

**Transcription ICANN Dublin  
GNSO session Saturday 17 October 2015  
Open and Substantial Strategic Discussion**

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

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct>

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

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Yeah, I think, look, what I've said, just to be clear where we are, we've closed the discussion with the board. We're into the final session now. We can talk about it as much or as little as we like. And when we finish talking about it I get in a huddle with Marika and Mary and we finish off the topics for the board. And I go to the gym and other people do what they want to do.

All right so I've got Carlos, Bret, Michele.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you. Carlos for the record. I want to go back to what Bret said just before and James now. This afternoon we were discussing the subsequent procedures of the new rounds and the RPMs. And I got all confused and I had an exchange of information with Lars. When I hear about project management I think in terms of project management for the whole GNSO, not for the single PDPs because there is so much interrelation between some of the PDPs that is worrisome that we don't have this roadmap as you said, James.

I have the feeling that PDP work has become very marginal in economic terms. We are analyzing a problem on the margin for other problems. And by the time we finish this – this issue and we go back to the other three or four related problems we might find ourselves in an awkward position that we might have taken a decision that is blocking one of the other ones or should have been taken earlier or later and so on.

So I think positively in terms of this management of all issues in terms of a broader horizon and interrelationship between the PDPs. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks, Carlos. I mean, when I hear project management I hear across the scope of the GNSO's activities certainly. Bret.

Bret Fausett: Yeah, two quick points. And the first one is on the project management issue I mean, if you took any of the issues that we're currently dealing with and try to solve that kind of problem inside your own organization, you know, whether it's a registry or a non contracted, you know, party house from wherever people come from you would take the people necessary to do it and you would say I want you to work on this full time. I want you to work on this half time.

You know, the least you might say is I want you to work on this a quarter time. You'd never say to someone I want you to spend 2% of your time on this for the next three years. I mean, that's just not an effective way to get anything done. Getting that little time from someone is akin to getting no time from them.

So I think we need – and this goes into my second point – I think you want to have more – maybe fewer participants but more dedicated participants. And I want to get to the point where maybe people feel free not to be in the room. I mean, there are a lot of companies that are like mine, Uniregistry, that, I mean, if Donuts is in the room I'm comfortable because we have very similar interests.

I don't need to be in the room if Donuts or Minds+Machines or one of these other companies that I think is a little bit like me is in the room. And I think everyone can find a surrogate for themselves someplace. No one is a unicorn here. I mean, we're all – we all have someone who could sort of carry our voice for us.

And so maybe one of the solutions, and we can try this for some of the upcoming policy things, is to get those dedicated people who can really focus on things get them in the room together for a dedicated amount of time, one week, two weeks at the most probably, at the start of a policy project to actually give it that critical mass.

So in one or two weeks you actually get 60% to the end. You know, and really – and then everyone else can come in at that point and add their edits but you've actually moved something substantially very early.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I think that's certainly the objective is – that intensive face to face, right, the facilitated face to face meetings. And we certainly found that with the cross community working groups when we needed to get, I mean, it was grueling but when we needed to get a substantial amount of work done we back to back the series of meetings over a couple of days or even a weekend. And as I say, it was grueling, very, very challenging, but nevertheless it kind of forced us through to getting some kind of product out. So it is a – it's a good point.

I've got Michele and then Volker.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Bret, I love you to death, you're an awesome guy, but oh my God, you are so far off track with this I don't even know where to begin. If...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay. Michele Neylon for the record in case anybody didn't recognize my dulcet tones considering for once we're in a country where there's more than one of me.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Irish people in the room, Avri, thank you. You work for a registry. You are – well it's also a vertically integrated entity, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. You guys do this full time. So for a company like Uniregistry to say hey, I'll give you a staffer for a week or two weeks, might be viable. It might be viable for a VeriSign, it might be viable for an Afilias. It is definitely not viable for the vast majority of registrars. It is not viable for the vast majority of non contracted parties.

Now for those of us who lived through what was best described I suppose as the torture, the joy, the adventure, the journey of the EWG over about 18 months, which did involve us doing exactly what you're suggesting, it was – the number of people who could potentially participate in that was incredibly narrow.

And if ICANN is meant to be representative of the global Internet and to come up with policies that work for the global Internet and not for a bunch of vested interests, then that kind of taking people aside for two weeks at a time or something like that is simply not going to work.

Now the face to face – the face to face type engagement like we had yesterday in the Proxy Privacy Working Group, yes, I totally agree that works. That works very well. We managed to get through a bunch of issues yesterday that it would probably have taken weeks if not months to do over these long kind of protracted phone calls and things of that which when you're in the middle of your working day.

And I do agree with you that the idea of giving somebody over for 2% of their time over three years is absolutely insane. But at the same time the idea that a policy process would be driven only by those entities who could afford to put – assign human resources to them, for that length of time at the beginning I think that is going to end up in the creation of policies that only serve a very very narrow interest group which I don't think is what we want. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Michele, for the counterpoint. Tony.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Jonathan. I couldn't agree more with Michele. I think the only way the multistakeholder model is going to work is to make sure that our processes are totally inclusive. And there is a danger of going down that path where those with the vested interest can put the effort in and the rest really can't. so I'd offer full support for that.

Yes, we have to find a better slicker way of working. But that approach I think is going to harm ICANN in the longer run rather than deliver what we really want.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Well, I mean, that tees things up for further discussion, some useful – there's clearly something to be said for how we – I mean, there's a theme – the whole theme of continuous improvement, making sure we get the most out of PDPs as fast as possible but also recognizing that there is a limit to the pace we can work either through resources or through – in one shape or another that people can put onto it.

Arthur Zonnenberg: Arthur Zonnenberg, for the record. How about scrapping policy. Do we have any kind of principle or strategy on removing policies that are not helping? Do we have any kind of performance idea – performance statistics, the Data and Metric Groups, like the Data and Metric Group, in what manner can we clarify the GNSO strategy based on those public numbers, based on public performance of the various policies that can influence. Which also ties back maybe to the question that gentleman had about the principles to abide by.

So I think this question should be more about what is the long term strategy of the GNSO and the desired end result to be inclusive of the interests of all the people involved. Because right now I don't see a complete and inclusive inclusion of the interests of all the parties involved in particular the end user. So that would be my comment. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: A couple of points, I mean, were you just – were you talking about actually deciding what not to do or actually removing existing policies that are no longer relevant?

Arthur Zonnenberg: Yes. That's also one important point.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, okay.

Arthur Zonnenberg: As well as clarifying what we do want, also clarifying what doesn't work...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Arthur Zonnenberg: ...so that you can move towards an efficient and effective policy within the GNSO or within any other group.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thank you. All right, sounds like we might have come to a natural break. I think if there's – is there anything else, any other business that anyone – let's call that session to a close and then just check if there's any other housekeeping or other items. I mean, we're clearly getting together for a dinner this evening. The existing councilors and incoming councilors have all been invited together with the ICANN policy staff. It's an informal dinner. You should have received information, if you're not sure what's happening please talk to Glen.

Glen, if you could just remind us the exact time and the logistics on that?

Glen de Saint Géry: Certainly, Jonathan. It is at 8 o'clock at the (Brasili) restaurant bar which is very close to this convention center. You walk out of the convention center, you turn to your right, you walk past the center hotel and then the next street down is where you will find this (Brasili) bar to the left.

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: It's at 8. And why it's at 8 is because One Direction is playing in Dublin tonight and everything – everything is, yes, and Glen is going to the concert – and everything is booked up until 8 o'clock when everybody starts leaving to go the concert.

James Bladel: And you weren't successful in asking One Direction if they would maybe do a different time?

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint Géry: Actually...

Michele Neylon: Jonathan, can I just apologize? We tried to get them to break up, they wouldn't. We're sorry. We apologize to all of you. But think of it this way, think of it this way, as of tomorrow evening all the hotels will be empty, you'll be left in peace. But the city will empty. It'll get back to kind of normality. All the teenagers will be gone.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah and we would have lost your favorite band.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: We haven't talked about the agenda with the GAC tomorrow. I omitted that. I suggest that that goes around on the list. There's already an agenda that's pretty well structured. So let's – if we could just circulate that on list. Have you seen it, Marika, you're familiar – I'll check in with you. And Thomas Schneider saw it yesterday and came back to me and replied that he was happy with that.

It's really to update on the GNSO GAC Consultation Group. Marika, did you want...

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to note there was one specific question I think that was put forward by Donna for the GAC with the relationship or role of the public safety working group so I don't know if that's something you can squeeze in at some point or...

Jonathan Robinson: Well yeah, we certainly can. And I'd encourage you to raise it, Donna, if you're willing to do so. Because the way in which it's – the meeting is organized is it's got – I'm just casting my memory back, certainly an update, there's four items one of which is AOB specifically designed to kind of fish out if there's any other points that need to. It's update from GAC GNSO Consultation Group. I think it's – what's the second one, do you remember?

Anyway there's a third which is – thank you, Marika.

Mary Wong: So starting with the status update and current issues for the GAC GNSO Consultation Group; Item Number 2 is GNSO policy work current PDPs and the use of the new GAC quick look mechanism. The third is on the work of the GAC, updates from them as relevant to us. And last is AOB.

Jonathan Robinson: Donna, to the extent that it doesn't come up in 3 it can come up in 4 so yeah. Oh dear.

Michele Neylon: Just two...

Jonathan Robinson: Did I say something to bother you?

Michele Neylon: Well two things. One, I've just discovered, by the way, that One Direction is actually playing a concert tomorrow night as well. I didn't know, I'm sorry. But just in – thank you, Elliot. In relation to the public safety working group, I mean, if you are going to be discussing with the GAC, could you please politely but firmly point out to them that they need to respect the same timelines as everybody else with respect to input in public comment periods?

Because otherwise any documents they produce I have absolutely no idea where the hell they're meant to fit into anything. If a comment period is open for 60 or 90 days and they're incapable of getting a comment in during that window, I mean, I'm sorry, I don't know. I mean, either they're part of this, they're a stakeholder, or they're some kind of special little flower in the corner that needs special treatment. But, sorry, I mean, I don't know what to say.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay seems like we can't quite let go.

Man: Very quick reply to that one. I was in the leadership training with one of the GAC representative and we spoke extensively about their procedures and how they're trying to get things done. I can tell you basically for them and how it's set up how they're set up internally and how the governments are set up there

is no way that they come to any decision under six months. Just how it's set up. Even if they wanted they couldn't do it quicker.

Jonathan Robinson: Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jonathan. Donna Austin. So just to respond to that, the public safety working group is working more expediently than what the GAC does. But because they operate under the auspices of the GAC what I would like to understand is the public safety working group have provided comments on a number of things now. They have turned up late.

And that makes it difficult for some of the working groups that are going through a process of finalizing public comments and then you get something that comes in from the public safety working group. If the public safety working group, you know, decides that, you know, they're getting a little bit miffed because their comments aren't taken into consideration in my mind they have the option to take that and make it GAC advice. And that becomes very problematic I think for both registries and registrars, contracted parties.

So we need to find a way to make that work or at least get that point across that we really want you to be more timely in the comments because what we don't want is any of that stuff becoming GAC advice. So that's kind of where I'm going with it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. All right well that sounds like it's been a productive day. Thanks very much. Nine to five. We've covered more or less everything we needed to thanks for your attention. And we'll see various of you this evening and everyone again tomorrow morning. Thanks.