

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Sunday Session
GNSO Meeting with the Board
Sunday, 6 March 2016**

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.

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

James Bladel: This is James Bladel and we are now meeting with the Board of Directors in the GNSO Sunday session at ICANN Marrakech. We have some of the board members here, some others will be arriving and we'll seat them as soon as they get here.

But in the meantime we'd like to get started on our list of questions. As you recall from our work yesterday we received two questions from the board and we sent three questions to the board.

So (Bruce) how would you like to proceed?

(Bruce): Why you don't answer the questions or you could pick one from each right? So start with one of them from the board and then we'll go with one of them from the GNSO how's that?

James Bladel: Sounds good we'll alternate. Okay let's kick it off then by addressing one of the questions that we received from the ICANN board which is essentially this question of diversity.

Diversity is a challenge in ICANN. How is your SO or AC doing in regard to enhancing diversity in all dimensions and what can ICANN do to support that effort.

And we had a fairly vigorous conversation on this topic and this question yesterday. And what it generally boiled down to in our response is that the GNSO is an accumulation of other stakeholder groups and constituencies.

Each of them are undertaking various efforts and initiatives to promote and ensure diversity within their membership and within their leadership. But to that I would welcome any comments from councilors who would like to perhaps describe some of the diversity efforts that are occurring within their groups.

And then of course we can take a discussion on that for the board. So does anyone want to kick this off from the council? (Ed) you're up.

(Ed Meyers): Thank you James. Yes I mean I have some numbers here.

James Bladel: Sorry can you state your name?

(Ed Meyers): Sorry, speak into the microphone would be nice. (Ed Meyers) for the record. We have some numbers here coming from the non-commercial community. And in the NCUC our constituency we now have reached a point where 51% of our members are not from Europe and North America.

We have a majority of members from Africa, the Asia Pacific region and Latin America. And I think we - that marks the first constituency, the first group within ICANN where I believe that's actually happened.

And a lot of it has to be attributed quite frankly to the work of the board and the work of ICANN through the fellowship program. As we go to the meetings I keep meeting new fellows who are coming back and getting more involved in the community.

At the same point you're going to love where at least in the NCUC we're having a diversity problem. We're not bringing in members in North America under the age of 50. We have one.

So we focused our efforts on bringing in folks from the developing world and now we're seeing a big age difference. We have the - and I'm speaking on my own behalf I should make that clear right now in terms of this problem.

Others may think this is a benefit. But when we're looking to fill some of our elected positions which by region we're not finding any eligible candidates under the age of 50 from the developed world.

So I think one thing I want to complement the board on, the new next gen program which when you go into a geographic area we don't depend upon income, we're able to bring in younger people under the age of 30 from the developed world.

So when we go to Puerto Rico and I really hope we do go to Puerto Rico. I know there's been talk of going someplace else but when we do go there I'm very hopeful we'll be able to bring in some younger people from North America and start developing them.

The fellowship programs work great and our numbers show that but what we really need to do is start also bringing in younger people from the countries where we may think they don't need such financial help.

Younger people do need financial help everywhere to attend and to get involved in ICANN.

One other thing I do want to note. We have both individual and organizational members in the NCUC. (NPOC) is all organizations, the NCUC actually is about 2 to 1 individual members.

What I think is interesting when we look at our membership about the size of the membership it's about 2 to 1 small organizations. So we are very diverse in the size of institutions we bring in and also I talked about ideological diversity.

It always hasn't been the case in the non-commercials that we have a wide range of ideological perspective. But now I can sit here and state the NCUC includes everything from the Heritage Foundation on the right to CDT and EFF on the left.

So we're starting to bridge that gap and starting to expand our ideological perspective as well. So I think when you're talking about diversity (Stephanie) would be mad at me if I didn't bring out the fact that we need to also to try to expand our age diversity.

Bring in some more retirees who have ample time and experience to help us here. So these are just some challenges we do have. But what I want to point out to the other groups is that if you use the fellowship program, if you focus on bringing in folks from around the world you can actually do it.

And our problem and one I'd like to express to the board is one of the problems I'm starting to see is we've focused so much on the developing world and I don't want to take away that focus, we also have to be aware that we need to start bringing in some younger people from our traditional areas of recruitment.

(Bruce): And gender diversity how's that going, gender diversity do you have numbers on that?

(Ed Meyers): I don't have numbers.

(Bruce): What you got right here?

(Ed Meyers): Still predominantly...

((Crosstalk))

(Bruce): I'm sure that roughly in the world it's sort of 50-50 so what...

(Ed Meyers): Yes, no it's still predominantly male. We do - obviously you as our council representation it is 50-50. We do not have gender requirements for executive committees.

I served on an NCUC EC 3 years ago which was all male. That was not good. It's something we need to look at. In terms of our executive committees I honestly don't know how (NPOC) selects their EC.

I wish I did that's a failing on my part. On the NCUC we have one member from each of the regions on the executive committee itself but it's elected by the totality of the membership.

But (Bruce) I'm sorry I do not know the gender diversity.

James Bladel: If I could just jump in on that point with a couple of announcements. First thank you Steve, Steve has been able to join us. We kicked off a little earlier so thank you for that.

And (Bruce) something I neglected to say when we got started and I think you teed it up very nicely with your indication of gender diversities. We should

probably introduce the council leadership team who maybe you've met us individually but this is our first session together.

I am James and then (Heather Forrest) from the IPC as the vice chair from the non-contracted party house and (Donna Austin) is the vice chair from the contracted party house.

And I think that just pointing that out there is perhaps one indication that at least amongst council leadership this is possibly the most diverse group that we've had since I remember coming to ICANN anyway. I don't want to say ever.

So I apologize for jumping into the queue. I don't know if you wanted to respond to (Ed) otherwise I have Wolf-Ulrich next and Susan but I - or if you had me.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thank you Wolf-Ulrich speaking James. So I didn't calculate our ratio within in our constituencies, the ISP constituency with regards to gender diversity and geographical diversity.

I can give you the figures later on but what I know is it has to be improved so for sure in this regard. But so we can't go this step first to search for woman let me say and just vote for the female part rather than we are going to enhance our diversity in geographical area and hope that in this context we also can improve regarding the gender diversity.

I was very much surprised by I was just participating in a business lunch here which was organized from the - from (Chris Mondini) from ICANN to have many people from Africa here available from the business area, from the diverse business area.

And they are keen on - interested in - there are many of them. They were the first time here participating in an ICANN meeting here. So this is the way we

are going. We are looking to how we can improve and we started some let me say some meetings ago with - to improve our outreach activities as well.

And this is a major point we are to - for the improvement. But I have to say the outreach activities which we can - which ICANN is doing at the time being to some extent is a little bit let me say directed in the direction towards ICANN.

So ICANN is going to invite people to several events while - and then try to bring contact to those people to others. So what we are doing is what we feel is necessary is to go out to the regions themselves, you know, to use platforms, appropriate platforms like other countries in our business interests and also to advertise for participation here.

So that what is started to do so. It helped in the past, it's helped in regions like in America and it's going to help in regions like in Africa as well. And that's really how we see we can improve. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Susan and I would just ask folks so that we can get as many questions in as possible if you could limit your questions as possible because we have a number of other topics as well and a healthy queue.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, thanks. Susan Kawaguchi from the BC. And I appreciate the fact that you brought up gender. That is something that's very important obviously as a woman.

And if you look around any room in an ICANN meeting you'll see that there is a lack of significant, you know, gender equality. It's getting better but we would - the BC was very concerned about the candidates picked for the CCT review as there was many women that applied, not as many as men but there was quite a few women candidates but only 3 out of the 15 seats were women which is not acceptable and is something we cannot allow to happen going forward.

We sent a letter and it was like thank you very much for your letter was the response we got. So which I don't - I can't agree with that response either. We should address this. We need to address this in all aspects of our life.

I happen to work at Facebook which is Sheryl Sandberg is quite a leader in gender diversity. So it's one of our, you know, something we're tasked with at work on a day-to-day basis is to make sure you look around the room and that everybody is equally represented.

The BC I don't have statistics I didn't dig into that but if - BC has done a lot of outreach in the - for geographical diversity and unfortunately even though ICANN provides lots of different programs now and we have leveraged those funds, travel funds but we're having problems with VISA's.

One of the candidates that we selected to attend this meeting I'm not sure if they have arrived but it was a VISA problem. So they said they couldn't come here and we had that previously with a meeting, one or two meetings ago.

So if we can figure out the VISA issue that I think we've got stronger geographical diversity method of bringing people in and I think we all need to work on the gender.

James Bladel: Thank you Susan and that came up yesterday as well frequently that geographic diversity is somewhat impeded by VISA challenges. And I think one of the suggestions from the table was whether or not ICANN could investigate retaining a firm that there are firms that do this as part of their travel support to facilitate VISA's for some of these folks who are having challenges attending ICANN meetings.

Next in the queue I have Keith and then (Jen) and then we'll move on to the next topic.

Keith Drasek: Thank you James. Keith Drasek for the transcript. So speaking for the registry stakeholder group and I don't want to extend it entirely to the registrar's I'll let the registrar's speak for themselves.

But as contracted parties our membership is in a sense dictated to us. It is the fact that we have contracts are what basically gives us the positions that we have.

The companies that are the contracted parties have employees who are assigned to the duties. But I think that the new gTLD program has introduced a tremendous level of diversity into the registry stakeholder group certainly. We have geographic diversity that we did not used to have. We went from, you know, less than 20 members to well over 100. The - we have a diversity of business model and diversity of interests.

Whether it's through the legacy or the traditional approach to distribution of domain names or (GO) TLD's, dot brand TLD's, the sponsored TLD's. So we have a very diverse set of interests and areas of focus within the registry stakeholder group.

And certainly on our executive committee we have gender diversity and it's something that we're certainly aware of as we move forward thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks Keith. And then the last speaker on this topic is (Jen) and then we can move onto a question from...

((Crosstalk))

(Jennifer Standeford): Thanks James I'll keep it brief.

James Bladel: ...to the board.

(Jennifer Standeford): On behalf of the registrar stakeholder group I think it's important to realize that we have geographical diversity through our registrars and our resellers and certainly our registrants that support Internet services anywhere around the globe.

The one thing I'd like to point out is we have benefited recently by adding additional diversity as far as females on the X Com as well as participating in working group and we also have a member of the GNSO council is a female, myself.

So one thing I'd like to ask the board and discuss further is around the KPI's with the engagement centers and how is that resulting in new active members from the contracted party house and on the non-contracted party house to further understand the relevance of the engagement center and how we can ensure that those are actually resulting in additional members and addressing diversity?

James Bladel: Thanks (Jen). Responses from the board. Steve, (Bruce).

Steve: On this one?

James Bladel: Yes just on the diversity.

(Bruce): Well it may be (Renadia Pippis) erased it on the board but I think it's just useful and I don't want to kind of take up too much time because we've got a lot of topics. But did you have any questions on this?

Yes but I think that was very helpful just to...

Steve: (Jennifer) is asking specifically how the KPI's that were being implemented for the engagement centers relate to engagement of new members of registry constituency. Yes.

(Jennifer Standeford): Any constituency for that matter. So active members within the community, female members, members that come from a topic that's been thrown around such as underserved regions and such as the direct correlation between the engagement centers and the resulting of new active members. That's what I'm looking for.

Steve Crocker: I think I'm afraid I'm going to have to give you an honest answer here which is we've actually asked that question ourselves and we're not yet in a position to know what the answer is.

So I'm not trying to be facetious or cute here. It's an important question we agree the question is important and the good news I can tell you is that it did cross our minds as well.

And I wouldn't contrast by saying it's bad news but we're just at the point of engaging with the engagement centers if you will, engaging with that process and trying to ask some very pointed questions along that line.

So we want to be able to - we want to be able to know those answers for ourselves and we want to be able to like I said we want to be able to give you those answers.

The more correct answer is we want you to have those answers as well. They shouldn't have to come through us or be us.

(Jennifer Standeford): I appreciate that Dr. Crocker. It would be nice to get a timeline associated to that in order to understand the expense and how it will eventually result in new active members.

Steve Crocker: So we surely are from this dialogue we're surely obliged to be able to - for you to have a different answer whether as I say whether it comes from us or elsewhere by the next meeting.

The second part of your question is how much will it have affected anything and that I don't know at all until we look at numbers and see it. But I would look forward to having that part of the discussion based upon some actual numbers that we have next time.

(Jennifer Standeford): Thank you. Thanks James.

James Bladel: Thanks, good discussion and now we'd like to move on to a question that the board - I'm sorry that the GNSO asked of the board. And for this one I'm going to ask Volker to take the lead and it's relative to the structure of meeting structure B which will be happening later this year. Volker.

Volker Greimann: Thank you James, Volker Greimann speaking. Meeting B has always been a bit of a puzzler for all of us because on the one hand it was always displayed as an outreach meeting with a very, very heavy policymaking slant i.e. the focus on outreach to the region where the meeting is being held but also for the internal community to have a very focused policy meeting.

Now we have received from the board their proposed scheduling just last month and we found that there was quite a number of conflicting sessions of the board where the board expects to meet with the community where the community had - the GNSO had plans to hold policy work.

We therefore feel that the potential of the second meeting to actually hold effective policy work sessions is somewhat impaired. That's one question and the other part of the question is how will the goal of outreach be affected by the changed venue for the second meeting?

(Mike): Let me pick this one up if I may. Volker the first thing is the way that the question was sent through to us is somewhat different from what you've expressed now and I do appreciate your restatement because I find it quite offensive when people talk about board scheduling as if the board has somehow imposed this meeting B on the community.

And that's certainly how the question reads if you look at what was transmitted to us. You should be well aware this was a 2-year process involving a cross community working group looking at restructuring the meetings.

We haven't had a revised structured meeting yet and people are already critiquing. So my one suggestion is let's give it a try.

My second comment is maybe we should be a little more flexible and from what I understand there has really been some discussion about the ability to add an extra day even though there will be significant cost. But the ability to add an extra day to see at this particular time if that will assist and then the question is does that need to continue?

What I would encourage though is that people need to be a little more flexible in how they work because already we're seeing some pushback from some people who have a meeting at 3 o'clock on a Wednesday and insist that everything else must be moved so that their standard 3:00 pm wins the meeting that they've been running for the last 5 years can continue at that time rather than saying well actually we can fit it in 17 other time slots around the meeting.

So I would encourage people just to be a little less weathered to their existing way of doing things and to see how it can work. I think the one consideration that you've raised in terms of how do we deal with outreach when we're going to a revised location which maybe doesn't require the same degree of outreach as we had expected for a meeting B venue.

And the answer to that is well then let's make that time usable for additional policy work because at the moment we've been in almost a 2-year running close to or over the red in terms of the accountability work.

Some of the policy work has fallen back. There is still accountability and transition work that needs to be done. So I think that we can take the time that was allocated for outreach for the B meeting and to actually use that internally for policy work in this meeting and hopefully from the following year we can actually revert back to the idea of actually using the B meeting for outreach.

James Bladel: Thank you (Mike). I have Jeff and then Volker if you'd like to respond after that. Jeff go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Jeff Neuman. Just a quick question just to add to - (Mike) actually you acknowledged one thing that I'm a little concerned about is I know that there's going to be - we're going to be in the middle of implementation of the accountability work.

And one of the things I'm worried about for policy meeting B or for meeting B is that all of that accountability work trumps the policy work. So whatever we can do to make sure that the goal and intention of meeting B sticks with policy.

And if there has to be accountability work done that that's added on either at the beginning or at the end but that we keep to the schedule we set because there's a lot of policy work that has to get done and like you just acknowledged a lot of that work has fallen backwards because of all the accountability work and the distractions.

(Mike): I think that's a very valid point and I think that's something that we need to engage with the transition teams around in terms of well there was a somewhat tongue in cheek question that we need to add in the accountability day to every meeting going forward.

And I can see Thomas Rickert is about to fall off his chair. He is not even listening.

James Bladel: Okay thank you. Volker with a quick follow up here because then we'll need to move onto the next question.

Volker Greimann: Yes first of all thank you (Mike). It was not my intention to insinuate that board made the meeting as it is. One impression that we had from multiple talks with board members was that board was frustrated with the endless line of supplicants coming into the board and talking to the board one by one.

And therefore we were surprised that - to see that day two and day three again included such time on the board schedule. Now when you look at that time as time for policy work which is also supposed to happen on those days that means that one stakeholder group will always be required or maybe not required but encouraged to go out of the policy work, leave the working group sessions, come to the board because they have something to address with the board and then come back to the policy work.

That means that the work that would happen in parallel at the same time might not be as effective as it could be if the line of supplicants would be handled differently.

(Mike): Volker that's not my understanding of how those days are structured. My understanding is those are opportunities for the board to actually come and sit with you.

And the board can split itself up and will divide itself up in a number of ways that we will actually be sitting in your rooms. There will be no official board representation in your room but rather individual board members watching, listening.

They may be asked a question or decide to engage from time to time in their personal capacities. But the idea is for us to stop being removed from the policy work that you are doing and to actually listen and where appropriate

participate rather than as you say be a councilor on high receiving supplications from its supplicants who arrived to make wise decisions as if we are some sort of conglomerate Solomon (ph) that can actually resolve problems for people.

And so I think it's a misunderstanding and maybe we need to improve the communication in terms of how this will work but no the intent was not to just recreate the current constituency day.

James Bladel: Thank you (Mike).

Volker Greimann: Thank you for the...

James Bladel: I'm sorry Volker we're going to have to - I had to - unfortunately jumped ahead of (Marilia) and (Donna) and they promised me they're going to keep them brief so we can move to the next question. (Marilia).

(Marilia): Absolutely James thank you for the opportunity. This is (Marilia) speaking. Actually what I want to say is quite complementary to what Jeff has said. We heard that this meeting is going to be focused on policy development.

And being in policymaking by the way do appreciate that. We just wanted to stress the point that the question is should policy development should be considered on a case by case basis.

It can be the case that working groups are very much related to policy development but there are other structures that such as discussion groups, such as cross community working parties which are also relevant to policy development.

So let's not draw the line in terms of this is a working group related to policy, this is not. Then it's not going to be accepted. Let's look on the case by case

basis and look for this substantive importance of the particular session to policy development. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you good point (Marilia) and (Donna) you have the last word.

(Donna Austin): Thanks James, (Donna Austin) for the record. I was a member of the meeting strategy working group and (Mike) I take comfort in what you said about it is the intention that the board will be present at the, you know, the policy sessions and be active in those.

One of the discussions we had yesterday, when we saw the schedule that went up on the screen that Volker had it looked to me like we had four days where we're operating in silos again.

So the ALAC had a room, the GAC had a room, the board had a room, PDP's or GNSO had a room and we were back to silos. And for somebody who was actually part of the meeting strategy working group one of the things that we were trying to avoid was conflicted sessions.

And the understanding that there are very few opportunities where we can have a substantive policy discussion with everybody in the room. So the GAC's in the room, the board is in the room, ALAC is in the room.

So we can have some real substantive discussion around topics that are of interest across the board but generally those conversations happen in silos. So what I would like to see on the Tuesday and Wednesday - and I'll just note that there's two substantive policy efforts that the GNSO has just embarked on with the next generation ideas.

The new subsequent procedures, new gTLD's. I can never remember the name. And we're also about to likely to approve at this meeting the RPM's UDRP.

So we have three substantive policy efforts that will start. So that - have started, will continue to make some process. And there is some real benefit in the ability to use meeting B which was the intention that everybody is in the room at the same time having a discussion around one topic rather than doing it in silos.

So my kind of point is can we try to keep with the intent to that the (mini) strategy working came up with when they did meeting B?

It is a policy focus. We're supposed to take away from the silos, get rid of the (conflicted) sessions and use it as an opportunity to have some real substantive discussion and dialogue among the community on the policy efforts that are going on. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, (Donna). A good exchange and I don't know if you, (Bruce), (Steve), if you'd like to respond. I think - you know, or (Mike), if you have any follow-up statements.

(Mike): Just that I think the input was very useful from what was I thought was somewhat adversarial question that's turned into a really useful discussion. And I think what we need to do is engage further with the meeting teams and with the various NSOs and ACs to achieve, (Donna), exactly what you're talking about and to make sure that - because we have had people who want to continue working in silos.

And just making sure that we try and actually balance the intentions and the hopes across the various participants. But as you say, there's policy work that's backing up and we need to get to that. We're here to facilitate, not to create problems.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Mike), for and finding something useful out of adversarial conversations is kind of what we do here at the GNSO, so appreciate that validation.

So the next question, very quickly because I know that we're getting deep into our question here, is question two of the GNSO to the board. Certainly we'll open this up to other counselors but I wanted to give a lead on what is our feedback on the final report of the CCWG accountability.

This has been a subject, as you might imagine, occupying a significant part of our weekend discussions. We carved out time both yesterday and today on our agenda to address, not only the substance of the process but - or, I'm sorry, the process of the report but the process that we will use to evaluate and ultimately presumably approve the report.

We have established some time, as well, through the week, including a final agenda item on our agenda for a public meeting on Wednesday. I think it is fair to say that for some stakeholder groups and constituencies, this is buttoned up and ready to go.

And others, I think, would like a little more time, particularly to make use of the Tuesday sessions, to consult with their communities and make sure that they have taken all of that feedback on board before they come into the session on Wednesday for the council vote.

So I don't know if that's addressing this question specifically enough, but generally, the answer is we're still working on it, we're making progress. We have joined a line in the dirt on Wednesday as we'll make a final determination but there's still quite a bit of work that needs to happen between now and then.

And I'll certainly open it up to anyone else who'd like to weigh in on that or the board members, if you have questions. Let the record show that this is the first time in the last two years that there have been no questions associated with CCWG accountability.

So, okay, yes, it is good news and I think, you know, it - they're making progress. So, okay, then we'll move on to another question here from the GNSO to the board. And if you don't mind, I'm going to go out of order a little bit here and pick a little bit on the auction proceeds.

As you're aware, there's the GNSO, along with some of the other SOs and ACs, have launched at least an initial effort to draft a charter for presumably the community working group that would start to address the question of how to examine and ultimately disposition funds that were the result of gTLD auctions.

I think we would love to have an exchange of views on how we see the board participating in that effort, that only the drafting team, which is starting now, but also presumably the subsequent cross community working group as well as some of the staff that's been named and what their roles would be.

And just - really just kind of throw open the floor to a broader discussion about this effort is just now being born within the community. And for stuff I have (Erica).

(Erica): Thank you, (James). Let me maybe lay down some of the - our thinking. At the moment, we haven't had a real (deep) exchange about it in the board, so this is what actually the two colleagues, (Asha) and myself, together with the staff, which would have thought through.

It's very early thinking, and so please don't (unintelligible) if there's something you really don't like. Take it as an approach, and I hope we all, together, then can work out what is the best approach.

So right now we're looking at it from the following principles. So we need to take into consideration that we talk about a major amount of money. It's about, if I'm not mistaken, \$100 million, so this is - carries automatically a huge responsibility for the whole organization.

And, of course, there will be recommend- they will be responsibilities which automatically will take the board more into duties, so we have to look at this. We will be asked consider a recommendation, the board, and automatically approve the distribution of the funds.

Then we thought, is this important to look at the fiduciary duties which we have? For example, just to give you two examples - it might be more, so that there will be no conflict of interest, there will be one important one.

The second will be probably that we do prudent investment and we do the prudent investment in coordination with our goals and the bylaws. It sounds all very simple but, I mean, when you then execute later, who do understand that we, altogether, will have great responsibilities.

We're a not-for-profit organization. That means we have obligations to make sure that a fund is expensed in service of ICANN's mission. We can't go beyond ICANN's mission.

We might have to look, again, early (phase), we might have to set up a separate audit procedure because the fund is so big that it might not be merged automatically with the current procedures.

And then when we look into the way we think we might want to participate in the drafting group, so we would love to participate in the chartering group so that we have all these goals which I just mentioned in there might be more that they are in coordination what is going to happen in the chartering group.

The two board liaisons will be (Asha Hemrijani). Makes sense because she's the co-chair of the board finance committee, and myself, I'm the chair of the audit committee. So you have the two bodies involved which have the - some kind of financial oversight.

And then we want to (avoid) that we have - the development of recommendations at the board leader might not be able to accept because of the special duties we have as an organization.

So it makes sense to work together to collaborate together as intensively as possible. We would love to do, and the same, of course, in coordination with the CCWG later, we would love to ensure that the same procedure is then insured.

We haven't discussed what I'm going to say yet to you. We haven't discussed this with the board yet. So in the two of us and in discussion with our staff, we thought it's maybe not a good idea that the - so we would not seek to be part of the chartering organization.

But we haven't discussed yet. There might be different opinions, so give us time to talk this through with the board as well. The board - the staff - ICANN staff will insist, as it has done, and the CCWG, and we have a great team.

(Susan), you will be happy about this. This is only females in this team. We were laughing yesterday morning, so only females were once in life, 100%, which is maybe not good. But anyhow, that's the case.

And then with regard to the participation in the CCWG, again, the two of us, the board liaison, will help to make sure that the deliberations of the CCWG are in line with the fiduciary duties and staff will continue to help and support you as you are used to it. And if there are more wishes you have, I'm sure staff will be more than willing to provide them to you. That's it. That's the current concept.

James Bladel: Thank you, (Erica), and I don't know if I could speak for everyone but I certainly appreciate the clarity, and particularly noting how you and (Asha) have those roles with the audit and the finance committee and bring those to the participation. (Asha).

(Asha Hemrijani): Thank you, (James). I just wanted to introduce myself because maybe not everyone here knows me. So my name is -- pardon me -- my name is (Asha Hemrijani) and, as (Erica), mentioned, I'm co-chair of the board finance committee.

And (Erica) and I -- sorry, excuse me -- (Erica) and I are very happy to be board liaisons to this charter team. I want to - I have nothing much to add because (Erica)'s really covered most of it.

I just wanted to add two small points. One is we really seek to be - to work together with the rest of the charter team in a very collaborative fashion and we want to be there in the beginning, as (Erica) mentioned.

In the second thing is, one of the concerns that I had and that I think is shared, is we really would like to see in the charter, some kind of project management discipline and budget set into the charter from the very start. This is something we think is important and we think will help with the efficiency the way this team is run. Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you, and pleasure to meet you, (Asha). Sorry. Any other discussion either from the counselors are other board members that maybe want to weigh in on this issue?

I would note that we also have some numbers from the drafting team in the room as well if they'd like to weigh in on this conversation. Otherwise - I see (Donna). Sorry, I just noticed your hand, (Donna).

(Donna Upton): Thanks, (James). So, (Erica), thanks for the explanation. I think the impor- so one of the issues that kind of raised a bit of a flag for us when we got the letter from Dr. (Crocker) is that I think having members of the board on the drafting team raises the precedent that we haven't dealt with before in terms of the CCW- CCWG work is, you know, recently new within itself.

But having board members participate in a drafting team is - was, you know, something we haven't dealt with before. Similarly, assigning staff to participate in that effort, as well, it's something that we haven't come across before either. I think the idea that herself and - I'm sorry, (Asha)...

(Asha Hemrijani): (Asha), (Asha). Don't listen to that man sitting next you. He's known me for 18 months. He still can't say I name, so (Asha).

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Donna Upton): I have the same accent so I'll go with (Bruce)'s - I'll probably end up (defaulting) to (Bruce). So, (Erica) and (Asha), if the intent is that you would be liaisons to the drafting team, then perhaps that's - acceptable is the wrong word but maybe it's more a level of comfort with the involvement, given we haven't come across this before.

And I would be interested to understand what the involvement of staff would be given that we always have staff support with these efforts but the intention to have (Sam) and (Nora) as part of that group as well, you would (see their role). Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks. Okay, I saw a couple of hands go up. I think Tony first and then, was it (Stephanie). No, (Erica). Okay, Tony and then (Erica) and then we'll start to (saw this) topic and bring it in for a landing.

Tony Harris: Yes, Tony Harris. Just a couple of words since I'm on the drafting team. We do have a leader. Jonathan Robinson's going to be the chair and Alan Greenberg is the vice-chair of this effort. We're kicking off with meetings here in Marrakesh.

And I do - I have noted (Asha)'s suggestion - is that right - about project management. I think that's a great idea and I'll certainly - we'll certainly bring that to the table in our meeting. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Tony. (Erica).

(Erica): Thank you so much. I think the idea is for staff to be there, in particular, in areas where legal precedents will be raised, the fiduciary duties which a board has to fulfill and so - and then, of course, maybe even on some other issues we might not foresee yet.

So I would see this, you know, as a very supportive and positive function you want to provide to you, both the board and the staff, so there is no hidden concepts, no hidden agenda.

It's just that we get this all together in - from the very beginning on the right track. We lose sometimes so much time if we go, you know, step-by-step. It makes really - and from a concept point of view and a project point of view, it makes no sense. Just let us work together and then if (questions) cannot be sorted out and immediately - and we don't lose time.

James Bladel: Thank you. And I think that was helpful. I think that there was - and I'm going to be just blunt. You know, Jonathan was much more diplomatic than I am, and I'll just say that right out of the gate.

I think there was some sense of confusion when we received the notice that we were having two board members and two, I would consider, very senior members of staff being appointed to what is essentially an early step in the process, and administrative step, at that.

But I think that you helped address some of those concerns and clear up some of that confusion. You know, I'm sure there're or concerns and confusion in our future but at least, for the here and now, I think that we've

cleared some of that up. So does anyone else have any comments on this?
(Mariela)?

(Mariela): Thank you, (James). This is (Mariela) speaking. Just to come back to the letter that has been sent by the board responding - your letter. I think that a very important point was raised, which is conflict of interest.

I think that this project is really important. I just wonder - and I asked the same question to Jonathan Robinson when he came to visit us - do you have an idea of how this could be reflected on the charter so this conflict of interest is presented and we ensure that this is reflected well? Thanks.

(Steve): Let me take a - just (reflect). I think that's exactly the kind of thing to put into the charter and so the people writing the charter should take that into consideration and try to speak to it. We raised the question and I'm going to put that as an item for consideration but didn't specify the answer.

There are always pretty natural obvious kinds of things that people who make decisions about who gets money should not be standing right under the faucet collecting the money as it comes out. So keep those separate. But something sensible and transparent and, you know, in keeping with our traditions.

James Bladel: Thank you, (Mariela), and thanks for clearing that up, (Steve). Any other - (Sharene). Go ahead. Here, move this one over.

(Sharene): Sorry. Just to add to your point, it would be very good to actually have a common agreed definition of what is conflict of interest so that there's not ambiguity as you go forward.

The board will define it, for our own purpose, when we're doing, for example, the new gTLD, as actual conflict, potential conflict or perceived conflict. So

these are - and we can help you with those three definitions if you so wanted to.

But they're really designed it so that covers any possibility of anyone could be either really conflicted or potentially conflicted or even perceived by others to be conflicted, and that's very good that you agree (to) that as part of your terms of reference.

Man: Or we consult the CCWG on conflict.

James Bladel: Yes, we don't have enough of those. Okay, thank you (Sharene). And it's a good point because I think that that had come up in the context of the new gTLDs and I think there're some analogues to draw from there.

But I think that, you know, generally speaking, (Steve)'s statement about, you know, the person asking and the person answering shouldn't be the same person or entity. So (Edmund) has a question from the floor.

(Edmund): Yes, on the topic of conflict of interest on this particular topic, I think we need to also look back at some of those things that we've done like in the new gTLD process.

You know, all through the development of the guidebook and everything, potential applicants were involved in that process, as well, and also the joint applicant support team for the financial assistance program for the new gTLD.

So we need to distinguish between the development of the process and conflict of interest within that and how do we deal with that. And when we get to a point where certain applicants or, at that time, the interaction, that kind of - you know, when, let's say there's (funds) and somebody applies for it, that kind - you know, how the evaluation happens, that kind of conflict of interest.

There're two very different scenarios, so the development of the processes in the development of the poli- or the framework is very different from the actual, you know, administering of it.

I understand that there is, you know, a certain relationship with it but we need to be careful that we don't, you know, over-extend what we mean by conflict of interest in the beginning and in the development of the process and the framework itself.

James Bladel: Yes, excellent. Thank you, (Edmund). (Asha), you wanted to respond, and that I have (Donna) and we'll probably be out of time by then.

(Asha Hemrijani): Yes, thanks, (James). Very quickly, thank you, (Edmund). I think that's a really good point and that's definitely something we could think about in the chartering team from my perspective. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, (Asha), and I think we're going to come if you don't mind, something else that's popped up. We're going to - and not the spring this on you necessarily. I think you'll like this topic. But I think we would like to substitute our second bullet point with a different topic. So for that, I'll turn it over to (Donna).

(Donna Upton): Thanks, (James). (Donna Upton). So this goes - is related to the person sitting next to me. (Bruce Tompkin) is the representative from the contractor parties house in the council and (Bruce) is term limited and I think ends at the (ATM this year).

So the contracted party's house is actually going through the process at the moment to find a replacement for (Bruce) and we hope that we will be in a position to provide that name sometime in April.

James Bladel: Thank you. (Renalia) and then (Keith).

(Renalia): Sorry, is (Keith) responding to the issue that (Donna) raised?

James Bladel: I'm sorry if you want to - a separate topic, okay.

(Renalia): Okay, I have a topic to raise.

James Bladel: Okay, go ahead.

(Renalia): Is the GNSO working party present in the room or any representative? Thank you, (Chuck). So I have two requests. My committee is eagerly awaiting the visibility assessments and prioritization of the recommendations of the independent examiner.

I'd like to have an idea of when the organizational effectiveness committee of the board can expect to receive the working party proposal and recommendations. That's the first question.

And the second request is, I note that there are three recommendations that will be recommended as not to proceed. What the committee would like to suggest, for the working party and the GNSO to just provide an explanation and rationale so that we can understand and we can make the appropriate recommendations to the board.

(Chuck): Thanks, (Renalia). This is (Chuck). First of all, as a timeframe, there's actually a motion that has been made for council agenda this coming Wednesday for council consideration for this.

But to be very honest with you, I don't think there's any way that council has had time to see the full report. As you probably already know, there are 36 recommendations, three of which we - the working party recommended not be implemented, at least not at this time.

And there are then 33 others, some of which are just recommended outbreak to do. Some overlap with other things that are going on and so forth. So it's actually quite a detailed report.

And to be fair to counselors, to give them time to adequately review it, because it's very important for GNSO, we thought - I think it's unlikely that anything could be done, probably impossible, that anything could be done at this meeting.

Now, this came up in the working session yesterday and I think the sense of the room was they need more time. And that's perfectly understandable, especially for those of us that have been close to it and now how much is involved in that.

Now, what does that mean in terms of an actual estimate? When - how much time will the council need? I think they'll talk about that if they have time on Wednesday.

I'm sure it'll be a minimum of one more council meeting. It might be two. That's not as aggressive as the working party had hoped, but because of all the other things going on like accountability, transition and so forth, people just haven't had time to focus on this nearly as much as the working team.

So that's not a very good answer for you. I also understand that, really, the recommendations need to go to the board committee rather than - and necessarily to the council, but it was our belief on the working party that it would be a good idea to get the council involved representing their stakeholder groups and constituencies so that we - it's not just the working party.

We want their support for the recommendations that the working party has made. Now, let's see, now that I've said all that, let's - give me your other question please.

(Renalia): It's a request. It's not a question - that when you submit the...

(Chuck): Oh, yes, I got it. Okay.

(Renalia): Yes.

(Chuck): Sure. We actually have - I was just looking at those three because this is actually a topic on the agenda in about an hour from now. Is that right - 3:00? We're actually talking about this in this working session.

And two of the three that we recommend not pursuing do have a brief explanation as to why. I suspect you may want a little bit more and I don't think that's hard to do.

One of them doesn't, at least not in the little format we have, but that's a very reasonable request. And I should say, I'm not the chair, so I hope I'm not speaking out of turn for (Jen) who is the chair, but I think that's there. And (Larissa) is probably in the room somewhere and she could - she's the staff support person who could correct me if I misspoke on anything.

(Renalia): Thank you, (Chuck). (Larissa) briefed the committee this morning on the status of the working party work. And I appreciate the inclusive approach that you are adopting and there is no rush. Take your time. When you're ready, send it onward.

(Chuck): Thanks. And I said this yesterday in the working session yesterday when this topic came up, it's - we need more - it's fair to give the council more time to consider it in their respective groups.

But also I personally think that we also need to get this done as soon as possible because there are a lot of very good recommendations that will contribute to the GNSO work and so while more time is needed right now, I

suggested that we make that as minimal as possible so that we can get on with the improvements.

James Bladel: Thanks. Good exchange. And yes, just what (Chuck) said. Yesterday it became pretty clear that we need more time on this and I think the sense of the council is that, while it is on our schedule for Wednesday, the potential is very strong that it will be deferred to a future meeting. Thank you. Keith, you have the last word, sir.

Keith Drasek: Okay, thank you, (James). Keith Drasek. And forgive me for going back to the CCWG accountability. I was stunned that there were no questions. I missed opportunity. I knew that we were going to get away.

No, but I just wanted to take an opportunity today to thank the board. And, you know, in June 2014, it was the GNSO that led the community and requesting community driven accountability process to support the (IANA) transition, and the board ultimately supported that.

The board supported that and I think it's worth noting that this was a long process. It was a long and winding road. It turned out to be longer and more expensive than any of us expected.

But I think we can all be proud of the results and I do want to just take this opportunity to note that the board supported the community request for a CCWG, was engaged in the process from start to finish, and I think - as I said, I think we can all be proud of the results here. Thanks.

Man: Thank you, Keith, and it's very gracious of you. And I'm particularly glad that you mentioned that it was expensive too.

Man: Thank you, Keith. I think just to - a (short) follow-up because costs aren't just sort of cash that you pay out, but just sort of cost in terms of people's volunteer time.

So, you know, I think we should recognize just the sheer volunteer effort that was not compensated that people put into that, so I think it was a tremendous amount of resources that people put into making it a success.

Keith Drasek: Yes, so thanks. (James), if I may, just a quick response. I think we can be proud of the results but I think we can also be very proud of the process. And the fact is that CCWGs were not very well tested when we entered this last two years.

And I think the fact that we, as a community, not just the GNSO, but across the community, really came together and worked on the CWG and the CCWG. And I think we proved that the community can break down silos, what together, work collaboratively, compromise when necessary and deliver results. And I think that's a testament to all of us and I'm just very appreciative that we have the opportunity to prove that. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Keith. Thanks, (Bruce). Okay, I don't know if we want to jump to our last question here. (Yuls), if you want to tee that up, the floor is yours.

(Yuls Sasina): For the record, (Yuls Sasina). I'm also one of the people who are still in the learning mode. Is my second year at the GNSO council meeting. And as part of that, I actually had to look into a lot of questions about who actually does what and whose responsibility is to do what.

And I think we all agree that the GNSO exists to formulate policy for global domains and that is (unintelligible). But there have been a lot of cases where - well, not a lot - there have been several cases where either staff or ACs initiate policy in this space.

And I think that it will be good to sort of look at some of the cases. I'm not going to say any specific cases, but discuss the general parameters for when this happens because there seems to have been cases where the board then

kind of blesses those initiatives and goes and implements them without actually involving us and even when we try to get involved, we get told that's not policy. It's not your (limit).

James Bladel: Thank you, (Yules). I don't know if any board members would like to respond or - this is the second bullet point under the - sent by the GNSO to the board. And I think to elaborate...

(Bruce): Yes, I'm happy to comment on that, (James). Before I do, I noticed (Donna) was referring to one of the criteria replacing board (seat) 13, and clearly one of the criteria are being able to pronounce people's names.

I'd like to welcome - and I'm both an Australian and an engineer and I struggle with anything with more than one syllable but I will welcome (Yuran) to the meeting. Close enough?

So the role of the GNSO, this is the role of the board in determining policy and monitoring implementation of policy. I think firstly the GNSO's role is to develop the policy. The board's role is then to approve the policy and then direct staff to implement that policy.

But a very important part of that process is actually receiving feedback from the users of that policy, particularly during the implementation. So I think we actually welcome the feedback from the GNSO to inform the board and the staff on how the implementation is going.

And if they think the implementation isn't meeting the intent of the policy, you should let us know. And this is one of the things we've been looking at with these review teams like the ATRT review teams, is that will be great if those teams (almost link) to the small group.

That could interact with the board and the staff during the implementations so there's a bit of a sounding board. So yes, I think we should start to formalize

that a bit more going forward so that we ask - you know, let's say there's a thick WHOIS policy that came up recently but maybe there's a small group in the community that act as the users or the user group.

And they informed the board and the staff on whether they think the implementation of the policy is meeting with the intent of the policy was. You know, I'd encourage that (Yuls). You've got one syllable. I like it.

James Bladel: Thank you, (Bruce). Anyone else? (Yuls), did that address your - (Sharene).

(Sharene): Again, I'm going to refer to the new GTLD program because that was very recent. I think one of the things that cause sometimes a little bit of tension during implementation is that, if staff went ahead and did something.

Sometimes it was unclear in the eyes of the GNSO whether that - whatever staff did in terms of implementation, is it implementation are still changes to the policy?

And that has been a very contentious thing. And I think we need to find a way of actually - provide clarity on that point because I don't think we had clarity during the three years of the new GTLD and that is an issue which I suggest ought to be addressed.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Sharene). And I think to some extent, there has been worked in that area as far as finding that clarity group implementation review teams, but I think I agree that more could be done. Okay, I didn't know if there was follow-up from other members of the board or - (Yuran), you want to point at us and laugh or...

Man: My microphone is broken.

James Bladel: Sorry, technical malfunction. Oh, sorry. So we have two more hands in the queue and then we'll probably - then (Chuck) and then...

(Chuck): (James), can I respond to the implementation issue?

James Bladel: Yes, okay.

(Chuck): Yes, I'll be brief.

James Bladel: (Chuck), Phil, (Donna), Jonathan and then - okay.

(Chuck): And we may be ready to share the same thing. The policy and implementation working group - now, true, this applies to the GNSO, so it doesn't necessarily apply to the cross community things.

But not only did the GNSO approve those recommendations that I think address the concerns that (Sharene) raised but it was also approved by the board. And in talking to staff, they're quite a ways along in terms of implementing those, at least with respect to the GNSO. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Chuck). Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, Jonathan Robinson. Maybe I need to be so diplomatic anymore, (James).

James Bladel: Let's see Jonathan unchained.

Jonathan Robinson: Actually I leave that to (Chuck) and his alter ego. Really, actually, the point is brief. The - I wanted to draw your attention to something we talked about this morning when we talk about this CWG stewardship work.

And actually we're doing some very effective work there with ICANN staff on implementation. And, as you know, the CWG has moved on from being a policy development body into working and transitioning to do - to undertake the oversight of the implementation.

And it's another model that seems to be working very well. So I guess the broader point is, as we collectively learn about the CWG, including the involvement of the board and non-controversial involvement of the board, as we're going to try and do with the auction team, we are collectively developing some of these ideas and these ways of working.

And some of it is systematically, like (Chuck) just described. Some of it organically, and you know, I think we need to give ourselves some credit where we are doing things well and recognize some of that. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. Phil is next in the queue. Phil.

Philip Corwin: Thank you, (James). Philip Corwin representing the business constituency. I want to raise a question that I think can help inform work stream two where we're going to be looking at secondary accountability and transparency measurements, important ones, albeit secondary to the work stream one, including the DIDP, the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy, and the request for reconsideration process.

And let me (assure you) I have no (intention) to re-litigate the recent exchanges regarding be in position of URS by contract for (Cad pro) and travel.

And when the board approved those amended contracts, I want to commend the board for saying that approval of the renewal registry agreement was not a move to make the URS mandatory for any legacy TLD.

And it would be inappropriate to do so. And on (behalf of) the BC, we very much welcome that statement about inappropriateness particularly in the context where, at this meeting on Wednesday, the GNSO council expects to approve the charter for the working group that will be renewing all rights protection mechanisms.

But the question I have, the request for reconsideration was filed jointly by the non-commercial stakeholder group and the business constituency, fairly credible parties, important components of this body.

And in the decision of the board governance committee turning down that request for reconsideration, it was stated that there's no policy or procedure that requires the board to review each and every email or written exchange between ICANN staff and registry operators during the course of contract negotiations.

And we can see that there's no such policy, but the key issue here was not whether bilateral negotiations - obviously the negotiations are bilateral. The key issue was whether something inappropriate had happened where, in effect, there was a quid pro quo where the registry operators, each was requesting important changes in their agreement, and whether they were informed by GDD staff.

Well, if you want that, you have to take URS. And it's very difficult for parties, even the BC and the NCSG, to obtain that information because, number one, you must file the request for reconsideration within 15 days.

And if you file a DIDP, you don't - you're not promised to get information within less than 30 days and there's an option to extend that period. And also there were 12 separate reasons that staff can come up with for denying the request.

And those of us who have used DIDPs have found that in most cases, staff will find one or more of those reasons for telling you why you can't get the information you requested.

So my question is, and again it's to inform the work stream two, is well there's no policy that requires the board to look at this type of exchanges between

contracted parties and staff when there's an allegation by members of this - components of this council that there was an intrusion on the policy process.

Does the board think that the lack of requirement is the end of the story or, in this type of situation, wouldn't it be the right thing to do to at least make some inquiry to make sure that nothing inappropriate had happened? And I ask the question, again to inform the work stream two reviews of the DIDP and the reconsideration request (unintelligible). Thank you very much.

James Bladel: Thank you, Phil. Can I intercept before board response? And I understand that we didn't prep you with this question, and I think we should mention that this is a BC - this is you speaking for the BC now, Phil, and not necessarily the council generally or...

Philip Corwin: Yes. Yes, to make that clear especially for our newcomer, this is on behalf of the BC which is one of the two parties that filed the request for reconsideration.

James Bladel: Thank you. And I got (Mike) and then - yes, go ahead, (Mike).

(Mike): Thanks, (James), and thanks, Phil, for the question. I think that - and (Chris) they want to jump into this as chair of the board governance committee because we reviewed the reconsideration request.

But I think it's a very different approach when a party to a negotiation makes an allegation relating to the manner in which that was conducted and that would require us to actually look at the conduct of staff as opposed to third parties making unsubstantiated claims without any basis, any evidence and (informal) discussion with various parties.

There was no indication raised that there was validity to the concerns raised by the requesters. We felt that there was no specific policy or even a moral

obligation to go and second-guess and interrogate parties to a contract to had not been complaining.

If the converse had been true, then, if those parties had alleged staff misconduct in the process, then that would be very different because it would be the parties to the contract and that would require a board to do a more detailed investigation relating to the factual circumstances.

And what I can really suggest to Phil is that, if a reconsideration requests is going to be filed, based on board allegations and rumor, that at least facts be provided to substantiate that rather than we have heard, and it is rumored, and it has been suggested by various parties.

Or there (isn't always) adult commercial operators with reasonable understanding and experience in this industry who would sign a contract of this nature.

And I think the parties (that are under) contract may, in fact, be insulted with the way in which they were represented as not actually being able to understand the conduct or the content of the contract that they signed.

James Bladel: Thank you, (Mike). Okay, and I think we're probably going to leave it at that. I think that this has come up before and I guess at risk of coming up again. So how do we find a path forward, perhaps, you know, informally maybe to start with - you know, with the parties involved?

I mean, Phil, obviously you have - you, and perhaps your constituency as well, have concerns that are not being addressed. And so, I mean, rather than kind of continuing to raise it at the sessions, I wonder if we can bring this to a resolution. I'm not diminishing the concerns. I just wonder if this is the right avenue for them. So...

Philip Corwin: Let me assure the chair that I think this will probably be the last I bring this up within this council but the denial of the request for reconsideration has occurred since our last meeting, and again, I'm more interested, at this point, it's been litigated.

The decision has been made but, again, the community will be looking at both the DIDP and the request for reconsideration process in work stream two, and that was the reason I asked the question, and we can continue that conversation in work stream two.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks, Phil. And I'm sorry I missed the point about what had occurred since the last time we discussed this and that update. So with that, the password will go to (Donna). Thanks, (Donna).

(Donna Upton): Thanks, (James). (Donna Upton). I just wanted to go back conversation of the GNSO versus the role of the board in determining policy and sharing something that you said in relation to the NGPC.

Some of the challenges certainly for registry operators in the way that the policy has been implemented has been complicated by the fact that the GAC has been able to lobby in advice on a somewhat (irregular) basis which has caused problems to the NGPC, has caused problems to staff that has certainly caused significant problems for registry operators, particularly in terms of delays and inconsistencies in the way that some of the things have been dealt with.

As some of you will know, I've been closely involved in the way that we've handled the preservation of two characters that the second level and that has been an ongoing process for two years now.

And we're looking at probably not resolving that until September, I think is my best guess at this point. And what's happened because the process has

taken so long, is that we have disparity across the registries and how that has been rolled out.

So - and what I mean by that is some of the registry operators, because they got into the process through the (RSEP), so (unintelligible) is able to use two characters, all of them, with the exception of the four or five that are still reserved under the ITR names.

And there are other registries that, you know, maybe only have a handful that are stories because of government comments and there are others that have 30 or so that are still sitting out there reserved because of government comments that are coming later in a process that came in that was implemented later.

So I think - and I'm not necessarily having (a going) relation to that but what I would like to say is that moving forward, we really need to take lessons learned with us and try to make sure that we can do this stuff better coming down the track. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, (Donna), and I have Chris.

Chris Disspain: Thanks, (James). Chris Disspain. (Donna), yes, I had knowledge what you said and without going into the specific details of that particular one, it's a function to some extent of policy arriving with -- and this happens all the time -- policy arrives with stuff described as implementation that turns out not to be implementation.

It turns out to be policy. The - and then decisions get made. Some people like them. Some people don't. The GAC comes along with advice because of the decision that's been made, and so on.

It seems to me that one alternative way of dealing with this, and I'm not entirely sure that it's workable, but it's worth thinking about, is simply for the board to say, when something like this happens, freeze it.

Send it back to the GNSO. Figure it out. And that's one way of dealing with it. But the question then becomes we'll get pressure from some people saying, "No, no, no. Make a decision. Make a decision."

So the argument will end up being - some people argue that it actually is implementation because they want us to make a decision and other people argue that its policy because they don't want us to make a decision.

So - but the thing I really - the message I really wanted to deliver is to say, look, I agree with you. There are a significantly large number of lessons to be learned.

There's been a significant amount of work that's had to be done in the community and at the board level because of the way that the (stuff) has been dealt with and (arrived) from the GNSO in the first place.

They'll need to sit down and work this out. Round two, whenever around to happens, is our opportunity to pick the pieces out of round one and say, "That should never happen again." Answer the questions first, or actually, that is implementation. I acknowledge that. I'll live with a decision that you make. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Chris. Well, (Steve) had to leave and I think that we're nearing the end of our session. So I just wanted to extend a thanks to the board, as always, for making time for us on your schedule and coming to visit.

I think we'll be seeing you as well in smaller groups as the week goes on. If we have any follow-up questions, I think Marika and (Mary) will make sure

that we follow up and deliver with you anything that we've committed to intentionally or accidentally during the last hour and a half.

So thank you, and of course, the reverse is also true. If you have any follow-up questions for us - okay, then let's consider this session closed, and we can stop the recording.

END