
MONTREAL – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board & CPH
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

GRAEME BUNTON: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. If people would take their seats, we'll get started.

Okay. Right. Welcome. This is the joint meeting of the ICANN Board and the Contracted Party House. My name is Graeme Bunton. I'm the chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Beside me is --

DONNA AUSTIN: You don't know who I am?

GRAEME BUNTON: I'm letting you do it.

DONNA AUSTIN: Donna Austin, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

GRAEME BUNTON: Do we want to do a round-the-table intro? Yeah. So maybe we'll start over here with Jonathan.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Good afternoon, everyone, Jonathan Robinson, contracted parties house, with Afilias and treasurer on the Registry Stakeholder Group.

ELLIOT NOSS: Elliot Noss, Tucows.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain, ICANN Board.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Matthew Shears, ICANN Board.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Danko Jevtovic, ICANN Board.

BECKY BURR: Becky Burr, ICANN Board.

GRAEME BUNTON: Graeme Bunton, chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and from Tucows.

DONNA AUSTIN: Donna Austin, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group for Neustar.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, ICANN Board.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman, ICANN Board.

MERIKE KAE0: Merike Kaeo, SSAC liaison to the Board.

GORAN MARBY: Goran Marby, ICANN org.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Owen Smigelski with Namecheap. I'm vice chair for policy of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

KEITH DRAZEK: Keith Drazek, Verisign, Registry Stakeholder Group and GNSO chair.

PAM LITTLE: Pam Little. I'm with Ali Baba registrar. I am also vice chair of the GNSO Council from the Contracted Parties House. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Sam Demetriou, Registry Stakeholder Group, vice chair policy, and I'm with Verisign.

BETH BACON: Beth Bacon, Registry Stakeholder Group, vice chair, admin, and I'm with .ORG.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thanks, all.

So we've got a number of things on our agenda for you, and I'm sure you have some questions for us.

I think maybe we'll take the lead and see how we can go on that?

BECKY BURR: Yes, that sounds perfect.

GRAEME BUNTON: All right. Let's just get going.

The first one I'm going to tackle is and is not long. We have been in sort of back and forth discussions I think with the Board for some time about a new format for this particular meeting we're in, the joint session with the Board. Because I think there is lots of opportunity to make it better, and to increase the actual interaction with the Board, find more effective ways to communicate, and really make sure that the Board and our members have a opportunity to interact. So to that end we proposed format, I think out of the GDD Summit in Thailand. And it turns out as we got closer to this meeting that it was going to be problematic for the Board to engage in the format that we had suggested. And so that, for us, was pretty disappointing, and so we sit here like this today. But I think where we got to is that the Board is going to see if we can do this for Cancun, to try a different format for this meeting in Cancun. We'll pilot it. Hopefully that works. If not,

maybe it needs some tweaks. But to try to find new ways to interact with each other. So I just want to make sure that the Board has heard that; that you're interested still in a new format for interaction, and that we can look forward to working together to figure out how to make Cancun happen.

BECKY BURR:

I can confirm, we're disappointed that we were not able to get things together for this meeting, but look forward to trying the new format in Cancun.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Excellent. Thank you. That's super pleasing to hear. Look forward to that. And that is topic number one, and then I think I'll pass off to Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Graeme. Donna Austin.

So some of you in the room may not be aware that Graeme and I had the opportunity to make a presentation to the Board on Saturday about the domain name marketplace, and we were very thankful for that opportunity, and we hope that we have the opportunity not just for Graeme and I as the chairs of the stakeholder groups but more broadly representatives of our groups to have that interaction with the Board so that we have a better understanding, or perhaps provide you a better understanding of the industry and the way we operate some of our

challenges. But what we didn't get the opportunity to do during that session was to get some feedback from the Board on how useful that was and if there's anything that you would like us to cover in the future and even how we can make sure that we have opportunities for that engagement in the future.

So we just thought it might be helpful to have a ten-minute discussion on how helpful that discussion was and any feedback you could provide to us.

Thanks.

BECKY BARR:

So I do want to solicit feedback from all of the board members. I can say that I heard very positive things, things like that should be a two-hour session not a one-hour session. That was very valuable session. We really appreciated the work that you put into it, the thought that you put into it, and the important information. The Board really does need to understand the business models and the challenges.

And we will have our workshop aligned with the GDD Summit this year. I think it was very unfortunate that it was not aligned physically last year, because that is an excellent opportunity for board members. But I would like to just suggest that we think a little bit about whether there's some time we can use in that for furthering that dialogue.

So now I want to ask any board members, including board members in the audience who -- and incoming board members who were there.

Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Becky, and thanks for the question, Donna.

I am currently tasked with working on the Board's induction process. And one of the things that I'm going to come talk to you about is whether we can find a way of putting a piece by the registries and the registrars into the induction process for new board members. It's not that I don't want other board members to see it, but it would be very interesting and, if we can find a way of doing that. We might need to have some flexibility around timing, we might need to have some flexibility around the way that it's done. But I think it was incredibly useful, really important, and we should make sure that we memorialize it in a way that means that new board members always get to see that without fail.

Thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Any other thoughts, including thoughts on what might -- what additional content might be interesting or valuable?

Okay. I gather that everybody -- oh, Cherine, go ahead.

CHERINE CHALABY:

So I'm sure I can speak on behalf of many of my colleagues. We really found this to be extremely valuable. And what was also very valuable

is we saw the two presentations, one after another, and the interaction between -- the relationship between you two guys, I mean as registries and registrars, was very -- was very clear. And, you know, it really brought it alive, what's going on in the industry. So we're very, very grateful for that.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Cherine.

And the Donna and Graeme Show is fantastic. Coming soon.

So one of the things that came out of --

CHERINE CHALABY: Sorry. Did you discover a few things about the registries and registrars that you did not know? You did? There you go.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yeah, it was a really good sharing. And in fact that's the point I was going to make. It was pointed out to me that that presentation, which to be clear for the audience is not policy related. It was all about the economics of being and the businesses of being a registry or registrar. What are the realities of the people operating in the industry. That that presentation is not only useful for the Board but probably also the GAC, and probably just the community in general. And so that's something that we'll look at trying to get on the agenda maybe for Cancun or the meeting after that, AGM next year. Because there probably -- in my experience, there are lots of people who have misconceptions about

registrars, and I'm sure registries. And, you know, putting that out there I think will be valuable for lots of people.

BECKY BURR: So Matthew, and then Maarten.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes. Two words. More, please.

No, to be more specific, I think you put your finger on it. It's exactly the economic and business aspects to this, the market aspects that are so important for the Board to understand. We get far too wrapped up in policy and it's nice to better understand how the market works. And that's invaluable.

Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, thank you. Really appreciated to see a very crisp, clear overview. And as Donna confirmed herself, while putting those words together, you begin to get even better what you already know, but you formulate it better.

And in addition to appreciation for to make sure the Board understands the communities, not only registries, registrars, I also think it's an excellent basis for material that you could put out there, as Graeme just suggested. So it's not only the Board, but the entire community who gets a good feel. And I think the material presented on Sunday is very

well suited for that. So if you can put that in the public domain, that's great. And if the same could be true for other communities, where they clearly fragment, define their domain of interest and what's important for them, I think that will be a favor to us all, and it will help us to continue our dialogues in much better, mutual understanding.

So thanks again.

BECKY BARR:

So it sounds like it's a candidate for ICANN Learn, for example

Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

So very positive things have been said, so I'll try to be more concrete. One of the things that is important to learn was about the registrar model and to understand how it is not only about domain names but is part of the larger business facing registrants, but they are the ones who are putting out the content. So we are not in the content but it's important for us to understand you. So maybe a little bit more about that. And time-wise, it's always good to have more time for questions.

Thank you.

BECKY BARR:

So very successful. Thank you very much. More, more.

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Thank you. That's wonderful feedback. We look forward to doing that.

Next up, I'm going to pass over I think to Pam and Donna to raise a topic.

PAM LITTLE: Hi, everyone. It's Pam Little again.

Goran, you said at the opening ceremony what makes ICANN unique and great is this bunch of volunteers doing voluntary work; right? So I guess this session, I will take the lead in opening just to share with the Board, we are really feeling the weight of all this ongoing amount of work at the moment. All the major EPDPs, the reviews, the implementation of those, and a number of governance improvement initiatives, which themselves also create additional work.

And I guess within the ICANN community, no parties are as directly impacted as contract parties.

So -- And then we are also volunteers, so -- and tend to be reactive to those work that's started by either the Board or organization or the community. So we have no choice but to follow, for example, the PDPs or the EPDPs or the implementation of some of those policy work.

And then when they become policy, we actually have to change our business process or system to implement the policy.

So there's a lot going on. And we do feel very stretched as volunteers in this ICANN community.

And I think this is not new to anybody. It's been felt throughout the community and within ICANN for many years, but we don't seem to have a solution how to address this sort of workload issue. And we're really pleased to see now we have a number of initiatives, like the PDP 3.0 that Council has been working on and the other initiatives started with the project that Brian Cote is leading on the multistakeholder evolution to make us all become more efficient and effective.

But in doing so, we felt one of the things that stands out in all this effort is it's very crucial, which is how to prioritize our work, or prioritization of our work. So today we thought maybe it would be good to hear from the Board not only we recognize the importance of prioritizing our work but we need to probably prioritize in a way that we are synced up; right?

So in the five-year strategic plan, the Board is asking us, or the community, to align our work with the goals of those strategic plan. But I think when we now work -- looking at the workload in front of us and to come down the pipeline, we need to probably make sure how we actually know to have a sort of more consistent priority list. Otherwise, maybe the Board is work -- in the Board's view, these are the priority things we have to do, and maybe in the org view, these are another list, and then when it comes down to the community, we see different priorities as well.

So I guess my question is maybe the Board could share with us how you see as priorities for the next while, and then how do you actually prioritize work. And maybe we can also share what the councillors is kind of doing or, at the stake level, what we think some of the things we

can all do to sync up; to make sure at the Board level, at the org level, and at the community level we actually have more consistent priorities. Otherwise, if we are not working on the same priority list, we'll be working on different things and we probably won't be very efficient.

So I'll just stop there, and if anyone would like to respond, please.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks, Pam. Very difficult questions, to say the least.

I think we're going to have people just talk. I know Goran wants to say something and Maarten, also.

GORAN MARBY:

I didn't know I was thinking of saying something. Sorry. You caught me offguard.

BECKY BURR:

Sorry. I thought you had told me that.

Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Goran, you just said something.

No, thanks. And of course it's -- we always talk about volunteer burnout, but we see it across the board that there's a lot of people also in the organization, and sometimes also at the Board level, where we take so much on, because things come all the time. And I think the

strategic plan will also help us to become more clear and tracked on where we need to put our attention, be more proactive, more streamlined. So in that way, that's a very important part of the way forward.

How we improve our decision processes so that we don't have to take very long to move forward where it's not necessary, and to be very clear on where responsibilities lay so we don't waste time and energy there either.

So I think it's that improvement process that we're engaging in. And we as a Board cannot do alone. We need to do it together. I think it comes very much hand in hand with taking our own responsibility for our role in the process. And let's set it up in such a way that we don't confuse that either; that we don't have people anywhere sitting and waiting until something is done to them and say they don't agree. Let's see how we can move forward on this together. And this is the setup that we're facing.

BECKY BURR:

Now I believe Goran does have something he'd like to add.

GORAN MARBY:

Now I have woken up again. Sorry about that.

So I think -- we all know that this is important. It's also for my own staff. Right now with the amount of reviews we're running -- some of them are really large PDPs -- we have 150 people here, I think, to run this

meeting. This takes a toll. There is no contradiction between the Board, the org and the community about this. If we can actually figure out a way of making sure that we can make this, I think it's going to be better for everybody.

As pointed out, it has to be a common conversation. Maybe what the Board is really trying to say is that instead of having the big ideological discussion about everything, let's see those things that doesn't maybe make sense. Like, we talked about the reviews. We talked about the length of the reviews, how often the reviews come. That's a big part of the job. How do we make sure the interactions with the PDP, which is another thing. You heard the Board talking about this this week, that instead of -- instead of having everything done in a PDP and then it's thrown over to the Board and then everything sort of restarts, let's see if we can work together in a better way when it comes to -- before it reaches the Board and when the Board has to make decisions.

I think one very good example, which I think is actually something that is improved, is every meeting now since Abu Dhabi, I think it is, we have a meeting with the SO/AC leaders who actually sit down and talk so they can -- not to jointly decide anything but actually start talking.

I know that through that, some discussions have started where interactions between different parts of the community. So I think we are there. We are in the process, but we should not -- you can't eat an elephant with one bite, so let's start with the bites.

BECKY BARR: Okay. I have got in the queue Matthew, Cherine, and Keith.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Becky.

This is a very -- it's an issue that the Board is very aware of and we feel your pain, so to speak.

I think that a number of the initiatives that we have proposed and are bringing to the community in terms of prioritization, in terms of timing and things like that are all intended to in the longer term provide a greater sense of management of resources, of management of time.

Hopefully while it seems like there's a lot coming at the moment, I think we're hopeful that through these various initiatives that the Board is kicking off and sharing with the community and getting community input in is that over the longer term this will help in terms of managing that workload. So.

I think we definitely understand and what we're hoping to do is put in place those mechanisms or at least contribute those mechanisms to the mix of things that the community can use and that will help in that regard. Thanks.

BECKY BARR: Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY:

So I do agree with everyone that this is a pressing issue. There's no doubt about that. And it has been pressing for a number of years. But as I mentioned earlier, we put it on the back burner because there were other priorities on top of prioritizing our work. I think we reached a point where we need to find solutions for this. We can't just continue [audio cutting out].

The way I personally see this are two levels. There are properties within each of the SOs and ACs, and there are collective priorities. I think the priorities of the individual SOs and ACs have to be sorted within the SOs and ACs because there isn't a central body that can tell any of the SO or AC what to do or how to prioritize their work. There isn't one SO/AC that can tell another SO/AC.

The thing that is in the middle, which I call collective priorities and responsibilities, is to do with the strategic plan or the collective decisions we make in the middle. And we'll have to find a way of how we prioritize this work. To me, this is a supply and demand problem. There is a limited supply, limited pool of volunteers, limited availability of ICANN staff, limited amount of money. Yet, the demand on that comes from everywhere.

So we don't have -- it's not the totality of the demand. It's how to prioritize that demand in terms of the need for those resources.

And I don't think it could be a Board decision to do that because I think the Board cannot prioritize and say, Well, this PDP from the GNSO is more important than a PDP from, let's say, the ccNSO or the CCWG work is more important than this or this review is more important than this.

So we have to find a central group representing perhaps the seven SOs and ACs, ICANN org, and the Board sitting together and design a set of principles by which we can then prioritize all of these.

That group has to be, in my view, empowered to be able -- on behalf of the community to make -- those kind of recommendations. So that's what I think. It's just a supply and demand.

I think the supply, we don't need to sort it out. We know what it is. Hopefully we can increase the number of volunteers. It's really prioritizing the demand that's coming from everywhere to that central pool.

BECKY BURR:

Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Becky. Keith Drazek for the transcript.

And thank you, Cherine. And thank you, Goran, for those comments.

So, first, I'd like to thank the Board and thank Cherine for his leadership as it relates to the effort around the strategic plan and setting up this conversation as we take it to the next level of reviewing the financial and operating plan annually and then taking on this consideration of evolving and improving our multistakeholder model, right? And, essentially, you know, the Board has obligations and responsibilities in this regard. ICANN org has responsibilities and obligations in this regard.

But I think we as the contracted parties and registries and registrars also recognize that we, the community, have obligations and responsibilities to help iterate and to help improve upon our interaction and to make ourselves more efficient and effective.

And so I think the framework that you've brought to us as the community, I think, is a very positive one for the coming five years.

Essentially, I think as we all know, the strategic plan will go into effect on July 1st of next year and that essentially the framework we're reviewing now and providing feedback on now will help us be able to take those steps and to take on our responsibilities.

Just of note, I think this is really important for the community and this group as participants in the community to take that responsibility and help do it because if somebody tried to tell us how to do it, we'd probably react sort of negatively, right?

[Laughter]

In good tradition. That's just one note.

A little bit more operationally and tactically, I want to thank Goran for helping -- and Cherine to help us bring together the SO and AC leaders, as you have. This is something Goran mentioned. To be able to bring us together in an early roundtable session early in the week of every ICANN meeting and also for the offer to, for the first time, bring together the SO and AC leaders together in January for sort of a more strategic engagement so we can start talking about these priorities.

I think that was offered when we had our roundtable this week, and I think it was very well-received. And we're currently working to try to find a time as the SO and AC leaders to start talking about what do we want to achieve and what do we want to accomplish during that week or those couple of days of meetings in Los Angeles in January.

I think that's an excellent step forward to accomplish, Cherine, what you've just described in terms of having a cross-community group, if you will, informal of leaders who can help to do that prioritization that you described, not within the silos but across. And so I think that will be very helpful.

Just for everybody else's benefit, the GNSO will also -- the GNSO Council will be meeting around that same time for our strategic planning session over three days, and this will be topic number one. This question of prioritization will be topic number one for us. We have a lot of work already in the pipeline and already under way. We have an obligation to try to bring some of these policy development processes to a conclusion in 2020 and to advance ones that can't be finished. But we have more work coming on because of the impact of the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations on other existing policies and procedures where we may have to be initiating new PDPs to deal with those conflicts between the new consensus policy recommendation.

I think Pam was very eloquent in describing sort of what we're feeling, what we're seeing, the concerns we have moving forward. And it's certainly not only about our community of bandwidth. It's community bandwidth broadly and the availability of resources including staff

resources. We know they're stressed really thin right now and it's only going to get worse.

So I think that prioritization is going to be key.

And my final comment, Cherine, is you talked about supply and demand and sort of the resources available. I think the other factor there is time, right? You know, how much can you achieve in a specified time frame with the available resources and still produce a quality product? And I think as a community, we have to take it on to be able to help to measure and to predict and to better understand, like, what those inputs are, how they come together and sort of what the answer to that formula is. And I think that's going to be really important work for us going into the early part of next year. So thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Any other comments?

I can tell you this is near and dear to my heart because the week before the -- the Thursday before this week, or last week when we came up, I literally spent from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on back-to-back ICANN calls. Two hours were EPDP. But that was a real wakeup call. It's, like, nobody can do that.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Becky, just to kind of highlight one of the challenges from a regional perspective, I recently spent five weeks in Australia. And I felt like I had

fallen off the bottom of the earth because there are no calls really that are a reasonable time for anybody in the Asia-Pacific, which Chris --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Australia can make you feel like that.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, well, whatever.

But, I mean, it is -- it's another challenge of the puzzle, if you like, because if you are from that region and you want engagement from the regions -- and I know that Pam is feeling some of the pain being vice chair of the Council. I know Heather really felt that as chair of the Council. But that is a real problem as well.

So, you know, that's just another part of the puzzle that we need to try to figure out.

BECKY BARR: Go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Pam Little for the transcript. Just to add on to what Donna just said, the other unintended consequence of this overload of work or stretch of work or bandwidth is -- I personally see we tend to see the most -- the best-resourced companies or participants now doing the work.

We are talking about broadening our pool of volunteers. This is to me counterproductive because the amount of work -- hours needed to participate in the EPDP, the time of those calls really are now to me a huge barrier for those less experienced, less resourced, newcomer, participant to join. So we might be perpetuating the problem with volunteers or new volunteers rather than improving it. So it's kind of all related.

We don't obviously want to see a situation where only the well-resourced companies or individuals are participating in ICANN. That would undermine our legitimacy and our intention to really have new people and make it more diverse and inclusive.

Thanks.

BECKY BARR:

Okay. Thanks, everybody. I think it's a great idea that you're going to get the SO and AC leadership together for face-to-face thinking about this. So well done.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Yeah, thank you, guys.

Next up, I believe I've got Beth.

BETH BACON:

Good afternoon, everybody. So I think this next topic is kind of -- we're going to have a lot of areas of agreement.

ICANN in 2018 started reporting on various global initiatives: Legislation, regulatory initiatives, and laws. And then in 2019, there was the charter on ICANN's organizational engagement with governments and strategic bodies.

So we just wanted to propose this topic to reach the status of engagement with governments and other efforts regarding legislative tracking. We know ICANN and the Board are focused on this. It's in the strategic plan.

Goran, would you like to comment?

GORAN MARBY:

I actually had a problem hearing what you said, so I'm trying to read the transcript.

Yes. We started -- so for everybody, let's take a step back. It has been said that we didn't react fast enough on the legislation of GDPR, especially when it was written. We didn't engage at the time. I can't judge on that because I wasn't actually here then.

With that, we realized there are many different -- we took a decision -- we went out to the community and talked to you guys about it. So we started tracking legislative proposals around the world, which you can find on our website. So that was good. Then we know there's a lot of legislative proposals around the world, which are close to GDPR or that kind of legislation. That's the one we looked into.

The next step of that is we actually went back and forth myself because ICANN as an institution should not, and cannot, I think, have a political view on different legislations. We would never say, for instance, that we think that this legislation is good or bad.

So we came up with this notion that we're going to look at it from a technical perspective, for instance, that it prevents the ICANN community to make policies because we still believe that the ICANN community's best way to do policy is not through legislation.

The second thing is that, for instance, it prevents an Internet user to connect to the Internet. That's, as you know, we have seen in legislative proposals in some of those.

The next, of course, then is how do we interact with the ICANN community. So I'm happy to say that just this meeting, we talked to this group of SO/AC leadership and made a proposal for an interaction point with the ICANN community. We did -- because we think it's very good if we have one interaction point instead of several.

And we really want to be able to tell what we are saying to governments and other ones about legislative proposals to everybody. But we also would like to have input from the community if there are legislative proposals we should interact with.

It's fairly -- it's fairly hard for anyone to track -- at least anyone of ICANN's size and funding to be able to track all countries all around the world who make legislation that have an effect on the Internet or our ability to make policies. It's quite hard.

So, therefore, it's like a two-way street. There's an intersection point where we want the community also to tell us this could be an interesting legislation for you to look into. We proposed -- you may disagree or -- you may agree or disagree with our proposal or my proposal, but we looked around. We didn't want to -- we didn't want to invent something new, so we found this.

And I'm sorry I don't know the correct name for it right now. It's Tuesday afternoon. The cross-community working group for Internet governance-related something. Close enough? Thank you.

Yeah. It should have a better name, something with a fruit in it.

But, anyway, so this group works with Internet governance. Even if this is not Internet governance, it's a subset of Internet governance. Our proposal was to use that as an interaction point with the community. We understand this is today only At-Large who started it. We can understand that if you think this is a good idea that the different parts of the community has come back and maybe restarted it for having this purpose. If the community and you have proposals of others ways of doing it, we are, of course, very positive to have that. So that's the sort of next step.

When it comes to those specific legislation that happens, it's also very important for us that we don't become the sort of lobbyists. For instance, you as contracted parties have several of your own trade organizations in Europe. You have, for instance, ECO, which if you want to sort of lobby the actual legislation, I would suggest humbly that it

happen through your own trade organizations because that's much more fitted to it because we want to stay in this format. Thank you.

BETH BACON:

Graeme just raised his eyebrow.

So I think certainly we're looking for coordination and not asking ICANN to lobby on anyone's behalf. So we are on the same page there.

We did talk a little bit about rechartering the CCW-IG and didn't get into depth about it. At the moment, it is not chartered. So this may be an opportunity to find a fresh group who could focus on this and identify some experts, even within the contracted parties house for that.

So I think we at least look forward to finding a way to coordinate and provide input from our part as well as receiving expertise from you guys.

Thanks.

GORAN MARBY:

As I said, we just wanted to find a point somewhere we can interact with the community. We are totally open for any suggestion from you. We just thought also in the eyes of the other discussions we had about not finding out even new tools to put in the tool box when you already have too much things to do, so we took that into account.

This is not a sacred thing for us at all. We are here to serve.

BECKY BURR: Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, thanks. This is a really important topic. I just wanted to highlight a couple of things that the Board is doing as a part of its priorities.

In addition to the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, which you are aware of that has ongoing information from org in terms of legislative tracking but also in terms of what governments they're engaging with, who they've met with, and things like that.

We also realize that it's important to have a more forward-looking approach.

And so two of the priorities are -- that we got in the Board priorities, the first is to annually review the strategic plan. And that involves looking at various trends which will also include looking at legislative and regulatory trends but also looking a bit further afield in terms of where we may see legislative initiatives developing. So looking a bit further ahead than what we can actually track at the moment.

And then the second priority that's part of the Board priorities is actually to implement, for lack of a better term, a horizon-scanning mechanism which will look more further afield and try to identify not any legislative or potential legislative initiatives but also other issues like cyber threats, different technologies, and things like that. So that will give us a more forward-looking understanding of what potential threats or opportunities may be coming down the road.

And so those two key priorities that we've adopted as a Board for 2020.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, y'all, for that discussion. I think the last thing on our agenda I'm going to throw over to Elliot Noss to introduce.

ELLIOT NOSS: Yeah. Thank you, Graeme. I thought it might be instructive while we have this opportunity, that's only slightly more intimate either than the ones we'll have later in the week, to interact with the board on DNS abuse. And we certainly had some items we wanted to share with you, but I thought it might be useful to start by checking whether you had any questions for us on anything that has happened since the last meeting as it relates to DNS abuse, all of the -- there's been a lot of talk in the community. Cherine put out a particular document, you know, I'm sure you know this is -- we though this is an important part of your interactions with other members of the community to date. So is there anything that, you know, if you were to imagine that we were going to be engaging on the topic that you would want to really -- you'd want to hear about from us? Want to give you the opportunity first.

BECKY BURR: I think that's a really great question, and I also think it's a really great way to think about it because we are hearing a lot about this topic. We're hearing about it from all parts of the community, and it's getting a lot of heat.

I will say that we were very pleased with the initiative that was -- that people are calling it the PIR framework, but I -- I don't know, it's maybe the Tucows framework or the Neustar framework or the GoDaddy framework or whatever. But we were very pleased with that, and I think the question is, if you can -- I think we were pleased about it because it's showing ownership of the issue, acknowledging that it's out there, and getting down to concrete. So, you know, are there plans to sort of take that further, are you working together on tools or ways to identify things? I'm -- I know other people on the board are going to have questions.

ELLIOT NOSS:

Sure, so that's a great place to start. First let me do some level setting around a couple of things. You know, that framework was a small group of large companies. I will tell you that you should not infer from that that there was not also a large group of smaller companies who didn't want to participate. There simply was not enough time to organize, you know, with everything else that's going on. So, you know, we expect that there will be more people signing on to that.

Second, I think it's important to note that that's not a formal registrar constituency document. This is a framework. And then, what I -- I think, you know, you said specifically there, you know, intent to extend that. And I think that's a great place for me to share some specific pieces of information with you.

That document was intended to create a level set for the work that is going on today in the main -- you know, with these companies and it

was -- you know, I will -- I will -- no, I'm not going to digress there for a second. The important point is, that what we need to do is -- and what we can do inside the community is in two separate directions move things forward. And what that doesn't mean is extend the definition. What it does mean really importantly is that we start to actually distinguish on the ground, in execution between good and bad actors and that we start to recognize the things we can do inside of the current contracts and frameworks.

So I want to talk about each of those points a little bit. You know, I think that one of my frustrations with nation state governance over the years, and I'm sure all of you have versions of these stories in your own countries, is that I would see politicians do the political thing, which was pass legislation and avoid doing the difficult thing which is deal with on-the-ground regulations and enforcement. So you would get the headlines but not the solution.

To me, in this context, getting some broader definitions in the contract for what is covered by DNS abuse is the headlines. What the actual work on the ground that will help deal with DNS abuse is going to come from compliance and registrars working together in a much more effective way. Today that relationship is not constructed. You know, we talk all the time when we're talking in cybercrime about well, we know who it is but we just can't deal with it, usually because of conflict of laws issue. In the -- in our community we know that things are going on and we can't and don't deal with them. You know, I'm -- I'm very interested in engaging further with Jamie Hedlund around this. I've tried to -- you know, I think you -- you've heard me talking on this issue probably for

over a decade now. I think there are real specific things we can do and we should do them.

So I think -- you know I've said a lot and answered one question, so I'm going to pause there and try and take in more.

BECKY BURR: We have comments on this? Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks. I wanted --

ELLIOT NOSS: You're not a board member, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: No, I was waiting to see if any board members wanted to respond to Elliot at this point. But if not, I will simply jump in and pile on. I think Elliot was very eloquent in what he just said. And I can say, speaking for VeriSign, but I think for the registries we had some of these conversations in our session earlier today. And is that we've recognized that there's the need for further attention to DNS security threats and that we welcome the discussions that are taking place here in the community and here in the community this week. And we've also identified that better definitions are needed around DNS abuse and DNS security threats and that the community has a role in helping to figure that out. And, you know, I think there's -- I think there's a need

for registries and registrars to develop best practices, to address these threats and that collaboration between and among contracted parties and ICANN and the community is a really important component of that. Essentially we need to figure out as contracted parties working with ICANN, working with each other, what do we look for over the next six months or over the next year in terms of, you know, what do those best practices look like? Is there an opportunity for us as Elliot said, sort of within the existing contracts, to evolve things like specification 11(3)(b) or the RAA, and how does that look and what does that engagement look like. But I just want to note again, I think to support Elliot's point, that these conversations taking place this week I think should be very positive and informative to what comes next. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Becky. Donna Austin. If I could just add, the registry stakeholder group, to some extent, have been having these conversations for the last 12 months. We've had a lot of discussions around it because of the audit, because it threw up a lot of challenges for us because we felt that the audit was going beyond the scope of the Registry Agreement, so that was a difficult conversation that we had with compliance. But I think we came out at a good spot. And I think what we've actually done is improved the communication that we have with compliance. I think we did get to a good place. It was very difficult to do, but we got there. We've also -- you know, in August we put out an open letter to the community which again was a very difficult conversation for us to have internally to get to a point that we could actually put something out to the community. And the intent of that

was to show that we are taking it seriously. We recognize there's conversations going on. We want to part of that conversation. And I think today we've had more conversations along the lines of what Keith is talking about and that is, how do we show the community that we're actually doing things to -- we're not necessarily doing things to address DNS abuse but we -- we do things on a day-to-day basis that deal with these things anyway. It's not -- it's not a big ticket item. It's just what we do as the operations of our business. Because it goes to reputation. So it's what we do on a day-to-day basis, but we're not very good at communicating that. So we're looking at ways that we can potentially do that. But there was -- Jim Galvin will always come back to this point. We can do that and we will continue to do that, but we're still not sure whether it's going to address the problem that ICANN seems to think is the problem of abuse. So we had this conversation at the GDD Summit and we've had -- Graeme and I had this conversation with Russ and Cyrus. We still have a problem identification issue that we need to deal with. Otherwise, we might be providing solutions that aren't really addressing a problem that people are concerned about.

So we'll get better at the information sharing and what we're doing, but we need to be sure that we're solving the right problem. Otherwise, you know, we've done a lot of work for really not much result or the community isn't going to be satisfied.

BECKY BURR:

So I have Goran and Merike in the cue, and I just want to plant out there, we need to come back to talk about what we can do to help you make

sure we're answering the right question, identifying -- solving the right problem. And then Jeff.

GORAN MARBY:

It feels very nice to agree with most of the things have been said here, and thank you, Donna, for recognizing the work we've done with -- between ourselves and compliance, especially about the audit. I think that was an enlightening process for all of us. As you know, I appreciate where we can actually have a conversation about things. And look forward to having conversation about the next audit whenever it's going to come.

So there's just a small thing. From my standpoint, there is now -- so we have -- we already have said we're going, together with the contracted parties, look into what the spec level (3)(b) actually means. That is we have a joint (indiscernible) we're going to continue that discussions about that reporting tools. But I don't really see that as the abuse discussion. Because now when the community has engaged in an abuse discussion, I shouldn't be part of that, ICANN org shouldn't be part of that. It actually belongs into the community because as we -- when there is because as we -- when there's a discussion within the community about if it's going to be -- and I'm not going to say that it should be a policy or not should be a policy, but when the community acts and starting to take up something, we should be very careful not to influence that discussion. Because if it becomes a PDP -- and I'm not saying it should be, I'm not even proposing it should be -- but if it becomes something, that really belongs to the community. You well

may know enough now that I've been trying to dry that line in the sand all the time. For instance, in the abuse discussions, we had many people come and ask us why don't you moderate the discussions, why don't you provide information for the discussions. I happen to believe that within the community there's a sufficient enough amount of knowledge about what this is. And I trust the community to continue the conversation.

So I divide the conversation into two different parts really. The abuse discussion belongs in the community, but I'm also looking forward, together with the contracted parties with Cyrus, Jamie, and everybody else involved, to start -- to look into the spec level (3)(b).

And yes, we are aware that there are -- in the ecosystem of Internet there are bad actors. Not all of them is even -- we often talk about the ICANN remit. Some of them are not even in our part of the ecosystem. Because there are 350 million domain names or something out there, and in ICANN it's sort of 185 million of those. There will always be something that is outside.

So we know about this, and as I've said previously, we are looking forward to engage with different partners of what we can do in the ecosystem. And I give an example, a little bit of this, because I think there is a change in the discussion which I think is very positive and that is, for instance, that in the DAAR we will very soon announce the first country code operators who will come into the DAAR reporting system as well. I know the DAAR is not the end of all reporting matters, but it is an attempt from our side to get more information in. So by having a

bigger DAAR with more information in, we actually could provide even better factual-based information. Thank you.

But I have to say, I really appreciate this discussion. Because many times -- I have only been here for 3 years, 4 months, 6 days, and 12 hours or something. Who counts. But this is, I have to say, coming into this meeting, also the with the webinar before, there is a sense of a very good discussion. And I would like to take the opportunity, which I've done before, to compliment these -- I've not -- the companies, organizations that signed off this document. I will not say about the quality of the concept but it's a very good attempt to move the discussion, and I think that's very good. Thank you. I'm being -- this is a very nice discussion. It's not abusive.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks. I have Merike and Jeff and then Danko in the cue.

MERIKE KAE0:

Yeah, I just wanted to say that I really, really appreciated the framework document because really having an understanding of what people are doing realistically operationally is really, really important to continue to moving the dialogue along, and I'm very much looking forward to the community discussion tomorrow on DNS abuse.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. Jeff Neuman. One of the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures PDP that often gets mentioned in the discussion with -- on

DNS abuse and the subsequent procedures PDP is taking up all of the applicable recommendations of the CCT review team, but are likely to not make any recommendations in the sense of those that would just apply to new TLDs going forward. I think several times the term "community discussion" has been used, and I think that's absolutely right. This should be a community discussion and not something that we try to pigeonhole into a process that may not see new TLDs launched into the root for another several years. So I think, you know, just from that approach and from discussions that -- other discussions that have gone on, you know, we certainly applaud what's going on within the community and want to make sure that this effort keeps up and it's not used as a tool to introduce further competition in the namespace.

BECKY BURR:

Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you. The question is are we asking the right questions. So in trying to answer to that, we will have this high-level, high-interest topic about DNS abuse, but even the question of the name is something that we are kind of discussing. So maybe we should say security challenges. It's kind of a new speak.

But I think it is very important that we view this discussion as something like it is happening in the IGF or somewhere where lots of ideas can come up and we can discuss about them and see what are the different

points. And we are now having this framework that is coming from contracted parties, at least parts of them, and I think it's very important contribution for this.

But I will go back to Elliot's question. So what can we ask you on that. So my question would be what is your view of the larger market, not just the things that you can do? And how to tackle the bad actors that are obviously there?

So in that sense, it is a very good thing, but probably you, who are on the market, also want to be able to not to compete against the ones who are not doing the good work. It is understandable that your work is also bringing up the value of your business's services and your brands, but market is complicated thing.

Thank you.

ELLIOT NOSS:

Yeah, that's great. I think that gets us right to where we should be spending the bulk of our conversational time.

I think that there's probably something that I would put up front, which is that when I started in this industry 20 years ago, I would have been loathe to see registrars touch any content. I probably would have greet with that ten years ago, maybe even five.

The reason was because I believed that governments, nation states, should deal with this problem, not registrars. Over those 20 years what I've sadly come to realize as we see in the domain name space and we

see in many other areas that the Internet touches that governments either can't or won't deal with these issues. These are global issues that nation states are not well equipped to deal with.

So we are left with this problem in this community for ourselves. With that realization I think comes greater responsibility. So then the challenge becomes defining it properly and working with it properly. And I think that there are -- that it's really clear that where we are, at the level of the DNS, is a blunt instrument that we have to be extremely careful with.

You know, I thought that the group that looked at registration abuse, I want to say it was last May but then somebody told me that it was years ago, that distinguished between -- it was May of -- yeah, something like that. That distinguished between registration abuse and content abuse did a really -- a job that held up, because I read it recently and I felt like it held up.

We -- You know, we echoed a lot of those sentiments. So I think what you see in that document is where it is clear DNS abuse, then we are appropriate to deal with it. Where it's content abuse, that should be very dear in how it's dealt with.

So let me give you a very specific example to try and ground that. You know, one of the -- one of the complaints that we've heard from the security community is, well, this framework we put out didn't deal with spam. That's right. It didn't.

So now I want to distinguish between two things. A domain name that is used for spam and a registrar that, at a business level, has 10,000 domain names a month that are registered for spam -- registered for spam. Those are different. That second one, I would argue, could be captured in today's RAA. That becomes a compliance issue. That is not a criticism of compliance. That is a -- that is a different approach. That hasn't been where compliance has been focused on things like that, but those is known and knowable. And I think that highlights beautifully the difficulty in putting a word in a contract and saying, "Registrars deal with spam," and what we have in the contract today which is a general concept that comes down to application. Because this all comes down to the application.

So what do I think we should be doing next is I think, as a community, we should be -- you know, and by the way, let me -- let me make it -- let me make more enemies, you know, at the same time. And those registrations are facilitated by deep registry discounts. By a new TLD trying to establish a brand.

Well, now we've got all kinds of things that bring it right inside this community, right inside the rules and framework that we make.

So it's moving from, you know, an existential debate about what the RAA should say and it's moving too dealing with these very real issues that we can deal with today.

And then, you know, if you want to ask me that at a personal or a personal/professional level, you know, what can we do as a business, I can do this, and I can try and, you know, isolate these behaviors.

And I like to say with all of these things, don't hate the player. Hate the game. If we are the ones making the rules in the framework, I'm not criticizing people for operating within them, you know, to maximize their abilities or to maximize their output, but I am saying, hey, I think we should -- you know, we should and can deal with real issues like that today.

By the way, I could, you know -- I could give you numerous more that are just as clear as that. And I should note, because the transcript don't capture all the heads nodding, when I drew that distinction between one kind of spam and the other, I think I saw, you know, a unanimous Board consent on that issue just from the heads nodding.

So look, here we are. We know this stuff. We can deal with it.

BECKY BARR:

Any -- Shall we go to -- Do we have comments from the -- from the audience on this?

Maarten, go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

I really appreciate the discussion because this is also what's happening in the maturing industry with bigger impact.

Yes, I know we cannot deal with everything that is relating with abuse within the ICANN framework, but if you look to abuse as the bigger picture, in that let's not limit ourselves at the start of what we can deal within. But once we start acting on that, we need to take that explicitly

into the account. But I agree with you that the bigger picture is very important. And yes, some of it may not be dealt with within the ICANN framework, but at least we know, we talk about.

GORAN MARBY:

Thank you. I just had an idea, which I haven't checked with my team. They're going to love this one.

So we have a registrar audit coming up, and you've talked about the contracts and the utilization of some of the parts of the contract. I think that I would love to engage with you in that, understanding what you think we can do more with the contracts and being a leading voice also with your own community, your own part, what we can do more with them. Because we know that in your part of the world, there is -- not everybody agrees with the contracted provisions (indiscernible)-tation. And if we can get -- a little bit like we're doing with the registrar -- the registries right now. Engage them the conversation before we go into the audit.

I think that would be very good, indeed, and thank you for leading the way.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Any more -- sorry, this is Graeme for the transcript. Any more thoughts or comments on this issue?

I'll note that I believe the framework has gone out to the registrar, and -- I think registrar and registry mailing lists as we've been talking,

looking for more people if they're interested in joining that. So take a look for that.

Jeff, final thought here?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. And -- sorry, Jeff Neuman again.

The framework is an excellent document, and I think it was great that it was published, and I think it's just one of many initiatives that are out there. And I think rather than referring specifically to the framework, I just want to make sure that many registrars do have policies and procedures in place. And I think as -- I think it was Donna was saying, we don't always publicize it very well, and that's one -- something that we hope to improve.

The framework is great, and it's been latched onto by the community, but let's remember that the framework is only an example of what many registries and registrars already do. And I don't -- There's always the danger that the community takes that framework and says, okay, now everybody needs to sign onto it. It's great, but there is many registries and registrars that go well above and beyond the framework. The framework, I believe, was just meant to serve as what those registries and registrars could all agree that they all do, but there's so much more out there. And we just need to get that out there.

Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Jeff. Yeah. It was crafted to be a floor, not a ceiling.

And what was that one more point I was going to make on that? No, it's gone.

Okay. I think we -- oh, Elliot.

ELLIOT NOSS:

You just said something that I heard earlier today that I just -- I think you want to be very careful with your language. If I was sitting on the Non-Contracted Parties House and heard it's a floor, not a ceiling, I would have just heard you say it's the start of a negotiation. And -- And, you know, I get the context that you're using that term in. In other words, there will be more parties coming into it, we can start to work into the details around it. But, you know, I think you should be careful with that phrase.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Agreed, Elliot. Thank you.

It came back to me. The point I was going to make about not being good at advertising what we do. I asked, Reg, our head of compliance, for some rough stats on what we're doing, and it's something like a hundred domains a day come down for the variety of DNS abuse. And that's real work that all registrars are doing and we just do an absolutely terrible job of telling people about that.

I think I saw -- Donna, was that...

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yes, thanks, Graeme. Donna Austin.

One of the things that came up with a session that we had with the GAC was the question about, you know, what do you do to develop best practices. And I think the framework is an excellent best practice.

And we had some discussions with PSWG today about what are examples of best practice that you think go to the problem of DNS abuse.

So I think we have agreed that we need to give some more thought to that and how we can, you know, perhaps work better together as registries to reach some common ground of what we think are best practices and how we get that out there. And we're actually looking to -- we have a website, which is really for members but maybe we need to repurpose that to get more information out there so it's more accessible for people, you know. And that's just one avenue. But if we could point people to the website to say this is what we're doing, at least it's a step in the right direction.

Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

I have a very brief comment, and in terms of adding this all up as a package if you like of collateral of what's being done, what can be being done, I think the conversation with the PSWG I would describe as functional, in a very positive sense, because as we know, when contentious topics come up, so often in this area we end up in dysfunctional dialogue. So I think it's very important for Goran,

Cherine, the Board to have at their disposal the recognition while this is work in progress, there are some very functional initiatives being -- taking place on the ground right now. You've heard all about active -- practice within existing operating businesses. Some of them coming together and describing a composite document, and then some very specific and functional conversations within the ICANN community.

Thanks.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay. I think that does conclude the conversation on DNS abuse. Thank you all for that.

We've got, by my watch, about 17 more minutes, and we haven't gotten to the Board's questions for us. Do we want to tackle those at this point? I'll leave it to you.

BECKY BURR: So, Cherine, I guess the question is can we have a very shortened version of the Board's question to have a discussion?

CHERINE CHALABY: Do you really want to do that? Or people have -- everybody seems very tired and --

DONNA AUSTIN: Your last opportunity, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Sorry, this is Sam. This is just a suggestion to keep us moving along. I think we've all done some work to read through these documents. I don't think you need to necessarily go through a whole presentation, but if you guys have specific questions or points that you want to convey to us at this time, we'd be happy to hear those and respond to them now. Maybe that's a better way to use 17 whole minutes.

BECKY BURR: And I think --

CHERINE CHALABY: I'll leave it to you, then.

BECKY BURR: I think what we want to know is did we correctly capture the input that we heard from the community both in the public forums and in our conversations?

We know, as a Board, we are talking about what we are going to do to try to maximize the chances of successful implementation of the strat plan. We are aligning our work to the strategic plan. We are asking each committee to look at all of the strategic objectives and goals and identify what their responsibilities with respect to moving those

forward are. In some ways it's an accountability exercise that we're engaged in. And the question is, how does the community take that on?

Have we identified sort of the right checklist? And is there more that we should be doing? Is there more that org should be doing? Is there -- Have we correctly captured what we think the community should be doing? And what -- you know, how can we help you take -- take this on and figure out how to put it into -- align the work that you're doing with the strategic plan to move it forward?

Go ahead, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Becky, for framing it in that way and posing that question.

Sorry, Keith Drazek.

I think the answer to that is largely yes. I think, as I said earlier, I think acknowledging the Board's work to come up with the framework and the roadmap essentially for the next five years, strategic plan -- and, of course, we will be looking very carefully and closely at the financial and operating plans -- and considering this week what the next round of updates from the evolving the multistakeholder model effort, right, so I don't think we're finished with that.

I think -- you know, I think we have winnowed down through community input from a much larger number of topics into some categories or buckets that we'll have, I think, this week to consider six

or eight sort of categories or topics that we've identified through community input.

And then there will be a public comment period, I understand, for people to continue to refine, I think, that work and that project plan for the community's engagement in terms of our improvements and our iteration of the multistakeholder model and our bottom-up consensus policy process. So I think there's more work to be done here, not just from the Board or from org but those of us in the community.

And I think very much looking forward to seeing, you know, the next round of sort of iteration of that project plan. And then really taking that into the early parts of next year and incorporating that into the overall work prioritization that we discussed earlier.

So I think very much on the right track, still some work to be done as it relates to the community's role. But I think the points that you've identified from a Board perspective and the org perspective are very much on track. I hope that's helpful.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU:

Thanks. I also think the efforts to put in the costing plan, the operation plan that goes with it, and really just sort of -- some of the concreteness of a lot of things that are featured in the strategic plan, I think that was a good response to some of the feedback that maybe past strategic plans have been sort of esoteric documents, that after a few years exist but we don't really know how our work continue to kind of tie things

into the strategic plan and have it serve as a roadmap as we all collectively do our work is going to be very important.

And that's why I have also been really encouraged by, Cherine, when you have talked about that this is intended to be a living document that we'll review from time to time.

I think what you guys have done here is establish that we all have skin in this game. And I think that's set up to be very successful. I think there's going to be a significant learning curve as to how we all need to do our jobs and meet our responsibilities under this.

But at the risk of sounding a little cheesy, I think we understand that we're all in this together and that there will be opportunities to work through that.

BECKY BARR:

Any other thoughts on that?

Can I ask one sort of completely out-of-sequence question here? It's kind of related.

Related to this at some level is the work that we're doing to struggle with how do we prioritize and budget all of these community recommendations and hundreds and hundreds of them that are coming up. How do we prioritize across the various recommendation groups? I mean, we can ask the review team or whatever community source, CCWG that's responsible for them. But we have to prioritize across them.

One of the things we've proposed in the framework -- in the discussion draft that we have out there is that more work be done at the front end about understanding the cost, budget, and implementation resource implications of recommendations so that the community actually, with they're asked to comment on the draft report, has that information and is asked to -- asked to respond to that information as well.

So it's not that we would ask a review team to understand all of the budget implications of a recommendation but that the draft report would be supported by information provided by -- or working with the community source. And the community could -- their comments in response to a draft report could be informed by that information.

I was actually surprised by -- in one conversation today where a group said, "That's a really terrible idea." You know, we want to decide whether an idea is a good idea or not.

And maybe I'm naive about that, but I was surprised by that. And I'm curious about -- what you all think about that.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Becky. Donna Austin.

Doesn't that go to the concept of scoping? So when these review teams start their work or any effort starts their work, that the scoping is very deliberate? And wouldn't the cost and those kinds of things come into that? Is that the kind of thing you're getting to, or have I missed the point completely?

BECKY BARR: Scoping certainly has implication for it. But I think we were talking about: So, okay, there's a recommendation. How much would it cost? What would it take to implement that?

DONNA AUSTIN: There has to be a cost associated.

BECKY BARR: Pam. Jeff.

PAM LITTLE: Hey, thanks. Pam Little for the record.

I -- Becky, in an earlier GNSO effort in developing the -- I think it's data and metric reporting nonPDP working group or something like that. As a result of that effort now in the GNSO charter template, there is language or provision which meant that it's a policy impact assessment when a working group makes policy recommendation. But that was, I believe, quite a few years back now since that template has been finalized. And now Council is using that template to charter work.

However, because the problem is we do our work in such a hurried fashion, we don't have time to take that step, to actually look at this recommendation, how much is it going to cost, who is going to be impacted, and how. We don't take that step.

As far as I know, we haven't done the policy impact assessment in that PDP process. But I think what you were describing is similar to that.

Costing is definitely one of the impacts that we need to be aware of to make sure that recommendation is actually implementable or feasible from a cost perspective and other aspects. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I'm trying to think of the best way to put this.

Within a normal organization or commercial enterprise, that is a fantastic idea and that should always be done.

It's harder to do in this type of environment because much of the community -- it's not their money that you're kind of playing with. It's not like anyone in the community understands the ramifications of if this costs us a huge amount of money, they're not going to understand what that means for them, that they're not going to get in other areas.

And because many in the community that participate in policy development processes only participate in that particular issue, so they may not care if it costs a huge amount to implement this thing in that policy development process because that's what they care about. And the other things may not affect them.

So it's a great exercise for obviously the Board to do when it's going through. And within an organization, if you are an employee of an

organization, it's harder to do when you don't feel the impact of what you're actually prioritizing or what the costing happens to be.

BECKY BARR: Sam, Beth, Cherine. And then I think we will probably be close to time.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: So I can understand where Jeff's coming from, but we're going to have to grow up eventually. And an idea or a recommendation that can't be implemented because there's not money to do it because we didn't understand that it was -- would cost a million dollars, a bajillion dollars, is not useful to anyone.

I think we're all at a point where we understand that for this to continue to be successful, we need to professionalize a little bit as an organization and part of that is understanding this.

I don't think it's going to be easy. The community isn't good at this right now, but it doesn't mean that we can't be. So we have to try.

BETH BACON: I'm going to agree with Sam. I take a bit of a different perspective than Jeff.

I think if you're concerned about a lack of awareness about how it impacts the budget, then I don't see how doing a review of how much things might cost would help that. So I'm certainly supportive of saying let's try it before we say it's not a great idea. Thanks.

CHERINE CHALABY: So I want to tie this to the conversation we had earlier when Joke said that Goran is going to group the SO and AC leaders in January and you're going to talk about prioritization and talk about the supply and demand.

Frankly, it would be very hard for any solution to do prioritization if we do not know the cost of what we're prioritizing. It may not be to the benefit of the group that is producing the recommendation, but eventually it will be the benefit for the prioritization process and which decisions we make at what cost.

So I can't see how we can escape that going forward, particularly that our funding has plateaued and the availability of funds are limited. So that is going to be an important criteria in the decision-making going forward. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. We didn't get a chance to try out the new format, but I think we had a really great conversation.

I'm going to turn this over to Graeme and Donna for final words.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Becky. Yep.

Despite maybe not being our preferred method, I think we've had a really productive conversation today. And I've enjoyed it quite a bit so thank you.

I think the last bit on our agenda is to make sure that we express a really heartfelt thank you to Cherine for his services as chair of the Board.

I personally --

[Applause]

Thank you.

I personally feel like I've learned a lot from you, and I have really enjoyed our interactions. And we are very sorry to see you go. And thank you so much.

GORAN MARBY:

Thank you, all.

[Applause]

Just a short reminder that we will now turn in this room for a session about our dear friend Tarek. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]