

**Transcription ICANN Dublin
Board, GAC, ccNSO meeting prep: GNSO session Saturday 17 October 2015**

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

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct>

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

Jonathan Robinson: Are we ready to start the next session then? Good so let's use – let's get straight on with that. Any concerns or objections with what I've just said about scheduling and organizing these next few sessions? Okay well we'll work through them as quickly as we can.

First session that's due is tomorrow morning at 9:00 am we have our update with Generic Domain Names Division, which is headed by Akram Atallah and will be – the plan is that Cyrus Namazi and Christine Willett, who both work closely Akram in that area, will be here to talk with us.

I think, Marika, they have sent us a schedule for that. Can we have that up on the screen and just – no, I guess just – so okay let me put it another way. Do we need – we probably don't need to discuss anything, right? They have some slides they'd like to walk through. I guess what I'd like to check with this group, is there anything that anyone would specifically like to raise with the GDD? You have the opportunity tomorrow.

We don't necessarily need to rehearse or go through it now. But it's just being aware that there is an opportunity tomorrow. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, Mary just pointed out that Volker actually did include a number of questions that I think came through the different topics that were submitted so we may just send them over to them so they're at least prepared.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, if you could flash those up now that would be helpful if it's possible. I don't know how...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: If you can talk about the board first then we have it up for you in the next round.

Jonathan Robinson: You want me to go – okay, did you not hear what I said about the agenda earlier? And you had your chance to object. I said we'd walk through it in the order that we're going to work through it tomorrow.

Marika Konings: I was out of the room.

Jonathan Robinson: I know but that's why I did it when but your colleagues were keeping a close eye on things I see. All right so look, we can – I think it would be useful to just walk – in that sequence. We can come back to those GDD questions. It's fine. We'll come back to those in a moment.

There's also the prospect of talking with Nora Abusitta. And I seem to remember I gave her that 9:00-10:00 slot. Does anyone – from staff, do you guys remember (unintelligible) 9:00-10:00 as a...

Marika Konings: Yeah, that's correct. I think you – this is Marika. I think you suggested that she could maybe tag along with the GDD team so maybe...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: So I think we have Nora 5-10 minutes just to say hello and just for those of you who are not aware of who Nora is, I'm not completely aware but she is now recently promoted to the main – the senior management team at ICANN, the so called Global Leaders' Group and is working on a number of different strategic initiatives I think it's called. But one of which is some work on global public interests. And so that's really our interest in talking with her.

But so Marika, Mary or Lars, whoever is communicating with Nora, I think what would be useful is just to let her know that we're – she can give us a very brief introduction to who she is and the scope of her work so we know what she's doing and then in particular touch on the public interest point. So we know who she is, what she does and what she's planning on doing with respect to public interest. At least we have that little interchange. And thanks. Sorry for putting you on the spot but that's great. Now we've got – so this is GDD.

So here are some questions that are previously posed on the Council list from Avri, Carlos, Phil and Phil. So these are some of the points that we can get them to touch on in addition to what has been – what they prepared.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: No so conditional on this discussion, these will get sent across. So if anyone's got any significant reservations about these make that be known. If you haven't these will be communicated to them as topics they can touch on in addition to anything else that's covered. Phil, did you want to speak?

Phil Corwin: Only one of these issues is one I was – I was just wondering who the other Phil is.

Jonathan Robinson: I don't know how – so which is the one that you would like to be attributed to you and...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: Oh the one about, you know, the reconsideration request on using new TLD RPMs as a starting point for renewal agreements. But I don't remember bringing up enforcement guidance 20...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Fine so let's, A, strike your name from against those two items. And, B, consider striking...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: And dotAfrica, I don't – I've never spoken on dotAfrica.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so unless anyone is seeking to hold those in there – those bottom two are going to be struck off.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Not so much who originated the topics but the topic regarding the undue interference in dotAfrica is also something that was suggested as possibly being suited more to the board. So when we come to the board slide you see this topic repeated as well. So one thing you might want to consider is whether you want to drop this topic altogether or whether you want to address it to the board rather than the GDD or the other way around.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, okay so well I think for now it appears we strike those bottom two bullets off this list and send the top three across the GDD unless there is any other input or comment on that.

Phil Corwin: And I also just noticed below on the GAC it has the name of a Phil next to the bullet point, future role of governments within ICANN based on governmental responses submitted for July Paris meeting. I don't...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so let's come to that in a moment.

Phil Corwin: I don't recall bringing that one up either so I just don't know the name Phil got put in paren next to all of these.

Jonathan Robinson: I cannot explain that and since Volker is absent from the room and is partially responsible...

Phil Corwin: I'd like to know who that other Phil is who's been bringing all these issues up.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Okay so, Mary, we're clear, right, the top three and we'll work with those. All right, let's move on then to the meeting with Theresa which comes up next. So just to be clear, in case I've lost anyone, I'm looking through tomorrow's schedule, tomorrow's – the order in which tomorrow's meetings take place and just making sure we've dealt with those in sequence and so we can tick them off and say we're satisfactorily prepared for each meeting.

I feel we are for the GDD update now. With Theresa I think she has proposed some top – Mary.

Mary Wong: Actually I was going to go through Volker's list so maybe I'll go after you.

Jonathan Robinson: Volker's list – Volker's list for which group?

Mary Wong: For Theresa.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. So – but has she not come to us with some topics in addition? So all right either way around, let's – if we can bring those up then that would be great.

Marika Konings: Yeah, we don't have those on a slide yet but the topics that she sent were the new AOC and organizational review schedule, generally the launch the competition, consumer choice and trust review team and the IANA stewardship transition. So I don't know if that aligns with what Volker has sent or whether we need to add something to it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Mary go ahead.

Mary Wong: To some extent that last point on the IANA stewardship transition from Volker's list apparently Carlos had asked a more specific question which is whether there has been any insights on the views of other governments on the stewardship transition. So there is a linkage there with regard to Theresa's last topic.

Then the other two topics that were suggested by other councilors include one from Donna who had suggested that she give us some sense of how they're managing all the work going on on the various efforts on Whois. And the third and last topic that was suggested by councilors is again something that I think has been suggested by Rubens most recently as maybe something to ask the board. And this is the impact of the Court of Justice of the European Union's recent ruling on the safe harbor arrangement of the United States. And that was from Avri.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so let's just say a couple of things here. Why – okay so first of all, I mean, I think the reason we attribute these to someone is because we'll be expecting that councilor to raise that question, that specific question in the relevant meeting so just to be clear on that.

If you're comfortable doing that and you still would stick to asking that, great. If you're not or someone else has reservations about raising that we've just – we're going to raise the European Court of Justice ruling and data transfer with

the GDD. I'm not sure why we would need to raise it with Theresa immediately afterwards. I think so is what I'm saying.

So can – Marika.

Marika Konings: I saw – this is Marika. I thought it was a topic for the board, not for GDD or maybe I missed that as well...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so let's just be clear. We are walking through the sequence of meetings that we're having tomorrow. The first meeting we are having is with the GDD. We've talked about what we're going to talk about with the GDD with and we closed that. We're now onto the meeting with Theresa. And so the suggestion that - so that's all we're talking about is meeting with Theresa.

Marika Konings: No, no correct, that you just said that the safe harbor was the topic for GDD but I thought it was as well something to be asked to the board.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, but we're talking about Theresa now.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: That should be also added then to the GDD questions.

Jonathan Robinson: It up here in front of us for the GDD now. And we're expecting to talk to the GDD about it.

Marika Konings: All right.

Jonathan Robinson: So with the GDD we're going to talk about those top three bullet points in addition to what's on their presentation. With Theresa we're going to talk about her presentation and whatever other bullet points. So are we clear? Okay good. Right, so can we just recap what the topics for Theresa are in addition to whatever is on her slide?

Marika Konings: So it's the new AOC and organizational review schedule, generally the launch of the competition, consumer choice and trust review team and IANA stewardship transition and then the management of the various Whois efforts, and then the specific question on any insights on views of other governments in relation to the transition.

Jonathan Robinson: Which is Donna's question, right?

Marika Konings: No, the last one the government one is Carlos. The Whois efforts is Donna.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so those are the two. So one from Donna, one from Carlos. You guys are clear on that. And so maybe what would be helpful, Marika, as if we circulate those to the Council, I mean, say, you know, agenda items with the GDD, agenda items with Theresa so that everyone is clear who is attributed and we can just go into those meetings with that in mind. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes, just one comment. I mean, I originally included the names not to but those people on the spot just to have a reminder for us here to voice those concerns first. And of course it would be helpful if those people that proposed a topic could address them but if they don't want to we should not force them to but also keep this is a topic of the Council. In the end everything that was proposed should be a topic of the Council, not the topic of those who propose it.

Jonathan Robinson: Look, I agree, that's fair enough. But nevertheless we need someone to raise otherwise it'll end up being chair raising all of the questions. So, you know, if someone says look we can accommodate that of course. But for the moment I think the default assumption has got to be that the person who raised it raised it in that meeting. It doesn't have to be personally attributed to them but I take your point. So please say if you're not comfortable with raising a point against which your name is set but you still want it to be raised let's talk about that.

Okay Phil.

Phil Corwin: Again of all -- unless there's another Phil that I don't know about the only topic I suggested that I want to raise tomorrow from this list is the one about continued use of new TLD Registry and the starting point for renewal of legacy TLDs.

((Crosstalk))

Phil Corwin: I'm not saying the others shouldn't be on but I don't remember raising them and are not prepared to speak to them.

Jonathan Robinson: No, Phil, to be clear...

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's just be clear. The GDD, which we have closed...

Phil Corwin: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: ...we're going to deal with those top three bullets, the other two are struck. They are not happening. So your name...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...the bullets don't exist and your name doesn't exist next to them. With GAC we're going to come to that later in another...

Phil Corwin: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: ...we're coming to that in sequence.

Phil Corwin: Got it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so we're done with Theresa. Is everyone clear what and we are happy with the meeting with Theresa? All right next up is our meeting with Fadi. So by now we've dealt with the GDD and Nora who will be in that 9:00-10:00 session with the GDD and we've dealt with Theresa. And the next meeting is with Fadi. So we have an open agenda as to what we talk with Fadi. We have not given him - and I missing something? You just look like you were wanting to say something. Are we okay? Are we good?

Okay great so the next meeting is with Fadi. Have we got any suggestions so far as to what we should be talking about with Fadi? Bret, go ahead.

Bret Fausett: I don't know if we have any but if you're asking for some, you know, he's at the end here. I would be very interested in hearing him talk about the greatest challenges that he thinks his successor faces, and particularly here I'm talking about operationally, take away, IANA transition and accountability and those big picture things.

By just looking at it as sort of the CEO of an organization what are the top challenges that his successor is going to have to address when that person is seated.

Jonathan Robinson: Seems like a reasonable question. Go ahead Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Jonathan. There's an email that just come around in the CCWG that apparently Fadi is making some rather personal statements right at this moment about transition, his own views on transition. And if he's willing to state those in that forum could be interesting to hear them here.

Jonathan Robinson: So just to give some insight, that was my intention was to perhaps – I mean, look, it's no secret that Fadi has been it appears almost 100% of his time if not 100% of his time virtually focused on the successful outcome of the transition.

He's personally got involved in preparing and attempting to sort of encapsulate the work of the CCWG recently, the work on the accountability group, and prepared a PDF presentation which tried to summarize and capture the key issues and drill down.

I'm not sure how timely that is and whether the last 48 hours at events have even moved beyond that because the CCWG is working in parallel with that work. But nevertheless that was my idea coming into this notwithstanding Bret's suggestion which I think could be dovetailed in with that quite easily. It could be married in with that quite easily.

But I was wondering whether we shouldn't ask him for that kind of input. And I think he would -- seems to me that he should be able to do that relatively easily. Heather respond.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Jonathan. Heather Forrest. If he's willing to do it to the CCWG I would have assumed, let's say, but that's a clear signal he be willing to talk openly here. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or points on this? Bret.

Bret Fausett: I mean, I think he would be willing to talk about it and I think if you got him talking about it that he would only talk about it. So I feel like we're going to hear a lot from Fadi over the next week about those issues. And I wonder whether we could use our time with him to talk about something that we're not going to hear at any other time.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a really, I mean, I get that and I think it's a good point. We could do it the other way around if you wanted to guarantee that the issue had that air time. I guess I've had the benefit of getting some exposure through so-called SO AC leaders conference calls and various things. And he presents a very impassioned position as to the political and other context behind the transition,

what he is views are on what may – and so from my point of view I think it's not a bad idea that others get to hear that.

But you're right, if the view is that we've heard enough of that I could equally understand that. So let's think about that. Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you. Stephanie for the record. I may be in the minority but I'm a little bit transitioned out. I'd rather hear what Fadi had to say to the question, "If you were going to fix three things in the multistakeholder model at ICANN what would they be?" Because I think that goes beyond this whole transition thing.

Jonathan Robinson: It's reasonably well connected to Bret's point I would think. Yeah. Tony.

Tony Holmes: Thanks Jonathan. Certainly I agree with you that Fadi is really focused on one issue. And having also shared some of those SO AC conferences with him I think it would be beneficial for everyone to hear where he's coming from. We also had quite an impassioned plea from him last night. And it actually are most impacted something that Stephanie brought up because he was actually raising the point there that he saw that as a major threat to the multistakeholder model.

So if you ask him what the three things are that he would look to fix I think we'll get on to that anyway. But I don't think we're going to get a complete answer or a complete focus on many other issues. And if we haven't really got something substantial to raise with him I would suggest that accountability is a pretty good time to have that discussion before we get into the later discussions this week.

Jonathan Robinson: Just to add one thought on that. It depends how much this is going to take place - when and if we go into our - Tuesday when we go into our stakeholder group and constituency meetings. If, I mean, the question I would ask you is do you think hearing from Fadi in this kind of environment will better prepare you for any discussion that's going to take place in the stakeholder group and

constituency meetings? That's the value in it. If it's going to in some way prepare the community other than what you'll get on Monday, for example, or at any other time, Monday morning's open session or later. John.

John Berard: I think rightly we've been thinking about asking Fadi questions because he is leaving the role of CEO. And so we naturally think of questions that he might be more willing to answer now than he would have been still in the post.

He's also leaving the board. And we've heard this morning I think we've heard a need for better communication, better ability to work with the board. So I would suggest that we ask him, as he's leaving the board, how can the community better influence, better advocate, better cooperate, collaborate with the board. Because that would be a, I think a different angle or perspective for him.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay just two quick comments. One, we're due to meet with the board immediately afterwards so that's – I understand the subtlety in your point, it's not the board, that we're talking with someone who's leaving the board. But second, Fadi is here until the next ICANN meeting, right, his last – this is not his last ICANN meeting so just...

John Berard: I don't expect to see him working on much else besides the transition until he stops working at ICANN. So I mean, he effectively is, I mean, I assume mentally – I haven't spoken to him in a couple of months but, I mean, I think he's probably gone through this departure checklist already and would probably be in a position to answer a question like that.

Jonathan Robinson: Perhaps, but just to play devil's advocate, you might get a more – a different answer in Morocco. I'm just, you know, think about that whether, you know, there's three months still to go. Any other points or questions or discussion items?

So I think we, I mean, certainly as a courtesy we absolutely owe it to him to feed these things back. I mean, I think there's a question here as to Stephanie's point about fixing three things – any three things, three things within the multistakeholder model. There is Bret's point which is – which was really in some ways focused on I think, Bret, challenges in operations for a successor which is interesting because actually at one point Fadi spoke to me and said he felt the job broke down into operations, community and sort of the more global politics stuff.

And from – I imagine from a contracted party's house point of view where you come from operations is what you want to know about. So – and then a subtle variation of that is John's well – a variation is also any thoughts on departure from the board about how the community might interact more effectively with the board.

Perhaps we should offer him these three and let him pick up on any of those and offer any thoughts on the transition. So, I mean, we've got – how long have we got? We've got 45 minutes, I mean, those could be, I mean, I suspect he could deal with any one of those for the full 45 but, you know, can I just get a sense on the transition? Do we want to hear from Fadi on the transition or not? No?

Okay so let's – so those are the three questions then. Just to be clear. Really looking at what fixes or improvements – Mary, Marika, am I with you? Okay. So what fixes or improvements or changes might be made to the multistakeholder model, what are the three fixes, if you like.

What challenges does he see his successor facing in terms of enhanced or improved operations? And given the recent experiences how might – and his impending departure from the board, what are his thoughts for us as to being more effective and for the board in terms of being more effective in interacting – interactions between the community and the board. Have I captured those sufficiently?

Marika, are you comfortable transmitting those or, yeah, okay great. Thank you. Is that going to fill – we're happy with the time we're getting the best value out of it, we've got our three topics, we're going, going gone with – Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, Avri speaking. I'd actually – before we ask him how he would fix the multistakeholder process I'd like to figure out whether he managed to understand it. And so I'd actually like to hear what he thought it was. Now because he came in here, obviously, not knowing what it was at all. He spent three years, he told us, learning it, you know, to the point where he's got it. So perhaps having him explain to us what it is he learned and then perhaps telling us what he'd fix. But to have him tell us what he fixes when I personally don't know what he thinks of it or whether he truly understands it, you know, I don't know.

Jonathan Robinson: No that's a really good point because in a sense this is – if you were to think what's the successor got to know? The successor ideally gets up to speed faster on the multistakeholder model than someone coming in from scratch or indeed comes from, in some way within the community. So actually that's not a bad precursor to the fixes. It's, you know, describe, you know, give some thoughts on the mechanics and operations and status of the multistakeholder model and talk about say three things you would like to see – you know, how it might be better run or fixed for once.

Volker.

Volker Greimann: Yes, maybe fix is not the right word because if we say fix – and ask him what he would do to fix ICANN then we are presuming that it's broken and needs fixing. I think therefore Avri's question is quite right here in this position. What is the multistakeholder process to him? What has he learned? What could be improved? What is not working right in this – from his view as a recent outsider. Maybe that would be the better way to address this concern.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so I mean, Mary, just to help you and Marika, if I was constructing the sort of multistakeholder model and then three or four bullets, you know, description of current status, thoughts and, you know, how – key lessons learned, fixes and so on. Okay. Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Hi, this is Marilia. Just to complement, I like the way that Avri reframed the question. But just to complement I think that something that differentiates Fadi maybe from other CEOs and I'd say – think that this is a strong point with regards to him is that he has circulated around, he did not stay here. He knows other communities. He has gone to the IGF. He has gone to multistakeholder spaces elsewhere. He has seen how the UN works sort of. So the guy has walked around.

So maybe to compare what we have here and what are the strengths of this model if compared to other multistakeholders or spaces that call themselves multistakeholder would be interesting considering the knowledge that he has acquired.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay did someone else – was James or someone had a hand up? James.

James Bladel: Yeah it sounds like if we're starting to construct an ad hoc exit interview here so I would like to tack on my two questions which is maybe a little bit more positive which are how has this experience changed him? And what will he miss five years on from this – you know, I think we can always focus on the negatives and the gaps and the deficiencies but I think that it would be interesting as someone is leaving to hear an honest and candid assessment of, you know, the strengths of the community.

Jonathan Robinson: So I would – James, I'd be tempted to push back on that again because as you say – I'm not sure we are conducting an ad hoc exit interview here. And so I think we've got some specific points and I wouldn't want to, I mean, we started off relatively tight, we had two or three points and maybe we should

remind ourselves what those are because otherwise we will end up with four or five or six.

James Bladel: Can I then ask that the list that we've constructed so far that we take everything and then view it through the lens of what did we expect in terms of a delta between now and Morocco which will be his, you know, his curtain call.

Jonathan Robinson: You see I guess where I'm coming from is I think we've got another opportunity - we've got another bite at this cherry. You can talk again in some ways in Morocco, you know, he's there at the Morocco meeting. It's his last meeting. And so in terms of the exit interview that's perhaps the opportunity to...

James Bladel: Right. So what can we take of the list that we've constructed so far and just to get to March?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I see well, Mary can you tell me what you've got so far I will be helpful before we go on to Phil who's next.

Mary Wong: So we've put them into a couple of categories. The first category is more operational and the question there was what challenges in operations will the new CEO face? What challenges in terms of improved operations and enhance operations?

The second category is about multistakeholderism and there's a series of questions. One is what does the multistakeholder model mean to you? Second, what lessons have you learned about ICANN as compared to other multistakeholder environments? And last but not least, what are three things you would do to improve the model?

Then the third category is about relationships with the community and the question there is given your recent experiences and your forthcoming

departure how can the community better communicate and collaborate with the board? And then we had James's questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah so I think that – in my mind that captures very well. The only thing I would say is departure from the board because it's very specifically that final one is a board related question because there's been a perceived, you know, form of some form of fracture in and around the work of the CCWG and the community and the board. Its insights into how community and Board could work more effectively together. James and then I've got Phil. I mean, does that cover - does it feel like we've got a package there. And the question is that's the way I kind of think of it is like here are three things, and I'm not sure we want to go beyond...

James Bladel: It still feels like we're sliding into the...

Jonathan Robinson: So you'd like to remove something rather than add.

James Bladel: I guess I would like to understand can be tighten it up or is this, you know, open season...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Either one is fine I just want to know where we're going with it.

Jonathan Robinson: So let Phil speak and then...

Phil Corwin: Yeah, my thought, and it's not an exit interview question is based on what he's learned about this organization and being in CEO and where we are right now with the transition and looking forward to a different, somewhat different type of organization whether he has shared thoughts with the board and if he has could share with us on what the best background skill set would be for the next CEO.

Jonathan Robinson: Carlos.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: This is Carlos for the record. I tend to support James position. Last time he spoke about that to us in the last meeting he made some comments that maybe you didn't take them the way I took them but saying that the SOs and ACs were tribes was terrible. I thought it was terrible. And he said it to us, he was not aware that he was dealing with tribes and so on. So I really think the operational is good and the relationship to the board is good but the middle one he could really speak 45 minutes about that and this is the least interesting. I really don't expect a lot of him in terms of the tribes of the multistakeholder model. So I really support James's idea to try to cut it a little bit short.

I think it's very interesting for us. I think the way Avri has put it or Marilia has put it is very important for us but I don't expect a lot from him after last meeting's comments. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so there's the question of sequence and priority here then I guess it's really we could put the multistakeholder one at the third point and see if - but let's focus on the other two first. So it's really - it sounds to me like successor challenges in and around - what challenges does the successor face then followed by lessons to be learned in terms of board and community interaction and third then questioned in and around multistakeholder model. Okay.

Mary, do you need anything more from us or are you okay with what you've got? Okay good. Thank you. All right thanks everyone. So we won't be discussing the transition unless it comes up by other means.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: It will come up.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. All right and actually to my mind the transition is no longer the issue it's really the accountability, right, that's really what it's about. That's the current, you know, the transition will be what it is. It's really a question of whether the accountability issues that are being worked on can be dealt with properly.

Okay so that deals with that, we have an update from Thomas on the transition so that's the next session in any event on the CCWG on Accountability. Does anyone know, Marika or Glen or Mary, do you know if we are still due to hear from Thomas on that one?

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: No for tomorrow is he coming in?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yeah, yeah, I think for tomorrow, yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so we're on schedule for that. And so next item up is then the interview with the GNSO chair candidates. I sent something across to them. For that slot we have half an hour, given that it's around lunchtime it could probably extend slightly into lunch. But of that half-hour and so I just like to let you know that the structure I suggested to them and make sure that that's - them being Heather and James respectively from non-contracted parties house and contracted parties house.

And I essentially suggested that we have a structure which would be an introduction to their candidate statements. I would expect that something like five minutes per person. And then a series of questions from either Council or GNSO in general. And ideally each of those questions is asked to both so both have an opportunity to respond to the same question.

I guess it's conceivable that there are specific questions for specific candidates. But on the whole I think it's more balanced if the questions are asked to both candidates and both candidates have the opportunity to make their same reply. So as a matter of guide while questions to individual candidates probably shouldn't be forgiven as such it's more balanced if the same question is asked.

And then probably some kind of wrap up. So that was kind of -- that was how I imagined the session. Introduction, you've see my candidate statement, here are some points I'd like to make with respect to it, Q&A followed by some closing remarks from each candidate and probably in reverse order so that if Heather goes first followed by James the wrap-ups go in the alternate way, James first and then Heather.

Any questions or comments, including from James and Heather, about that structure or that format? James.

James Bladel: Yeah, thanks for sending that around. I think it's fine. One thought would be because there are so many other things going on tomorrow if we could send an explicit invite to the incoming councilors that are currently here and probably hadn't otherwise planned on being in the GNSO working session, making sure they're aware of that and have an opportunity to throw rocks at us like everybody else.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Glen has been very good about making sure - I think many if not all of them are coming tonight. I don't know. But, Glen, if you wouldn't mind sending that invitation saying to them, look, there's the slot where we're going to be interviewing prospective chair candidates and, you know, you're very welcome. In fact we encourage you to be there and so we get the message out that would be great. Thank you.

James Bladel: Good. All right, any other comments or questions on that format and the structure of that session? Okay great. Well, I mean, I'm sure we're all very much looking forward to that.

We have an update from the ICG. We have our meeting with the board next. And so I don't know if, Mary, if you are in a position to bring up the topics that we have now. Okay so here are topics that have either come up -- is that the full list of them from the course of today or is there -- and what was on list?

Okay so the question is, looking over this list we've got, I mean, I realize these are sort of shorthand at this stage. It'll need some refining so we prepare them carefully about how they stand. So Bret, your hand is up first.

Bret Fausett: I do think we need the bullet points on CEO search. So we didn't have that today so I'd like to have an update on that. I might add an asterisk to that and also say, you know, update on CEO search and transition plan. Just I'd like to have someone thinking about what's going to happen when the new CEO takes his or her position. I mean, I'll note the importance because to me it seems like every new CEO that ICANN has ever had has felt like he had to come in and remake the organization.

And we've remade the organization too many times. And I want the board to hear that. I'll say it if I need to. And I think we've got too much on the go right now to re-create the operational structure and the staffing structure of ICANN. So I'm hoping that they're giving some thought to that as they're searching for new CEO.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah so, Mary, to create this list I would be thinking about - I think it would be -- it's useful, I mean, the way I like to think about these things it's probably useful to have them in some kind of order. Actually I don't think especially having just finished with Fadi and having some of those kind of reflective thoughts and it's not a bad thing to go into what the board the new CEO, it seems like a natural sort of segue.

So I would put transition to new CEO, so we want first bullet, updates on CEO search. Second, effective management of the transition. Is there anything else that we want to know from the board? But certainly those two seem like too sensible bullets to work with there. And we cannot do those if necessary but that seems like a good start.

Whose hands have I got up? I've got David waiting to speak.

David Cake: We did - one thing we discussed earlier today was definitely the question of workload but not just workload also the board's role in that, you know, that we have board initiated -- some of that work was board initiated PDPs and things, is that something that we should also put in this list of topics? I mean, not just specifically the general issue of workload because I think they're well aware of that but do they, you know, the board role in initiating PDPs and things and their role in helping - do they think they should be slowing down or increasing their workload?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so as far as I know the board initiated PDP on Whois or next-generation data services is the first board initiated PDP. So, Marika, I but you said there was another one, right, that was...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...BPA, yeah. Okay so but - so let's - maybe this is - the topic here is - we did want to talk to the board about the board initiated PDP is it RDDS? What does RDDS stand for? Remind me.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Registration okay so all right good. So board initiated PDP on RDDS. And then the various questions under that including expectation on timing. So Mary, if you're comfortable doing that I think the structure certainly feels like a Main bullet with a series of subsequent points underneath it. Is that okay?

Mary Wong: So you mean on the Whois point?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Mary Wong: Is the order of the questions right now okay?

Jonathan Robinson: The order of the questions is CEO so far and then, I mean, it's CEO followed by -- well we can reorder - we can check the order afterwards but right now it's CEO followed by RDDS.

Mary Wong: Right exactly.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Michele.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon for transcripts. Just if you're going to be talking to the board and CEO about workload, which I believe is what you're trying to do. I mean, you're not. Why are you shaking your head at me like that?

Jonathan Robinson: That's not the topic, we could talk about that although David referenced that. Essentially the issue here is that there is a board initiated PDP and there's a number of questions that relate to it including the board's expectation on timing. And the reason we want to know their expectation on timing is related to workload. If that were not specifically talking about workload.

Michele Neylon: Okay so I did actually understand you correctly. My immediate thing was workload. Because the way the board and the CEO are approaching the community around the IANA transition and in the rollup to this meeting has been hey everybody, drop everything and focus on IANA. But that is completely incompatible with let's kick off more PDPs, let's keep pushing on timelines for existing PDPs, let's initiate more work.

I mean the two are incompatible. I mean if you look around the room I'm trying to see, is there anybody in hearing to recognize? And there probably isn't. And if you look across the workgroups and you look at the people who are going to end up trying to do this work it's essentially the same people. And there's no way that people can be actively engaged which is what Fadi and others are asking us to do around the accountability track and start asking hard questions around that when we're swamped with an ever increasing list of different things.

Anything involving Whois - and somebody really needs to turn around to the board and to say, guys, this is futile. You know, Whois related topics have been eating up millions of dollars, hundreds if not -- well actually it is thousands of man-hours for years. Some of this stuff just needs to be put on hold and put on pause. But there's no way you can do all at the same time. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Michele. Responses or follow-ups. I've got David. Who else is wanting to speak? Anyone else going to speak? David.

David Cake: Yeah, I mean I think I was trying to get a more specific question to the board rather than about specifically involving their role. I think it is also worth saying. I mean, it's become very clear today that this is, to me at least that next year is looking like one of the busiest policy years I've seen in my time that ICANN.

We've got not just the RDDS, we've got potentially reviews of rights protection mechanisms, we've got, you know, including they UDRP which, you know, and we've got other new TLD stuff, we've got, you know, and plus implementing - while we're implementing a review and, you know, it really is looking like an astonishingly heavy load largely carried by, you know, the same people as you put it.

So I guess we should really be flagging back to the board as well just I don't know what their answer is going to be other than, you know. But on top of that the board is also getting us with, I mean, the global public interest and a few other things which are going to be adding to that load. So I think it's two questions. One just letting the board now that we have a huge amount of work and we're really strapped to deal with it and then questioning the specific ways in which the board is handing us even more work at the same time and how they are going to respond to that.

Jonathan Robinson: Just a question, is the board handing us lots of work? I mean I don't question the fact that there is a huge demand. I'm just wondering where this conversation is going to go, I mean, it has to have -- what's the purpose of the

conversation? The board is going to say well, I mean, I think we're at a very specific point here what leeway have we got in terms of timing with work on RDDS?

And what are the thoughts of there? So there's a real conversation to be had. And sure it can expand out into workload which is relevant and important because it's critical. Just we need to know what we are expecting to get out of it, otherwise if we're not careful it just - they'll say sure, we understand it's been busy. But it's a question of how we get back into some kind of productive dialogue on any particular point.

Donna, did you want to come in on this or?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jonathan. Donna Austin. I thought this workload issue was being discussed through the SO AC leadership with Fadi. And I thought there had been a number of conversations around that which never seem to go anywhere because he gets taken over by something else. So I think it's a prioritization of workload issue that that's been floating around for a good 12 months, two years, three years. I think it's been a constant source of frustration.

Jonathan Robinson: I can speak to that a little. There has been some structured work that's been done on that to try and deal with it across the SO ACs. That work has taken place in or around the last two or possibly three meetings and it's been going on in the background to try and get some kind of cross community view of the workload.

But sort of irony is that this meeting it was pulled from the agenda, the meeting that normally deals with that to create space for the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability. So it's sort of all roads lead to Rome and away in that I think there's probably -- we would be busy enough without the overlay of the transition and that's just sort of steadily but surely swamped everything else.

And so I guess whilst it is saying something that everyone knows already it's no bad thing to make it clear that what has become apparent through the course of the weekend discussions is that actually many things, including this board initiated PDP, are proving particularly challenging at the moment. And this happens to be a massive amount of work and issues.

So I've got Stephanie and then Bret.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. Obviously this topic has come up with umpteen times but particularly in the context of accountability, who is actually accountable for the overburdening of the volunteers? Because, you know, this whole burnout thing comes up. I mean, I would hold the CEO accountable for the burnout of the staff because it's up to the CEO to say no and limit and protect his creatures. Whose job is it to make sure that we don't take on more work than a group of volunteers could possibly take on?

Jonathan Robinson: Well there's a related point and that's the extent to which ICANN has increased asked resources, not necessarily on the policy side actually but increased generally resourcing and whether or not that's been matched by increased to enhance community resources. Bret.

Bret Fausett: Yeah, I was going to make a comment about workload but I was going to save it for the open and substantial part of the agenda, but it seems like we're here now so I might as well say it. I think we're working in the wrong way and I think things are taking so much time because we're giving them so much time. And I wonder whether we might complete our work more quickly by, you know, taking a hard issue like subsequent rounds or the RDDS and saying we're going to get everyone together for two weeks and they're going to work on nothing but this and at the end of that we will be 90% done.

We will put out for public comment and we'll be done. I mean, or you could ask me and you could say I need a dedicated employee, it's easier for me to give you a dedicated employee for two weeks straight then to give you two hours of

someone's time every other week for three years. You know, I'd rather just say okay you go, you do this work, get it done and then come back and get on with your regular business.

Now I know that two weeks is going to be harder for the non-contracted party side of the house. I mean, we've got employees that we can give to things. But, you know, maybe the non-contracted parties have to figure out a way of maybe ICANN funding them or, you know, everyone, you know, deciding there's going to be one issue or you take one for the team and you go do you two weeks.

But I think if we sort of change the way we're working and give more focus time to things our work will take less time. Just a thought. This is my last Council meeting so I will try to give you the benefit of all my exit interview questions right here.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I really would quite like to call this to order. This is really a good important topic and you're right, that's an innovative suggestion. But let's sort out what we're doing with the board and then if we do want to talk about workload and related point. I mean this is really what to do with workload do we want to discuss with the board, I would say, I mean, if anything.

And we really need to get between three and five topics that are constructive and valuable use of the time with the board sorted out. We've got the CEO related one, Carlos, we've got the CEO related work and we've got the RDDS PDP and, you know, the board's expectations given the workload which are a source of broader concern for this group. What else? There's a couple of other things.

And so I'm suggesting we come back to workload as you intimated, Bret, if we need to in the follow-on session. Yeah, so let's capture that queue.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, yeah sure. Sorry. These items up here. So, I mean, can we just clear off a couple of these? It gets a little confusing having these. Any action items - avoidance of impression of undue interference from IRP decision (unintelligible). Who if anyone's is this point or can it be struck? No one standing behind that point so can we...

Phil Corwin: Since originally not recognized and Volker had reminded me that I sent an email in August conveying this as a suggestion for a member of the BC. But it's not a issue with which I have any familiarity or ability to speak. So far as the next one, guidance on the enforcement of the 2013 RAA, that's probably - I don't know if that's the right one for the board or for Allan Grogan. But again it's not one that I personally have enough familiarity with to lead a discussion on it.

Jonathan Robinson: So unless somebody advocate strongly for these, Marika, and we just delete these off the slide right now so that – if possible. Okay. We've dealt with CEO search, we've dealt with Whois. I think there's a question on recent – so I would say recent correspondence between the board and the GNSO and then it's really to separate out the subjects which is the GAC communiqué, the new meeting strategy, and then responses from the board relating to recent communication and then it's - so that's fine, we can deal with those.

CCWG on new gTLD auction proceeds. I guess this is a question that we might get a short answer on this. I would be very -- I wouldn't be surprised if the board simply said we will look at it with due care and attention when and if it comes to us. So if you prepared for that sort of answer. Does anyone think that they can get more juice out of that at this stage? It's very early in the process. But we could ask the question anyway.

Man: (Unintelligible). In the Netherlands and in the UK and in Sweden we've seen the registries setting up funds to spend such public money, which is a similar problem as what ICANN is facing. So perhaps we can make the question more specific to the board and ask them are you thinking about setting up a similar

fund to give a kick starter? And also my question to the GNSO is do we have a position on what should happen with the money other than of course saying well let's give it to the registrars because we know that's not going to happen. But, you know, do we have a position?

Jonathan Robinson: Question. And we had an update on this this morning so essentially in a nutshell we initiated something, say we would do the work, we would figure out together with others in the community what we would do and included as part of the preparation for that work. We had inputs from the Netherlands, from the UK and so one as to what those registries have done because we saw the connection.

And essentially what this question is really saying is when the community has done all that work and we provide that wonderful piece of well-thought-out work what will the board do? Will the board say, wonderful, thanks very much, we will take those recommendations on board. Or will the board say thanks very much, nice piece of work. But we've got our an idea. And that's really what this question is trying to tease out in a sense. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. We did discuss this earlier and we are still in this phase where we're trying to figure out the process on this and not really the substantive issues of who is going to do what with the money. If I was on the board and I got this question I think my response would be well, there's an open public comment period, we're going to wait until it closes and then we're going to review all the comments, then we're going to figure this out.

So I think this question may be a little premature right now. I think we should wait to see - we should all submit comments to the public comment forum. We should wait and see what all these comments will be and sort of figure out what the process is first. If at that point the answer to this question is not clear then yes as a council we can ask them this question at a later date. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Can anyone speak whether they'd like to hold on to this question, whether this question should remain or whether we're going to strike this at this stage or whether it is indeed premature and we're not going to get much out of it. Anyone opposed to striking this question? Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Marilia speaking. I do see Amr's points. And maybe it's a bit premature. That's why I asked the question, do we envision an alternative model that is not the CCWG? If we do then maybe it is premature and we discuss – if we threw the idea of doing a GNSO working group instead of a cross community effort. But it seems that it's – we have heard that the role that the time has passed to think about it.

And if we do have a CWG then the earliest that we have their commitments that they are going to take that into account as an outcome that they are kind of politically bound to, I mean, I think it would be useful to have that position from them as early as possible. So I think it's a useful question.

Jonathan Robinson: Volker. Is anyone else waiting to speak? Volker, go ahead.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Volker Greimann speaking for the record. Maybe we can just take a different tack on this and ask them if the board has considered participating in the CCWG, i.e. contributing their input in advance rather at the end of the – the end of the deliberations. That way we would avoid a situation that the accountability track has run into where a lot of work and a lot of legal expertise and advice has gone into review process and once the solution has been presented then the board says, yeah, no. If we have that input at the beginning rather at the end then a lot of fruitless effort could be avoided.

Jonathan Robinson: Actually that's a really good point if I understood. I was multitasking there a little bit. But I just – I do wonder whether there is – given the experience with the CCWG and the early engagement of the board – now the board has been early engaged. To be fair, the board has been engaged early on in this. I mean,

Steve has been – Steve was at the workshop we held with the various country code registries and so on.

But we could say – I think one thing we might want to say – and this kind of links into it. We could say, you know, if – because this links into the question with Fadi about the board, you know, the relationship between the community and the board and how that might be better improved.

And we could even say, you know, given the recent experience of – with board's grappling with their involvement with the CCWG how are they feeling about their involvement with the auction proceeds? And how do they feel they might deal with the outcome of any proposed community work? So it's more kind of conversational, more engaging and getting them to talk about how they feel. Are they – because I have a feeling Steve might say actually it's been great. I've been involved. I've been talking to Jonathan. I've been at the workshops. You know, I know and actually we're feeling quite confident in your work on this one. And we've appreciated the early engagement.

So that might be a better way of framing it. And we'll get the same question asked in perhaps a more conversational style. So, Mary and Marika, if it's okay with you what I think we'll do is just maybe get in a huddle for five minutes and make sure we frame these. But, I mean, I'm sure you've got the essence of it but we'll just work together and quickly put a quick polish on those.

Is there anything else we should be raising with the board? I think what we will do is we will do as I suggested is I'll get together with Mary and Marika after this regardless of what else we have. I'll polish it off – polish it up with them. And we will then transmit that to the board and to the Council. And we may even ask for people to represent specific questions or points. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah thanks, Jonathan. This is Amr. I do have a question for the board. And I think it's a good idea to take the opportunity to discuss this with you all first and also with the policy staff. And Marika is aware that I do have this question

regards to the board resolution on adoption of the Policy and Implementation Working Group recommendations. In that resolution the board adopted the new processes that were recommended by the working group and is – it's going to make changes in the bylaws so that they're in there.

But the thing is that the principles that the working group recommended be adopted were not exactly adopted. And I think we all kind of have a question of how do we actually adopt this recommendation of sort of codifying these principles. And they don't exactly fit into the GNSO Operating Procedures I think would be challenging to try to fit them in there.

But the problem that I have with this is that a lot of these principles are really good principles on how policy should be dealt with and how implementation should be dealt with, some principles on implementation review teams. But the thing is they really – they sort of complement the new processes. Having the new processes alone without the principles doesn't really do what I believe the working group wanted to get done.

What the working group was trying to do was kind of answer the question of what is policy and what is implementation but then can't really answer that clearly. You have to sort of define these new processes that will help you deal with this question whenever it does come up. So adoption of the processes alone doesn't do this, you have to have the principles hand in hand with those.

And this is sort of something that will help us avoid in the future avoid sort of situations like we were talking about earlier with renewal of the registry agreements with dotCat and DotPro and so forth. And so I don't have an answer to this question. So I can't suggest a solution to the board. But I would like to hear what their thoughts are. And if they don't have any at this time I would at least like to know that we're all working on resolving this.

So I would like to hear from Marika maybe and some of the other folks in the room about this. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, okay go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. So just to clarify because I think, you know, the board in deed didn't adopt them or say they adopted them, they didn't endorse them. And I think it's particularly as well because, you know, the adoption means indeed it gets incorporated somewhere. And I think indeed the working group agreed as well it's not something for the bylaws or for the GNSO Operating Procedures.

So I think the idea is, and as well part of that endorsement they've instructed staff as well as the community to respect those principles and, you know, take those into account as the community and staff engagement policy and implementation related issues. So at least I think from a staff perspective it's envisioned that indeed there is of course a Post-it on the relevant sites as well as all the other work that the group has been and that indeed is something that the community and the staff abide by.

And in cases where indeed the community feels that staff is not abiding by those it's something to take back then to the board and say well you instructed staff to abide by these principles and here is actually evidence that we the community believe that staff is not following those.

As well as the other way around, you know, staff may also say look, these are principles we jointly agreed to let the community is actually not respecting those so how can we make sure we get to the same place? At least I think, you know, from my personal perspective how I see that going. But I think it's a fair question to ask as long as you indeed, I mean, it's not that they didn't adopt them, they endorsed them which I think basically equates that, you know, they support them and agree that it's something that both staff and the community should work along those lines.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks Marika. Yeah, the resolution did - I don't remember the exact language, it was something maybe to the effect of the board will instruct staff to respect or maybe consider these principles. But I wouldn't go so far as to say abide by because abide by may suggest that there is actually a bylaw or something in the Operating Procedures that requires not only staff but the community, as you said, to really have this as an enforceable rule sort of.

So it doesn't go that far. But I feel that he really should go that far. There should be some mechanism, some way where you can get around this because if we don't have these principles in a sort of - as a sort of rule that the community and staff need to follow that I really feel that the new processes lose a lot of their value. And they are really good processes if you combine with the principles. And we need to make sure that they do retain the value of the working group intended them. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So I am not clear what if anything -- I mean, are we reminding the board? What would we actually be asking or saying and what would we hope to get out of it?

Amr Elsadr: Well the way I see it is because they did pass a resolution on this I'm guessing they kind of put it to bed so they're done with it. My question is can we revisit this because it needs to be done a little differently. And we need to maybe think together - this was a non-PDP working group so I wouldn't go so far to saying we need an implementation review team on this. But we do need to work out some way where ICANN adopts a working group recommendations as they were intended by the working group.

Jonathan Robinson: So I thought I heard Marika say that actually that staff has absorbed that into their working practices so I'm just not sure where the gap is and what we're expecting the board to fix here or change or what different...

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, I think my problem with this is that they really -- these principles are really not codified in any way, they're not a requirement. They are something that you

can – well, yeah, you can consider them. We urge you to consider them. We instruct you to consider them. But you don't have to. There's nothing in the bylaws, there's nothing in the operating procedures that says you have to follow them. So this is where I have a bit of a problem.

Jonathan Robinson: I mean, any comments or thoughts from staff on this again, from Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I mean, I thought principles are what they are, their principles to be followed. I don't see how you can require principles. I mean, if you want to require something you need policy. And I think here there is - there are principles that are followed. And again I think staff has committed to following those. The board has now even instructed us to follow those.

I'm not sure what more can be done because I don't think it's something that if you look at the bylaws it doesn't fit there. I mean, as said we will post all the relevant material so people can as well publicly see this is the principles that, you know, Council approved, the board endorsed, and we've been instructed to, you know, abide by those.

And again I think the mechanism there is if the community views as as not following those you have a mechanism to go back to the board to say hey you told staff to do this and actually they're not doing it. And then I think I guess we get an angry e-mail or call from someone. So, I mean, I don't really see what alternative mechanisms there would be.

Amr Elsadr: This is Amr again. And, yeah, I agree with you, Marika. And I don't see an easy answer which is why I have a question. But I don't want to go on having this conversation here but I do believe the conversation needs to take place and that's the only point I was really trying to make.

Jonathan Robinson: So, I mean, to be constructive I suggested something, it might be for the wrap-up, it might be worth just thinking about and formulating this a little bit more. What I wouldn't want to do is fall flat. Maybe we can develop this a little

bit more and then either bring it up in the next ICANN meeting or something because it's not -- this could be a slower burn and this doesn't have to be dealt with tomorrow I don't think.

But I understand the concern, it's just a question of, you know, what's the evidence that they're not being adoptive. There's various things, we should think through. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. One suggestion could be and maybe that something indeed if there's time left at the end and we need something to fill it because I think a way to approach it could be to basically thank the board for, you know, adopting those recommendations and endorsing them and instructing staff to follow those. And we hope that, you know, those commitments will be followed through.

I mean, in a way like that in at least I think it's on the board's radar screen. I think it again confirms as well with the understanding is I think from the GNSO that these are principles that, you know, staff is expected to follow. And I think that then allows you as well if at a point down the road you believe that, you know, there is still something missing to reopen that conversation. That may be a way of talking about it but without any, you know, at this stage concrete...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so here's the way I suggest we deal with it. Let's put an AOB in there, you know, so that, you know, the topics, A, B, C, AOB. I think there's another one which you've suggested as well which is any issues or items from the board for the GNSO. So let's get that in there ahead of AOB. AOB, if there is time is your cue to say look, by the way, this isn't fully formed yet but there's some concern about how you're going to get those principles enshrined in the way we work. And we might be coming back to you to talk about this if we're not satisfied.

Avri.

Avri Doria: Actually I was going to say something that ended up very similar to what you ended up saying that basically it's asking comment not so much thanking them for a green to them but asking basically, you know, how these principles to get instantiated and carried over into the work and asking them how they understand that. So I think it's similar to what Jonathan was pointing at, that kind of is, you know. So they're approved, they're in there but what does that mean, how does that work, how do they get instantiated in the work, something like that.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So, Mary, maybe I could ask you if you just summarize where we got to because I think we've got what we need here more or less and then we can polish it up afterwards.

Mary Wong: Sorry, Jonathan, did you mean just for the board or do you mean for all these different...

Jonathan Robinson: Just for the board please.

Mary Wong: So just for the board in the order that I think you've now placed it, the first item would be an update on the CEO search with a related topic on how to ensure effective management of the transition to a new CEO.

That would be followed by the registration directory service discussion which is the questions about the board's expectation on the board initiated PDP that we talked about this afternoon. Then that would be followed by the topic of recent correspondence from the GNSO to the board. And this would concern to specific letters that Jonathan, you sent which is the GNSO response to the GAC communiqué and the board response on the new meeting strategy, the GNSO's document.

And then we would have the question of board involvement in cross community working groups which could encompass - well first of all it would precede it by

saying that there has been early engagement by the board in CCWGs and the board has had recent experiences in CCWGs.

So generally, you know, what is the board's feelings about their participation in CCWGs and possibly more particularly what is the board's sense about board involvement in the potential new CCWG on the new gTLD auction proceeds?

And then we have the most recent discussion items here which of course has to include any items that the board might have for the GNSO. And this last item of how the board might envisage the recently developed principles on policy and implementation actually being applied.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Sounds good. I'll work with you to do, I mean, I think we want to get in some more of these sub points that are on the slide up front here on the RDDs. But as I said we will get in a huddle for five minutes afterwards and shape those up a little bit more and then they should be good to go.

All right so that clears our preparation with the board. It is now 10 to 5. We had originally scheduled a session to have an open and substantial strategic discussion, if that's required. We also how they, as you know, the sessions on Friday. My temptation is to get this wrapped up by five o'clock and give everyone a bit of well-deserved time to do whatever you need to do prior to the Council dinner this evening. But I'm open to what you'd like to do.

All right well just to be clear, there is a couple of key themes that have come up. And probably the most significant theme that's come up is this one which is a perennial one, make no mistake but it's a perennial one that's turned into - is workload management. And I think it comes out at two levels really. It's what our capacity to keep taking on work. And there's some quite big questions in there like how much do we want to rely on staff to do the work for example?

This is critical because some people are philosophically very strongly opposed to that with good reason. Others are more receptive to it. So there's that. And

then there's a much more practical one, how does the Council operate as an effective manager prioritizing, organizing, which is clearly something – I know, James, I think you raise that in your candidate statement. I know it's a topic that's generally around. So there's clearly a bigger theme in and around workload that needs to be picked up at some point.

I'm not sure now is the right time but, you know, you may want to make a couple of remarks on it. James.

James Bladel: Just that I think Avri earlier today said it's time for us to get serious about project management. And I wholeheartedly agree except for project managers have the ability to take people off of certain projects and move them to other projects or say this project has to wait until that project is complete. So it's kind of like a project manager with both hands tied behind their back.

You know, I think we need to recognize our limitations to some extent and say that the only recipe here is some sort of a roadmap where you say that, you know, X cannot start until Y is completed. And it doesn't really matter how mundane or trivial X is or how urgent Y is. It's a weird sort of dynamic that we've found ourselves in.

END