## Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

## CSG Meeting

## Sunday 14 July 2013 at 07:30 local time

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.

((Unintelligible))

(Tony):     Well good morning everybody and welcome to the first of a number of CSG events with across states ICANN meeting. I'd like to welcome Bill Graham here, always really appreciate his time and particularly want to thank Bill for being flexible. He has another commitment later and agreed to meet with us early.

Also to thank all of you for turning up at such an early hour as well. This meeting, it will be transcribed, just for the use of members and we also have dial-in capability. So I would ask that anybody who joins we are advised at that as it happens.

I would also ask that at the end of this session, I think both Bill and (Bruce) will both be leaving us around 8:30, members remained for a while, there are a couple of other issues that I would like to take the opportunity to raise while we're together. And it seems a good opportunity between 8:30 and 9:00 to have a brief discussion on some of those issues.

But for this morning, we have three topics on our agenda for discussion without the NSO board members. The first one is operational band and

budget. Some concerns and issues that we have. The second one is ongoing concerns with new TDODs and the third one is the impact and overload on constituencies and volunteers.

I do have some copies of the agenda so I will ask if we can pass those around. Would you like to take one Bill, and pass them on.

Bill Graham:     Thank you.

(Tony):          There is also a list for people to add their details to sign up just for the record. And I'll also circulate one of those down both sides of the table. So with that introduction, I'd like to get going pretty quickly and turn to the first topic which is the operational band and budget and I'm sure there are many people who want to join in that discussion, Bill, but for now, (unintelligible) there are a number of issues around those matters that give us concern.

Certainly these three constituencies that make up CSG, independently submitted budget requests and we have yet to hear how they are going to be handled. We are now at the stage where we are really living hand to mouth in terms of trying to perform some of our operational aspects. The constituencies, in terms of outreach looking ahead for opposite travel, even planning some of our support activities as well.

Seems to be rather a long process, and it's been a complex process as well. A number of us tried to get under the fingers of the budget and understand them a lot better. With the changes from last year, that proved very very difficult do to. We're also aware that the budget envelope from which our requests are going to be considered, 50% or more of that budget is also being allocated, and we have yet to receive any notification of how our requests are going to be handled.

We are aware that the boulder might be considered in the budget whilst we're here in Durbin, but there is this general (unintelligible). So with this brief introduction, I'll ask others to offer some input some ongoing influences as well. (Steve) is that something you particularly wanted to pick up on?

Steven Metalitz: Thank you. Steven Metalitz for the transcript, good morning. I think (Tony) has (encapsuled) the concern about our requests, but we also have a number of concerns about the overall budget. It's a twenty - I think it's a 25%, 24% increase in spending. And we were quite puzzled by how some of that is going to be spent.

There are some very broad categories like, stay colder engagement and DNS industry engagement, which we still - I still don't really know what the DNS industry is. Or whether everybody who uses that phrase and allocates large sums of money engaging it, all have the same understanding of what it is.

I think we felt - and I want to thank especially (Chris Chaplow) and Mikey O'Conner who really did do the deep dive on these budget documents which we totally inpenetratable to me, but since they came back with some nuggets, we still have a lot of questions and really very few answers.

There was a document that came out last week, but frankly it didn't really answer most of those questions. So even aside from the very serious problem of, we have asked for some support, we're trying to make plans and we don't even know whether we are going to get the support, I think there are a lot of questions around the overall budget that we're concerned about. Thank you.

(Marilyn Fee): Let me join in and thank you (Mike) and (Chris). I too did my best to - I should say for the transcript (Marilyn Fee) - did my best to kind of trace the

documents, and I think they are actually - while we may be on a path to improvement, the present approach to the documentation is extremely challenging and I think you're going to hear that from almost everybody including at the budget working group.

The other thing that I see reflected in the budget is the large buckets of money allocated now to these big categories. I don't think that there has been acceptance and buy in from the community to, but it is feeling like it is moved to a centralization of activities that we had previously been working towards supporting in a distributive way and strengthening and one example is one request that we made for resources.

That I think you know, yes these communities have asked for chosen resources, but what we were getting seems to be basing very fast ahead, moving to completion in this bucket of money approach and the community's input. It is very difficult to see how the community's input can be taken into account because some of this funding seems to be pre-allocated.

(Tony): Thanks (Marilyn) and before I ask you for any comments Bill, I think maybe it's the time to ask those who actually did the deep dive or a couple of the constituencies to offer any inputs. (Chris) you indicated you might have some.

(Chris Jetlaf): Yes, thanks (Tony), (Chris Jetlaf). Yes, as we have alluded to, this year was a lot more difficult than usual to comment. It was practically impossible so difficult really to know which way to go on this one. Whether we just give up this year and say, we should give some slack here, we're going on to the new system. But when does ICANN in the past go into the myICANN and drill down and think of ideas or think of projects that you are interested in, and then actually do - drill down as what he's asks us to and see how those

projects are doing. And actually feel where are we with this and is it answering your questions.

You know, but back to the actual - actual numbers and there were more questions than answers and the questions weren't answered until - well the original tie in was for the clumse of the reply which is a bit Irish and it didn't come out until two or three weeks after then. Well I have it here, there is about 80 questions. And there is 80 answers, but I'm just going to finish just by reading from my favorite comment, and it is actually one of Steve Metalitz'

And it says here "further we have informed that after the (FY14) budget is improved, (Sally Gustafson) who leads stake holding engagement globally will present to the ICANN community a detailed plan that explains the 5.5 million budget expense. That is one budget item, 5.5 million. This is backwards." I think you are 100% correct there, (Steve), you've hit the nail on the head.

Steven Metalitz:    Thank you.

(Tony):    Thanks (Chris). Mikey?

Mikey O'Conner:    Mikey O'Conner for the transcript. (Chris) and I had a great time with this budget. I used to be a controller of a great big university and I have never seen a budget as screwed up as this one, just on a technical game point, I just want to amplify what (Chris) is saying. But I kind of want to come at it from a business guy sort of perspective.

One of the things that's interesting in this budget is that if you look at the numbers the revenue track is flattening. Demand for domain names - new domain names, appears to be flattening and no particular indication that a

whole ton of new revenue is going to come in real soon from new GTLDs. So we have sort of flattening revenue and really cool expanding costs. And (Javier) kind of waved his hands at this in his reply. He said "well no, no, no no, blah blah blah blah." That's a pretty good summary of what he had to say.

And so I think there is a fiduciary responsibility issue here and you know at least I want to raise that through you to the board to the budget committee. I think this budget is out of balance.

(Tony):        Thank you Mikey. (Christine).

(Christine):        Thank you. I again wanted to thank Mikey and (Chris) for what they did with the budget and I think quite candidly that ICANN is not helping itself in how it presents the budget. In the sense that what I think would have been very useful at least the point of allowing the comments from this stakeholder group to be comments as opposed to questions would be to put out the budget, have perhaps, two weeks later a webinar that allows people that walk through the budget, allows people to ask questions and then start the comment period.

So that people within the community have had the opportunity to fully ask their questions, understand what is allocated where, and I think personally one of the issues that the ITC is in the budget is that there is so much money being allocated to outreach stakeholder engagement, and none of us really have a very good sense as to what exactly the scope of that is, what those activities are, how those integrate with activities that we as constituents (unintelligible) undertaking.

How those will compliment and how - what the outcome is. What is the metric for successful engagement? More people coming to ICANN meetings,

more people on webinars. I mean having that type of information particularly for those types of budget categories would be incredibly useful to have.

(Tony): Thanks, so Bill you've heard a number of concerns that we have both at the macro and the micro issue of the budget, let's give you the opportunity to comment.

Bill Graham: Thanks very much (Tony) and thanks for the comments and thanks for the opportunity to be here. I have to do my standard disclaimer at this point and say that I can only speak as an individual; I can't speak for the board. And as an individual, I need to say that I am not on the finance committee so I'm not deeply down on the details of how the budgeting process is going on.

I do hear your concerns that there is inadequate information and that the categorization of spending has been clumped together in a way that makes the budget less readily understood. I'll take these concerns back, very reasonable comments. Part of the difficulty I think that we are having in getting a handle on the budget comes from two factors.

One is an attempt to introduce new systems and new ways of budgeting and that is a process that is fraught with the possibility of making mistakes, so there is a learning process underway, there is new staff, this is really (Zebeya) first kick at the can for a full budget cycle. (Suzanna Bennet) is now on board and again she is bringing a great deal of experience, but she is very new at this so I think this is good input and I will pass it on.

The other thing is the impact of the new GTLV program. Because that effectively means that we have two budgets now, I think that is creating some difficulties in presentation if not an actual allocation and I can't really comment on the latter, but I can assure you that on the board we're struggling

with what goes in what bucket. And I hear that you're having the same concerns. So all I can really say that this point is that I appreciate the frank feedback, I will pass this on, both to (Zebeya) and to the finance committee and see what we can do.

I would also encourage you to raise this in the session with the board because I think these are reasonable and important concerns. So it sounds an awful lot like a waffle, but frankly that's pretty much all I can say at this point.

(Tony): Okay, thanks Bill. I think one of the additional difficulties that we have with the budget is that there are these big buckets of money and we look at the headings of some of those programs for instance the Global Outreach Program, some of the issues that (Sally) is dealing with and we don't really understand what that strategy is. We don't understand how it fits with some of the outreach efforts that we are conducting.

It seems to be a lack of understanding as to how those things plug together and that gives an added degree of unease when we look at these huge numbers could be input as well.

Is there anybody who wants to have any further comment on this particular issue?

(Marilyn Fee): (Marilyn Fee). I think right now I can't figure out how the bringing together of the communities concerns and the budget are going to happen over the next few days, but we're also going to be talking on Monday about the launch of the new five year strategic plan. And inherent in the budget allocation I think are some significant shifts. It is really important not to lose the present community while we're trying to find the next 10,000 pioneers.

If I can say that auspiciously, but I'm worried about the gap that I think is existing right now in the minds of the people who have built the organization and new processes. And I think the budget is a really worrisome example of it. So besides the questions we have, I think the big question I have is how do we get the community back on board if in fact more of the community is where these constituencies seem to be.

(Tony): I think that's an important remark, particularly when you take it on top of the comment that was made, do we just give up on this budget, it is too hard to get underneath. And it's not a good platform for going forward, but I'm sure you got the message that we do have concerns around that and certainly we will be engaging in some of the additional dialog that will take place.

So with that, we'll move on to our second topic. And this one I'm going to open up to comments right from the start. It is the new DTODs and the ongoing concern that we have had. You'll be aware I think what this comes from is the mutual stakeholder group on DTODs. We are aware of the work that is being done by the DTOD program committee. Some of those concerns have been addressed, some in a way that's quite acceptable, others of course as you get with any dialog in a way that may be not the preferred way of handling those issues from the CSG perspective.

But this is an opportunity to make sure that our representatives on the board in TNSO are fully aware of these issues. So I'll open up comments from people who have been at the forefront of this. Ron?

Ron Andruff: Thank you (Tony), good morning. Bill I sense that you feel you might be thrown on the grill here we keep turning up the heat, but we are grateful because you are our representative. So it's more on the basis of informing and discussing, so I just wanted, in terms of the dialog within the board, there has

been a letter from (ALAK), letters from the Center of Rockefeller, there's letters from (Unintelligible) there is a lot of people that are leaning into it slowly slowly slowly.

Is there any sense that this is going to slow or is this going to continue at the current pace that we are seeing rushing down the track? I know that is a bit of a loaded question, but is there a sense of discussion about that or something that you could share? Thank you.

Bill Graham:    From our perspective on that, the new GTLV program and committee it's drinking from a fire hose. Things are, I agree, moving very very quickly, that said, we are trying very very hard to pay close attention to the inputs that we are getting. And are we going to slow, I don't think I would say that, I think we'll continue trying to pay close attention to this. Part of the problem I see as a member of that committee is one of timing and one of the roles of the board itself.

With the program committee being a proxy for the board as a whole. There are a lot of pressures on us to do things in a way that I consider premature. Things are working their way through the process that was set up in the applicant guidebook, and yet we are being asked by all kinds of very credible sources to essentially preempt those processes that are in place and make decisions before the process has run out.

We're getting that certainly form private sector side; we're getting that very much from the (GAK) side. So in terms of slowing down, we are trying to do that in a sense that we are trying to avoid prematurely taking action, which may appear that we're taking no action in point of fact, that is exactly what is happening, but we feel it is inappropriate at this point to act on the basis of inputs that we are getting.

That doesn't mean that we aren't paying attention to the inputs. It's just that at this point, it's premature. So there is a very fine balancing act that we have to perform to be aware of the concerns, try to raise those concerns with staff as they go through the processes that are in place and yet not preempt what should be happening through the process.

We have had 41 meetings in the last year as a program - (unintelligible) program committee. Some of the information calls some of the actually decision making meetings, but we are paying a very large amount of attention and inputting a lot of effort into tracking the reviews that are coming to us from all sides. Trying to be prepared when it comes to the point of the committee making decisions and yet not preempt a process that could work out very well.

(Alisa Cooper): (Alisa Cooper), for the transcript. So there are a few actual implementation details that I think are still a great concern to the business community. In particular those details are relating to the trademark clearing house. I'm hopeful that we'll be receiving some information on let's say the fifty previously abused variations, specifically what will be required to submit those, how that will all work, because we don't have that information yet and obviously if we're planting the seed for the first launch in September, a lot of businesses are going to be interested in perhaps submitting those variations.

Similarly, I know there is not yet a testing environment for registrants to actually test the trade mark clearing house. So there are some issues around that. There are also some implementation issues I think which we commented on, related to the new specification 11 requirement. In particular exactly what we're required and how will compliance be able to handle all of those new requirements and ensuring that those are implemented effectively.

So those are just a few things that kind of rise to the top for me and I think for many business users and it is important for us to get an understanding and hopefully find out because those things will be happening very very soon.

(Tony):          (Marilyn):

(Marilyn Fee):   (Marilyn Fee), my comment was going to be the focus on a phrase that you used Bill, and you said that the new GTLV committee board wants to be careful not to preempt the process that was previously agreed. The guidebook was always subject to further advise from the (GAK) and public comments and I think that these constituencies, in our experience, particularly when we go back to thinking about the Straw Man proposal that we made and the efforts that we undertook with many other people from the community that are not part of these constituencies to provide detailed information about critical improvements to this program so that it doesn't fall over completely at some point.

I think I myself would be very concerned if there is a growing feeling on the board that the guide book is somehow sacrosanct and not subject to the details of implementation that had been strongly supported, both by (GAK) advice and by public comment. And the example that (Alisa) just gave; I think is an excellent example. The improvements to the trademark clearing house, but also URL. The picks, many other things. So I wanted to ask for clarification on that.

(Tony):          Just one. Mikey I thought you were asking as well? (Christine)? Sorry, go ahead (Mike), you want to get in. No let's get everything out on the plate.

Mikey O'Conner: I'm sorry; you know its 1:00 AM for me. I'm just not right at my peak. Bill I want to put on the pile a question of the whole security and stability stuff. And I won't reiterate the little list of horrors; it's more a question of where are we at on that. There was talk about some studies going to be done; just as the meeting started I heard some of that coming out now. If it is coming out, where is it at?

And the reason I am curious about that is because some of those, you know like the (ZAK45) report where you know it has the error strings in the root blah blah blah would indicate if that is a real problem that we have to put some strings on a reserve list and if we do that how does that process play out. What is the committee thinking about that, that whole pile. I'd like to get an update on that.

(Tony): (Christine).

(Christine): Thank you. Thanks Mikey for mentioning those studies because you know; they were supposed to come out in time for us to discuss them here. And at this point, that hasn't happened. So whether or not we'll get them to discuss them here or not I think is very much an open question.

So I did want to report that. I just wanted to raise a few points with regard to, for example the TMCH, kind of supporting the concerns that (Alisa) had indicated. I also have to say that after sitting through the (GAK) discussions yesterday afternoon, you're hearing more and more calls from different groups for exemptions from this, and exemptions from this part of the clearing house and that part of the clearing house and this rights to protection this and that rights to protection that.

And I would just stand by and see to start carving out and saying for example "okay the GTLV, don't have to do Sunrise because they can work with the local government and get reserve names first." Or this group of self identified categories doesn't have to do that. I think that starting to kind of pick and pull can really cause some harm to the integrity of that entire process and really prevent us from having a good understanding of what those mechanisms actually achieve when it comes time to renew them.

Couple things that I also wanted to flag were kind of from a personal view. I think one issue that is looming that I don't think anyone anticipated is what happens when you have (GAK) advice and formal objection results on the same string, on the same ground with different outcomes and how the board intends to reconcile that.

Finally again, speaking personally, but I know that this is an issue that several applicants have had is that you know, there is some real concern about the independent objectors conflict of interest and the complete absence of any mechanism for addressing those. While he certainly is supposed to be independent, I think there has to be some accountability for addressing conflicts of interest. ICANN refuses to keep the claims he doesn't have one. You know, the ICC says the panel can deal with it if it wants, but it doesn't have to and even if it does, there are no criteria. And that's just not how things should be built.

(Tony):     Okay, so maybe I should close here Bill, and refer to you. I think with any program where some people there is an understanding that it has to move ahead on the basis where it's written currently. And others where there is a desire to make sure that all the checks and balances are there, comes to a head.

There's always going to be some difficult decisions to make. And on this one, being part of the GTLV program committee very much in the hot seat. So that would be interesting to hear. And your view of life both within that group and some of the issues that has been mentioned.

Bill Graham: I think your anxiety is entirely understandable. There are a lot of balls in the air and we are desperately hoping not to drop any. Mikey, the studies that you mentioned, I understand that a number of studies are on the verge of coming out which is not exactly timely for dealing with them at this meeting, but on the other hand, the studies are studies of very complex issues. So frankly I think it's better to take the time to do that.

Trademark Clearing House, we have spent a lot of time talking about that, we haven't yet got a result out, but there is a lot of attention being paid to that, trying to make sure that the system works, and works reasonably for trademark holders. That is a serious concern and something we are really trying to ensure happens, so those two things are really among the ones we are working most attention to.

You're right about the (GAK). A concern of mine is that they are probably the strongest single voice at this point. Trying to get the board to - and the new GTLV committee to ignore the process that is in place to take preemptive decisions and we're really trying to avoid that. We're really trying to explain to them, that there are processes in place and they need to wait for these processes.

A good example is a meeting we'll be having with the minority opinion of - on the (GAK) who wants to talk about (Halal) and dot Islam. There are objections on both of those. It would be absolutely wrong in my opinion to

take any stand before those objections work through and we see how the process is working.

We think the process will probably work in a rational way, but with all of these things, there are a range of parties from all sides that are concerned about how things are going to work out. We're concerned about how things are going to work out we're monitoring as closely as we can, we're listening to your concerns, but we're deliberately holding back because we think there's a process in place.

(Marilyn), your question about whether or not the guidebook is sacrosanct, no its not. There is certainly an understanding that we need to address at a certain degree. We're trying not to do this on the fly; it needs to be done in a reasoned way. And at the minimum level possible. We don't want to interfere with the results of a very long process, that involved all parts of the community unless we can see that there is a really significant problem in the implementation.

At this point I think a lot of what we're hearing is legitimate concern in most cases, speculation in some cases, that things may be going wrong. We're trying to track and make sure that we're prepared to deal with things when it's the right time to do so.

(Tony):        (Steve).

Steve DelBianco:  Morning Bill, Steve DelBianco, (unintelligible). Like you mentioned the study, can you just as well said they may not be released in this meeting, we're talking about the two independent multi jurisdictional studies on the dot less domains and the other issue, internal name commission. Given that those reports aren't out - we talk about not wanting to drop any balls, but I think we

don't want to set new balls in motion, because as I understand it there were some contracts signed last night.

New registry contract signed last night and things are moving. A lot of applicants definitely want to launch and if they have cleared all of their initial evaluations and there is no objections there is a sense that let's let them go. And yet if the strings they are launching are among those that have a high likelihood of collision with internal name certificates, why would we want to put that new ball in the air and have it come crashing to the ground and undermine the entire program, so it's prudent to look at ways to maybe park or defer is the word I believe the new GTLV program committee used. Right, defer certain contract signings in that string.

No you've deferred things with respect to (GAK) advice on safeguards, but as of yet I haven't heard anything from the committee about deferring string, assigning a contracts first string, or those strings, likely a big proponent of this. Things like corp home, mail, offense, and there might even be more, Mikey can help us with. Thank you.

Bill Graham: Point taken. I can tell you that those two specific examples are the subject of rather active discussion. I think you will - I know the studies are going to be released probably this week. That is what I have been told yesterday, we'll have to see how that actually works out, but I believe they'll be out this week. The board is - the committee is completely seized with both of these issues and we understand that these are really fundamentals stability and security issues.

We're not going to act precipitously without those studies coming out and being well considered and commented on by the community. So I think I can reassure you on that.

Steve DelBianco:   Just as a follow up, the words "we're not going to act" should I take that to mean we're not going to delegate the string, even though the contract is ready to go, if that string is among those, it creates risks.

Bill Graham:   Again with the caveat that I can only speak for myself, yes I believe, I genuinely believe that is true.

(Jay Scott Evans):   I want to stand here to say I'm from Yahoo. (Jay Scott Evans) from Yahoo for the record. One I want to support everything (Steve) had to say. And secondly, I want to say with regards to the process points you've made today. Please understand the stakeholder community is getting bigger every day because executives from companies are being brought in where they have not been involved in this for the last two years. It has been driven by pockets of large organizations, but now it is going up two levels because budgets are needing to be allocated, strategies are needing to be bought into.

And since this has taken a while, some of the people who made initial decisions within organizations that are no longer within those organizations, so there needs to be a new education process. So they are very frustrated when they are told there is a process, because they believe processes are designed to adapt and change as situations change.

So I would say that to you. Secondly, you need to be very careful about how we handle these security and stability issues because people are watching very closely. In my experience and I'm speaking in my personal experience, not as a Yahoo representative, but as a person that has been involved since 1997,many times I hear, "we're going to wait until a study comes out, and then we're going to take in public comment and then we're going to analyze it."

And what happens is, that all happened after the action has taken place. We get the public comment, six months after they have already signed the five contracts, put them into the - and that is not going to stand with senior executives in companies who have made millions of dollars of investments into this.

So I just would caution you, as this community of stakeholders grows, I think there is a larger number of new people that are not as seasoned as maybe (Marilyn), (Alisa), (Steve), and I and so you're giving to resell the credibility of this organization every day (unintelligible).

And so I would ask for you to partner with us as we try to do that outside of the bubble. That is ICANN participatory members; help us do that by listening to us and acting cautiously. Thank you.

(Tony):   If there is one area, Bill where I know you have a lot of expertise, it is protecting the credibility of this organization, but I think you'll be more than aware from those comments and it is really difficult period.

And just moving onto the next topic, I'd like to personally thank you for the work you do on that committee, it really is a tough one. Your attention right way to ICANN on this and you're very much in the hot seat, so thanks for your efforts on this.

Looking at the clock, we should move on, so that the last topic we wanted to have some discussion on with Bill, and that's the impact and overload on constituencies and volunteers, and I'm sure you're also overloaded at the board level, but from our perspective, we're certainly in a situation where most of us involved in the heart of the constituencies are running, we're

finding it very difficult in terms of the demands that come out, the common periods, but I'd open the floor with other people to raise issues with this. (Alisa).

(Alisa Cooper): I think that one of the biggest issues in this last trade was responding to all of the comments. I was asked, well what can we do about that. If we can at least spread out the reply period due date by two weeks so that we basically have one set of comments due every two weeks, that would be tremendously helpful because I think we were working on numerous sets of comments at the same time and they were due very close together so it was very hard to get them all done. Thank you.

Mikey O'Conner: Mikey O'Conner it is now 1:20 in the morning for me. I have an idea on this. It has to do with that giant outreach thing that is going on, you know. We have sort of had the 10,000 new folks that are scheduled to arrive in the next two years. On the one hand, and on the other had we had this pretty overloaded, pretty small group of folks that do the heavy lifting.

And in the middle, it seems to me that if we could spread out some steps between the brand new people and sort of the hard core that are here and make maybe the comment reply cycle part of those steps. So that if someone wants to join a constituency, and then they want to get a little bit more active, maybe to get on a group that prepares the first draft of a public comment and so on and so forth. So use the - combine the two problems into one solution and say let's figure out some gradiated steps of engagement for new people to have a pretty safe environment to create content and learn the process with a lot of supervision and mentoring and put a bunch more steps in the process.

I think otherwise, I'll join the parade and say, it's getting pretty overwhelming. Talk about a firehouse, its firehouse time for us too.

(Tony):          (Christine).

(Christine):     Thanks, I completely support what (Alisa) and Mikey have said from the perspective of the ITC. I know that since our last meeting actually within the past couple of months there have been topics that we simply couldn't comment on. We wanted to, we just couldn't.

We have also found ourselves unfortunately to use the reply period because we haven't had the opportunity to come to a consensus within the ITC draft the comments, get it circulated, get it signed off on within the initial comment period. So as grateful as I think we are for having the reply period, I also think there needs to be acknowledgment that many of the community are forcing to use it for a purpose for which it wasn't designed.

To the extent that it would be if at all possible to get any kind of forecasting, even if it's not necessarily 100% accurate, kind of a quarter ahead. Here are the issues that we anticipate will be going out for public comment in the next quarter would be really really helpful, and I don't know the extent at which that can be done, but I would think that to some extent, particularly for things that are in the PDP process, you should be able to at least flag, re-anticipate that the public comment period on these particular issue are going to be x, x, x.

I don't care if that' all the weeks, but if I know ahead of time, I can at least start thinking, who in the constituency cares about this, who in the constituency can start being the point person so we can start getting organized in such a way so that we can provide the institution with the input that it needs to make good sound decisions.

(Tony):              Thanks. Certainly from the ICP perspective, I'd like to endorse everything (Christine) has said. There is a real need to prioritize full cost here. And it's something that isn't really happening in a way that helps us currently. So Ron and then Mikey.

Ron Andruff:        Thank you. Ron Andruff for the record. One of the, I think, one of the biggest issues we all suffer from is back in the day when we were at 3-400 people at ICANN maybe. We could go around and talk to our colleagues at the ISPs and our colleagues at the IP constituency and we could actually build consensus.

We could say "hey, this is how we're feeling about this issue, how do you guys feel about it?" And get good exchanges and actually come with something that was meaningful and bring that to the public forum, and sure enough that would find its way in one form or another to become part of the ICANN policies.

It's impossible today to build consensus, even in turn within our own constituencies because as been well mentioned, there is so much stuff coming down. I don't know the answer to it, but what I'm trying to point to is something maybe along what (Christine) had said. If we know in advance what's coming, we can start to build consensus. If ideas could socialize a little in advance, so there is more thinking, more critical thinking can be brought to it and then we can build consensus.

And then that leads to the second part of my comment. And that is the subjectivity by which staff will summarize the comments. That is a real difficult one for us all. We work so hard and spend so much time. We bring our comments forward and then it is passed over with three words. So and so said this. And move on and basically, I am not pointing the figure at staff, but it seems to us, it means to me personally, let me say it that way, that many

times the comments are being shaped to fit something that staff would like to see driven. Fit that round peg into that square hole.

That's not what we want but that's kind of how it shapes up in the end. So there is two parts to it, one is building consensus, the other part is how that subjectivity has brought to the comment period, very difficult sometimes. Thank you.

(Tony):       Mikey.

Mikey O'Conner:   A couple of ideas - this is Mikey O'Conner. A couple ideas here, one, I think we need to separate (Christine) has a really good idea in this forecasting thing. I think we need to split this into two streams and take it - take part of this back to the counsel.

I think that () is so PDP processed, forecast is one that we can work on right here. And so weave those off in the one pile and then take the other public comment stuff in there, I agree, there are some bumps in the road in that. But I think that one of the advantages in the GNSO related stuff is that if working group chairs know that they need to provide a forecast for when - for that public comment, it puts some fences in their project plan that they can hit.

It puts a little pressure on the working group to say, you know we - six months ago, we said that we were going to have public comment created in June of 2014. That would be really helpful so if we could drive that one back up to counsel, I think that would be really helpful and then take the rest of the stuff. I would join the parade on that.

(Tony):       There clearly are elements where I think we can help address this ourselves and there are other aspects that need to be taken on more by staff. Looking

back I can remember the time when we were actually chasing staff to try and keep up with us. It is totally the other way around now. And there is a need certainly for some prioritization and forecasting that would really help with that.

One last comment and then I'm going to ask Bill to make a few.

Woman: For organization in Japan, I am speaking as an individual and also as a newcomer to the ICANN community. I started attending ICANN from Beijing. So I think prioritization, I think is very important because we can't comment on every single public comment.

And what would be helpful from a newcomers point prospective is give a bigger pushback about a particular public comment. For example if there is public comment on (Hewlett) then what is the general project that ICANN is trying to tackle or work on. Then I can then make a decision. Okay this is the area that I find is important so I would like to make a public comment on this or for another area or project.

I can maybe not relevant to my interest so I can choose not to comment so rather than simply having public comments and vary individual specific topics. If I can get, like, I don't know, overall picture of certain issues that ICANN is now working on and then from that bigger perspective, now we have the public comment on this particular thing. That would really help me prioritize what to comment and what not to comment from a newcomer's perspective.

(Tony): Thank you for that. It is always very helpful to get input from newcomers, I think some of us miss some of those aspects, when we have been around here

a while. Bill, I am very aware that you have another commitment, but I would like to offer you the chance to make any closing remarks.

Bill Graham:     Well on this last topic, I would like to thank you for your useful suggestions. I actually think that these are great ideas, there is no good reason of why a staff should not be able to share with the community more broadly, the kinds of things that are likely to come up. I think that's a great idea.

I think the notion of putting more effort into showing how a particular topic fits into the larger picture or the larger process is a very good one as well. I will pass these along.

So, I think just in conclusion, I appreciate the opportunity to hear these concerns expressed so frankly and clearly and I can tell you I do summarize what I've heard here and I have passed these things along. I think we are all going through a very difficult period where a lot of stuff is needs to be dealt with in a very short period of time and it is stressing - I'll say especially people on the new DTLV program committee.

It's - I hear very clearly it's stressing you out and stretching beyond the resources you have available. Point taken, that's really about all I can say. I hear this very clearly. I will pass this along. I know you will be raising these on Tuesday when you meet with the full board. I just would encourage you to be equally clear with them as much as you always are.

That's really about all I can do at this point is to say points taken. I have notes of some very interesting suggestions here; I will pass those along and see what we can do about getting some implementation. Thank you.

(Tony): Well thank you Bill. Just to reiterate, we very much appreciate your time, these are always very useful sessions. We very much appreciate the ability to have frank talks with you which we very much respect. We look forward to it continuing. And please don't hold us all guilty from the pressures that we know we put you under, difficult situations as well, but thank you very much, we all appreciate it.

Bill Graham: I should also pass on to you that (Bruce) had lost track of this meeting, he had another engagement. He - when I talked to him last night, he regretted that he was in this conflict situation. So he would have liked to have been here. Thank you. And thank you again for the good discussion.

(Tony): It just proves that everyone is on overload I think.

Bill Graham: Yes, that's right.

(Tony): Thank you very much.

Bill Graham: Thank you.

Man: We can stop the recording now and we can mute the phone line up, but the recording should be stopped.

Woman: Actually can I ask about that. We have members who - we have members who aren't able to be here.

Man: Oh, so maybe not stop the recording sorry.

Woman: I think we have agreed that this transcript is just for private use.

Man:             It is.

(Tony):          It is.

Woman:           Because it is a closed meeting, is that okay.

Man:             Sorry about that. Yes, that's fine. I presumed that, sorry.

(Tony):          Yes I don't know how many people I find on the line, but they may find it a little difficult to follow the next part of the discussion, but -

Woman:           Right and we have some members who are in transit who had asked for this.

(Tony):          Okay. Okay so I mentioned at the start that there were a couple of other issues that we should take the opportunity to discuss while we have some time. I'm going to hand over to Mikey now to raise an issue about ICANN's business involvement and some of the issues that are happening around that. Are you okay to go Mikey?

Mikey O'Conner: Yes I am. Now 1:34 in the morning. So I'm at my absolute peak now, I'm really hot. I sent around a note to the CSG leadership and we may want to push this along to our respective constituencies, but yesterday or the day before, ICANN announced a new initiative called ICANN the number 4 BIZ. And I just want to give you a quick tour of what ICANN 4 BIZ is all about.

                 Came as kind of a surprise to me and I thought it might be interesting to you as well. So ICANN 4 BIZ is two things. ICANN 4 BIZ is a Twitter tag, hash tag, so if you want to subscribe to ICANN 4BIZ, there is the tag ICANN number four BIZ and what you'll see is that finally is announcing that this

initiative with a blog post. I don't think its body posts; its post is on the ICANN site, okay.

There we go. Small steps for business engagement launching new platforms, and then blah blah blah blah blah. Okay I'm not going to take you through all of this, this is a boatload of material, I just wanted to give you a really quick tour. So there is a whole Twitter feed on this.

The other thing that this launched is a Linked In group called ICANN 4 Business and I think I may be the first subscriber outside of ICANN staff. So you know there is my informal picture, etcetera etcetera. The whole Linked In vehicle. And what you have in here is a whole series of posts by (Chris1D) and yes (Christopher) unfollow.

This is a very compressed webpage. So it's not really (Christopher) unfollow and (Ricardo) actually has a last name too. So I've just clicked through to some of the stuff that is posted here, for example there is a slide deck.

So let me just show you some of the stuff. This is the - this is an info graphic that is on a web page business to community that they are promoting and there is all kinds of checks. The Louisiana Purchase, talking about the great land grab and then there is this info graphic that has been put together, talking about going from 22 to 1400 so that's 63,000%.

So then we have a picture of the United States and comparing it to the surface area of planets and you know there is all this stuff you know, like holy cow what have I been missing, man. Another thing that they have is an article by a fellow who says "Why internet entrepreneurs should join ICANN." This is all stuff that is just linked to that page that I followed the threads on. Go ahead (Scott).

(Scott): I just have a question and we have a business constituency that has been reaching out to businesses for 12 years. Did anybody in the business constituency know they were doing that?

In other words, this is considered the help they are supposed to be giving us -

Mikey O'Conner: Well yes.

(Scott): But they don't ask us a work at all.

Woman: They did send an email. (Christopher) sent an email maybe, I don't know, I've lost track of what time it is, but -

(Scott): I mean I got an invitation off of Linked In to join the group.

Woman: No, no, no, he sent an email the day before, two days before they launched it saying "we're doing this."

(Scott): But they didn't tell us before, that's my point.

Woman: No, not at all. Not at all.

(Scott): We could give our input on what we've done and where we have had successes and failures.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): I actually wanted to raise it here, (Scott).

(Scott):      Okay.

(Tony):      Because I think we all share that, this part of the organization that is really focused on business, it would have been better to have some engagement here. I will also point out if you troll through some of the information that has been put on here, it is actually incorrect. Some of it seems like -

Woman:      I got an email weeks ago asking me to share - because I do this presentation called The Changing Face of the Internet and (Chris) had seen some of the slides and he asked me to share them and I never did, because I was in the midst of updating them.

But a lot of what is in my Changing Face of the Internet, it captures the shift in democracy and the growth of - the use of the internet in different continents and it's public, it's out on the web everywhere, but I would never had thought that this approach would be how we would approach the broad business community. And I also wouldn't have - that was why I made that comment earlier that I feel we are being highly centralized as opposed to the district distributive model that we are trying to build being supported.

And it's incredible because this is something that money and time and resources have gone into while we would have given them guidance in a different direction and probably had tools and resources that we would have been happy with.

(Tony):      I was going to add that I think this also links back to my other comments that I made earlier in terms of the outreach strategy where this seems to form part of that. And we don't actually have the hooks in to understand what's happening, how we can help, how we can engage and it seems to be rolling in the head at quite a pace causing us problems.

The issue that I would raise here for these three constituencies that make up the commercial stakeholder group is what we should do about this. I mean we clearly have some concerns and we haven't had an opportunity to discuss this, but within our constituencies or even within the CSG discussions that we can have here, I think that this is an issue that we need to think about very carefully because it does relate to all of us and it impacts back on all of us as well.

Steven Metalitz: I think there will be a lot of places this type of concern can be raised and one of them has to do with the budget because this is really the same question we were asking where there are all these big numbers for stakeholder engagement and DNS industry activation or something. And we don't know what that's for so, I think in 30 minutes from now or 45 minutes that's a topic at the GNSO sessions and I hope people can raise - maybe this is an example of it.

It is just an example; there is a lot of other questions about what they are spending this money on.

(Tony): I think that is true (Steve), that there are two - there are two threads to this. One is to address it that way, where it clearly is an example. The other thread that we need to think about is how we need to engage to make sure that we are part of this going forward and that link is missing as well. I will refer to (Tony) and then to (John). (Tony).

Tony Harris: Yes, Tony Harris from the ISPCP, I would just like to mention with regards to this, that there is a lack strategy group which is being working for the last - we had a big meeting in February in Uruguay within the ICANN framework which is lead by (Rodrigo de la Farra) who is the VP for Latin American

ICANN. And developing better business sector participation and the ICANN is part of what we are doing.

And this is one thing I intended to mention in meetings here and where we are right now, but there is a lot going in to what - what we are structuring as a region to help ICANN develop better participation from Latin America and the Caribbean.

(Tony): Thanks (Tony). (John).

John Berard: When I first saw this - this is John Berard for I guess (unintelligible). When I first saw this yesterday, I was a bit surprised but not shocked because it is in keeping in my view, with the approach that ICANN has historically used in which there is initial hugs and kisses leaving one feeling warm and fuzzy and then it goes off and operates as if it was its own entity without the engagement.

I was hoping when I met (Sally Cozerton) in Toronto, I think that was her first meeting in which she was presented as a long standing communications executive that would be tasked with engagement. And then the three or maybe four sessions that I was involved with her, I came away from Toronto feeling that there might be a change in that approach.

Whether it is a result of (Sally) being sucked into the black hole that we often see staff sucked into, or if it's some more elaborate bait and switch approach that has been adopted, I am shocked that we weren't even - that we were in no way oiled up for this even if we were to disagree with them.

I'm a little surprised, I don't know how else to put it. And if there is some message that we can convey at the counsel, certainly would be more than happy to be a part of the course.

(Tony): (Christine).

(Christine): I completely agree and I actually think this might be an opportunity where we can actually work with our folks on the other side of our house on this. It is my understanding that the NTSG has very similar concerns and given that there seems to be so very few issues so far that we are in alignment on, if this is one of them, I think we should do whatever we can to take advantage of that and join forces.

(Tony): (Alisa).

(Alisa Cooper): I agree with all of this. I think we just need to follow up and find out exactly what this thing is before we jump to any conclusions. So I think before reaching out to (Chris Mondini) to have a discussion might be a good first step.

(Tony): On that line of thought, one of the options we do have would be to see whether we could get a minute of (Chris Mondini's) time this afternoon at the end of our CST session. And if he can't make that, maybe to come along to the session on Tuesday because I do feel that we need to have this dialog and it seems we're all on the same track on this.

So with your agreement then I will reach out to (Chris) see if he can join us. If possible today would be a good time because if it isn't today then as (Steve) pointed out there is going to be other times when we can raise this and it is

probably fair to have this conversation with (Chris) as quickly as possible. (John).

John Berard:     Yes, I think inviting him to come by today would be great. I would just caution you against being surprised if he expresses shock at our reaction.

(Tony):     I think we'll be expressing shock as well. So. Okay, (Marilyn).

(Marilyn Fee):     I just quickly want to link the fact though to what happened yesterday in the GNSO counsel discussion with (Chris Gift) because (Chris) was also presenting aggressive set of tools and activities. I see the dissolving part of a - kind of roll out of - the community asked us for tools and resources. We're building them, we're delivering them, we're moving ahead, we're on an urgent track.

I don't think (Chris Gift) understood I sit in that room and I thought he got really negative feedback. I don't think that he understood what the comments were or the negativity of the feedback. So I just want to park that thought to think about because you know perhaps we're not being heard. We're speaking but not being understood.

(Tony):     I agree with that and I think it relates back to (John's) comment as well because I had the same thought when (Sally) came along to join our meeting, this is going to be a real hell for now we have this huge initiative that she is heading up and we don't really see how we fit and there is some element to this where we should be involved and we clearly aren't. Mikey.

Mikey O'Conner: I sort of want to pile on, on the (Chris Gift) thing and point out that one of the things that is interesting is that these folks don't get what we do. So for example, one of the things that (Chris) did yesterday is he announced

something yesterday called ICANN Labs which is a gizmo that I'm not even going to go down the tracks with that one as to whether it's a good idea.

But one of the things that is interesting is that they have the Twitter tank, they have the Linked In gizmo, but they didn't register the domain names. So here is the deal, I registered the domain names.

Mikey O'Conner: As a defensive registration so that somebody else who has somewhat less altruistic motives didn't do that, but the point is that this organization has a little bit to do with domain names and we kind of understand what they are. And the staff, the new leadership of this organization don't get it.

(Tony): So when are they going to make a bid for you Mikey?

Mikey O'Conner: I tweeted it and I said in my tweet, have your people call my people.

(Tony): (Christine).

(Christine): One thing that I think we should consider is I think on this topic in particular, you need to be not necessarily less diplomatic, but perhaps more direct. It is very much my sense that some of the nuances in terms of what we're saying are not necessarily being picked up and I think we're at the point where we need to be very clear and very direct about what our concern is.

We can still do that politely and diplomatically, but I think we need to be very - so there is no uncertainty on the receiving side as to what the concern is. I think quite frankly, given the comments that we have all made on the budget allocation received by the outreach engagement, they should get it, but I think we need to make sure that they do.

(Tony):         Okay. Thanks. Ron.

Ron Andruff:    The issue here is that we have a new CEO who is coming in and is building a company and he is basically putting his lab, he's putting all the parts together, so what is happening is the staff that is coming in is marching to a corporate program. And ICANN is anything but a corporate program, I mean this is a huge disconnect here and this is a prime example of this.

                I mean for us to go down these different links and find incorrect information. I mean and no discussion with the community. It is a massive disconnect and I think that really has to be flagged when we have our conversation with the board.

                That yes, it is encouraging that the CEO is putting forward such energy and bringing on new people, but bringing on a bunch of new people who don't have any idea who we are, who live in a corporate environment before they come here is a really really really bad recipe for disaster particularly with the programs we have going right now so I agree.

                I don't know how diplomatic we want to be, I think we want to be right up front. Huge disconnect, and this is so troubling, Mikey, you really woke me up this morning, I have to say. Thank you.

(Tony):         Okay, so with that, I think we are done. I'd like to thank you all for attending. I'd ask if the list of attendees could be circulated back to this top table and I will follow up to see when (Chris Mondini) can join us. And we meet again later at 4 o'clock, thank you.


                                    END