

ICANN

**Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 14, 2017
10:00 am CT**

Tapani Tarvainen: It seems we have (unintelligible) connection.

Göran Marby: Can you hear me now?

Tapani Tarvainen: We can hear you but with a delay of about five seconds, so since we have something like a half (unintelligible) connection. Anyway, I was saying that I will start off with one easy issue for you and then let you have your little spiel if you like and then I'll hand over to our nasty people around here will ask you difficult questions.

So the easy one that surprisingly came up first and everybody but a few people asked, it's been coming up today as well many times, why can nobody ever find anything on ICANN websites other than by Googling sometimes but no search function, there is no organization. It's impossible to find anything. Why don't you hire a librarian to sort it out?

Göran Marby: That's a very good question. Actually it is a very good question. Can you hear me now?

Tapani Tarvainen: Yes.

Göran Marby: Okay. This is going to be good. This is a good interactive section, speaking out in the cellular space. The simple answer to that question is that you are right. We don't have a library function. We don't have a document management system at all and, even worse than that, we don't have any system in place on how to store things, how to label things, how to categorize things, how to collect things, and how to sort them together.

And without that, it kind of becomes what - the quality will be as good as that on our website. This is of course not a very good way of doing things because the way we would like to do things is to give - it isn't a question about transparency in that sense that by able to have the ability to find things or actually getting recognized there is something happening, that increases transparency.

So what we're doing right now is we're running an internal project which we called transparency - Information Transparency Project, or something like that. And what we are doing right now is to look into what do we need to do to kind of create a system where we can contain this information and then how to confront it.

We are going to have the first initial discussion with the board in probably already in Copenhagen maybe in our meeting later this year, because it's also a fairly costly thing to do. I would need to make sure that we do this in the proper way. It is not only about data system, it's also about a culture of how to do things where we have to engage and also with you, how are we - what kind of information that should be sharing, how should we be doing in it in a cost-effective way, but more or less how do we do it transparently.

So I agree with what you said that we should hire someone who actually understands that, and that's where we are. And no pun intended, (unintelligible) understand it. Was that an answer to your question?

Tapani Tarvainen: Well it sounds like you are doing something about it, which is good.

Göran Marby: Yes, to set the expectations right, we're in the beginning of the process. So we sort of are having a plan to have a plan. The cost for doing this is substantial. Without knowing the exact budget numbers, we are talking in the range of maybe 5 to \$8 million to be able to do it over a couple of years. That is how substantial it is. And that actually explains I think why it hasn't been done before.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. At this point, is there something you would like to tell us in particular before I let our members loose on you?

Göran Marby: I'm thinking, Tapani, that maybe I should share some of the discussions we've had over the last couple of weeks for you just to know that between all ICANN meetings, I engage and talk to all constituency leaders. So I set up a range of calls, which I think is now 21 calls, where I share the same things with all the constituency leaders.

The reason I'm doing that is because I want nothing to do that I do or surprise. My intention with those calls is that you can ask me any questions and then you - when I hear the participation from your side, it's always open. Invite the sheriffs and the sheriffs can invite anyone. But maybe I should just share what some of the things that we are talking about, and there is actually two things that I bring up.

One is -- and I tell the same stories I tell to everybody else -- a couple of months ago, I was sitting in my office together with (Teresa Swinehart) and we - and I actually said to her, "How does the process actually work in practice? Could you do me a flowchart or a manual of the processes, starting with the where has community has done something all the way up to now it's time for the ICANN organization to implement it because we were ordered by the board?"

Maybe it wouldn't come to a surprise to you that that was an easy task to give but rather it was more - it was tougher to actually fulfill it. And this has become something that I think is very, very important. So the formal name of what I'm going to do is a manual and flowchart review of implementation processes. I asked them to put in the decision points in those processes to be able to see what they were.

And when we actually blow them up after we did them -- and we're not 100% done yet -- they became fairly long. In meters I think that the longest process for policies is about two and half meters long if you blow it up to something you can read.

I happen to think that this is an important project because I think it's important that everybody has the understanding and clarity about how the process works. It also turns out that there are some things that we could discuss, not in question in who decides what, but we all agree how the processes worked. I think this is good for anyone who is a member of the multi-stakeholder model to know where to intervene so we make sure that no one can, for instance, hijack the whole process because they have a better understanding how it works.

I want to emphasize I'm doing this for the clarity reasons and nothing else. And so what we are going to do in a couple of months is we are going to publish those flowcharts to the community, to everybody, for knowledge and I'm also opening it up for comments if there's anything we got wrong or something that has been discussed. Because this practical issue I think it important so we do spend a lot of time doing that.

I call that actually -- and I know it's not the best word to use -- but I call it transparency in the terms that it's not transparency of the disclosure of minutes and stuff but it's actually by bringing the opportunity for people understanding the processes for better interaction.

In talking about transparency, I don't know if you've seen that but now for the second time in a row I published what I call the CEO report to the board. I hope you find something interesting there. I know that some of those things already exist on the ICANN site, but as Tapani mentioned, it's not always easy to find. But this document is the same that I give to the board when I report my operations.

This of course has created some questions and therefore why we proposed that during Copenhagen we do a test where I sit together with my expert team and in an open-mic session where you can ask me or my team any questions based on the report or anything else. We didn't want to impose on the important policy work in Copenhagen, therefore we didn't ask for a high interest - as a high interest topic and therefore it got moved around a little bit. I think it's on Thursday right now.

That means that is actually is competing with some other sessions as well. But I hope you like the attempt that we're trying to do something and if the community thinks that this is a good thing, I'm very happy to do that going

forward as well. That was sort of things I talked about with you, Tapani. Any questions about that or comments?

Tapani Tarvainen: Actually not at this point. I think I'll open the floor for questions. Everybody who wants to ask Göran, raise your card or hand up at this point. I'm just watching. Nobody. Okay, Ed, go ahead.

Ed Morris: Hi, Göran. Ed Morris, GNSO Council, among my positions here. (Unintelligible) My colleague on the council, Phil Corwin, in his Internet Commerce Association had an interesting blog post last week. Its title, if I get rid of this little thing here -- please do not send me messages while I'm doing this folks in the room -- its title was ICA Files (Moby) Comment That ICANN Will Ignore.

I believe you're familiar with this, at least I hope you would. It relates back to the issue of staff imposing the URS on legacy domains during contract renewal. I'm one of the folks that have written public comments on .xxx, .travel, .pro, .cat, a similar issue. I've gotten used to the fact that ICANN ignores our comments so I didn't even write one and the NCSG did not write one for dotMoby.

So the question I have is this: If the RPM Working Group that's currently ongoing decides to dump the URS, what do you now do with these legacy contracts where ICANN staff has put the URS, which was not developed by the community, into the contract? And the second question is what do you tell those of us who have labored in these working groups to establish bottom-up multi-stakeholder domain name policy, what do you tell us when staff decides to ignore our work and impose a RPM such as the URS into legacy domains with no input from the community? Thanks.

Göran Marby: Thank you. Actually it's kind of - I actually spoke about you yesterday with Steve and Akram, so thank you for raising it. I mean first of all it's very hard for me to go back in time to see where, you know, something happened. And that is one of the reasons I would actually like to use this complaint against us as a testing method for the complaint officer. Because you obviously, and I read a blog post or something you wrote, and my immediate reaction is this is something I would like to look into but I would like to look into (unintelligible).

So I asked people, I asked (Steve) if it was okay and I also raised it to (JJ) to look into how we can actually formalize this thing that you're talking about into the complaint officer, which we are now hiring and we will make official in two to three weeks. Because - and the way we think about this is that if you can help me, and this is really a help for me, if you can help me to formalize this complaint, we will take in we will publish the complaint and I will investigate it and I will come back with a thorough answer to that. So you can also have my, you know, so I can see the full complaint and I can also give the full answer to it.

First of all I don't know as - I'm not 100% sure about all the details, but that is one of the reasons why I sent it up to the complaint officer a function to be able to visualize those types of complaints and making sure that you get the answers that you rightfully deserve. So my answer would be would you like to help me with this function and then I promise to give you a more formal answer to it, which will also be published for me? Would that be okay going forward?

Ed Morris: Yes, I'd be happy to help out. I'm sure my colleague Phil Corwin of the Business Constituency we and work together to give you the information you need to understand what's going on and hopefully take corrective action, if

you agree with where we're going from. So yes that'd be fine. Thank you,
Göran.

Göran Marby: Good. So can you do me a favor? Because we're now starting up the process. You know, we are just opening the door for the complaint officer function. So could you do me a favor to send me, and we don't have to be formal - could you send -- now I hear myself -- could you me send me a, you know, send me an e-mail or something which summarizes what you think and I will publish that as well (unintelligible) and I will ask the complaint officer to handle it and then come back to you. And we will do everything openly. I would be very grateful for that.

Ed Morris: That would be wonderful. Thanks so much, and we'll be in touch.

Göran Marby: (Unintelligible) Thank you. Thank you very much. Next question, please.

Tapani Tarvainen: Matthew?

Matthew Shears: Yes. Hi, Göran. Matthew Shears with the NCSG. This morning we spent time with the business community sharing our priorities for 2017 and I was wondering if you could share yours for 2017? And second question is we're now six months into ICANN post-transition. Have there been any particular things you've noticed about the way the community is operating? Are there things that have impressed you? What's changed, if anything? Thank you.

Göran Marby: My - to answer the first question, I have a - I can share with you the goals I'm working on right now. But just to give you a background to that -- and by the way, we can send those goals over to you if you want to because they're not a secret at all -- my thing is this is that I've actually - I'm amazed how well this works in many ways. But with that said, the improvements I have to make

within the, you know, with the staff and the organization itself to be able to work better and support the, you know, support the community and the ability to implement what the board tells me.

So what we are doing right now is really trying to figure out those missing pieces or notes. As Tapani mentioned, why can't you have a proper word page? What is the reaction to that? The manual and the flowchart I talked about for review, some of the implementation processes, the, you know, things like internal communication, external communication, working on various different things that is very much related to the inner workings organizations so we can really support you the best way we're doing.

I think over time we have to - we have a five-year strategic plan and I'm working to fulfill the things that you have decided that we should do in this plan. I'm spending a fair amount of time, and this will not change, about the word transparency, which doesn't only, for me, mean the ability that I share what I do but also increasing the ability for you to be a part of the processes we are doing and making sure that the discussions are happening at the right place. So that's kind of the overall thing.

I think I get I surprises almost every day. What I knew about ICANN, and I had representatives at ICANN meetings, what has positively surprised me is the passion and the time people are willing to spend for the benefit of others. I took this job for personal reasons. ICANN is one of the important organizations that works with Internet-related issues. We're not the center of the world and we are not the center of the Internet or anything else but they are one very important organization.

And I'm very proud to be here for doing that. What also make me even more proud is to see so many people, you know, (unintelligible) and I'm very

humble of that learning experience. I think that the biggest difference now after the transition is we use words like accountability and that's a very - that's a good word. I think over time we more and more are getting realized that the (unintelligible) functional that NTIA and the U.S. government had is - you can discuss at length how important that was.

But I think that it's true that we're now in this together. It is a shared responsible, whatever our roles are. I think that is getting more and more in to people's DNA. I think that's positive. I think that some of the discussions are, you know, evolving. And then with that said, I'm still amazed about the energy that was put into the decision process. I still claim that no other international process has ever worked this way before with so many participants around the world.

A little bit fluffy answers, I know, but the question was a little bit fluffy as well. Thank you my friends.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you for that. I see that I have Kathy and then Poncelet. Kathy, please?

Göran Marby: Any more questions? Or am alone (unintelligible).

Kathy Kleiman: Göran, this is Kathy Kleiman. Can you hear me?

Göran Marby: Yes I can.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay terrific. Everyone around me said don't ask but I asked. Okay, so my question has to do with the public interest commitments that were put into the new gTLD registry agreements. And I was part of the group that negotiated the base registry agreement which had not public interest commitment. That

specification wasn't part of the base registry agreement we created and put into the applicant guidebook.

There are people who don't like the public interest commitments at all and many in my group would argue they don't belong there. I know - I understand why they were created. They were created to embody certain compromises that were being made with the GAC by some new gTLD registries that had strings that the GAC wanted to see more regulated. But what happened was that a lot of other things were put into the public interest commitments and according to (Alan Grogan) before he left, this material was never reviewed.

What went into the public interest commitment was not reviewed by ICANN ahead of time. You could have put in anything or a registry could have put in anything and now it's grandfathered in. But what's in there is, and in some cases, and at across registries, entire registries are proposals that contradict consensus policy. What's also in there are proposals and commitments that advance one stakeholder's interest over another.

What's in there are things that go outside of ICANN's bylaws, including going into copyright areas. So my question is how can ICANN enforce these provisions? And what I'm going to do, I understand the sanctity of a private contract, but my parents moved into a house in an area called Shaker Heights, Ohio and the original contract from the 1930s said no Jews, blacks, or dogs. My family is Jewish.

That provision of a private contract is void as a matter of public policy. Shouldn't things outside of ICANN's bylaws, including copyright, be void as a matter of ICANN bylaws? Shouldn't we only protect and enforce what's within our mandate, what's within our box? Thank you.

Göran Marby: Thank you. I know that (Jamie) is around, isn't he, and maybe, as he is the person who replaces (Alan) or it's best that you ask the same question to him. On a more, you know, it's very hard for me to come back and say what was done or not done because you have a longer history than I have. And we need to have a better understanding.

So one of the things that (Jamie) I think has proposed was to set up this ad hoc group to get a better feeling on how different truths can be told also into contracted complying as an advice. I think that's going forward. On a more general note, you're saying something that I think is in the heart of the multi-stakeholder model and as one of the things I've seen through the processes analyzed is that sometimes things go through without checks and balances within in. I'm not saying that this thing is something there because I'm well aware - I'm not as good at the details as you are.

But I think that one of the discussions you might have within the community how do we make sure that we do something new that doesn't end up in something that people don't agree upon in the end. I think that is a very important discussion.

The other part of that I have to come see more of the specifics about it. We are not a government, as you know. You've heard other CEOs saying this before. We have a legal contract. And there has to be a process if we want to change that process going forward. Because there's one thing that I would now draw a line to say is that I don't think that I have to mandate to change the policies, or I don't have the mandate to change or interpret what you do from the policy side coming into me.

Then even if I would think that, you know, maybe that would be a good idea, I have to stay very strict to the core that has been given me from the

community. So I can actually face back to you as well and say that, you know, how would the community come together and try to change some of those agreements we already have. Thank you. Do you have any follow-up questions on that one? I bet you would.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. So this is Kathy Kleiman. What you're talking about sounds very - I think there's a time delay. What you're talking about sounds very prospective, putting into - putting in checks and balances, checking in the future. But the problem is now that there are things in these agreements that go against consensus policy decisions, things that were accepted, things that were rejected but somebody put it in. A wish list got in to these public interest commitments.

And the community may not come together because it actually serves the interest of the community to bypass the consensus process because if you can get a private party to agree with you, why bother to go through the consensus process? So it's a route around. I know it's a tough question but the problem is now, it's not just the future as well. Thank you. Please.

Göran Marby: May I ask a question back to you? When those - the new program was decided, this was taken to the board and the board told ICANN to go and implement it. Before that and, you know, where did this discussion actually start? I'm trying to understand the history now. Where should these checks and balances actually be and how can we - I mean the things that you're saying is very, very important and core to it, but we have a legal contract. So I'm just trying to figure out what, in your perspective, where did it go wrong, from your perspective?

Kathy Kleiman: In my - from my perspective, and I respected your predecessor greatly, he decided to come up with some quick solutions to some tough problems that

hadn't been resolved in the applicant guidebook. And those quick solutions didn't go through the checks and balances in the review of the community. But again, still we had these provisions in the picks, again, that contradict consensus policy, that contradict the limits of what ICANN should be doing. I think we have to address what's in the contracts, unfortunately, and that is a tough position but one that I think is critical to stakeholder confidence. How can we spend thousands of hours negotiating consensus policy only to see it undercut through the back door? Thanks.

Göran Marby: Thank you. Could I, you know, I want to do a side remark about spending thousands of hours or something. One thing that I - when I looked into this flowchart, I realized there are some missing points. And one of the missing points maybe is, and I call it an impasse now, is when the community agrees on a policy which is a compromise and it's given to the board and who then directs me to do it, remember my voluntarily part disappears, the board has told me to go and implement something, then I have to do it according to the bylaws. Because this is the check and balance to make sure that I do things the right way.

In that sort of - from that policy written, and so for instance a contract, sometimes there are discussions that has been made. And the explanations were for instance we know that something has come in. I understand, and again without knowing details, I call it the policy we did for name and domain name transfer policy proxy something. Part of that was actually something that the community or the GNSO didn't appreciate in the end.

So I'm also asking myself if something comes to the board and ICANN all, together with the community, realized that maybe this is not 100% done, we don't have the mechanisms to throw it back to the board so we can go back to the community and especially GNSO for reconsideration. Because when the

board has told us to do something, we have to do it. So if we don't have the ability to - and I would never do this without the community saying that this is okay for me to do it, so it's not me who's going to validate anything, it's a joint decision.

So one of things we're thinking about is to come out and ask the community if the (unintelligible) -- and I call myself the (unintelligible) right now -- together with the community says that we need - this was not ended up as we thought it should, there should be a mechanism to bring it back to the community again.

The reason I bring this up right now is because it's I call it an impasse or a process for failure, whatever it's called, is to make sure that the discussion happens in the right place. So it's not a negotiation somewhere. It is not kind of me who negotiated it, it has to be done in broad daylight and so we have solution that carries over time.

I don't think that this particular process will be a solution to the problems that we seem to be having here but at least it's something that - because I think it's important that discussions are happening in the right place. (Unintelligible) please go and speak to Jamie because I'm going to go and speak to him so I can hear his views on this as well. If Jamie is in the room, everybody can look at him or you can go outside and look at him later. Because I would like to understand a little bit more about this. Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: Jamie is not in the room but we will go find him and look at...

((Crosstalk))

Jamie Hedlund: You trying to get me fired already. No, I'm here.

Tapani Tarvainen: I guess we can try to keep Jamie even after Göran is gone. But at this point I think I'll move over. The next in line is Poncelet.

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes Poncelet Illeleji from NPOC speaking for the records. Hello (all). And my question is in regards to the PDP processes involved - involving our constituency, both in the two constituencies under the NCSG. How do you see personally staff support towards these constituencies within the PDP process? Will you do anything differently?

Göran Marby: The question - I could hear you a little bit, right. But I understand the question is if I would do anything differently to support you in your work?

Poncelet Illeleji: Yes within the...

((Crosstalk))

Göran Marby: My job is to - you tell me. My job is to facilitate your policy work. That is what I'm supposed to do. So if we need to do things differently or better or anything -- I know David Olive is there. And he will always be your spokesperson when it comes to doing that.

But I'm, you know, I can hold up a mirror and ask how are we doing? Are we doing anything wrong?

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay Klaus, do you want to...

Klaus Stoll: Göran this is Klaus. Just for clarification, yes I had yesterday the opportunity to speak to David Olive because we have some of the concerns that we are basically - there is a reversal of roles that instead of the staff supporting the

community, basically sees the community as a role to support staff in their metrics and their goals.

This is something which seems to be creeping in over the last few years and months. And I want to make sure that that is only a passion creep, not a general creep.

And we - as I said, I had talked to David Olive about that and I gave him specific details. So he promised me to look into it. And I trust he will talk to you about this too.

Göran Marby: Well we are, you know, I think that ICANN as a whole, as a system is, you know, we have to (mold) ourselves all the time. I think that one of the reasons I'm stubborn enough to talk about the different roles we have is that it's also important that my staff, my organization facilitates the discussion in the right way.

I bet there are things that we have to improve. There always are. So I'm keen to know more about details. And if there's issues we can resolve, we will of course do that.

There are other concerns of course that we have to take into account. You know, simple things like budgets and money. Despite the fact that everybody thinks that we have extremely a lot of money we still, you know, a lot of the money we have is actually (costly). We give it away and we do other - but I will ask David Olive to look into it as well.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you very much and I trust that if we work together - and I think this is just one of the elements where we have to work it out together on practical

examples, on practical level and solve real problems, not just theoretical problems.

Tapani Tarvainen: Thank you for that. Next I'll hand over to Stephanie Perrin who's in the remodeling from here, let's hope. (Unintelligible) Stephanie, please go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Can you hear me?

Göran Marby: I can hear you.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes? Maybe not.

Göran Marby: I can.

Stephanie Perrin: Wonderful. There's quite a time delay. So yes, my name is Stephanie Perrin. I'm with...

((Crosstalk))

Göran Marby: I can hear you.

Stephanie Perrin: And there's a huge time delay so I'll just keep talking in the interest of time here. I've been working on privacy issues. I'm an NCSG counselor, but I'm also very active on the RDS working group.

And I've been with Peter Kimpian of the Council of Europe trying to get the data commissioners globally - representatives of them - to come to an ICANN meeting and discuss some of the data protection issues at ICANN.

As you're probably aware, they've been writing for years. We've been working on this since March. I'm going to say we - I've been helping them at the ICANN end. Clearly the Council of Europe is in charge of this effort.

And I'm not blaming staff for this, but we thought we had really pretty good consensus. We had spoken with some board members. We had spoken with some community leaders in Hyderabad and it was looking quite good.

But it's still been remarkably hard to put together a day of meetings with senior people for the data commissioners to meet with. And we're talking here the UN Special Rapporteur on Privacy and the European Data Protection Supervisor and hopefully the head of the Article 29 working group.

Now, I've been here four years fighting about privacy issues. I've read all the history. I know what we're dealing with. But I guess I'm just asking for advice.

The situation is getting serious because of litigation and court cases and the evolution of privacy and yada, yada, yada. How can we get beyond this recalcitrance to even basically hear the messages?

Just as one example of what's been happening is folks - some of our counterparts have been trying to make sure that there's law enforcement on the same panels - on a 90 minute panel with the data protection commissioners. Quite frankly, we have them at every meeting. They're all over the RAA. They're in the GAC.

We don't really need to hear their views anymore from my perspective. What we need to hear is the other side who are never here. Anyway, that's enough from me. Thank you.

Göran Marby: Thank you. You know, we decided - the community decided that - and we thought - the board members thought that we would set up this day and the - and I don't know why the - I thought it was great in still having it.

I know that - speaking - we know a little more about the privacy concerns from (unintelligible) because I was involved in that. I don't - I thought that there was a lot of people interested in doing that.

I'm not a marketing guy, so I don't really know how to market it better. Maybe some of my straw persons has a better idea of doing it. With that said, I think it's, you know, we - I have the bylaws to, you know, well how much can I do to - for a special project and systems. What can I do to help is my question to you really.

Stephanie Perrin: Well I'm not really sure because as I said, I thought we had this thing well organized in Hyderabad and staff assuring us it was going to happen. And then we've just had a number of hurdles that have made it sort of touch and go whether we're able to do it.

Now a strong message that the board was interested in seeing this happen might help. I kind of think maybe that would be about the most useful thing is strong messaging from the top that it was really about time we had a serious talk about data protection because quite frankly, we're a year into the RDS working group.

We have at least 14, probably 16 years of history of unsuccessful Whois exercises. None of my colleagues who were here in the early days will go near these things with a ten-foot pole. So we're running out of suckers to staff the PDPs.

These issues are very complex. We need to make it stop. We need to solve it. And I really think whatever we have to do we should do it. And I don't think that helps answer your question, but I'm stunned that it can be so difficult to just arrange a meeting, you know, and get people together at the appropriate level.

Göran Marby: Yes. I agree. But this is - maybe we can take this offline so I understand what the problems are and if there's anything I can do to solve anything. Can you send me an email?

Stephanie Perrin: I'll send you an email with the details. Thank you so much.

Göran Marby: Okay thank you. I think I got (unintelligible) if I get you correctly.

Göran Marby: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Göran Marby: Okay so what I wanted to talk about is we talked a bit earlier with our session with (Jamie) and about things like the healthy domains initiative and so on, which Omar is trying to set up kind of alternative policy processes outside ICANN that get around.

You know, essentially, you know, try to set - try - take issues that didn't come out the way some people wanted it at ICANN and try and do it by other means.

Is this - if this becomes a sort of a very common form, it will considerably sort of undermine ICANN as a policy creating body to some extent. Do - and I

don't really want to get into the details of what ICANN - well we've already talked to Jamie about, you know, how this fits into his job and his role.

But as - ICANN as an organization - is this a sort of an issue for the whole of the organization that people are trying to sort of work a way around that whole policy process? And if so, you know, which undermines the organization's whole remit to some extent I guess.

Do you think we should be having a sort of - at least a conversation, a discussion about this issue that the sort of whole of ICANN level about how we should respond?

And so and I don't know if the board has had discussions along these lines. But I would be very interested to know, you know, if, you know, the board thinks this is something we should be sort of discussing and thinking about and perhaps responding to as a community.

Göran Marby: Thank you for all the easy questions, by the way. I - the Internet is a voluntary system where, you know, we work together on the numbers community and the main community.

And, you know, ICANN as a whole is a systematic voluntarily organization. I call it sometimes a grassroots one. And I think it's - I always think it's important to discuss the (limits) and the accountability we have for this system, especially after the transition.

Accountability for what we do, who we do it for and who we represent is going to be important. I - this is a philosophical discussion that I think it's ongoing to have all the time.

It's - so with that (unintelligible) asked the question, should we discuss it. The next question we should be aware. And that I would say very much within the community.

When I said sometimes that I happen to call it a parliament, it wasn't my intention to be political. It was more of a sense of that these are discussions are going to be essential also coming up with the following five-year strategic plan - to have a view on that. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. I think Stefania, Marilia, Avri in that order. Stefania please go ahead.

Stefania Milan: Hello, Stefania Milan here at CSG. I have one question and a smaller question. So the first question concerns outreach. So organizationally, ICANN spends significant resources in promoting outreach - helping us as well doing it.

And of course as non-commercial stakeholders were particular keen in seeing this happening because we need also fresh energy, you know, for the work that is expected from us.

It is also - it was also a pretty debated issue this morning within (unintelligible). So my question for you would be how does outreach fit in your vision of the company, mostly in terms of the sustainability, the kind of long-term vision that we would like to see embedded into any outreach effort?

And the second question which is probably inappropriate, but I flushed out anyway, Europeans and questions related to for example data protection legislation. In particular, there has been new data protection regulation which is going to affect us all pretty soon.

It's probably an issue for (distinctabilities) to (sole), but do you have any position considering how ICANN looks at this and now ICANN expects to embed this into its own proceedings? Thank you.

Göran Marby: So the first question about outreach, and that's a very timely question. I'm going to go to with my team and also to the board to kind of figure out a way of doing things on a more I would say granular level. Because we are - and I would post this - we are formally a non-profit, but I don't see myself as a company. We are not a - we are not here to produce revenue. The money we get in is funding for something else. And a part of that is what we call outreach.

So what we're doing right now is just taking the next step in globalization. And we kind of licked a term for it, and I call that demand driven, more than anything else. And to better way engaging local communities around the places we are to see how we can better the granular outreach to make sure that we are diverse.

And I just saw the discussion on diversity, which I think is very well come - a very timely thing as well. So we need to be better understanding the (local) needs for outreach rather than thinking that we can have one big model that's going to suit everybody.

In a way that's already how we do it. But we need to be more structured doing it so we make sure that we don't spend money or using money the wrong way. So my clear vision of this one is to engage with local community to figure out more at a local level what issues do we need to resolve. What - who do we need?

I also think when it comes to outreach that because of the changing political climate, we still need to have an ear of what happens within (unintelligible) and what happens within some other areas because even if we now have done the transition, I think it's important to make sure that no one can hijack us again.

So that was the answer on that one. Could you please repeat the second question again? I'm not sure that I understood it.

Stefania Milan: Yes so it was about the new data protection regulation.

Göran Marby: It was data protection (unintelligible). We are - when the - with the safe harbor and everything that's happening right now, we have an internal discussion on how to store data and how to finance that. But I bet that your question was bigger than that.

And I'm coming back to the questions we had before is that we in a discussion or having a part of this discussion in Copenhagen as well. I, you know, for a lot of reasons, when I look upon the questions I get to see about from governments and private citizens and different groups, I would say that cyber security and cyber security and privacy are among those top things that people are talking about today. Which means that we need a way to facilitate that discussion (unintelligible).

I also think that this is a discussion that we need to make sure happens in the right place as well within the community because it's also that's the right way to doing it. Privately I have a lot of ideas about it, but we probably shouldn't say anything. Thank you.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. I have Marilia next. And then after that we may have time for one more question. The queues is closed and so no. Marilia please go ahead.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you Tapani and thank you Göran for being with us today. This is Marilia Maciel, member of NCUC and GNSO Council Representative of NCSG.

My question is about the travel ban in the US. Several American companies are supporting a lawsuit against the travel ban measure. And being a global organization, ICANN is being affected by this ban. We have colleagues that were supposed to be here with us that are refraining from traveling.

Are you considering to sort of join this effort against the ban somehow? What could we do as a community? I think the different part of the organization are against the ban. So how can we act together and how can we mitigate the harmful effects that the ban is already having on our work? Thank you.

Göran Marby: First of all, right now this week, I don't even know where the bans are. As you know that's simply a legal issue. But I (happy to) bring it up because I think that we have a bigger problem.

And then I will reverse the discussion we had about India as well. There are many countries around the world right now who are for reasons which are their own, who has made a decision to impose travel restrictions or harder visa application processes.

There are, you know, we will - we also see that many countries are planning to do it. Countries that always been an open and it's no problem, just there's never been any problems.

I brought this up to the board's attention as well that this has an effect on the whole ecosystem of ICANN because where can we go to have our ICANN meetings in the future? Where can we do - how can we make sure that people can even remotely participate if governments potentially will block access to the task forms that we're using?

I think, and the board also agrees that we need to our part and start talking about this as a major thing and not rather than, you know, one country is doing something and one country is doing something. We have to have the discussion.

I take this as a fairly big concern because even if we (keep up this pace) as we're doing now, I think new also need to meet. And the meeting strategy that we have today where we, you know, the order is given by the committees all around the world. Maybe we have to look into that going forward.

(You have to) mention, I don't know if David - we are looking into how to enhance our support for the (reset) process by adding some functions as well. And I hope that will, you know, make some life a little bit easier. But it doesn't take away the bigger problem of the perceived insecurity around the world or the action in security around the world.

So we are not - right now it's kind of hard to plan anything, especially in the US. We are also monitoring this, of course a lot. We don't really know what the outcome is. But the problem I think is much bigger than the US, sorry to say.

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay thank you. We still have seven minutes to go. Avri you get the last point (you do) for the time.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. This is Avri speaking. I'm here in an NCSG role. I'm going to go back to - hi. I'm going to go back to a couple of the points that we were at before.

One of the things that still has me somewhat concerned is that we're still in these isolated silos of corporation and community and I don't really see that breaking yet.

Now I think when you said once the board tells you to do something, you have to implement. And that's that. And I think that's a wonderful bit of humility, but what we have seen in the past and not necessarily during your regime, but in the past was that all it took was saying we can't implement that. And then basically the staff could go to the board and get an emergency policy variance or new policy in order to implement something that they could.

Now since then the - and the GNSO, and agreed to by the board I believe, came up with a whole set of things of policy and implementation recommendations of how community and staff could work together during implementation so that the policy was not lost. So that the implementation could express the policy that was intended.

And these were developed to address those questions. So I guess the immediate question I have, other than to make sure that we remember that and do something with it, is when you were doing those many, many meters of processes, in terms of how things go from policy to implementation, did you have that loop in there?

I'm not sure that I've seen that loop in operation yet. But did you have that loop in there that says implementation, implementation problem, go to the

policy people in the implementation review team, review, try again and cycle through. And then hopefully that was there and you'll just say sure, it was there.

And the other thing is in the metrics that we start doing in terms of how things are working, whether that's something we can measure? How often is there an implementation impasse? Do you go to the policy implementation review team? How does it work? In other words, is there a solution or does the impasse remain?

And just to A, make sure that that mechanism is in your - I'd love to see the pictures of this process - but is in those pictures. And whether that loop, because that is one of the first times when it isn't just throw it over the wall for comments and hope that a reasonable response comes back. But it's actually work together to get the policy implemented properly. Thanks.

Göran Marby: Thank you. There's a couple of things. First of all Avri, remember I'm trying to do something good here. I just want to point that out. And everything I do will be publicized. And actually we decided yesterday that the - in my room in Copenhagen - apparently I have an office there - I'm going to actually put on the wall the processes.

And when we done this (all through it's right) so you can have a look and feel of them. And then I will publish it for comments if we missed anything. I'm not - this is just to provide clarity - nothing else. Because I think it's important also explaining for newcomers coming in, how does the processes actually work in practice? What are the decision points made there?

And to your point, yes there was a lot of work between how - when we get a policy and there because that could be, you know, that's a for instance, it has

to be put into a contract, which means that you have to translate in the contract. And that's a lot of interactions there.

What I want to - what I think is important - I hope you agree with me - is that anything that is done is done in daylight so it doesn't perceive as we are negotiations. And there are things as, you know, we can point to things that this process maybe hasn't worked to 100%.

And that is when I need, because according to the bylaws, and I do respect this and I think it's important. It's got nothing to do with being humble. It is that orders that you've given to me that I pointed back toward who should even make that decision. It should be handed back to the community so the community - all of the community - also knows how the discussions are going.

So I think that we are - I'm not trying to do something where I move around things or throw things over the corner or the fence. What I'm trying to do is to make sure that any discussion that goes on is made in daylight. That people are aware about them and given the opportunity to also interact with it.

So that is what I'm trying to do. And there is nothing (behind) that. I hope that you - we can - and Avri, we can spend as much time as you want to talk about this as well because it's coming back to the opportunity for me and for you to understand where we are in the process.

And maybe not you because you know the processes, but we also need the new people coming in to understand how this works. And if I'm wrong in anything in this, if I misunderstood anything, that's very good because that means that my organization has misunderstood something. And then it's very good that we clear that out. Thank you.

We can probably hear that I'm a little bit passionate about this as well. So
thank you Avri.

Göran Marby: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Tapani Tarvainen: Okay only ten seconds to go now so thank you. I think that's all we have time
to say.

Göran Marby: Thank you very much.

END