

SO-AC-SG Call on May 29, 2014

David Olive: Why don't we start? The time is allocated about 60 minutes today and people I know have busy schedules. Fadi is on the line. Let me just start by saying welcome to everyone and thank you for coming to this call today with our SO, AC, and SG leaders, the CEO, and other senior ICANN officials. We'd like to note that this call will be transcribed and recorded. So you'll be able to share it with your various groups at that time. After the call, it will be shortly posted on our SO-AC engagement site and I'll send it around to you.

On the screen today, we have the agenda in basically two parts, one for discussion, it's the IANA stewardship transition and the ICANN accountability. The globalization and the hardening of ICANN's organization and operations, and the third one is the evolution of the global domain's division. And for -- draw your attention to the expert working group on the gTLD directory services and the five-year strategic plan sessions in London, as well as a note on the public responsibility department and the head of that department, Nora, will be communicating with you a little more on that topic. The status of the Ethos report as it's moving forward with volunteers and we thank those of you participating in that, and then a new quarterly reporting session to the community, as well as some other mechanisms for us to interact with our community members.

With that, I would just like to again turn the floor over to Fadi for some of his comments and we'll proceed from there. Fadi, the floor is yours.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you David. Hello, everyone. Just a quick check on whether I'm audible or it's okay. I'm using a landline and hopefully it's fine. If it's not, please write so in the chat room and maybe I'll try and switch the line.

Michele Neylon: You're loud and clear.

Fadi Chehade: Very good.

David Olive: Yes, loud and clear, Fadi.

Fadi Chehade: Excellent. Okay. Well, hello everyone. It's good to connect with you as we are ramping up the preparations for ICANN 50. ICANN 50 will be particularly busy meeting for a number of reasons, most notably because at ICANN 50, we will also hold the At-Large -- the second At-Large summit that will have representatives of more than 150 ICANN at-large structures. I'm really excited about this. I don't think I met all these people together in a room before and I'm really looking forward to that. I think it's a chance for all of us to connect with the important edges, the interface points with the user communities. And I'm very, very much looking forward to this program and to contributing to it, and I hope you all do also participate.

And then in addition to that, as you know, we have done this in Toronto before. The host country invites kind of high-level government officials. I don't like to call it a super GAC, but because that's not what it is. This is more to just make sure we engage with the high-level government officials once in a while and make sure they see ICANN at work. And I think this -- in this year, where we are looking to Busan being an important meeting for the ITU later this year after the ICANN meeting in LA, I think the timing of the high-level meeting in London is important, as it will draw many key people who will be making decisions in Busan to the ICANN meeting as well.

We, just a few hours ago, got confirmation for example, that the South Korean chairman of the Busan meeting will be attending ICANN 50 because of that high-level government official meeting. So that that would be the second. And then of course, we have ICANN 50, which is a big milestone, not the least because of the number 50, but also because Singapore was far for some people. I know that many people have focused on coming to London. So we're expecting the largest ICANN meeting ever in London and I look forward to working with you there to make sure it's a good meeting, not just for ceremony, but also for getting work done.

As you know I -- it's not my place or anyone's frankly to take let's say themes for any ICANN meeting. It's the community that decides what it wants to do in an ICANN meeting and we're there to support you. But just looking at what's coming in the sessions that are forming, it seems to me that the three kind of hot topics are salient issues or areas of focus will be the following as you see them on the Adobe screen.

So specifically, the ICANN stewardship, the IANA stewardship transition from the U.S. government and the ICANN accountability are two very important leading topics for us as we dealt with them kind of, as they were hot news in the last meeting. But now we're delving into the detail of how these two tracts will work and how they will work together, and how they will work also independently. This is an important time for us and an important set of discussions. And many, many people in the world are watching how ICANN will facilitate the IANA stewardship transition, which is a facilitation that we are both humbled and overwhelmed by, because it's an important, important role and we appreciate the trust of NTIA in ICANN to facilitate this process. Because this is a process that touches on the entire Internet community, not just on the ICANN community.

So we are honored and humbled by the task ahead in making sure that we serve everyone in shifting the stewardship role that the US government has played to the Internet community. And then on the ICANN accountability side that is a family discussion. Of course, we will listen to everyone because the ICANN family is not a membership family. So it's not like a few of us can decide that. We welcome any comment, any input. We're open and inclusive in that way. But at the end of the day, it is about ICANN itself and how ICANN demonstrates to the world its accountability.

I think we have two things to pay attention to here. One is that many people in the world jumping on this ICANN accountability discussion frankly don't know enough about how much we've done in that area. And so an important part of this task is to share with people what 'we've done, what worked, what didn't work, and how we evolved over the years through many iterations, including of course the ATRT effort to improve our accountability. And by no means, we're there, but there is more to be done. But I think it's important people understand what we've done and the roads we've already traveled.

And the second part of that is an opportunity to also transform ICANN into the ICANN for the next 15 years. A lot of the ICANN structures and things we have today have worked very well for us. But ICANN has evolved, is evolving, everything evolves, not just ICANN. And therefore it's always a good time to just take stock, understand what we've done, understand where we are, and understand where we'd like to go.

Now, that doesn't mean the ICANN accountability track will be kind of an open season for every subject to be open, and therefore there is a scope and there is a clear set of things we need to do, but certainly it's a chance for us to attack these important issues together as a good community and family, and listen and be inclusive, and understand everyone's input.

So that's one key area that I think will occupy a good chunk of the kind of the discussions coming up to London. The second area I'd like to focus on is to give you all an update. I'm two years up in my contract and I think it's time as the President, CEO, for me to also step back and discuss where we are with the hardening of ICANN's organizational systems, tools, people, all the pieces that make ICANN, the staff function to serve the community and serve our mission.

So I think it's a good time to give an update on this and to talk about what we have done to date and what we still have to do, and we still have quite a bit to do. I think our journey towards what I would call the hardened, and the word hardened here is a term that I just want to clarify. This means simply that our combination of people, tools, and processes have been matured enough that we have institutionalized the organization's work and operations. And that, to me, is a journey that we still have a good three years on it, is my guess from this point, and we have plans and strategies already in place that lay out all the way to a good three years from here. But the journey has started and a lot has happened, and I'll give an update in London on that.

And the third and last point, of course you all know very well that we have created a new division to focus on the identifiers, most notably the names, but also the other parts, and as we know, the numbering area will also have important evolutions ahead of us and we should pay attention to these as much as we pay attention to names. So the global domains division, even though we called it that, in a perfect world should have been called GID not GDD, if ICANN would allow me. It's really the global identifiers division. But that's fine, that's a detail and doesn't only handle details. It handles all the names and all the numbers, and that work is within that new division. I think again that division was created from scratch by cobbling pieces that existed at ICANN, and I think it's time to give you all a view of where that division is, what -- how is it composed, how is it focused on the work that many of you care about, and where does it go from here as a division within ICANN.

Now, there are a number of other things that David mentioned quickly in that agenda to draw your attention to. Of course, the expert working group will be presenting its final work. And as we said all along, and I repeat again that they were not tasked to build policy or to -- they were tasked to give us input that will then go into our normal community track, into the normal work of the GNSO to take this to the next stage.

But from all I'm hearing, and Michele is with us on the call, he can confirm or not confirm, but my understanding is that we have done great work and we have advanced quite a bit on this, in this working group. And I hope that their input will be useful to the GNSO as the GNSO looks at these policies going forward.

The public responsibility department, led by Nora, will be engaging with many of you at the meeting in London to just get your views and input on kind of what I would call a blueprint they're going to propose for how we go from here. This is a very nascent department still. It includes a lot of things you know that you've seen at ICANN, including the Fellowship program. All of these are things we do to serve the public and to fulfill our public responsibility. But we're putting all of that under one hood so that we can pay attention to it in a way, and I don't think we expect in the next fiscal year any expansion in that work. But we are going to start structuring it and Nora would like before we do anything more than what you know and what we do today, to share with

you some thoughts and she'll be doing this in London. So I welcome your input to that as well.

Looking forward to launching the first Ethos Award and to basically get this out. I am hoping that with your help we will be able to bestow this on a person that certainly will deserve it for all the volunteer work that happens in our great communities.

Now, finally, I just want to mention a couple of things that are important. Effective FY '15, I would like us to move towards what I would call a proper stakeholder reporting cycle. So while these calls will remain, and will remain in place for us to just get more informal updates and feedback, we are going to hold a call once a quarter and we're going to go on a quarterly model, just similar to, say, a shareholder's call that would be done by a for-profit company. We're going to do a stakeholder call and that call will be done after the end of each quarter. It'll be an open call. Anyone can attend, including any member of our community or any person in the world, including the press. And during these calls, we will present our strategic progress toward our goals and we will present our financials. This will be done just like we used to do it, say at IBM, or another place that I worked, but this will be done very much with a focus on our public responsibility, our strategy and our progress, and then the numbers, the financial numbers.

So the first such call will be after the first quarter of FY15 and using the quarter model that means July, August, September is the first quarter of FY15 and typically, in the month after September, we would do that. So my guess is this call will happen in November this year. And these will be announced way ahead of time, scheduled for the full year and everyone will be invited to these. This is something new that we would like to do and I'd love your input now, or especially after we do the first one so we can learn from our first stakeholder call, as we will call it.

I also had a bit spontaneously in Singapore, when many people were concerned that some decisions are being made top down as opposed to bottom up, I had spontaneously offered to hold a call, hold a bottom up call, where anyone in the community could come up and share with me their views on certain things we've done in the management team and in the staff that are viewed as top down versus bottom up. It was frankly, a call for me so that I can hear this directly, understand where people are coming from and adjust how we work in order to make sure we live in the spirit of the bottom up every day.

I understood after I tried to schedule the call twice that there were people in the community concerned a little bit about what this call will be about and how will it compete with other calls like this one and others, and what will be the spirit of that call. So I told my team that I should bring this up today with you, and hear you out, and get input from you on how to proceed on this call. My intent was very simple and frankly, very spontaneous. I do believe that there is -- there are both situations where decisions should wait for a full -- should start from the bottom before they are made.

But I also believe that there is sometimes a misunderstanding of -- or a mix up between what gets -- what happens during an implementation phase and what happens during a policy phase, and where is the line between what needs to happen bottom-up versus what needs to be done so that we can perform on the policies and the things we need to do. So I thought this call could be a way for me to understand that and to flesh this out. But again, I look to your input and guidance on that if any of you have thoughts on this today.

We have extended the public comment period for the five-year strategic plan at the request of people in the community to the 27th of June. We were hoping that will all be done by London, but we've now extended the public comment period to the 27th of June in response to requests from the community to do that. I also think that many people will be now thinking, where is the internet governance agenda at ICANN 50. Nothing I've mentioned so far deals with that. It's very important that we do not -- that we ensure as a group that internet governance does not occupy a disproportionate part of our agenda at

ICANN 50. Internet governance remains important and ICANN has taken quite a bit of leadership, and our posture has been very forward in the last few months on internet governance.

Having said that, it is very, very important after NETmundial that we start the process of transitioning our forward posture to a broader group of people, to a broader alliance. We're needed to step in, in order to energize the process at some point. And the process has been energized. That's the good news. That's the good news. Everyone in the world at very high levels and at working levels has noticed that the multi-stakeholder approach to internet governance is working and is on the move, and is doing things. That in itself is a strategic success.

Having said that, and while this was important for ICANN in order for ICANN to ensure that the ecosystem we function within is an ecosystem that's healthy, it is also equally important that we do not lose sight of our core mission and our functions, which I just went through earlier, whether it is the IANA stewardship transition, our accountability and reform, or our -- the hardening of our operations, or the focus on the names and numbers, which are our core work.

And therefore, we need to bring -- dial back on our posture, our leadership in a global IG and so we don't squander everything that we've done, ensure that the momentum that we have built is handed to a broader group of people. And that is in progress. The board has asked me to do that and I am working on that diligently so that we involve others. And that doesn't mean we will withdraw. We will continue to do our part, our bit, but we need to do it in proportion to our role as opposed to kind of the forward posture and the outside role we played in the last six months.

And therefore, I ask for your help in ICANN 50 to keep things in proportion, and I will do that. I'll be the first to lead with that. I will finish with just a question. There was a question by one of you, I believe it was Kristina, on the expenses that were the costs that ICANN incurred around NETmundial. And I don't have the numbers yet, Kristina, because we've been quite embroiled in the budgeting planning for FY15 and closing this year. So we will have the numbers eventually and I will share them when I get them. But I can tell you right now that the portion of our involvement compared to say, what Brazil and the CGI played, is small. Most of the millions that were spent to make that meeting came from CGI, not from us. Our contribution, for example, you asked on travel, I think was about \$100,000 is what we contributed to all the travelers that got there.

And of course, there was quite some in-kind contribution, as you know. Nick Tomasso and his team helped quite a bit with our team to just help them set up the meeting. Now, we learned a lot. To leave aside all the internet governance value, we learned a lot from that meeting on how to run meetings because this was a meeting outside of the norm. So for example, having tens of video rooms around the world where people participated. You saw in India hundreds of people participating remotely via video and two-way links. This is something we had never done before. There was actually quite a bit of learning that we plan to take back to ICANN meetings from that.

But certainly, I will round up, as we add all the in-kind pieces, and so on. There was no cash. We didn't send a bunch of cash there. So this was mostly in-kind and the travel was about \$100,000. So the whole thing will be calculated and I'll share this with you when I have it.

So with this, I'm going to just hand it back to you, David, and I'm available for discussion and questions, and I'm listening intently.

David Olive:

Thank you very much, Fadi. If people want to ask a question, if you want to raise your hand in the room, and if there are some other people who are not in the Adobe Connect,

please let me know now so I could recognize you. I think I would go to a first question that was raised in the chat by Jonathan Robinson and somewhat added to by Keith Drazek on the GDD or the GID. The question was, was this always part of the scope or was this a new responsibility, adding identifiers. And the other question, follow-up from Keith's was, this may need more explanation of the scope involved here.

Fadi Chehade: It was always part of it, but we -- the name made it harder to track that. So we've been trying to explain it and I approached Akram about changing the names so that it is clear that he is responsible. For example, a lot of the IANA function, for example, is part of Akam's team. So they handle a lot of things, not just names. But anyway, I don't think he plans to change the name. GDD is not quite baked. I think in London he will clarify exactly how these pieces fit together and I asked him to take the time to do that.

David Olive: Thank you, Fadi. Elisa, you're next, please.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you. Thanks, Fadi. First of all, I'd like to say thank you for sending out that brief agenda prior to this call. That was very helpful. So I have sort of three questions. One is around the comments received on the IANA steering or the transition steering committee. I think we received well over 1,000 different comments and I was wondering what the next steps were and what might be done with those comments.

Fadi Chehade: Okay. You want to go through the three question, Elisa, and then we --

Elisa Cooper: Yes, that's one question. The second sort of, I don't know if it's a question. This is a concern that we've been dealing with in the business constituency and maybe some of the others have as well. There's a lot of interest in the business constituency in participating in the enhancing ICANN accountability working group and we haven't received much information in terms of like if there will be limited numbers allowed to participate and so forth. So that's something we've been kind of wrestling with. And I don't know if you have any thoughts on that or have any information, or maybe David has some information to share on that.

And then my last comment, and I hate to sound like a broken record, and I think that you're probably aware of this, but this always happens as we get close to the ICANN meeting. But in particular again, it feels like the workload and the amount of information, and the things that we're trying to understand and comment on is, again, becoming overwhelming. So those are sort of the three areas or topics I wanted to bring up to you.

Fadi Chehade: Thank you, Elisa. Thank you very much. I will ask my colleague, Theresa Swinehart, to quickly address your first and second question. She is the executive in charge of facilitating these two tracks and I am hoping and presuming she's on the call.

Theresa Swinehart: I am, yes.

Fadi Chehade: And as to your third question, Elisa, I'm suffering from the same, the workload is heavy across and of course, this is, as I'm sure you are thinking, this is my job and this is what I have to do all day. You have -- you all have day jobs. This issue of the workload, for a period of time I thought is related to our unusual foray into the IG space, the internet governance space. So I thought as we scale back a little bit and come back to our kind of normal work in that area that the workload will subside.

But I think the ICANN accountability and the IANA transition, plus all the other things that we already had on the plate are definitely causing you and many a sense of overload. Our board members are now pretty much working full-time, full-time. It's just the amount of load for them, for us, and for you has changed. This deserves a discussion I believe. It really does. I don't think I can keep saying this will subside, you all should distribute the work amongst you. I think this deserves a discussion, so much so that I'm

going to ask David to take as an action, I don't know if we can do it in London, but maybe -- and again, this is now Fadi talking off the cuff, so my staff will kill me later or you will, but maybe we should consider a workshop, like a weekend workshop for all of us on this call, with that being one of the topics. I am sure you have many others and I have a few, but I feel like we have this one-hour call every quarter, and we meet at the meetings when everybody's frazzled. We may need, just like the board and management do, a workshop once in a while to just step back and think big picture.

It may be time to do something like this, all of us on this call. So I'm thinking aloud now. So if you hate the idea, tell me so, but I do think it sounds like I'm adding more work for you. You just told me -- another workshop. But we may need to step back a little bit and think about this as leaders and say, okay, how is that workload really affecting us? Are we able to continue this way? Is there a shift of roles that needs to happen between staff community and board in a different way so that things are different. I don't know. I don't know the answer. But what do you think, Elisa? Top of your mind, if you can think off the cuff for a second with me and get into trouble.

Elisa Cooper: Yes, so I'll really get into trouble here. First of all, I like the idea. I think that probably makes sense. I think there has to be some potentially major changes and I don't know what those are. But there's just so much coming at us and it's not just the IGF stuff and the transition stuff. There's all these other important pieces of work being done that are important to the business constituency. Like, we want to comment on internationalized registration data. Whois is very important to us. How that information appears is important. Have we been able to spend the time to go through it, and understand it, and comment on it? Barely. You know what I mean? And that's just one little tiny thing. So yes, I feel the same as you.

Fadi Chehade: Okay. Well, David, have you quit or are you still on the call?

David Olive: I'm still on the call and I'll work on that one.

Fadi Chehade: What do you think? Do you think it's a good idea to do that?

David Olive: I think we haven't had the quality time to engage our community leaders in the topic and I think there are some programs we're planning, and in fact inter-sessional non-contracted party meeting is scheduled in the first quarter of the new year, and one could couple that or link that because people may be in the same area. I noticed Patrick and others have been saying this is a good idea, suggested maybe Washington. So we'll work on this. I think it would be a very helpful way to discuss things and plan things going forward.

Fadi Chehade: Okay. I give it back to you to, Theresa, on the two questions, the one on what is the next step with the IANA stewardship transition and I'm going to beg everyone on this call to be very careful. We have a big no-no at ICANN. It is not called IANA transition because IANA is not transitioning. It is the stewardship of IANA that is being transitioned. So if you could help me with that, especially in London. We've put a rule inside ICANN. Nobody can just say IANA transition because IANA is not being transitioned. It's just the stewardship, the oversight over it.

And then her second question was about, I believe, some concerns overall about the ICANN accountability working group. Theresa?

Theresa Swinehart: Absolutely. Thank you. And Elisa, thank you for the questions. So I think as you noted, there was a significant number of comments that came in on the IANA stewardship transition process, and which is extremely helpful. And thank you for everybody on the call who worked with your groups and stakeholder communities in order to get the input in.

We found that the input came sort of in various themes. One was around the composition of what was referred to as the steering group. There was some feedback around changing that name to coordination group. How the selection mechanism occurs for members of a coordination group, how the group operates. There was a range of views on what the role of that group is. The independence of the secretariat. That is the arm's length distance from ICANN staff itself. A lot of focus around the importance of transparency and openness, diversity, global reach, and then also respecting the work of the respective communities that are direct parties of the IANA functions themselves. So for example, the IETF, or the original internet registries, et cetera.

So that's quite a wide range of comments, but those were sort of the major theme areas on it. What's occurring right now is the incorporation of the comments, trying to ensure that those are incorporated well. We are hoping that that can be done this week, that we can start getting it out next week and socializing it with hopefully it having agreement in overall support then to be put out in order to move this process forward and begin some really constructive dialogues, including around the composition and the formation of the coordination group in the context of London at that point.

So that's where we are at this phase. I'm happy to answer any questions on that. Given the diversity of comments and the broad scope, encompassing those and pulling those together has taken a little bit longer than anticipated. But hopefully, we'll be able to achieve a balance for overall for the community and move forward on the facilitation of this.

So that's where we are on the NTIA stewardship transition process. With regards to the enhancing the ICANN accountability process, I appreciate the dialogue that's been occurring with regards to the working group. I think, as everybody will have seen in the posted proposed process that actually there is no fixed number for the working group and that community members should put their names forward to the leadership of their respective SO and ACs for selection there. So it is really up to the leadership of the SO and ACs to identify what appropriate numbers might be. I think the model that has been working within the GNSO and the working group model of an openness approach could be one to be looked at in that experience there, and how one might look at both the composition, but is there any voting mechanism or non-voting mechanism would be very useful input into this process itself.

But to answer the question, there intentionally has not been a fixed number. But we would certainly welcome input from that, from the SO and AC leadership, and from the community overall. So I hope that answers that question.

- Elisa Cooper: Theresa, this is Elisa. So one of the sort of issues or questions I have is that -- and Jonathan is the chair of the GNSO Council. I don't necessarily see him as the leader of the business constituency. I mean I see him as a leader of the policy council and I just, I'm a little concerned with how that's reconciled. And I'm not sure if I'm being clear, but sometimes we talk about the SO AC leaders and for instance, in this call we're all invited. But then sometimes we've talked about the SO AC leaders and then we're just talking about Jonathan Robinson.
- Theresa Swinehart: How would you suggest that the selection could occur, through which mechanism, so that there would be consistency across the different SO and ACs?
- Elisa Cooper: I would -- if it were these leaders on this call that could be involved, I think that might be a way forward.
- Fadi Chehade: Theresa, I think there is some good input that we need to hear.
- Theresa Swinehart: I think so, yes.



- Fadi Chehade: And I'm just -- I think it's very important, I hear some concern in Elisa's voice, that I think we should understand. May I suggest that you and Elisa at least have a call sometime in the next few days just to make sure we hear what is concerning her.
- Theresa Swinehart: Yes.
- Fadi Chehade: And if others have input to that, I'm sure you can submit this input as well. We need to make sure that this process serves our community and it's important because unlike the IANA stewardship transition, this is our family process. So we need to make sure we're all very comfortable with it. So please do provide input to Theresa, and Theresa, maybe take a moment to get beneath the kind of what is concerning Elisa here. I don't think she (inaudible) Jonathan. He's a good man, but she's making a good observation about "representation."
- Theresa Swinehart: Yes, absolutely and Elisa, if we could have that conversation and anybody else who would be interested in having that dialogue then we can ensure both the -- that we can work with that and also that the input gets provided into the process overall so there's a transparency around that. So that would be very helpful. Thank you. That's very good input and a good point. Thank you.
- David Olive: Okay. I think, Elisa, we covered your questions; is that correct? And we will now move to Michele. Michele, you have the floor.
- Michele Neylon: Thanks, David. Just a couple of quick comments. One Fadi mentioned about the EWG report and unless something strange happens, that should be published the first week of June, possibly a couple of days later than originally planned, but definitely in time for London. And what we have been -- what we have discussed at the last meeting we had face-to-face, which was in ICANN's offices in LA a couple of weeks ago, were ways of kind of engaging with the board and ICANN staff, and with community rather than just simply throwing a report at you all, going here, have a couple of hundred pages of text, see you around. Because obviously, that probably wouldn't work too well. Well, it might work well for some people, but I don't think it would work particularly well for anybody who wanted something positive out of it. So I think there's going to -- there's a couple of ideas that have been suggested, and Steve Crocker, and a couple others have been discussing that at length with ICANN staff.
- The other thing I think is something, which I mentioned in the chat and it's not directly related to the topics we're discussing here, but it has a direct and tangible impact on our ability as a community to actually engage with ICANN, and it's the ICANN website. The new site is a disaster. It's impossible --
- Fadi Chehade: Explain disaster, please. Explain disaster.
- Michele Neylon: Oh, no I intend to. Oh, no, don't worry, I intend to. It's proving impossible to find documents on the website. The search function doesn't work. I mean you can't -- the entire structure and layout of the site has changed quite radically and the search function does not bring up the documents you would expect it to bring up. You would expect the search function on the website to bring up every single document that is published and it's simply not doing that. So I mean for example, at the moment, you might know that --
- Fadi Chehade: Michele, just in the interest of time, go through the list of disasters. You mentioned one, the search function. What else so we can --
- Michele Neylon: There's been quite a few issues with respect to documents links and a lot of the links that are contractual obligations about registrars and registries not working. I mean I'm not going to go into it. I'm not going to go into anything further. I don't want to waste time on this, but I just want to go on the record, just make you aware of the fact that the website issues impacts us. If, for example, you want the registrar stakeholder group to

provide input on something, if we cannot read the documents, we cannot provide input. The travel support team, for example, sent out an email notice to everybody getting travel support for the next meeting, which contained a link to the travel support policy for the meeting. But of course, the link didn't work because the website structure had changed, but nobody had bothered to check.

These are things that just cause extra --

Fadi Chehade: That's not true, by the way. We had checked, but we had actually discovered an actual issue with the links. This was a technical issue that --

Michele Neylon: The point being, Fadi, that the links didn't work. I mean --

Fadi Chehade: We -- so let me just be clear. First of all, send us a list. That's what you should do, not just declare it a disaster, please, because --

Michele Neylon: I have been engaging with your staff on this. It's just that it's the kind of thing that this project has spent -- you've spent a lot of money on it. It has gone -- been going on for months and months. Things we -- several of us raised issues and concerns prior to the site being changed over and then when the site was changed over, our fears and our concerns became reality.

Fadi Chehade: Okay, Michele, don't become very sensational. This site is not a disaster, as you just called it. This is a new site. It has massive new technology and new things that we didn't have before. It has had, like any new site, some wrinkles. We have discovered four, one of which is the links. It's been fixed. The search function is an issue I didn't know about, so I'm going to raise it. But please do, let's keep cool as opposed to sensationalize the issue and make it sound like the whole mountain is falling. There's a lot -- we're receiving hundreds of positive comments about people being able to engage with us better (inaudible).

So let's be measured as leaders. Let's engage and be constructive and if you're not getting the response from my team then you should write me or write our new CIO directly. But I hope you're getting responsiveness and I ask you to be patient as any new site of this massive change has normal wrinkles that we have to go through. But we are attending to them one by one very quickly. We have a strike team that is on hand always addressing them. Let's work together to make sure that this gets fixed. Certainly, I'm concerned about the search function if indeed it is not turning up all the documents. I will bring that up quickly with our CIO.

Michele Neylon: Okay, and just one other thing just on the concept of some kind of workshop type thing. I'd be very supportive of that. I mean just from my own experience, I found it very useful when we're not at an ICANN meeting to be able to spend time with people within the community and with ICANN staff. Because during the meetings, it's impossible. I mean we get a lot of stuff done during meetings, don't get me wrong. Thanks.

Fadi Chehade: Yes, I agree with you. I saw some of the commenters also agreeing and we experienced the same with the Board, to be honest, Michele. If we look at the quality of the exchange and how we actually advance at Board workshops within ICANN meetings versus ones outside, it's almost day and night. So if it's okay with everyone, we will find -- we will crystallize the idea that was off-the-cuff here, but we'll crystallize it and propose to you some ideas on how we could meet between ICANN meetings in a place where we are quiet and away from things, and we can hopefully think together on how we can improve everything we're working on as a community.

David Olive: Thank you. Jonathan, you're next and then Rafik. Jonathan, please.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, David and thank you, Fadi, for hosting this call and also for giving us the sketch outline before and it's useful, and it enables proper preparation. I think I'll touch on three things, Fadi. One is on, and colleagues on the call, one is this issue of resourcing. I've sort of viewed it as in part, and there seems to be a developing resource asymmetry. I know, Fadi, your staff are working very hard and I know you are probably working harder than anyone. But nevertheless, my sense is that you have been able to scale to some extent and invest as the financial figures and other things will show. And the community hasn't either necessarily scaled similarly or has been otherwise engaged with things like new gTLD launches.

So a smarter working, like you've suggested, is certainly one way of dealing with this. I think one of the focuses we've had in the past about increasing our engagement has been to go out at a very sort of broad level, if you like, to get participation in the developing world and in other areas. I also think we need to focus on how we get experts, enhance expert participation. I'm slightly hopeful that with all of the new gTLDs coming on board, the company is behind us. We'll be able to supply participants, but I think it's something we need to actively work on and/or modify our ways of working. Because at the moment, it simply is getting to a point. And I don't want to use melodramatic language, but it is getting to a point where it's stretched beyond what is reasonable and it's simply the way in which things have evolved at this stage. So we do need to work on that. That's a critical point.

I think the second key point is to deal with and manage this issue of bottom up and develop a common and current understanding of what that means, because I hear it time and again that we aren't meeting some people's within the community's expectations of bottom up processes. And so that's something we need to do some work on. We won't be able to (inaudible) and fix it here, but it is something we need to do. And that in particular relates to a couple of the key topics like the stewardship transition and ICANN accountability. And then connect it.

And third point is this issue of which Elise touched on. And this is the mechanisms by which we develop representation both within the GNSO and across SOs and ACs, and how we wait at representation, and how we manage that for these sort of meta or cross-community issues. I don't think we're far from fixing that. I think there's probably some existing models and ways in which we could work to fix that, but I think at the moment we've got a gap between the kind of expectation that it is sorted out and it's not always clear that it is, and we run against potential confusion. So that's a third element.

So just to capture that, the resourcing that's the bottom up, and this issue of representation and waiting that we need to deal with. So I think those are my three key inputs for now. Thanks, Fadi.

Fadi Chehade: If I may, Jonathan, you just almost gave us an agenda for that workshop. I mean if you think about these three things, they will require thoughtful discussion. So thank you for these and I noted them. And if we do indeed hold a workshop together, these become very important agenda items that we will discuss together before we ever come to a workshop. But I think they're all relevant. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Fadi. If I just may make one final point then, I think the one issue that's most -- that's actually urgent, which is the one that Elisa was touching on is just making sure we deal with, at least in the short-term, even if it's a shorter term solution, is how we handle representation and waiting on -- in particular with respect to our stewardship transition and ICANN accountability. So we might need to do some more urgent work on that. We almost certainly do, so but thanks for recognizing that collectively those points could be dealt with in some form of workshop.

Fadi Chehade: Theresa noted, I'm sure, by your (inaudible).

Theresa Swinehart: Yes, in fact just two things. One is I've already communicated this in the chat room, but would very much like to have a conversation, a follow-up conversation as soon as possible about the points that Elisa had raised. And the point about the mechanism of representation, the observation that's being made by Jonathan here, I very much agree that this is actually an important topic that we need to look at more broadly. We need to look at it clearly in the context of these two processes to make sure that things are calibrated in the right way for the discussions here.

But I think it is a very useful conversation also for the long run, as we're looking at how ICANN is evolving and how one is looking at the balance of the representation and the mechanisms by which the selection processes could be occurring. So just to second, this is a very useful conversation here.

David Olive: Thank you, Fadi and Theresa. Rafik, you're next, and then Kristina. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, David. So I don't have so much time so I want to go back to about overload. I'm not really convinced by what you explained because I think there can be some measure that we can take quickly. I mean the last week, we observed I mean many announcements for public comment and requesting the community to respond. So personally, I'm trying to engage my group and try to help people to draft comments to read reports and so on. But at least some measures just to limit the number of public comments (inaudible). You cannot have so many at the same time and ask people to respond.

When everything, you label everything as priority, everything (inaudible) any priority at all. So there are a kind of measure. I am an engineer. I work in software development project. It's kind of problem we have. It's always about the (inaudible) priority. You need to develop some (inaudible) reports on something. You cannot try to develop this (inaudible) everything. So I understand you are interested about actual approach about lean management and so on. And the idea is to avoid to overload your resources. You cannot over-advise (ph) them. So your resource is the community. Myself, I have work that's not related to DNS industry. I cannot really with all increasing overload to cope with that and I feel sorry for the group that elected me to represent them. So I think we need more urgent measure and if possible (inaudible).

Fadi Chehade: Rafik, this is just a quick question. Do you believe that it's Staff's job to prioritize all the activities or should each community to do this depending on its priorities?

Rafik Dammak: I mean you have to say it's -- you have many comments, but at the end, you need to find a way. You cannot just throw every time, because the problem, it's, I mean maybe like (inaudible) initiative or your own initiative, like for example before the (inaudible). So there is a kind of competition. So we need more coordination, coordination at the level of ICANN with the help of community, of course, and how to manage the flow of public comment. So I'm not meaning that you only will privatize new initiative (inaudible) but you find a way that you will cover, you will try to cover different aspect but without overloading the pipeline and it's kind of I'm just trying to use a metaphor like from (inaudible). But that is to avoid to overload.

So sometimes you just (inaudible) to postpone. But we can develop kind of mechanism within the community to decide. I mean, for example, you just also in your last -- latest blog post, you describe this four track that we need to cover, four track. I was surprised, I mean I said if you have more and more, so how we can cover, how many volunteer I need in (inaudible) to read all the reports, to draft and also we need discussion without our group (inaudible) just got 20 days, 21 days. And lots of people, I mean the ICANN problem is not the most, I mean, important thing to have just to do their (inaudible) they have a lot of concern. So we need to find a way. If you want really to engage, you need to make more easy for people to participate. I'm not sure, maybe just longer comment,

but it's to avoid that you have many things at the same time. That's some kind of some route that we can start to implement to change.

Fadi Chehade:

Thank you, Rafik. No, I think this is good insight. I think I'll add it to the list of things, David, that if we do have a workshop of sorts for this group, we should discuss. Because clearly, there are two parts to this. One part is to establish amongst us an understanding of workload. What is, I mean do we in staff and board do stuff and then throw it over the wall and assume that the community will just consume it. Or do we take the time to look at the big picture and understand the workload, is that happening. If it's not happening, how should it happen. I'm not pointing fingers here. I'm just saying this is the kind of discussion we should have and understanding of how to measure these things and appreciate as they keep coming, and we keep throwing them on the other side of the wall, what is the expectation of the throttling and measuring these things.

The second part of this is the prioritization. My sense of that is much of this should happen by you, by the community leaders in each community. But again, how do we do this together and how do we become more, I would say, synchronized or aligned when more work is being put on the community is an area I think we can improve. I'm hearing it. I'm hearing it loud and clear. I can't do it alone. Obviously, we have to do it together. Hence, I think more and more need for us after London, not in London as many of you have written, to take the time and step back, and think about this together.

So we will do that. We will do that. ICANN's workload has changed and the fact that we have 200 plus staff at the moment should help. It shouldn't cause more difficulty and so we should step back and think through this model together. I can assure you that the same type of discussion is happening between staff and the board, and how do we ensure that the board can keep up with all the things on our plate. So we should have the same discussion amongst us. So we will do that and it's definitely tabled, and we will get back to you. And it seems from the comments I'm reading in the chat room, you all want to meet in Japan to make Rafik happy. So we'll take care of that for you, Rafik. We're all here to make you happy, reduce your travel.

David Olive:

Thank you. And the last question will be Kristina Rosette, but I just want to point out that part of the ATRT2 recommendations was to give staff little more flexibility and refinement of the public comment process and hopefully to address some of those areas that I think you're right, the strategic thinking behind that of such a workshop would be very helpful. With that I'll -- the last question goes to Kristina.

Kristina Rosette:

Thank you very much. Thank you, Fadi, for continuing to have these calls, which I think are really valuable. I don't have a question. I do have comments in large part to reinforce what my colleagues, particularly in the GNSO have stated. I mean quite candidly, within the IPC, we are in triage mode. We are not commenting on nearly every issue that we would like to comment on, and that frankly, we feel that we should be, because we simply don't have the capacity. I do think that there are some things that could be looked at, and I do support the idea of a workshop.

It seems to me that to some extent, it should be possible to use some forecasting tools so that people know ahead of time these are the issues that we expect are going to be out for public comment in the next 30 days, in the next 60 days, in the next 90 days or whatever metric makes sense. But in most cases, it should be possible to provide some kind of idea to the community as to when things will be coming. I also think that perhaps going to the prioritization issue that perhaps we just need to put a cap, that there can only be 10 items out for public comment simultaneously.

Further, I know that there had been, I don't know how formal it is, but I know that at one point there had been a couple kind of processes adopted that seemed to be very helpful, namely that they're all documents that were going to be discussed at an upcoming ICANN meeting needed to be released at least 15 business days ahead of time. Similarly,

there was at least what I thought for a while, a process under which there were no new public comment periods started during an ICANN meeting or scheduled to end during an ICANN meeting.

Those are some really simple things that I think could take some pressure off the community. One thing that I think also needs to be done sooner rather than later is for us to all recognize the fact that the current time periods allocated for comment and reply in the public comment period just aren't working. I don't know if this is true for every SO or AC, or even every group within the GNSO. But I know that at this point, the IPC, the registry stakeholder group and the BC have all put in comments on the very last day of the initial period saying, we can't meet this deadline. We're going to use the reply comment period, which is not what it's intended to be.

So I think that is also something that could hopefully be done relatively easily, that would ease some of the pressure. With regard to the IANA accountability working group, I'm very pleased that Theresa is going to be having this call. I think it's an important one at least for the IPC. And finally, I just want to emphasize that -- and I have put in plenty of feedback about the website, but it's really important and I can't emphasize this enough how that the website really be functional as soon as possible, and certainly well before the London meeting. I know that within the IPC, we are going to have about 30 new members, potential members at the London meeting and it's challenging for us to do that engagement and try and increase participation and then point them to a resource that at this point in time, frankly, isn't working very well. so I would just ask that that message be communicated to the appropriate people. Thank you.

Fadi Chehade:

Thank you very much, very much for this. May I ask a couple of things? Please, if you have specific things that are not working on the web, please send the list to David and I'll ask David to compile these and send it to our CIO. So I'm hearing very sweeping comment that it's not working and I need details because that doesn't help us. We have a list of things that we're dealing with that we know are issues and they're being fixed very rapidly. I agree with you that we must have an agreement at the service level on the website by London has to be -- we should have gone through the teasing period of the website and should have reduced any major issues to very minor issues, if any. I'm in agreement with you, Kristina, on that goal. But please help us by sending us specifics. I'm not speaking here about trouble reports, but rather as Michele said, the search function doesn't turn up all the docs. This is a big issue. We should be on top of it.

As to your earlier comments, it triggers in my mind a couple of things that I'm going to ask David to help me with. One is I think Kristina went through some, what I would call short-term relief things that should be done. I would like to -- I would like, you, David to review the short-term, a list of short-term things with the global leadership team at our next call and let's act on them. Let's provide short-term relief to the community. And if you have other ideas, David, please share them with me and then we will send this group an email saying, here are the four, five things we're going to do short-term to give relief. What do you think? So that we can move forward with these hopefully within the next two weeks.

As to the long-term relief, I mean we have, for someone who has worked on supply chain engineering for many years, we essentially have essentially a supply chain problem here. We have what is very typically managed in manufacturing lines as an area that is overproducing and other areas that are unable to consume what's being produced, and the flow is not working. So I think we need to step back. That cannot be done before London, but after London. To actually understand that flow, we should look at the past and start having what I think you specifically asked for is a forecast. Basically, tell us what's coming so we can plan for it. We need to think through that a little bit better and more, and apply some better thinking on how we can give relief to everyone and do the right thing at the same time, which I know all of us want to do.

So I'm hearing you loud and clear. This is a priority now. I've added it to my list and I'll work with David, who will be in charge of helping us with let's call it the community supply chain here, and ensure that we can modulate and manage the flow in a way that makes us effective.

David Olive:

Thank you very much, Fadi, and all on the call. We're running a little past time, but it was worth the discussion I am sure. There are a number of action items, which we'll be captured in our transcribed notes, as well as the recording, which will be posted soon, and I look forward to the new engagement and follow-up on public comment, website comments, as well as the possibility of a strategic workshop for community leaders, focusing on such things as resourcing, bottom up depositions, and understanding, and the representation of the various SOs and ACs, not only just the GNSO but others in a non-CDP effort.

And so with that, I'd like to thank everyone again. Fadi, thank you for your time, and Theresa, and others on the call, and all the community leaders. We'll see each other, I'm sure, shortly in London. So I wish everyone a good evening, good afternoon, and good morning to wherever you may be. Thank you very much.

Fadi Chehade:

Thank you, everyone. We'll see you in London. Bye-bye.