Transcription ICANN Dublin
GNSO session Sunday 18 October 2015
GNSO Meeting with the Board
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

Man: All right everybody I think if we say counsel is back to the table please. The timing has gone a little not quite as intended. So rather than having the full board here we do have like to welcome George Sadowski who I believe is going to talk to us about the CEO search in 30 seconds which will give counselors time to return to the table.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's get so if you could continue any conversations outside the room otherwise join us at the table and come and participate in the discussion.

So George just to give you some - a couple of remarks to give you a sense of where we got I mean we did various pieces of preparation.

And as you know we had originally planned for you to come yesterday and you were otherwise occupied which we fully understand.

But so we transferred an update from you in your capacity as chair of the CEO Search Committee. But we did have a follow-on question and if you feel you can answer that George great or if we wait for your board colleagues to join us that's equally satisfactory.

But there we wanted to talk to you about the plans to ensure an effective transition. In other words what are sort of the handover type thinking. So that goes beyond the remit of the Selection Committee but it may be something you are willing and able to talk about.

So if you have managed shovel a few bits of food in and get a little lunch we welcome hearing from you George.

George Sadowski: Thank you very much and my apologies for not being able to be here yesterday. We were locked in deep mortal combat on an issue that I don't even remember now and it was - so I was - I felt I could not leave the meeting.

At the same time the board is deep in discussion today about something else. And I've just left early. They will be up here and they'll be very pleased to know that there's food here because they missed their lunch hour.

We were supposed to end the previous meeting at 12 o'clock and they are still discussing. So they'll be very well - very glad to be here when they arrived.

So let me talk a little bit about the search. I'll give you an outline. There are certain things I can say and certain things I can't and then open the floor for questions if that's all right. And that can go as long or as short as you want it to be pending the arrival of my colleagues.

We announced the search in May shortly after Fadi announced that he was leaving mid-March. And the committee for the Search Committee with me as chair and seven other board members was sworn in in early June.

We've contracted with (RL Benson), a search firm which did a very good job for us the last time around and has done other things for ICANN.

And we advertised the search through the committee through multiple, multiple mailing lists through the community with several ads in the Economist magazine.

We closed. We did a soft close on the nominations in September 20 recognizing that if any stars came in after September 20 we weren't going to hold them to that deadline.

Now the search is - the applications period is closed and I can report some of the results.

We received well over 100 applications. And I'll give you some percentages. And this will be in a blog. This is public information and will be in a blog that I'm in the process of writing if I get time over the next couple of days.

With regard to gender balance 90 -- I'm giving you percentages -- 93% of the applicants were male 7% were female.

With regard to regional breakdown 16% of the applicants from Asia 7% came from South America and the Caribbean Latin America and the Caribbean.

Forty-one percent came from North America, 9% came from Africa. And I will tell you that I fudged slightly these percentages so that if you try to infer the exact number by looking at what number of applicants caused these percentages to fall out you will fail.

So all right so the - we've gone through the first step of contacting people we think are viable candidates.

And of course this, you know, the search process starts with a very broad field and then we apply several processes to consecutively narrow the field

and to sequentially and up ultimately at the final panel which the board will interview and from which the selection will be made.

And of course at the first you get 100 and some resumes and it's very difficult for those of you who have hired people -- and I suspect that's most everybody in this room -- would know that when you get a piece of paper it could be a candidate, could be better the candidate, could be worse. It's not clear what's missing from the resume, et cetera.

So when going into this process we had the distinct feeling that we didn't know what we were getting. And we - there was an issue about whether we would have a core the really was worth looking at.

I am pleased to report to you that based upon the first round we think we're in pretty good shape and that's good news.

No what we have told people is that there are really three major components of the job that we want people to understand, appreciate and respond to. And the first is management. The second is community relations and the third I characterize somewhat as foreign policy or relationships with the rest of the world, the rest of the world being governments, international organizations other iStar organizations and the like.

And we really like to find someone who has the very strong capabilities in all three. That's very difficult because those roles don't often come together in previous positions.

But having strong backgrounds into and a rapid ability to learn and the personal characteristics which make it likely that they will succeed in the remaining one is something we look at.

So the where we are now we've looked at these people. We're going to be - we've looked at them on paper and we've looked at them over the telephone.

And where we are now is to go to a narrowing process where which will involve probably more work on the telephone and face-to-face work with the ultimate selection meeting being probably mid-December.

It would be very nice to have someone by Christmas. That's a target which I think is possible.

Now we've talked about various things that might happen that might cause that to slip. The most prominent of these is the possibility of a CCWG meeting, an intercessional meeting via the CCWG accountability work important as it is has caused us to reschedule things a number of times.

And it may cause us to - it may cause this process to slip. We don't know. We'll find out because we don't know what the CCWG is going to do with regard to the need for more public comment or not and intercessional meeting of some sort or not, et cetera.

So we're aiming for the end of the year. We think if we have somebody by the end of the year there will be a process by the successful candidate of disengagement from their present situation and then re-engagement and paralleling with Fadi.

And if that can be done before March and continue through the Marrakesh meeting we think we are well we'll be in pretty good shape.

Now the process that you alluded to regarding the handover is not properly the process belonging to the search committee. But Steve has taken that in hand and when he gets here I think he'll be able to report on that in some detail with his own thinking.

Let me leave it there and open for questions. May I do that?

Jonathan Robinson: Of course George. Thank you very much. That's I think helpful in some - certainly from for me some unique information I haven't heard before.

I have a question from (Lars), a remote question.

Man: Yes.

(Klaus):   (Klaus) for the record. It's a question from Chuck Gomes remotely. Would any of the candidates George have experience in the multi-stakeholder model?

George Sadowski:Yes. I can't give you a percentage. I don't know. But let me say that there are more multi-stakeholder models or more quasi-multi-stakeholder models in the world than you might realize. We are not unique.

(Klaus):   I think there is maybe Chuck actually referred specifically I'm sorry to the ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

George Sadowski:Oh, that's a harder question answer as you're really asking me whether there are people from the community who have applied aren't you? I'm not going to comment on that.

The - I used to run the NonCom. And the rule that we applied there was process is public, data is private, data are private and I think we should hold to the same thing here.

Jonathan Robinson: So as we - other - any other members of the board in addition to George please come in and please come and join us at the table. I have another question from Volker. Go ahead Volker.

Volker Greimann: Hi George, just one question. Volker Greimann speaking for the record.

Will you have certain experience or knowledge of the ICANN multi-stakeholder process as a prerequisite to hiring the new CEO or will it be a situation where like this time where the CEO confesses that he only understood the multi-stakeholder process that they - he decided to leave?

Man: (Unintelligible).

George Sadowski: Maybe I should have Fadi come in on that but he's not a member of the Search Committee.

I think we recognize the stakeholder or the community, we're calling the community part of the process as being a very important component of knowledge.

And if they don't have that of course you never know if they, you know, sometimes you learn as you - and in the job. And clearly ICANN is unique in the number of respects even though it's not unique in a general multi-stakeholder class.

And unless you're a member of the community or have watched it very carefully you don't understand that until you get into it at least that's my sense.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, so board members please do join us. Those of you that haven't had the opportunity to get some food please grab what you can what's left there.

I'm thinking of a Bob Marley song which says that there's a hungry man is an angry man and I don't think we want a hungry board being an angry board so please help yourself to some food.

George I have - (Maria) has a question. Where is (Maria)? Where is (Maria). Maybe it's an old hand, I don't know.

Okay so one possible outcome to these processes George is that you get to a point where you can't make a selection. Is that something which you would countenance? I mean it's always a possibility that you - and you're not guaranteed even if you - from your short list.

George Sadowski: That is correct. And we have had discussions about plan B which is if we can't do that or alternatively if we might be able to but maybe not quite in time. So we need some kind of a bridging solution yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Have I missed a hand or is - would anyone else like to...

Man: If you want to go up to the mic?

Ken Stubbs: Yes I have a small question. My name is Ken Stubbs. I have a concern. My concern is that you may come down to the right person.

And the right person looks you in the eye and says, "I'd love to take the job but I can't do it until next June or July."

We're going to be going through some very critical times in the first half of the next year so it seems to me that whoever we bring on board needs to get on board very quickly.

So I'm just hoping that the committee is taking a very close look at that being a significant factor, the ability to get to work. Thank you.

George Sadowski: Thanks Ken. We are aware of that and it's - that's why we are trying to maintain our schedule regardless of the interruptions that have been occurring pretty constantly since we started our work.

The other thing by the way I should add is that not only do we want the person to start working as early as possible but we want them to start working in Los Angeles as early as possible. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks George. I've got (Brett) next.

(Brett):   George this will be our sixth CEO after about 15 or 16 years of operations. Are you looking for someone who can actually hold the office for five, ten years maybe? I think that would be an important attribute.

George Sadowski:I don't know what we do to our CEOs (Brett). We burn them out. It's - that's hard to judge ahead of time.

I think certainly we want a CEO who understands what kind of an environment they're entering. And the fact that there are significant tensions, pressures concerns that there - this is not an easy job.

We've also told them by the way - we've identified this job as a CEO job. But we've - I've taken pains to say this is not a classic CEO job.

We don't want you to grow your market. We don't want you to absorb competitors, maximize growth, et cetera.

We could have called this job an executive director job or a Secretary General job and it's somewhat of a combination of those things that we're looking for.

So what we want to do is make sure we do not plant false expectations on what is expected. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: George I don't mean this flippantly but a follow-on is I mean would you consider changing the title of the job then? Maybe that's part of the issue that

the title of the role sets expectation. Perhaps you could consider changing the title of the role?

George Sadowski: We could. That's not a job for the search committee to do but - or to consider but yes, I think we talked about it as I recall early on.

And the notion was that we would probably get more candidates if we, you know, the attraction would be stronger if we called it a CEO even without limitation.

I mean it's something for the next search committee which I hope will be a long time from now to consider.

Steve Metalitz: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Steve come in.

Steve Metalitz: So this is me speaking having thought about this not just on the spot here but not as an official position or one that's been coordinated.

Without actually discussion I don't know about changing the name of the CEO position but even whether or not the Board of Directors ought to be called the Board of Trustees. So the idea of what the name is has been in play a little bit.

The question about the longevity of the next CEO is related I think very strongly to the degree of change that our institution is going through.

We've gone through a very rapid expansion and growth in staff and in revenue and also in status and position in the world and a lot of internal focus.

That process is going to be different going forward. We're not continuing on the same path but I think there will still be quite a bit of change.

My personal guess is that although it would be delightful to be able to put somebody in place who is therefore indefinitely long period of time five, ten years or more it will not surprise me and I don't have a bias, you know, it would be fine if it happens but it won't surprise me or particularly perturb me if the next candidate is in place for a decent amount of time and as part of that we take that question of what the stability is over a longer period of time and whether we reach some sort of level operating state. I don't think we're quite there yet.

Jonathan Robinson: So no actually we've sort of talked a little - we've touched a little on the handover and the transition arrangements but that was the follow-on question.

Are there any other questions for George specifically relating to search or shall we move on then to the follow-on question which is related to - I see no other hands okay sorry (Kuwa).

(Kuwa):   In this session maybe it's better for the board, particularly the CEO Searching Committee to know what's the most concerned in the GNSO. Maybe you can tell us because there is still in the process.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Kuwa). That's a good opening to see. We didn't prepare it as such. I mean it was more - this was originally an update.

Certainly one key concern is managing the transition between, you know, outgoing and incoming CEO.

The other concern which was articulated in an earlier question of fact is it's the learning curve. It's recognizing and I'm - I, you know, I've have heard

many organizations described as unique. And people think oh, our business is unique, our operations are unique and they always argue this case.

And therefore I'm very well - I, you know, normally whoever this person is very well-qualified. I think that that arguably does pertain very strongly to this so that seems to be a question.

We are a unique environment. So Fadi is on record as saying it was a significant learning curve and one that arguably remains to this day as we all learn and that - and the situation evolves.

So the question then is is how do we - how does the board, the CEO Search Committee manage that transition both in terms of the selection but also the transition to the new cabinet and their familiarity and understanding of the nuances and subtleties of this environment and operating in this environment?

So that's a key question I think.

George Sadowski: Let me - that too is a question which we're taking up not just within the search committee but within the board as a whole.

We've started a - developing a set of questions and notes on whole series of things related. What are the things that are in process that are at risk because of a transfer of CEO that we should try to keep track of at a board level?

What are the challenges that we want to tell the CEO about? What are the pieces of education that may not be likely to get from the standard things that we want to say in addition to everything that you've been exposed to that you've read about and you go through the standard process, here's a half a dozen things that you better also know about.

And then finally what are the marching orders or briefing that we want to hand to the next CEO?

That process has started. When we did it before we did it both as a group and then privately I had my own notes. And I have some delightful stories to tell you if in another setting when there's time about what happened when I engage with Fadi when I had that set of notes and then finally got a chance to talk to him about it?

So we're very, very attuned and sensitive to that and it's in my view a defined - it's a task in and of itself separate from the search but of course intimately related to the search. But it's not just a casual thing. It's a first-class question which we devote quite a bit of energy too.

Jonathan Robinson: Other comments, questions reactions? I'll give a personal one. I certainly think that one of the things you would do is an incoming CEO to an organization is you would say you want to get out and meet the customers very early on.

And in a sense, you know, there's plenty of stakeholders in this case who are the customers in that sense.

So I think and the challenge there would be to make sure you've got an education as to what those groups think and feel rather than necessarily lobbying positions but rather understood from the point of view the operations and functioning and mechanics of the community. George?

George Sadowski:Jonathan thank you. We asked the candidates a lot of questions and one of the questions which is comes up often is what will you do when and how will you prepare yourself for this and what will you do the first thing on the job?

The responses are often telling.

Steve Metalitz: Oh yes, what I alluded to before about education, you know, the standard kind of thing is it exactly includes - it's not limited to but obviously includes get out and meet the stakeholder, get out and meet your customers. Here's a list of the obvious list that's visible.

In addition the private list that we give them says and here's what you need to know about Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) since I will no longer be just the chair of the GNSO Council from...

Steve Metalitz: The first thing that we tell them.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Steve. Ken if you have a question please come up to the microphone.

Ken Stubbs: Good afternoon again. My name is (Kenny) Stubbs. I'm speaking purely as an individual. I think something that needs to be - I'm responding to your comments or something that needs to be very strongly stressed with the candidate is the fact that ICANN is a service organization.

Its principal responsibility is to perform a broad list of services for the communities that are incorporated within it. We need to be in a position in the future to provide those services in an efficient and effective manner.

It's been over the last five to eight years been quite easy for the new CEOs to get distracted by the sexy world scene. And I think it's extremely important that a new hire needs to understand that his focus needs to be inward at first.

And once he totally understands the community and has a good handle on exactly the hierarchy of the services and so forth then he could take a look at the impact on his ability to provide those services from various global perspectives.

But I really wouldn't want to see a new CEO gone for four months or five months of the year to global meetings doing outreach.

We don't need outreach at this point in time. We need to reach inwards and take care of the people who constitute this community. Thank you.

Man: Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Ken. Any other reactions, comments responses, questions?

Steve is there anything else you would like to say about the transition, the second bullet or do you think we've covered that satisfactorily from your point of view?

Steve Metalitz: No thank you very much. No the - I said exactly what I wanted to say perhaps not quite as crisply. But there were - I listed four kinds of buckets of things that we're developing lists of what are the dropped balls or likely possible drop balls that we want to keep track of, what are the special education - it's a funny title but you know what I mean.

What are the challenges that - beyond whatever is obvious and then what are the specific guidance that we want to provide from the board to launch the CEO?

Another, you know, there's some obvious things. Fadi has very graciously made a point that he will spend quite a lot of time, quality time bringing the new CEO up to speed and sharing his knowledge and transferring not only details of what's happening but making introductions and so forth.

I'm expecting a very civilized and very forceful robust transition process, not walk into an empty office and say, "Oh my God where do I start?"

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve. All right so let's move us on then to one of these other points. They are in a sequence here, not necessarily in a preferred sequence so if Steve you or your colleagues would like to bring one further up the schedule please do including things that you would like to raise with us. So please do that.

This PDP on registration directory services this is a board initiated PDP. And of course the PDP is the heart of what the GNSO does in terms of our policy development function for generic top-level domains.

I think the issue here really is we are aware that it's a very sizable and multifaceted project. As you know from the boards group, the board groups work with their GNSO group in terms of scoping this enduring some of the initial work.

So we really wanted to understand your expectations on timing, how urgent your views are on this and how urgently you think this needs to be commissioned.

And this is partly connected to Bullet 3 where we are suffering from significant resource constraints due to number of issues that are probably self-evident and it's as you see in the parentheses there so it's a broader topic.

And also there's this reason point on CJE ruling regarding Safe Harbor. So that's really the point. Volker did you want to come in with further scoping on the point or did you - yes go ahead and then we'll hand it over.

Volker Greimann: I think the resource issues it's something that's broader than just the resources that have to be expended by the community as in participation.

I assume that certain issues of this project will also require extensive resources not maybe on the same level as the CCWG but at least other

smaller scales for analysis of privacy impact and the issue of personal data that would be retained by this.

Having legal studies to understand the privacy impact and the legal implications of the new project will probably be also a resource issue that has to be addressed.

Steve Metalitz: This is a topic very dear to me very, very near to my heart. We have known for a very, very long time that the registration trajectory services Whois in particular was broken in some fundamental ways.

And it was very natural that it - that that would be the case because it grew out of services that were developed originally actually on the (Arpinet) when we had tens or dozens of nodes.

And a node was a time shared system run by a system administrator. And the information in the directory was not the names of the users but the names of the systems administrators so they could reach each other.

That's been expanded now a million-fold basically. And nothing expands a million-fold without undergoing a lot of changes.

So I just want to set that context.

Three years ago in November 2012 if I remember correctly we took the action, we took a pair of actions. And I understand that there's some differences of opinion about this and so I'll - but I'll be clear about what our posture was.

We had the result from the Whois Review Team review which was exactly tied to the scope that was set out in the Affirmation of Commitments.

And it produced a very excellent report. And we accepted the recommendations and we're prosecuting them, some differences of opinion about how well we accepted them and so forth.

But that was one part. And the other thing we said was while we're going to push forward on that it's also time to initiate a strategic fresh look at that whole process and so we passed a resolution to that effect.

That has - that led to the Expert Working Group with a report and that's led down to this on board initiated policy development or issues report and policy development process.

Meanwhile that's not all that's going on. There's been changes to the registration agreement. There's your privacy report that's come out.

And I'm not sure that I have all of - that I've said everything. There may be more even in there.

At our last retreat a few weeks ago I had intended that we would have a review of where we stood and tried to have a better answer to some of these questions.

All of that got squeezed because of transition stuff. So the resource issue is affecting all of us. It remains very high on the list of things that we're going to look at and have a holistic view of all of this.

And the answer to your question about the board's expectation especially on timing is in fact tied exactly to the resource question which I don't know the answer so it's going to be an interactive thing of trying to find out what makes sense in terms of setting a schedule.

We're much more concerned with getting it right and doing what's necessary. And the timing will be as a consequence of getting all that figured out rather than setting the schedule and then having to live within that.

So that's the best that I can tell you at the moment except that as long as we're talking about resources it also affected for example the auction process which you and I have been very heavily involved in.

We anticipated the auction issue some time ago and we actually came to a sharp halt with an estimate that it was inappropriate to burden the community with having to take up the auction process.

And meanwhile the pressure welled up that said well we have to figure out what to do with the auction process.

So we've got these two pressures. One is how to live within the resources that are available and the other is the urgency of taking care of the problems that are in front of us.

And there's no perfect answers to these things and probably the only good thing to do is to make sure that we're all in communication not only about the objectives but about the realities of the resources and then to make a shared decision about how to go forward with these things.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve. I think to that extent we are. And that's exactly what happened I mean this is actually is a subject of a motion of our council meeting on Wednesday.

And when we look at this and the timing and then it naturally picked up on the community resource issues and then second point that Volker made about the requirement for potentially additional financial or other support resources.

So yes I guess this is a first step in that communication. And if that's all there is to be said for the moment I think that one of the concerns was of the GNSO potentially being seen to be it's probably not the right perfect phrasing but going slow on a board initiated PDP. And we were very sensitive to not want to be seen to be doing that which is why we wanted to raise this with you and discuss it.

Steve Metalitz: You won't be seem to be going slow because we have hardly enough time to see anything.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or points on this Item 2? I guess given that we touched on the auction proceeds it would be useful to go to four.

Now let's be clear about Item 4. Item 4 is not about new gTLD auction proceeds per se. This is about the emergence of the CCWG as a mechanic, as a broad community mechanic and process that's as we all know has emerged and become ever more prevalent and very much the topic of the day.

And we know that the board has grappled for a number of reasons with its involvement in the CCWG on accountability and with good reason.

Because in that particular case it impacts directly on the boards' involvement and work so it's probably the most challenging one to have known where perfectly to insert the board or not as individuals or collectively. And I think that's becoming increasingly understood by everyone.

But we wanted to have an open conversation with you about the board's role in future CCWG in a sense to start to head off future such problems and concerns.

So it would be great if everyone would share some thoughts. And we'd love your thoughts on this and how the board but deal with future such CCWGs.

Of course in the case of auction proceeds ultimately should this the - should the CCWG be the mechanism which currently is the mechanism on the table there is a follow-on question how will the board deal with the output from such a CCWG?

But that's - those are really the two questions. How do we work - how does the board work with and within the community on CCWGs and how might you deal with the output in this specific case?

So Steve I don't know if you would like to make any remarks or just put it out to colleagues.

Steve Metalitz: The - I used to come into these kinds of meetings with a statement that we really enjoy coming and we want to use the time and get right to the hearts of issues and not dance around them. And if there are sensitive things we'll get to them.

And this is one of those moments that I think we actually have an opportunity to touch one of these emerging and potentially sensitive topics.

Let me tease apart three things. The CCWG that's in progress on accountability is a - it is a Cross Community Working Group but it is got a life of its own and has a whole bunch of special characteristics that may or may not relate directly to any other thing.

The - another another thing that you touched on is the idea of a CCWG in general has emerged as a very useful tool and is now being invoked for a number of different things.

And then it's beginning to raise the question of what is the status of the output of that CCWG so chartered by their sponsored organizations and they

generate a report and it gets validated I think is the standard process by the charting organizations and that it comes to the board.

And so the question sometimes spoken and sometimes unspoken is with what force does it come? Does it come as a de facto law because it's gone through this process or it is a suggestion in the form of good ideas or is there some other way to describe all that?

I think in fairness we're not all on the same page or have - we haven't discussed all that well enough. I have some concern that if we go too far in saying it is de facto law then we've created yet another mechanism that's overlaid on top of everything else we have. And I would want to look very closely at that.

On the other hand if it's - if it is taken as a serious piece of work that has a lot to commend it and needs to be examined seriously then it falls kind of in the realm of advice and I don't mean advice lately, I mean advice in the sense that we damn well better pay attention, absorb it, allocate the priorities to understand it and respond.

And that if there is a reason not to accept it it has kind of the same role in broad terms of say like an Affirmation of Commitment so Review Team response you don't set that aside lightly.

Now as I said I understand that this is a potentially sensitive subject, maybe not even potentially. And I don't mind that this stirs up some controversy and we'll all live with wherever it goes so that's a - then somewhere in the middle of all this is the auction proceeds by itself.

Let me extract the auction proceeds from the CCWG for just a second because one of the key things that we said from the board sorry - or at least I said very strongly was that we wanted to proceed deliberately. We wanted a process that was - and we wanted guidance on topics and we want it

processed and we did not want at the board level to make individual project decisions and that it was premature to do that.

And the other thing that we said is and by the way there is a very serious conflict of interest potential here. We do not want to be in a position where the people who are making the decisions are also the recipients of the funds.

And in fact there was a second layer of sensitivity about those who set the direction versus those who make the decisions versus those who selected.

At the board level we do not have any preconceptions beyond that. We're not saying well we secretly know where this is going to go or almost anything that it meets the general provisions and has a sense with the community about what we should do is fine.

But we have not yet at least in my mind pre-committed that we're taking hands off of this you say what you want to do and it gets rubberstamped in there.

So there's some room in their but there's certainly no fixed plan at the board level about this. We really want to get a set of ideas on the table first and then have some idea about how to do it.

And for the people that have not been following things closely we get ideas like while you should start a foundation.

Okay so that's a mechanism. What are they - what's the terms of reference for the foundation? What objectives are we given? But if you just start a foundation and you don't do anything all you've done is kick the can down the road.

There's a utility in separating out. That's a piece of the conversation but it's not sufficient. And so I'll stop there. (Bruce) you had your head up. I...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes to - Steve just in terms of the queue, the counselors have access to an Adobe Room so please go ahead or make yourself known if you don't like (Bruce) has done.

And very specifically I mean the new gTLD auction proceeds perspective CCWG or other process is work in progress as we know Steve. If that's - it's a source of a public comment and it's a discussion paper going on so that is not the primary subject matter of this topic just so we are all...

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: ...clear on that.

This is about CCWGs, how the board might deal with it and how the board involves itself in CCWGs. And we'd love an open discussion on the type that you referred to Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: So I've got - I'll defer to (Bruce) on the board and then come to you James. Let's go in that order.

(Bruce):   Thanks Jonathan. Perhaps if I deal with the second part of that question first which is what's the likely board methodology for dealing with the output of a Cross Community Working Group?

So Cross Community Working Groups are chartered by one or more of the supporting organizations or advisory committees.

And generally when we - when the board gets the output of such a group that the outputs actually come from effectively the charting organizations. That's when we really formally deal with it as a board.

And I think what's perhaps a bit unique with this current Cross Community Working Group on accountability is pretty much involved almost every SO and AC.

But let's assume it just involved two for example, might just be one SO and AC. It might be a GNSO and ALAC output.

In that case generally what we do is when we get a report that's come up from a part of the organization we put it out for formal comment.

And at that stage we may get input from advisory committees or other supporting organizations or other public comments.

And normally that what we do is we have a formal public comment process but we also meet with each of the advisory committees and supporting organizations and get their feedback.

Specifically with the accountability report what you'll see is due this week is we will be doing some of the feedback collection this week.

So on Tuesday we'll be asking - and Wednesday when we meet with the different groups including this group do you have any feedback on the current proposal that's come - and the current work underway? You know, what's your feedback on that?

I expect at some stage once we get the final report the board will formally meet depending on when we get there report, you know, I expect the board members will reach out to their respective parts of the community and get their feedback on it.

I think ultimately the first step could be that the board endorses the recommendations from that report. And then after that happens the board

might have issues with some of those recommendations and we set that all out in our board resolution back in October last year that if 2/3 of the board believe there are some problems with that output that we would then have a formal dialogue. So that's sort of dealing with the recommendations themselves.

Then I expect we actually have to come up with a set of bylaws that implement the recommendations from the CCWG. And it's most likely that we will need some sort of public comment process on those - on the final bylaws language before we approve that.

And that's normally how we deal with reports from review teams if you like. The Review Team report comes in. You know, generally if we approve the recommendations of that review team the next step is getting staff to do the bylaws drafting.

That goes out to public comment and then we finally approve the bylaws. So here we're trying to collapse that schedule is much as possible. So we're using this week to do some of the feedback gathering that we would normally get on the output of one of these reports.

And I expect that as parts of the report become finalized that the bylaw drafting would perhaps start to happen in parallel that we don't wait until it finally gets to the board before we start drafting bylaws.

Does that deal with that second question for you?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes and no. And it's yes in that it's extremely helpful, it's very clear, and it deals specifically with the CCWG on accountability.

Actually the question is posed in the general sense.

(Bruce): Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: But by illustrating your - the board's mechanism for dealing with that from the accountability CCWG its nevertheless very useful.

So just to make it clear that in a sense we're proposing the question looking ahead...

(Bruce):   Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...as well.

(Bruce):   Yes and I'll probably describe it more generally. So a general...

Jonathan Robinson: Right.

(Bruce):   ...thing is that we go and seek input from - once we've received the report just like we deal with the - a report from the supporting organization like the GNSO, you know, we vote essentially on the recommendations. And then if there's bylaws change as we go through a process there.

Coming back to your earlier point about the involvement of the board in a Cross Community Working Group I think that's going to vary by topic. So for example there was a Cross Community Working Group on applicant funds and new gTLDs.

And at the time we had a board member called (Katim) that was very interested in that topic and he actually got involved and engaged.

I can imagine depending on the topic there may be board members that want to get involved in the system, the development of the work.

And we are encouraging the board to do that in this case but for accountability. But ultimately when an individual board member is

participating they're participating by a large using their expertise because until it's actually gone to the board and there's been some sort of board resolution they're not speaking for the board.

And so I want to make that quite clear that we have individual board members that can contribute to Cross Community Working Groups. We encourage them to do that.

Generally they're doing that on the basis of their expertise in the area. So in the Cross Community Working Group (Sharon) and (Asher) who are members of the Board Finance Committee have been pretty active in looking at the budget here because that's - they're experts in that area.

I've been more active in some of the dispute resolution areas because I've been at the other end of most of those disputes for the last eight years or so. I've had a lot of reconsideration requests.

So yes each board member tries to contribute using their expertise but they're not speaking to the board when they're doing that.

When the board speaks it's generally through a resolution and, you know, as we did in October last year.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I've got James and (Ray). In the queue anyone else let me know?

James Bladel: Thanks Jonathan, James speaking. And, you know, Steve appreciate your thoughts on this.

I think some of the concern or some of the unease coming from our conversation yesterday is just some uncertainty around how the CCWG will work generally and how we're kind of seem to be making it up as we go based on each of the issues.

And they are becoming I think to (Bruce)'s point something like an ad hoc issue specific review team structure that we're forming and then issuing recommendations.

I think pulling it back away from accountability and back towards auction proceeds do you see any value in sort of having a preliminary discussion once, you know, with between the CCWG or whatever it is with the board to kind of lay on some parameters around where the board might differ from the recommendations and from the output of this group, what it would do in those situations, how it would engage, you know, similar to like a GAC scorecard?

Or if it had a veto over these recommendations would there be a finite number of vetoes under certain criteria? Do you see any value in kind of hashing that out in advance before, you know, before we go into this process?

Steve Metalitz: You served it up as kind of a softball in a way. Communication's always good right? So, you know, how could we say no? And in fact I don't want to be dismissive about it. It's very good idea to have some early discussion to stake out sort of where what some of the questions would be or somewhat - some of the concerns.

As I said, you know, what is emerging here is apart from any of the specifics whether we're talking about auction or we're talking about the accountability or some other topic is the fact of creating a CCWG has begun to carry a certain amount of expectation about what its authority is or what its status is. And I don't think that we've gotten that sorted out.

I mean I might be able to say I know exactly how I think about it. But that's - I'm just one person in this whole spectrum. And, you know, I'll go around the room and there might be some important and subtle differences.

Let me suggest that we start a CCWG on - no...

Man: We've already had one of those.

Man: That's been suggested. Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: To be clear we have one. There is a group working on the mechanics of CCWGs make, no mistake. It's live and running and...

James Bladel: Perhaps we should engage with the...

Man: Yes indeed perhaps. The existence of a CCWG on CCWG it's kind of symbolic of the GNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I have in the queue then (Ray), (Amr) and then Anne.

(Ray):   Thank you Jonathan. This whole discussion seems to be begging the issue about whether or not there should be a general charter for any CCWG which lays out the parameters about interaction and processes that need to be done and that for any given CCWG then you would take this general charter and add the specifics for the topic at hand.

                       That gives you the advantage of transparency in that there is a procedure process that's going to be followed.

                       It also is accountable because it lays out the steps that have to be done. It lays out the steps in the order they should be done. It gives the opportunity if the group describes it the correct way to put in checks and balances and petition points so that a fruitful discussion can take place.

                       It can build in the ability so that there are no surprises in the process.

So Jonathan my question is is that is that something that this working group is working on?

Jonathan Robinson: I'll leave someone - is anyone from who is on that working group prepared to speak out to that as to the scope and progress of that? It's probably - there's probably someone better qualified than me.

But in short yes and I mean what this has become more clear to me certainly is that actually that's a piece of, you know, perhaps the board involvement and I mean (Bruce) laid out some sort of scope of expectations of how this might work very well.

And so in terms of where the recommendations go and perhaps to your point about a general charter but if anyone would like to speak...

(Ray):   Can I come back at you real quick?

Jonathan Robinson: Sure.

(Ray):   Yes by doing this and actually taking this general charter if you will and putting it out for comment and getting everybody to agree to it then that takes all of those things off the table whenever a particular CCWG is put into operation.

Jonathan Robinson: I agree. And the board I think is aware of that work that group and by all means see that kind of thing. As you know that by definition the groups are open to those contribution so it makes sense to do so.

I've got (Amr) and then Anne.

(Amr):   Thanks Jonathan this is (Amr). I think since this topic has emerged there have been indications that there's a greater amount of interest in this than there is in other topics.

And there may be a significantly larger pool of volunteers who would want to get involved in a group discussing this.

And I'm comparing that to the general pool of people who get involved for example in GNSO working groups. So I have a bit of a concern when we talk about CCWGs in that context because CCWGs normally have a very limited sort of scope for membership to appointees from charting organizations.

I was wondering if the board has any views on this and if there may be an alternative sort of model to a group they would consider to allow for broader membership as opposed to participation? Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Speaking just for myself we haven't gotten our head around CCWGs yet so we don't have any alternatives to propose. Go ahead.

(Amr): One would be a GNSO working group that is open to membership by all for all members would be part of the consensus building of the group.

Steve Metalitz: No opinion. I mean it's a fair topic to discuss but we certainly haven't gotten into a discussion like that.

Jonathan Robinson: Response (Bruce).

(Bruce): Yes just very quickly and I think from being involved in the GNSO for some time and was back at the time when I was chair we deliberately we used to have these concepts of tasks force.

And the task force had a minimum membership of one member from each constituency and some task forces had two members from each constituency so it is quite constrained.

And then we went to a working group model and the working group model is pretty much anybody can join.

I think the only thing that we have to be careful of whatever we're forming a group of people to work on a topic I think there's two things that we want.

You want it to be open so that people can join it but two you want to make sure you have balanced representation.

And one of the ways we've tried to do that even in the CCWG process is actually provide travel funding and make sure that that travel funding is fairly diverse.

So the travel funding we've generally done is allocated to slots on a, you know, stakeholder group basis to try and get that diversity.

But that's the only thing I think we need to be conscious of as an organization is great let's as a general principle have working groups that are open but also make sure that working groups have got sufficiently diverse representation so that you don't have you know I've got this open working group on new gTLD policy and the entire membership new gTLD registry operators because they're interested in the topic. You know, we've got to make sure the working groups are broad.

Jonathan Robinson: Just for the record I mean so that everyone's clear on that position I mean the way in which it has been worked recently as (Bruce) and (Amr) are touching on there are there is a form of balanced membership.

And the groups are open. These Cross Community Working Groups are open to participation from all. And in general members and participants are treated equally.

But to the extent that either there is something like funded travel that goes - that's been awarded to the members in order to constrain the budget and balance representation and in addition the participants - well to cover the ultimate possibility of a vote but I'm not aware of that - of a voting mechanism being instituted in any of these groups so far. I mean I'm sure someone will correct me if I'm not wrong but hand over to you Anne.

Ann Aikman-Scalese: Yes very quickly Ann Aikman-Scalese with the IPC and not representing any views of the IPC. And (Lars) asked me to come to the mic because I put a question in chat that he thought maybe he was out of scope but actually it is a question about how the board does deal with CCWG input.

Very happy that you brought up (Bruce) the question of balanced representation because I think in fact there's not only a question of balanced representation on the CCWG itself and membership itself but a question of balanced representation in terms of the communication with the full community by the CCWG and its representatives.

In this regard I did want to bring up that if there's a minority view in the CCWG that's to be presented to the community I think it is much more appropriately presented by a member of that CCWG then by the CEO of ICANN.

And I think that yesterday in the GAC session which I heard all of our CEOs presentation and which are CCWG Chair (Matthew Vale) had to actually correct because it was not even current but was said to be well these are my personal views that I spent 52 hours working on and that if that office is used for the purpose of advancing a personal view and that the CCWG itself is not represented then I feel it's the board's responsibility to take corrective action in that regard because it's an imbalanced representation and it's not the proper use of the office of CEO.

So I would ask the board to address it if a minority review needs to be presented it should be presented by a member of the CCWG accountability. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Any other comments or reactions or points in and around the board involvement in CCWGs? We rely on your interaction and contributions for these meetings.

Steve Metalitz: And I give a minimal answer to you Anne because it seemed to me the issue that you're raising which is a perfectly appropriate issue is one that is specific to the CCWG Accountability Group.

And it seemed like that this is a not necessarily the right forum for a discussion of that particular issue here in that we're having an interaction with the GNSO Council.

Not trying to duck the issue at all but it's one that requires sort of the right setting to unpack all the pieces of it. It's not a short discussion I would say.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve. I mean if no one else has any comments on this I mean I think it's been very useful to hear particularly from (Bruce) but from others who contribute to this it's clear the perhaps not all of you were aware on - of the work of the CCWG of the group working on the mechanics of CCWGs.

It's quite clear all of you are aware of the CCWG on accountability perspective well on auctions and quite how the - in a sense as I mean if you had one theme of this meeting it's the sort of evolution and future shape of the organization.

And one such component of that seems to be the role and purpose and functioning of CCWGs. And that it's relevant to supporting organizations, ACs and the board it seems in equal measure.

So it's very useful to have the conversation with you. But if we're happy we're done with it then we can move on to the next topic.

Okay good. So the next one is slightly more mechanical but nevertheless there is perhaps something in it as well. And that's a couple of questions or correspondence as we've had with you and with respect to both the GAC communiqué which is a new initiative which is a GNSO response to the GAC communiqué to try and make sure this is in context of a - of an enhanced operation of the GAC within the community so that as you know there's - yes sure.

(David): Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: And so (David) I'll hand this over to you to make a couple of remarks about the context of that and then we can discuss the most recent GNSO response to that.

(David): So the context of this is at our sort of annual sort of new counselor induction/strategic sort of review session that we do once a year when the new counselors came in Bruce Tonkin from the board made the suggestion that were really helpful for to - for the GNSO to directly speak to the board about what we thought about the GAC communiqué and so that the board could respond, you know, to when considering its response to the GAC communiqué where it overlaps on issues, GNSO issues they - we could - you could do it based on actual sort of GNSO advice rather than sort of defining what the GNSO - I mean by sort of, you know, back channels or psychological profiling or, you know, fortune-telling or whatever and so that we've given you direct response.

We've only done it once. It took us a while sort of to do it. We will make sure the GAC understood what we were doing and why we're doing it and so on before we did it and we have to come up with our own process.

So we've done it once and now the question is really - I think a lot of this is really we've done it once, how useful was it, how can we change it to be more useful? Is this something - has it been helpful to - can we do it, you know, what would you like to see us doing with this new sort of mechanism we have for providing some input to the board on about how the board may or may not respond to GAC advice?

Steve Metalitz: (Bruce) do you or (Chris)...

Man: It's probably early days in the process (Dave). I think certainly I think where we get advice from any advisory committee that relates to so generic names I think it's important that we do get a response from the supporting organization that's responsible for policy for those gTLDs to perhaps pull out a response on that advice.

And I think there should be a consistent approach if the Government Advisory Committee was making a comment about ccTLDs or SSAC was making some comment about, you know, IP addresses.

I think in all cases we should get an input from the relevant supporting organization for that area before we would actually respond back to GAC advice.

So I welcome what you're doing even though it was probably my idea. But yes I think as a general principle I think that's right and we'll evolve together I guess to see how did that work - what's the best way of making that work.

Steve Metalitz: Let me offer something that is going to sound boring but I think probably can be very helpful at this.

We've been edging - inching slowly toward getting a much - a very regular process that it gives visibility and some certainty to how we handle advice,

GAC advice, affirmation of commitment recommendations, advice from advisory committees and so forth.

And I've been trying to both socialize and get implemented a four step process. And the first step is when we get advice -- and this is kind of a generic template that comes from (unintelligible) when we get advice to have it have a certain handoff that it comes from whoever is giving advice to the board and to the staff support for the board do we understand it?

And so that's like I liken it to a handoff and a relay race. You don't want to drop the baton as its going.

So and that ought to be very mechanical but sometimes there are differences in understanding of the language or so forth so that's an explicit step.

The second step is an evaluation process which is growing bits and pieces. But the basics are if we accepted the advice what would the consequences be? Who would implement it, what would the resources be and where would it be done and so forth?

And part of that is is it feasible? And I think in there ought to be exactly the question that's being touched on here. Is it the kind of advice for which we could just say yes or no and do something or is it something that needs broader socialization?

And that's where probably a well-defined process for reaching out and asking GNSO or others depending upon what it is. And as Bruce said, you know, if it was a specific let's suppose there was a recommendation from someplace that said, you know, we think that the key length ought to be twice as big as it is for the DNSSEC.

We might say over to SSAC and what do you think about this as a kind of thing?

The third and fourth phase is just to close this up the third phase is implementation. And the fourth is the cross check when we think we're done whether or not it actually meets the satisfaction of all of the parties that are involved.

But I think in that second phase which is the least well understood and kind of the black hole of the process is one that I've been working to both flush out and make more visible.

And it seems to me that that's the place that we ought to put a very explicit hook in here for interconnections and consultations with other parts of the community.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Steve. So I mean just to be very clear on that one though we developed a specific process to review the GAC communiqué, to decide whether there are any policy implications and if so to communicate that to the board.

So if you have any feedback on that specific template that we provided or and also if you looked at this even sort got a chance to look at it because I know everyone's been very busy that would be useful.

I know (Mike Silva) you wanted to come in. (Mike)?

(Mike Silva): Jonathan thanks. Moving down from the 3000 foot view can we get some real concrete steps. So you'll provide us feedback within a period of time.

If we don't get the feedback we assume that there is no feedback that's required or at least you'll send us a signal that you're working on some feedback.

Because otherwise we risk getting into this endless loop of you don't think we're listening, we don't know you're talking because there's a disconnect somewhere.

So I think it will be really useful to have templates is great but some real timelines, some real process do we need to solicit it from the GNSO, is it unsolicited from the GNSO?

I think what Steve is talking about in the third and fourth phases yes that's when we need to come back to the GNSO and say we've accepted this advice, now what do we do about implementation?

That goes without saying we need to come to you. But we really need to get some of the rules of engagement right and really you guys need to tell us what works for you. And we can look at the process and say we can live with that as well or no, doesn't quite work.

Jonathan Robinson: Well let me be specific. As far as I know I mean we took this initiative on was a suggestion, could have come from anywhere, happened to come and we looked at it.

We processed GAC advice through a systematic process, took a view on that and imparted that view to the board as to whether or not it had GNSO policy.

We felt that this was an important thing to do in terms of recognizing at times disconnect between the GAC advice going over the fence and not necessarily making the triangle relationship between whether policy work is done.

So we sort of feel like we've made that overture and we've made that first step and we'd like some feedback. Do that work and one piece of feedback that seems to be coming back is let's make some more of a process around this but...

(Mike Silva):   No, Jonathan sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

(Mike Silva):   Let's not add more process around it. What I'm just saying is if this is going to be regular and it would just be useful to understand this is going to be the way that you do it going forward, these are the timelines within which you will generally operate and you'll signal if you're out of the timelines.

I'm not saying add additional process steps. It's just we're not clear to us that this was a one off or is this what we are going to be expecting going forward. And yes it was useful.

Jonathan Robinson: Very good to hear. I mean to an extent we didn't know whether it would be a one off or not. It was our intention to start to do this.

But of course pending feedback from you as to whether it was perceived and received to be useful or not.

Steve Metalitz: Speaking for myself let me applaud. I think it was very, very good. If it's a one off then it's a one off. If you are intend to do it on a regular basis and you can say here's what our timeframe is we expect to be able to take a GAC communiqué tear it apart, think about it and give, you know, our response within a particular...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...you know, nominal timeframe.

Then I think the response on our site is a that's great. We will build that into our process.

Now in response to (Mike) we don't need more process I'm very empathetic. But if you have a process we're not going to ignore it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So just to make sure we're not talking across purpose. So there are two letters in this subject three for which we have received - from which we have received no response which is why we're raising them here.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: And so the first one is the one we're talking about and we sent a communication for which we didn't receive response. And we felt there was useful to discuss it and understand how it was received, why there was no response they what if anything we should do in future so that's the purpose of the topic.

Steve Metalitz: Just a second. Where's (Melissa)? Is she here?

Woman: She stepped out.

Steve Metalitz: She stepped out at the perfect time. I wanted to introduce our new vice president of board operations. And this is the kind of thing that I would raise a level so that we don't drop those kinds of balls.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve. Volker?

Volker Greimann: It's Volker Greimann speaking for the record. It's also helpful to us to see if the board can work with what we have provided if that is the information that you're looking for from the GNSO or if there's other information that you would be looking for more practical perhaps an analysis of what policy work would be required for that.

So currently we've just analyzed all basically what the impact is with regard to existing policy or non-existing policy that's going to be worked on.

But maybe we should also go more into detail what additional work would have to be undertaken to implement that. Is it something that you would feel is useful to you or is the current format already helpful to you?

Steve Metalitz: Yes so the consequence of this discussion is that you've made the point very strongly. And we take the point that we will look at this and we will do so rather quickly.

I don't have a quick answer for you at this moment but there's no question that we have to do with that. So I appreciate that and apologize for not having responded already but we will as I say everything's competing for attention and now you've managed to move up on my attention list.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve. So let's take the opportunity to go into the other item for which there hasn't been a response and would be useful to just talk about that briefly.

Sorry Avri I apologize. I forgot you were in the queue. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you, just Avri Doria speaking just wanted to ask a question for future reference. Given that these letters did not get an automatic response do we need to include a coda in any letter that we need a response to saying please send us an answer?

Okay, just wanted to make sure that that was still a requirement.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: So the second letter then is about the meeting strategy. And what's happening there is clearly there is a particular meeting B that's coming up and we'd like to talk with you. Volker do you want to say anything about that and then we can just talk with you about it about it for a few minutes?

Volker Greimann: Yes. As you know we have the meetings as their currently existing are coming to an end. We have new meeting structure that's rolling out at the next meeting already even though the next meeting is still very much old format style from the length at least.

The meeting afterwards will be the meeting that requires the most shifting of time. I've made a very short presentation to the GNSO regarding the progress that we've made contacting the other SOs ACs the board with regard to their planning to with regards to the new meeting structure.

And the reason it was so short was that there was not much feedback that we've received. The GNSO has a short draft proposal out there of how we see ourselves fitting into that new meeting structure that would be helpful to have prior to the next meeting starting even or even the planning beginning for the next meeting more detailed outlook of what's the board thinks, what other SOs ACs think of how they will fit their time into the schedule so we can avoid a lot of overlap and conflicts of timing.

It's - I think it's essential to get this process finalized possibly by end of January so we would be in good shape to have the new meeting start successfully with the next meeting in Marrakesh.

Steve Metalitz: I was just going to ask who on the board is in a good position to speak to this?

Man: I actually wanted to go back to something that Avri said and I think Chris is probably a good guy on this.

(Renalia Durain): Thank you. (Renalia Durain) for the record. We've had a small group discussion within the board. It was a - like the task force type thing that's headed by Chris Despain.

And we've sort of discussed about where the board needs to be, et cetera. But we haven't escalated that to the full board. Once we have that then we'd have a clear position for you and I think January's a reasonable timeframe.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay any other comments George?

George Sadowski:Yes thank you, George Sadowski. This is a personal feeling that we really need to examine how we interact with you and as well as with other constituencies.

We interact on Constituency Day. We interact at meetings like this so we see each other in the hallways, the public forum, parties. We drink with you, we eat with you.

And I'm wondering if this is the most efficient way for us to trade information and to discuss issues? And it's a general question. I'm not sure that we're doing anything wrong now but I'd really be curious to know if there are other ways in which time can be structured either to be more efficient or to cut down the amount of time or to just open up the range of discussion further? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Well George I mean I think that that feels very timely. It's a very good point. And to (Renalia)'s point as well when I think this has got to be perhaps interactive and iterative rather than necessary you go and tell us what your plans are for those meetings styles.

And I'm not sure that's what you meant but just to be clear that the work is going on and that's tremendously over used but in the kind of cross community way.

And we do need to figure out how, you know, this new meeting structure affects all of us. And it may even be an opportunity there I say to analyze the existing meeting structure.

But let's get how we deal with the compact one which is a big change first. And it may be that for example the board doesn't have, doesn't operate independently in that way and you just simply immerse yourself in the community for that.

But, you know, I don't want to preempt what you're thinking but that's just that's what the kind of conversation we envisioned having with you either now or at some point, appropriate point in the near future. (Renalia) go ahead.

(Renalia Durain): If I may just follow-up the sense that I got from the discussion that I was part of is that we would like to be with community during meeting B. That's the sense of it. It's a question of how do we do it? And we'll come back to you with more specific direction.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or points? (Ray) did you want to come back to your previous point or one on this?

(Ray): Well actually I'll go back to this point because I'm also a member of that task force.

Parenthetically I - when the idea of the task force was brought up Chris said we would like to get your comments before you go away. And I reminded him I wasn't quite in hospice yet.

So the real focus of our discussion was as (Renalia) has just characterized that we spend more time talking about how that the board can spend more time during this particular week with members of the community without having necessarily be informal sessions and being able to do other things besides sit around rooms and have discussions or hang around bars and have discussions.

And so I think that the intent is there to do that and it's going to be a matter of what is going to be the best way to do it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Would you - I mean any other points on this? I mean (Ray) would you like to make that other point, go back to another point? Are we done with that?

(Ray):   Yes, no I just to what Avri said about getting - expecting answers to the letters sent to the board to me it would seem that unless you say in your letter that you don't need an answer from the board it's expected that you would get one.

And in the beginning you should get one in very short order that says thank you we got it and we'll get back to you about how we plan to proceed on it.

The essence of writing letters and communication we tend to forget about that but when people actually took pen to paper and wrote a letter with the expectation of getting a reply.

And I think that we have become too forgetful of the fact that this is a means of communication and that we should take advantage and use it to the best way possible.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Is that a new hand Avri or is that the old one? Okay let me hand over...

Avri Doria: But since it's still up, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So now do I expect something more? That's it right, we're done. Okay thank you, all right.

Let me handover to Steve to make a couple of closing remarks. I'll just say thank you very much. It's a useful session and appreciate being able to dig into some of these issues a little and you're responding to our point.

Steve Metalitz: Big thank you. As I said after we were partway into this I like to take these sessions as serious engagements where we touch on actual points of interest rather than just pro forma points and come away with either new insights or action items or whatever is involved. I think we've done some of that today and that's good.

Also in this particular - at this particular meeting I think we all acknowledge that we're all under enormous strain and stress and that this is a very tense and turbulent period.

It's also equally a period of great hope and expectation. And I think that will be bored out. But I recognize that every one of us is stretched to the limit, all of us in this room, all of us in the supporting organizations and advisory committees. Staff is certainly maxed out and the board is even working pretty hard.

So I'm looking forward to a time when we're all a lot more comfortable. Whether it'll be Marrakesh or whether it'll be Panama City I don't know but it can't last like this too long. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you again Steve and board colleagues and everyone in the GNSO who's participated in this session. We can stop the recording now.

END