say look all things being equal blah, blah we think, you know, a reasonable time would be this from where we are. I know that's not an answer that you're looking for but I'm just being straight with you.

Paul Diaz:

I appreciate the candor. Any of my colleagues want to jump in on this particular issue? We've heard clearly from the board but any clarifying questions or concerns? All right I'm not going to belabor it. Again we do appreciate half a loaf is better than nothing but we'll look to continue the conversations.

All right then why do we move onto the next issue keep rolling which again is sort of financials related. As you can see on the screen, you know, the question in a nutshell is, you know, looking to see a better use of both existing and fiscal year '19 budget and the reserve fund replenishment with - as we described it without taxing the already challenged value chain. We saw the document that was published just before everybody came to Puerto Rico. It included a range of possible ways -- let's focus on the reserve fund -- a range of possible ways the fund could be replenished.

That included extraordinary fees, extra fees on registries registrars. Want to make sure that, that was just being comprehensive and that is not being actively entertained. We feel that the fees are more than enough where they are now and would like to see the replenishment strategy come from

somewhere other than out of the registries registrars. But perhaps I should shift this one Jonathan if you don't mind or James my colleagues?

James Bladel: Yes thanks Paul and thanks for having us for the session. Jonathan and I were respectively on point for the comments that were submitted on the FY '19 budget from the registries and registrars. Obviously there's quite a great deal of alignment in those comments. I think we had some specific concerns not only about the just the overall fiscal approach of ICANN but also some specific ideas regarding the reserve fund replenishment strategy and possibly some proposals that you may not have considered.

But before we kind of dive and I think generally the tone of the public forum yesterday was, you know, we need these things, you can't cut them put them back. I think maybe the sentiment from this group is you're heading in the right direction. We want to acknowledge that you're making difficult decisions and difficult decisions are necessary. And we want to provide you with the support and if necessary the cover to continue to push back on the community to ensure that the organization is able to live within its means. So I think, you know, look to us to be that backstop. So with that I think Jonathan has some outlined some of our specific comments and questions relative to the budget and our reserve fund.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I think it's important. Thanks James. It's Jonathan Robinson for the record. So as James said we both worked separately on coordinating the team within the registries that small discussion group within the registries and the registrars that dealt with budget comments. And we understand there are multiple forums for dealing with the budget. So this isn't really budget per se but this is about a strategic approach to ICANN financials and how that's manifested in the budget and talking with you and we'd like to talk with you a little bit more about it.

As James said first and foremost we're very supportive of the work that you as a board are doing to make sure and through the chief executive are making sure the, you know, Goran that's you through your chief executive are managing your finances and manage to live within your means. So we like that. We both submitted comments. We actually it was a tight timeframe. We all know the four letter word of GDPR that's been distracting a lot of us. So we were less coordinated than we would have liked to have been but as it turns out our responses were quite well correlated. We have a similar view.

Now you might say that's not surprising. But, you know, I think that some of the key points were as we've said ICANN living well within its means. And what we mean by that though is not spending your income we mean spending less than your income. So I think that's where we're at. We would like to see you spend less than your income. And in order to - and in so doing to be prepared to use the surplus that's generated to contribute to the reserve fund. We think that's the proper way to run the corporation.

There was some concern in our groups about the projection of the top line and we'd like to help you in making sure you do that as accurately and probably relatively conservatively as possible. Now there is some sensitivity to that because for us to come back and encourage you particularly to be conservative could have an impact on some of our businesses especially to the extent that those are publicly quoted entities. So we need to work carefully with you in a structured way but to help you make as accurate as possible projections. So we're very willing to do that.

As I said to any - to the extent that a surplus is targeted and achieved we'd like to see that contributed to the reserve fund. We clearly think that the primary mission of ICANN is policy development work. And we'd like to see

that adequately and well-funded and will support you in anything that you do to ensure that takes place. And I think in terms of seeing the forest for the trees of the wood for the trees that's important. We strongly believe that policy development work needs to be well-funded. And there's a sort of subtheme to that to that which I think Jeff would like to speak to in particular which includes ensuring that implementation work is undertaken in a timely and well-funded way. So we can come to that in a moment Jeff but just sort of teeing up the key points.

And clearly the cost of staff and travel funding has increased substantially in recent years. And so we'd like to encourage you to continue to deal with that and other high expenditure in the way and to keep a close eye on that and deal with it appropriately. One of the specific questions on that is there's been a reference to sort of being locked in to 85% of the budget and that really only a small proportion of the budget is in one sense discretionary.

I think we'd like you to talk to that and explain that a little more and make us - help us to understand that because from where we see it there's significant expenditure in staff and other items that has continued to grow over the recent past. And so we'd like to understand why you are unable to sort of deal with that.

So those are some of the thoughts and issues. And there's obviously a couple, you know, this is about dialogue. This isn't about us giving you a budgetary comment this is about trying to talk with you about understanding things. So hopefully I've teed that up. There's a couple of contributions I know from Contracted Party speakers and hopefully that lends itself then to some discussion around these various topics. So I'll halt - I'll stop now and leave the various...



Becky Burr: I think...

Jonathan Robinson: ...dialogue to start to develop.

Becky Burr: ...we - before we go for just one I – Cherine is going to talk about the reserve fund issue.

Cherine Chalaby: Thank you both James and Jonathan. You mentioned a few things about the FY '19 budget and staff and I'll let Goran answer those. But I want to go back to some of the points you made regarding the reserve fund. And I see two in particular and I'm going to add one more.

One is here taxing an already challenging value chain. So we certainly made it I hope made it very clear in the consultation paper we sent out that we are not intending to tax or even come anywhere near suggesting that the Contracted Parties should make a contribution to the reserve fund. So although we - for completeness we said that but we've also put a principal in the documents to that effect. So I hope you've read that message and I will give you the assurance now that that's absolutely we will stick to that right? So that's one thing.

In terms of spending less than income I 100% we agree with you. And in fact we did say something and I'll read it that said a future adopted budget could be made to provide a contribution to the reserve fund on an annual basis. This would require ICANN org to plan each fiscal year for expenses to be lower than funding by an amount explicitly designated for the purpose of replenishing the reserve fund. So I think we are an absolute agreement on that point.

The other thing I want to bring to your attention is the governance of the reserve fund itself. So, so far we have published two consultation paper and there is a third want to come. The first one was on the level right what should be the level and what should be the purpose of it, i.e., the reasons of when we are allowed to tap in. And I think the community responded. And overall we've agreed that the level should be minimal of 12 months and we've passed a resolution to that effect.

Now that immediately you make your calculation you showed a deficit of \$68 million. And this document that we posted is about the various sources of where we've put some ideas. The one idea we said is not we're not going to touch is taxing the Contracted Parties right? So when this is done we know beginning – we're going to begin working on the governance. And the governance means that what are the policies of how to manage the reserve fund and to withdraw money from it. And we want to put a consultation paper out so that the community is part of that. We want to be transparent and we want you to be part of that and put ideas. So I think we are aligned on those three things. Would you agree with that?

Jonathan Robinson: Look Cherine that's very helpful and thank you very much for that. I think in many ways we are. And it's useful to hear thinking. And I think we want to talk with you about budget reserve fund and board attitude. And clearly these are intertwined. And you've...

Cherine Chalaby: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: ...described that very well. I suppose the one additional comment I should make is that simply for the record and to make sure it's clear that as it happens the registries response on the quantum of the reserve fund to part one of your approach was that it was our desire that, that was only six months. And I think

there's a reasonably strong set of thinking in there that the - notwithstanding that we acknowledge that the balance of the public consultation led you to a 12 month decision and, you know, that's water under the bridge to some extent.

But there remains a concern that the reserve fund is fully funded. And by that I mean it could fund 12 months full factor operation for want of a better description rather than a scaled back emergency core functions. And so that's the ongoing concern. I'm not sure we need to get into that now but I just thought it was useful in the context of all of this to recognize what the comment was here.

Cherine Chalaby: As soon as you mentioned that...

((Crosstalk))

Cherine Chalaby: ...(Xavier) jumped from his seat. So he's there he wants to...

Man: Come on.

Cherine Chalaby: (Xavier).

Goran Marby: Hello I will start. Let's go back to some of the things that - because it's important that we share the same information with you as we've done with everybody else. And so I would like to do my what I now call my budget dance and go through some of the some of the things that you may not have asked them they could be interesting anyway.

Yes we are entering into a (POWC). We see funding coming into us flattening it out. We see that already this year where we have \$8 million less funding

than we expected. That's 5% of the total funded budget so it's not a big thing. That means that we obviously have been fairly successful of forecasting funding into us. We always appreciate more input. (Cyrus) is doing a fantastic job with many of you to come up with the numbers in the first place but we can always (unintelligible) that was the top line.

You used the word fact. In coming back to your questions about the (885) I want - before I go into that there's been some discussion about travel programs and other ones. And I would like to point out some things is that already this year we are doing efficiency measures within ICANN org otherwise we wouldn't have survived this year.

And next year the sort of internal costs is about in the range of \$8.6 million. That's 6-1/2% out of budget. And as an example which I shared a couple of times is that we are increasing travel spending for the community with about 12% and we're decreasing just about 12% for ICANN org personnel. We hope we can do that without having a challenge during the ICANN meetings for instance.

But one of the I think very good things with this week shows again how fantastic ICANN is because one of the things I cannot do and I'm responsible for throwing the first stone, that's my job. And I can appreciate how much you appreciate that I am the one who throws the first stone. And reseller sentiment for this budget process in a certain way we try to be more transparent but has driven a very interesting discussion and that's about all the fixed cost we have because ICANN for instance and I review has been some of the things that we've been talking about that ICANN in the budget proposed for instance that we are going to delay one year a budget - a bylaw something that is in the bylaw to say that a year later. I have to put it into the budget.

So I think that one thing that comes from me during this meeting so far has been that let's talk about the 85%. The 85% comes out of reviews - results out of reviews bylaws and for instance policies. And 2019 is a little bit of a perfect storm year in that sense that we are flattening funding we are through the policy rotating meetings. We are rotating a meeting Japan which is more expensive than many other meetings. It's also the first year really we take the full costs of many of the transparency measures we put in place for the transition as itself.

So if you see the amount of people that we have increasing many of them comes out of the transition not all of them but some of them. And also when we now are operationize the new TLD program. But it's still - so if we actually started to have discussions about the 85% the problem is that we - I was not aware and I think nobody knows who starts that discussion. But I think that I'm starting to be - I'm very happy about this discussion. We have to be financially prudent not only for one year but also several years.

And one thing I realized during the last couple of days as well or you knew about it is that we are draining you with work. To run nine reviews next year including an accountability one when I told people this they look at me like what are you going to do about it? This - the answer is we have to do something about it because the interesting thing is also that three or four years down the road we will have one or two. And I can't look at my staffing for that. I have a skeleton crew for reviews. And we have many reviews I have to hire people from external that costs money not to mention the fact that I'm - we are sort of driving you to do much more reviews naval gazing thing is not what I would call it of course but instead of doing policy work.

And the other thing is actually the budget process is itself. So we throw out a budget at a particular point in time before Christmas just to make sure that you

have a good Christmas. And then we have a short period of time for your comments to come in. I think we have 150 something comments coming in. And then we have a short period of time where we prepare that material to – for together with the board and make a decision about the budget. And then we throw it back again to have the empowered community possibility as well. We have done all those things.

I'm starting to think that we should do a two year budget process instead. It takes 15 months to do a 12 month budget. So maybe we can have a two year where we lock at down for two years so we have time in the community to actually have some of those essential discussions without pressing ourselves. So I'm very happy for the discussion. I'm very happy for your support. And in the material as Cherine said a part replenishment of the reserve fund will come from operations. And that's a substantial amount of money and to be able to do that we have to talk about the 80%, 85%. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Cherine and then I promise we're going to go to Jeff.

Cherine Chalaby: Go to Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Oh thank you, Jeff Neuman. The registries have asked me to talk a little bit about something. I saw that was said and I kind of did a double take. I just want to ask Goran you did say that there was going to be budget now for operationalizing the next round of new gTLDs? Was that what was said?

Goran Marby: No I haven't said that. This is one of the...

Jeff Neuman: Oh I saw that.

Goran Marby: ...sort of technical problems.

Jeff Neuman: Did anyone see that? Okay then I can make my comment then.

Goran Marby: No, yes I mean you asked a principal question. I can answer the principal question if I may and probably - may answer your question already. We have a problem of putting into the budget things that is not decided by the community. We have a discussion in the board right now how to address that problem as well. But it's hard for us. And with several not only this program we have discussion about Work Stream 2, and there are other initiatives in the – and it's sort of hard for us to say the yes we're going to put - we anticipate that the community now will have this solution to something because you will scrutinize that when we come out to the budget and we say we haven't decided that. And you would probably say to me Goran now you're interfering in the policymaking process.

So it's a principal question as well. We have been able to sort that out when we have growing funding. We can always think something there but now we can't. So we took the position of not doing that. What we're doing instead is that the board we are engaging in a financing if we should do something within eventual new program because we can look about the financing of that. And I think you agree on the principle of not to put things into the budget that is not decided by community. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: I do agree with -- sorry this is Jeff Neuman -- I do agree with the principle of not putting things into the budget that's not decided by the community. But the community decided in 2008 the board unanimously approved moving forward with a new gTLD process that not was not just one round it was a predictable process for the introduction of new gTLDs which at the time was assuming the next round would kick off in one year. So I want to remind you that that's incredibly important. It has been decided.

The other thing I want to say which I guess relates my comments are relevant. Prior to the 2012 round starting ICANN actually started budgeting in fiscal year 2007 for that process. So they actually budgeted for about six years on different things. Now given at that time it was thought that the new gTLD round would launch in fiscal year 2010 but that's still three years in advance, three fiscal years in advance. So to say that you're not putting anything aside this time around is actually not just saying that we can't starting around in fiscal year 2019 it's saying no to fiscal year 2019, no to 2020, no 2021.

And I think that's incredibly – it's critical. And I have a whole list of things that were done in – on here that I will go over with (Xavier) tomorrow during the budget session on all the things that they did to get ready for the 2012 round and ramping up. There were decisions that were made unfortunately in the 2012 round we can't change now meaning an application system that was a onetime use throwaway system. So we know right now we're going to need an application system. We know right now it's going to have feel – I mean there's a lot of things we actually do right now. But we can't put in a position to actually have to wait until the board makes an affirmative decision to approve the policies that come out from the GNSO before we start thinking about implementation.

If we do that then we're not talking about '21, '22 we're talking about '23, '24, '25. And just to remind everyone the last round is 2012. If we can't launch by fiscal year 2021, '22 an entire decade think about that an entire decade between the launch of two rounds. And that is not something that ICANN as an organization should be proud of especially when it said it was going to launch within one year.



I will also last point the community never asked the board to stop the board told the community it was going to wait for the community to again ask it to commence the next round which was backwards to begin with let's fix it. And in a budget that doesn't just mean extra dollars -- and we don't even need that much extra dollars -- it's reallocating those employees that you move to operations from the new gTLD program but if they stay in operations that's fine I don't want to control personnel. But then allocate them the responsibilities of working on the program. You should prioritize things and programs that are decided on by the community before we go to other projects. And the GNSO has approved unanimously the board approved and then restated again and what 2013, '14 or '15 said that we are going to start the next round as expeditiously as possible. Thanks. Thank the one person thanks.

Cherine Chalaby: So Jeff I said this at the GNSO Council that A, the board is committed to the next round B, we are having a workshop in another month where we're beginning to think about preparation for a next a round pending receiving recommendation from the GNSO on the PDP. So we are conscious of the time scales and the timeline now that things are coming towards the end of the PDP. And we are going to sit down with GDD and Goran and start thinking on preparing what needs to be done during FY '19 and where the money is going to come from so point taken. Are you unhappy?

Jeff Neuman: No thank you. This is Jeff. I think that's great news. And I know that the Subsequent Procedures the people that are working on that would be happy to know that and were to certainly volunteer to -- if you need other prep material for your workshop we can get that to you. So I appreciate that and think you.

Paul Diaz: Stephane.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much Paul, Stephane Van Gelder speaking. Just to come back to the question of reviews and repeat something that we discussed earlier on during our constituency day but I think it's also a point that's worth making here. The budget impact of reviews obviously is associated with the number the sheer number of reviews that we're looking at plus the timescale of these reviews. And only one of those reviews ATRT 3 is committed to a specific timeline of one year the others are not limited. So they could have a significant budget impact.

And as Goran mentioned earlier on there is a high number of reviews. So we're not only looking at budget impact we're also looking at the impact on the volunteer community, the impact on the organization's ability to absorb these reviews. And we have to question I think the fact that if we're embarking on nine reviews many of which have no specific timelines we may find ourselves in a situation where by the time we finish reviewing we start reviewing again. And we never ever take anything away from these reviews apart from just doing that work again which in budget terms specifically as this is what we're discussing makes absolutely no sense.

Cherine Chalaby: Stephane I agree with you everything you've said. I just want to add one small correction which is whilst you're right that a timeline of a year is mentioned in the ATRT it actually should complete not must. So it's actually possible for ATRT to also run over but I acknowledge that it's there because I just thought it was important to call that out. Thanks.

Man: I bleed with you on that one.

Cherine Chalaby: (Unintelligible) I bleed with you which is exciting news for me no doubt but just as exciting to you.

Goran Marby: Could I make you – could I ask you a question then about this? So assume that I will come, you know, I will go home from this meeting and together with the board come up with a paper that gives some examples on the what we call the 85% including one of the reviews. And you will answer what you think about those things. And maybe one of those things is you would say go and look about how you can change the cadences of the review. Let's call it that. And maybe we can do that because it's a bylaw change so we have to interact. Would you think that would be a good idea? Could you for the record say it's a good idea not just shaking your head or you can also say Goran that is not a stupid idea that was a joke and go home?

Paul Diaz: I've got Keith and then John.

Keith Drazek: Okay thank you Goran. This is Keith Drazek for the transcript. Yes I think that would be a fantastic idea. Frankly I think the reviews are too important as you noted not naval gazing. They are too important as an accountability mechanism to not treat appropriately. And I think in order to do them right we need to make sure that we have both community resources, volunteer time, and staff resources and appropriate attention from the board at the right moment to make sure that these reviews are done properly.

To your point having nine in a single year or nine commencing in a single year is simply, you know, not something that I think any of us can support in an appropriate fashion. So I think to your point somebody has to throw the first stone putting something out there for discussion with the community I think would be highly appropriate and speaking personally I would very much welcome that. If we need to find the proper cadence I think that's an appropriate path forward. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Thank you Keith. John?

John Nevitt: Hi. It's John Nevitt. I would agree as well. I think it's a great idea. I think that every dollar in expense that we cut from our budget we get \$2 of benefit in the reserve fund because the budget goes down and the revenue goes up. So you have an extra dollar for every dollar you cut. So the double benefit in reaching the reserve fund would be very helpful and we should be looking at cutting our belts, tightening our belts.

Well there is pressure as Jonathan mentioned on the revenue side with maybe less than conservative predictions. And there's also pressure in the last topic we talked about the new TLD budget of somehow it's now \$80 million in estimated excess application fees. In February it was \$95.8 million. And if you look in the budget in 4.1 somehow evaluation costs went up by \$8 million estimate. And overheads increase in allocation for the new TLD budget went up by \$4.6 million estimate.

And so I'm also worried that we're taking some money out of the new TLD program fund and using it for ongoing operations. And if we take a look at that, that might be a concern and it may cause even more pressure. So the more pressure we have on the budget the more pressure there is to cut the budget and the benefit will get doubles because the actual expense budget goes down so the amount we need for the reserve fund goes down and we'll have that extra revenue. So I strongly support your idea. Thank you, Goran.

Paul Diaz: Thank you John. So (Xavier) saw you stand up do you have anything? No.

(Xavier): No.

Paul Diaz: Okay. And for the record I think I used the number 80 earlier and loosely. Okay I want to make sure that I'm not being quoted because I don't even

know where to find the actual current dollar amount. Jonathan I saw your hand please.

Jonathan Robinson: Just -- it's Jonathan just for the record -- but I does anyone want to respond directly to John before I kind of - I'm just following up on a similar theme but if there's no direct responses? Okay so two things one on the reviews and the cadence of the reviews and so on I'll add support to Goran's suggestion. I think we need a paper that suggests here is how the reviews might be planned for the next -- for the forthcoming financial cycle whether that's a three or a five year plan. And we should work with you to optimize the cadence of those. And I think that to me seems like a standalone piece of work.

I think that's separate to the 85% question. And I know I see how they connected and that the reviews are part of that underlying core expenditure but I think we'd like to look deeper than just the reviews as well. And so to the extent that you can expose to us other similar problems that might help the organization to be or help you Goran and your staff to manage the organization more efficiently if we were to support you we should hear, you know, similar areas like that. So separating out the two let's certainly try and deal with the cadence of the reviews. And let's help you with other areas that might make your ability to run the organization more efficiently improved. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Michele please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele Neylon for the record. Very briefly fully supportive of the comments others made about this new term we've coined the cadence of the reviews. Better get an acronym for that one or else it won't be really be ICANN. Also I mean it's when you're looking at the budget in general I mean

the focus needs to be on projects that are directly related to ICANN's mission. And part of that is also serving the Contracted Parties.

So at a previous ICANN meeting we asked Goran and the board directly about what was happening with the portal for registrars. And we are happy to see that there has been some movement on this however the timeline that we – that was presented to us this morning was a little depressing. And I'm pushing a little bit further to find out why the timeline was so long? We were told that this was due to a lack of resources being set on that particular project. So we would love to ask you if you could possibly give them a little bit more resources so that that could be done in a more timely fashion. Thanks.

Goran Marby: Thank you for not asking for more resources.

Michele Neylon: You're welcome Goran.

Goran Marby: Could I make because if you want to at one point in time anyone are interested how we reshaped the project development in IT because we've made - since we met when I showed my throat to you we did a major overhaul on the whole project and planning process internally when it comes to IT projects. We don't have to do that now but we can meet up and we can talk about it. And yes I did say that to him I showed my throat. So let's talk about that because we are restarting and with the help of (unintelligible) and executive team we now do it differently and hopefully with more transparency and more important that we can keep our promises going forward. Thank you.

Paul Diaz: Yes not sure other questions follow-ups from the floor? Not quite done we're going to get to that Goran. Why don't we do one that I think will go fairly quickly moving on then the third bullet here about IGO acronyms.

Man: Very quick whatever.

Paul Diaz: And I've asked John Nevitt he's going to introduce this issue.

John Nevitt: Thanks Paul. As probably everyone in the room knows the IGO acronyms are contractually reserved by registries. We are not allowed to sell the IGO acronyms or register them to any party including the IGOs themselves. You know, this has been going on for five years since we signed our first registry agreements in 2013. We tried to take a simple approach two years ago and filed an RSEP asking for the right to provide the IGO acronyms to the actual IGOs themselves. That RSEP was approved but is in deep freeze pending community support on – community outcomes on the policy development side. There is a board resolution calling for the reservation of these names and ICANN staff didn't feel comfortable signing an amendment that goes against that board resolution.

Nine months ago we received a letter from an IGO called Euclid University. Euclid University is an African education support IGO. And they wanted not surprisingly Euclid.University. We sent a letter to ICANN asking for a waiver of the reservation for that single name. That was denied. We have IGO names that are generic terms, loss, idea, who, eco none of those could be provided to those IGOs themselves or anyone else because they have been reserved for five years.

And then the question is what can we do about it? What can we do as a community? Today we learned in our session with GDD staff that it's an ICANN Board issue and that we essentially can't do anything until the expiration of the Curative Rights Working Group. That was in a document today. And our view is that's wrong, that's plain wrong. We have the ability

to do a simple fix. We did it with two characters. We could provide protections in the agreements.

It's up to the ICANN Board in the contract with every registry it says as instructed from time to time by ICANN – by I'm going to read it again as instructed from time to time by ICANN registry operator will implement the protection mechanisms determined by the ICANN Board of Directors relating to the protection of identifiers for the intergovernmental organizations. So this is a board issue. We could fix it like we did two characters. We could add a term and condition in our contract saying anyone who registers a domain name that matches an IGO can't use a domain name to hold himself as the IGO. We did that with the two characters. We've sold over 10,000 two character names that resemble country code names and we have not had one complaint.

So this is an issue that could be fixed if we have the courage to do that. As a Nominating Committee member that's one of the factors I'm going to be looking for is courage, courage to take a stand not, hide behind a PDP that might go on for five years, not hide behind other processes but let's – we have a problem let's fix it and there's an easy fix. So I think the courageous members of the board that are here will help us and do that. And we look forward to working with you to get that done. Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Thank you John. The board has courageously chosen me to answer that question although I am going to bounce a couple of things off of Akram so if you want to grab a mic Akram or go to the mic. So John you'll forgive me if I go – I'm going to sort of go through it slowly because I want to make sure that we don't misspeak here. So first of all in respect to the names of the IGOs the names not acronyms the names my understanding is that issue is now



basically dealt with. They are reserved and you can – they can be registered by the...

John Nevitt: IGO.

Chris Disspain: ...IGO. So everything we are now talking about is not names it is acronyms.

John Nevitt: Correct.

Chris Disspain: In respect - yes correct. In respect to the very one the specific one that you mentioned Euclid I'm just going to digress slightly in respect to that one. I'm aware of that one plus a couple of others that shouldn't even really be on the list. If someone can explain to me how Euclid can possibly be an acronym of Euclid University I'll be fascinated to know how that works.

It is their name. And it - if they wanted to we could I'm sure we could find a way of taking it off the list and they would then be able to register Euclid.University. The problem is they've chosen to put it on the list of acronyms and unless they take it off we have to fix it another way. I will just so that is I'm not singling out Euclid alone I will tell you that a very famous institution known as the Commonwealth also believes that Commonwealth is an acronym of the Commonwealth. This is fascinating. I'm having a – I don't normally get this reaction.

Man: It's (Xavier) during a budget session.

Chris Disspain: Extraordinary. So leaving aside the fact that there may well be acronyms that can be taken off and then registered let's go to the baseline point. What we have is GAC advice that says that the acronyms should - actually no before I go there I want to deal with one other point you raised which is we – you

cannot – we cannot allow in the current process the IGOs to say I would like to register my acronym because the problem with that is that gives them a right to the acronym. So you couldn't say to OECD we will release your acronym if you want to register it because the problem with that is that they may not be the only people entitled to it, and perhaps a better example is WHO or IDEA.

You wouldn't want to prefer the IGO in that because that implies that they have a right to it, and the dispute that's arisen between – not dispute but the reason why the board told the GAC that it wasn't comfortable with its advice to reserve the IGO acronyms was that the IGOs have no rights to those acronyms as such.

They don't – they certainly don't have a preemptive right. They can go in to try and register them and that's fine, but they certainly couldn't stop other people from registering them so you can't do that.

All you can really do is solve the actual problem itself. Now we have GAC advice that says reserve them. The board has told the GAC that we won't do that.

We – what we will do is try and find a way of helping them. The way that we came to - for helping them - Bruce who's here somewhere – Bruce Tonkin.  
Thank you Bruce.

Bruce facilitated a discussion that led to an understanding that ICANN would create a watch list that would enable the IGOs to be notified in the event that an acronym was registered.

Now similar to Trademark Clearinghouse but with some slightly different rules, that is something that we need to do in respect to letting them know that someone has registered the name.

The other problem that they have - what - is that they believe they have no curative rights. We can argue about whether they do or they don't but we - they believe that they don't.

And that that's what the GNSO PDP, which I think was being chaired by Phil Corwin and someone else - can't remember - was - is working on and it - for the IGOs it goes as a package.

It's, "Give us the watch list and give us some curative rights." That means that we will reluctantly give up our GAC advice. Now what's the alternative?

The alternative is that we take the GNSO policy recommendation in respect to IGOs in the first PDP, which doesn't deal with curative rights but deals with the other side of the coin, and we take the GAC advice, which is to register/reserve as IGOs and we sit down as a board and say, "Those two are at odds with each other. What do we do?"

And we felt and continue to feel that the better - leaving aside the timing that the better way to deal with it is to find a way of having in essence the GAC be satisfied with what we've - what we put in place or - and the GNSO able to proceed with dealing with the names.

So my view for what it's worth is that if we are close to finalizing - are we close to finalizing the PDP? Do we know? Do I know that answer to that question? We are close to finalizing.

Man: I was told by the chair of the PDP that it's off the rails and unlikely to be resolved any time in the near future.

Chris Disspain: Okay so now we're into sort of uncharted territory so I've done my bit and said that's where I believe we are. Does anybody want to talk about the PDP itself?

Sorry Akram. Thank you. You – I – you nodded. That was all I needed. That was – it was brilliant. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: There's no better nodder than Akram. Phil.

Philip Corwin: Well I'm Phil Corwin. I'm one of the two Co-Chairs of that PDP. The other is Petter Rindforth, former IPC Councilor on Council. The situation in the PDP – when we met in Abu Dhabi I thought we were very close to conclusion.

We had three policy options. One of them had gotten what appeared to be strong consensus. What's occurred since then was that a number of members of the working group announced that they were reversing their position on that.

We went from – and members began bringing up new policy options after our initial call for support, and now we have six policy options. Another member – the chairs then attempted to poll the full membership of the working group to get a sense of where they were at on these new options so that we could initiate the consensus call process.

And one of the members of the working group filed an appeal under Section 3.7 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, which has essentially prevented the working group from holding any meetings for the past three months.

Recently the co-chairs held a call with the appellant and offered a – what we thought was a reasonable compromise that met him more than halfway. He refused it.

He continues appeal. He spoke with the chair of GNSO Council and the council liaison to the working group, and the council liaison at this meeting and over the next week or two will be individually reaching out to all the members of the working group to see where they are on the current options and to let the co-chairs then know of what the situation is.

So we've had extensive unexpected delay because of unexpected developments since Abu Dhabi and I certainly can't predict the outcome. But my feeling, unless something significantly changes within the stated positions of the working group members, particularly the block that's most active that seems to not want us to reach a conclusion on the central issue, which is the IGO claim to judicial immunity, which might arise in a registrant appeal, is we might be in a final situation where we may have a majority of the working group in favor of a particular approach that recognizes that concern, but not a high enough level to have consensus that could be approved by council.

So that's the situation. We've done our best as co-chairs to resolve it but those efforts have been fruitless...

Chris Disspain: Thank you Phil.

Philip Corwin: ...because of one particular member of the working group. And we – we're looking forward to working with the council liaison who's beginning her outreach tomorrow at what had been a scheduled meeting of the working group, but now will be a session in which she can listen to members.

So hopefully we'll have a better sense of where we're at with the membership I think within two weeks after the end of this meeting, but that's really all I can tell you right now because of the confused state of the working group.

Chris Disspain: Thank you very much. Thank you.

Philip Corwin: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: And were you okay to carry on talking about this? Okay so what happens if the – if it's a – not a consensus recommendation or no recommendation? What's the GNSO rules on that?

Man: Then there's no policy but it's not a policy issue and according to the contract it's a contract issue. So we could work out protections that don't go through a policy development process like we have done in other cases including two characters, and we could have the folks in a room led by a discussion...

Chris Disspain: I understand.

Man: ...by someone else and see if we could work out suitable protections that make sense.

Chris Disspain: Okay. Well – so I’m going to draw a line under it simply by saying that’s an interesting idea and let’s talk about it. There’s no point in discussing it now but it’s certainly worth talking about, especially if we think that there’s a possibility that the PDP itself won’t reach a conclusion we’re going to have to figure out a way around that. Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks Chris. Donna Austin. I’m not sure where this fits into the conversation but as a result of the facilitation that Bruce did there was GAC advice that came out on that regarding the notification: a permanent system of notification of IGOs regarding second-level registration of strings that match their acronyms in two languages, and a parallel system of notification to registrants for a more limited time period in line with both previous GAC advice and GNSO recommendations.

And in the council response to that advice I think we agreed with it that that could move forward, so I’m just wondering whether that’s the potential break to this and maybe that – maybe that’s a starting point.

Chris Disspain: The question is whether or not – I agree with you. The question is whether or not it would be accept – so I’m going to – you - say acceptable to the GAC. I know that’s, you know, not registering to say but the question is whether it would be acceptable to the IGOs that they proceed with that without an – without a curative rights mechanism, because the problem they have is if they then get registered by someone else then notified of it – but I suspect that they would argue that there’s nothing they can do about it. But I’m not saying it’s not a starting point. Please.

Donna Austin: I – yes I think James is in the room here somewhere but I – my – this was 12 months ago so my recollection isn’t terrific. But I actually thought that there

was an agreement to move forward with at least setting up this notification system.

And if that's – we're 12 months down the track already and if that hasn't started then we're already behind the eight ball so...

Chris Disspain: So that's a good question. Akram...

Donna Austin: Thanks.

Chris Disspain: ...would you like to answer that one? Thank you people without just nodding.

Akram Atallah: We have started to look into it but we don't think it's going to take an extensive amount of time to actually be able to implement it. So once we have the instructions to implement it it will take us probably a few...

Chris Disspain: Okay. All right.

Akram Atallah: ...weeks.

Chris Disspain: So you want to – thank you Akram. Good lord, I mean, welcome Bruce.

Bruce Tonkin: Hi Chris. Just one comment. The – it's probably just the particular language you're using but you're saying there's no curative right. What we actually did here when we ran the consultation or facilitated session is that I know that the IGOs actually do have legal rights.

And for example in Australia there's law that protects IGOs in particular situations so there is a curative right. They have a right. We don't create the right, the right...



Chris Disspain: Sure.

Bruce Tonkin: ...that they already have. So I think really what the GNSO was looking at is is there a way of reaching an agreement on a dispute resolution mechanism. We have – and using trademarks as an example there's a trademark right.

We've never created that right. That's created by law outside of ICANN but we came up with a dispute resolution process, which was UDRP, as an efficient way of looking at - as a dispute, and then the fall back from that dispute if you disagreed with the outcome is you always had the right to fall back on the courts of law.

So I think a holding position so to speak would be as long as you have a watch list and you're notifying the IGO, they can then exercise their legal rights.

And then the question is is there a way of reaching agreement here on any separate dispute mechanism, and it sounds like what I was hearing from the chair of the working group is they hadn't reached a resolution on a – an agreeable dispute mechanism.

But let's just be clear that they have legal rights and they can use their laws that they have under those legal rights.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Bruce. I appreciate that. So you won't be surprised to hear that this may well come up in the GAC this afternoon so we'll talk to them as well.

But I think I'm happy John to take this offline now and discuss it separately. Thank you.

John Jeffrey: Thank you.

Paul Diaz: All right. There's nothing else on that. Then what we'd originally put up here is a fourth item we thought was probably going to take too much time and needs to – a little more thought on our side so...

Becky Burr: I think we have a response.

Paul Diaz: You have a response. All right, why don't you, you know, help us...?

((Crosstalk))

Becky Burr: We think it's a great idea. The contracts are long and complicated and there are all kinds of millions of things out there that add to the complexity and it does make sense to do this, and we've heard from org that they are willing to enter into conversations about that.

Paul Diaz: Excellent news and we were going to hold off and come back to you once we'd had more thought suggestions, so we'll work with staff and maybe have more to discuss in the future once it's moved along a bit.

What we were going to offer or - we'll turn to now is can't get away from GDPR. We tried but we just couldn't and I'm going to ask (Sam) to introduce some thoughts we would want to share with you.

(Sam): This is (Sam). Goran you seem so disappointed we hadn't gotten to GDPR yet so this one's for you.

Goran Marby: I tell you I want to have a GDPR-free zone at the next ICANN meeting so...

(Sam): So the concept of a regulatory framework as we were thinking about it earlier today in our joint session is the much more pressing matter of what the regulatory framework is going to look like for this GDPR compliance model, and what changes to agreements or new agreements or waiver processes are going to need to be put in place to memorialize whatever the model ends up looking like.

So we specifically want to ask you as the board what conversations have you been having at the board level, and whether the board is anticipating any specific action in relation to these – this potential regulatory framework because we know staff has not answered what this is going to look like yet so...?

Becky Burr: So I'm sure I'm supposed to disclaim anything about regulatory framework. John is shaking his head. Okay consider that done. We have spent – we spent a great deal of time – we spent time at all of our workshops and meetings for the past year on this issue, and we spent a considerable amount of time discussing this this week.

We are very – we're monitoring the situation very closely and very much looking forward to reports as soon as they are available about progress over the next couple of weeks with the Article 29 Working Party.

As Goran has said ICANN is going to be engaged in those. We began conversations about what role if any there is for the board. There are several ways in which whatever the compliance waiver or whatever it is could be put into place ranging from the announcement at – by ICANN that it will consider you to be in compliance if you do X, Y and Z and look at variations to something like adoption of a temporary specification.

I want to make – I want to put – strongly underline the fact that this is not what – I’m not talking about that crazy contract amendment for any reason that we’ve subjected to constitutional balancing tests.

The – we’re not talking about that but a provision that’s been in the contract with registries and registrars forever, which permits the creation of a temporary specification on an emergency basis with very strict deadlines regarding creation of a PDP, a – the period of time that it could be in place.

Depending on what the recommendation from org is on that the board may or may not have an official role to take, so if it would be a temporary specification then the – that would have to be something that the board adopted having satisfied itself that it met – that the circumstances met the test for doing that.

So we will be watching this closely. At this point no decision has been made. We’re looking for more guidance particularly from the DPAs.

(Sam): Can I just ask a quick follow-up to what Becky said?

Goran Marby: Just want to make my comment, which is that we are not talking about a regulatory framework here. Thank you.

(Sam): Yes and Becky did the full disclosure. It was – I was – sorry for – I was just using the short term – the shorthand term from the mountain of paperwork that will land on all of us. Is that better?

My follow-up question is do you have any further insight on timing as to like when that information will come back from the DPAs when the board will continue this discussion?

Becky Burr: So I believe that org has told us that they expect to have conversations the week of the 26th – could be more like the 27th or the 28th. I think there will be people on hand in Brussels to have those conversations in person.

I – as we were talking about this earlier it’s likely that there’s going to be – need to be some give and take. The -they do have the cookbook. They received it at the same time that it was published, and hopefully there will be able to be very substantive conversations on that.

They may come back with something and it may be that we need to go back and say, “You said X but we really need to understand whether you meant whatever.”

So time is a-wasting and I’m just going to channel (Stephanie) when I tell you how much I hate being yelled at by my engineers every day so I totally feel your pain.

I hope we will have some update following the meetings in Brussels, at least interim update. John I’m looking at you to see if you’re agreeing with me on that.

John Jeffrey: No disagreement.

Becky Burr: I see you.

Paul Diaz: Okay thank you Becky. Why don’t we go to the queue? Maxim?

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Clarification question – a short one. Is board aware of the fact that under GDPR there should be a board formed? It's not yet formed.

And the Working Party – and they will not be responsible for any kind of advice Working Party, you know, 29 gives to you, that it's a different body which will look into the subjects, not these hypothetically - expecting DPAs to give you the precise advance – advice is not very realistic.

They usually give it paid advices. They give you a fine and the resolution why. Thanks.

Becky Burr: So my understanding is that the Article 29 Working Party turns into the European Data Protection Board and that there's not really a – it is a different organization and it comes into new powers, including the power to force a across the board solution.

Clearly the board is aware that the Article 29 Working Party is not under an obligation to provide advice; that the Article 29 Working Party has provided advice.

That's one of the things it does although, you know, at the level of a paper, a, you know, a letter. We've gotten many letters from them over the years unfortunately so we are aware that this is not a guaranteed outcome.

We have been told and - that we've heard reports on the conversations that org has had with them, which seem promising. Again they're not a guarantee, but we also believe that they understand that there are significant potentially negative outcomes from the absence of advice or incomplete or unactionable advice so we're aware of it. We hope that we get actionable, clear advice.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. Jeff Neuman. Just another thing to put out on the table is as a registrar we are dreary or not looking forward to the day when we get 1200 new registry/registrar agreements on our desk because there are - changes have to get flow-through.

So one of the things as registrars we are hoping you help us to consider is how do we deal with reviewing 1200 new registry/registrar agreements and sign them all by the May date?

So if there is a way either through some sort of – either through the Accreditation Agreement if – without wanting to open everything else up in the Accreditation Agreement where we don't have to sign 1200 new registry/registrar agreements – if you guys can think about that that would be helpful.

Becky Burr: So this is a sort of – I think this is not an ICANN thing, but typically what's going on is that people are signing these things called data protection addendums that incorporate model clauses and things like that.

It may well be a very worthwhile undertaking to create a standard form of data protection addendum that either is something that ICANN has something to do with or is just put into place by the parties.

And as the person who has to read all 1200 of them I'm – well I guess I don't have 1200 of them but as a person who would have to read any of the ones I get, I'd be very happy to work with people on a standard form.

Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks. I just wanted to put that on the agenda. Thanks.

Paul Diaz: Sure. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Goran Marby: Well following your questions for GDPR we're adding one extra session. I hope you know about that. And the meaning of that session is that you can ask J.J. because I don't have the answers to any specific questions about the proposed hybrid model.

And I would be there to talk about the process going forward, but I encourage everybody if anyone is interested to come and listen to our grand master and head chef, John Jeffrey.

Paul Diaz: And for the record Goran that's tomorrow morning, yes, 9:30 to 10:30?

Goran Marby: It might be so.

Paul Diaz: It is. Okay. Going to turn over to Graeme for another issue.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Paul. Yes this is Graeme from Tucows and Registrar Stakeholder Group. So I think this was a good discussion that we've had here today and I think we've all gotten some good pieces out of it.

And so this next piece shouldn't be seen as a criticism of what we've done here today, but I think there's sort of a general dissatisfaction amongst the Contracted Party House with how our CPH board meetings go.

They tend to be a little bit of this back and forth and we don't feel like there's a rich enough engagement with everybody around the table. We hear from a few people.



It's a bit of a back and forth and so what I think we want to try and do is explore with the board other alternatives about how we might structure these sessions.

And so I, you know, the world is our oyster on this. I think we could turn it into some sort of social gathering or we can break out into teams to discuss particular issues, or we could make sure that there's considerably more back and forth between the board and the CPH prior to each meeting so that we've got, you know, enough people spun up on enough topics that we can really dig into some stuff and have some richer back and forth.

And so I think the sort of question here for the board is if they – if, I don't know, if you love the current structure of how we do these things and would like to keep it that way, or if you also find that or think that there might be a better way to do this and if you have any ideas on what that might look like.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Graeme and you and I have had a chat about this. Sorry Graeme. You and I have had a – have chatted about this. I think – yes I think at one point I even suggested that we might try a hypothetical where we come up with a hypothetical question such as IGO acronyms and maybe John could be – act as a GAC person and we could get a GAC person in to act as a registrar.

And perhaps that's taking it a little step too far, but I think the answer to your question is we're open to discussion about how we run these sessions completely if you want to.

Part of the issue, however, is that it's important to remember the constraints we have are that we do this with everyone, so it's not that it has to be the same with everyone.

It doesn't but it does have to fit into the schedule, otherwise it won't – it's not workable. So I'm very happy to take on the challenge of chatting to you about it and seeing if we can come up with some alternative suggestions. Jonathan and Cherine want to say something, so Jonathan and then Cherine.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Chris. It's Jonathan for the record. So I have a question. I mean, you – this is a – and I'm not sure this – I think this is not the first time this has come up.

And you clearly meet with a number of different stakeholder groups and constituencies during the day. Does anyone do it better? Is there a session that's particularly productive that has a – at least an improved format or do they all feel pretty similar?

So is there somewhere within the existing ones that we could aspire to at least getting to or are they all pretty similar? So perhaps that - queue Cherine up nicely or I'm not sure if you're going to say something different, but any thoughts on that would also be welcome.

Cherine Chalaby: This format is the same format we use with all constituencies and it is an old format, right. And the only – it has one advantage and a couple of disadvantage.

The advantages of sending the questions ahead of time is that we can get prepared with the answers, but the idea of getting prepared with the answer is not to spend – replying to every question ten minutes.

It is to give a quick answer in order to stimulate the conversation and a dialog between us and that is not happening. We're giving full answers and in some occasion there is a lot of discussions on certain topics.

So that same issue came up in the GNSO Council just a couple of days ago, and one alternative would be to – maybe to have an issue-based type of discussion rather than a question and answer so that everybody's lined up with their question.

Everybody else is lined up with their answers because we go through all of your questions. We prepare well and then we kind of assign the questions to individuals depending on how much their knowledge is of the topic, and then they lead the discussion into that.

So you may – it just happens for example that the questions are around the budget, GDPR and IGO acronyms for example, and you typically have found on this table the people who are going to answer those questions.

Other board members are not on the table just to – so that we don't overwhelm that table with more board members than constituency members. The other thing is that we don't meet often so the relation between us is rather formal.

It just happens three times a year and there isn't a – an ongoing and continuous dialog, and that's another issue to consider whether we ought to have other forms of talking to each other in between these big gaps between one ICANN meeting to another ICANN meeting.

So we're open to ideas. We – not everybody's complaining about that format but certainly from your end we've heard it at the GNSO Council, and we hear

it here that you find it a bit cold and formal and lacks really a proper dialog, which is – which I understand and it's obvious.

So we're open to ideas and let's get our head together and see if we can find a different way of making this much more interesting and...

Graeme Bunton: Great. May I just briefly? Thank you Cherine and, you know, let's endeavor to do that. The only other piece to that I'll add is that it doesn't need to be an either/or.

We could do a both so that there's a meeting a year where we do it this formally and in this way, and then two other meetings a year we – we'd experiment with other stuff so we make sure that this opportunity still exists but there are others as well.

Cherine Chalaby: Well I agree with that so let me ask you to – let me give you a takeaway to think about and see what – see if – come back and talk about it. One thing we could do for example is we could – it – and it depends on whether the rest of the people in this room really just want to sit there and listen to us or would rather be participating, because one thing we could do is we could say, "Right.

Just – what we've got here is we've got a budget question. We've got a reserve fund question. We've got an IGO acronyms question. We're going to have three groups of people around the room and if you're interested in the IGO question go sit there and Chris and a couple of board members will do that, and then on the budget question we'll have Cherine and Xavier and whatever.

I mean, that's just an idea but the point is that would then mean that it's not the – all that information is not being disseminated to everybody. I'm fine

with it but if you guys want to have a think about that and come back and talk happy to consider it.

(Sam): I actually don't think – sorry, (Sam) again. I actually don't think it – that it means that the information can't be disseminated out. We could instead of doing a full transcript have notetakers and do minutes, right. Lots of love for the minutes suggestion.

Chris Disspain: Hey Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes thanks Chris. Donna Austin. I think it's important that if we do anything like this we understand what the purpose is. So I think, you know, John's come to you today.

He's got a question that we think is within the remit of the board so we're looking to you for an answer. So I think that, you know, this is – it's a great idea.

We get 90 minutes twice a year now. Do – because we don't meet during the Meeting B. Yes so 90 minutes twice a year. So I think if we're going to do something like this that we really understand what the purpose of it is and what we want to get out of it.

I've heard Goran say a few times now that ICANN can't make decisions anymore because you need to do it because you're the Empowered Community. So I think we need to understand the relationships and responsibilities better in the issues that we're dealing with.

I think there's a few things that we can, you know, that potentially we can come away with and do something that - out of this meeting and that is, you know, the options paper on the reviews.

I think that's a legitimate thing, that we can come out and maybe we can help engage that community discussion around it. So I think, you know, it's - I know people aren't trying to be flippant but let's understand what the purpose is that we're trying to do and make sure that we can actually, you know, come out with something rather than, "Oh well, another 90 minutes with the board," and we walk away with nothing. Let's try to get something out of it. Thanks.

Cherine Chalaby: Donna just an example. The discussion on IGO acronyms was a good discussion but it had to be curtailed at the end because there are other things and you said, "Let's take it away."

Now if there was a group for almost an hour and a half just on this, you probably would have reached some results or progress the issue further than say, "Okay enough of that because we have other issues." So that would give every topic its full discussion per se.

John Nevitt: Thanks. Thanks Cherine. John Nevitt. I'd like to propose that we do just that in May. You guys have a board workshop in Vancouver. We have our GDD Summit starting on Monday evening - that we use part of Monday afternoon.

Perhaps there's many board members who could stay through Monday - would be great, and there's many of us who could get there earlier during the day on Monday - would be great, and we could break off into separate groups on different topics and have that kind of dialog.

Cherine Chalaby: Agreed.

Chris Disspain: We could do that John.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes. I just – listening all - this is great discussion. If there's a question that just needs an answer I'm not sure that's great for this kind of forum.

Now you can get clarity on that but I think one of the things to consider is topics, and this was kind of mentioned, that you really want to have interaction for I think are much more beneficial if that's – and Donna's right.

What's the objective? If you want interaction a question that just needs an answer doesn't generate much interaction. Those kind of things could be handled offline just as easily even the clarification.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Chuck. Great to see you.

Chuck Gomes: About time.

Paul Diaz: All right. Excellent exchange at the end – especially at the end. We will follow-up and I think we're out of time so we thank everybody.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Paul Diaz: And we'll see you all around and about.

END