

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi**  
**February 2, 2018**  
**3:00 pm CT**

Farzaneh Badii: Hello everyone. Welcome to the NCPH Intersessional Meeting. In this – hi everybody, pay attention to me please. So we are – this session we are going to discuss the GDPR with the CEO of ICANN. It's quite a hot topic now for all of us fortunately.

So what we are going to do the format of the session is that the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group as we agreed is going to present for five minutes our position on the issue and what we think and then we are going to post some questions to the CEO to respond to. So that would be limited to 15 minutes.

And then we are going to have the Commercial Stakeholder Group to present and pose their questions for another 15 minutes. And then we can have a general discussion for another 15 minutes. So the duration is 45 minutes.

We try not to go over that but so - but we could perhaps go five minutes over if we have like a very hot debate going on. So without further ado Stephanie Perrin is going to present our – the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group perspective and the question to the CEO on the GDPR. Stephanie go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Sorry I just had a wee bit of a coughing fit there, Stephanie Perrin for the record. How many minutes do I have Farzi for this?

Farzaneh Badii: (Unintelligible).

Stephanie Perrin: Okay very briefly the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group and NCUC before them has been saying for many years that the Whois is fundamentally flawed, it should be in compliance with data protection law and that it should be revamped. So this is nothing new.

We have a number of submissions that have been put in in response to the call for proposals and comments. They cover a bit of a range. Some endorse Model Number 3, some endorse Model Number 2B. And personally I endorse the eco-model because I think it is the best analysis of the situation to date so you have that range among our stakeholders.

Basically I don't want to take up your valuable time discussing what the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group supports but if I could jell it down into a few bullets we're here to protect end-user rights. It is often said that we don't have skin in the game because we are not going to be find nor are we subject to fraud and any of the things that the IPC are dealing with.

That may be true but we do have skin in the game in that we are trying to defend end-user rights. So that may not have a financial impact but it certainly has a - an impact on the domain name system and how it runs.

Basically we have been suggesting a tiered model for a number of years as have the data commissioners. That tiered model would protect user data. And

I think that's about as deep as I can go without getting into the disparities of view on some of the other finer points.

We have four basic questions here and I'll just read them all off. First one is what happens if none of the models are compliant neither Model Number 1, Model 2 or Model Number 3? Second is in terms of layered access or tiered access how can we make it work in the interim? How fast can we get community input on this process? And in this regard I don't see why we are spending time on the various Whois activities that are going on when we frankly need tiered access immediately.

We need to come up with some accreditation standards even if in the short term they aren't informal ones. We need some kind of best practices to set this up and that's going to take quite a bit of time.

The third one is in terms of the purpose of Whois I have been saying this in all of the working groups I'm on. We are going backwards with starting with the use cases. The data commissioners have been telling us since the year 2000 that Whois was not in compliance with the European Data Protection law and with other laws because the first common position in 2000 was from the International Working Group on Data Protection Telecommunications which includes a far broader group of data commissioners than just the Article 29 working party. So the current model is not compliant so why would you start your analysis with the use cases that are probably illegal that are going on right now?

The other thing about the purpose of Whois that is quite frustrating is when you start with the use cases of course one of the uses of all data that is gathered is law enforcement purposes. Any data can be accessed by law enforcement whether it's banking or private-sector or rather charities -- you

name it -- law enforcement has the right to access data wherever it is with the appropriate legal authorities. So ICANN is not a law enforcement agency. How on earth can ICANN justify having law-enforcement as a purpose for the collection, use and disclosure of data in the Whois?

Then the fourth question is and possibly this is more like a suggestion, given the variety and the legal opinions that have been posted and the ability to select lawyers and pose the questions that you want the answers to would it not be useful to as we move forward with this process get independent counsel as we did in the IANA transition? Thank you very much.

Göran Marby: Thank you. First of all I'm going to give a bit of a warning I'm getting a flu so my voice could be even more muffled than it usually is but I hope my answers will be straight. So the way you answer it – answer a question is based on the assumption that is in the question itself.

So I want to start by sampling, you know, the first answer to the – I mean the first question is quite simple. The DPAs will take us to court. They will make a decision.

And here I want to go into some of the other questions you said. You said legally and un-legally from European perspective. We don't know how the current law applies to the Whois because it's never been tried in court. The Article 29 group's letters is not legally binding.

They are a guidance and I am the first to admit that we should have listened more to it. I came in two years ago but it's a very fine – it's a fine point where you draw the line which one versus legal and illegal.

And I don't - I just want to make that point it's never been trialed from a European perspective when it comes to how the Whois has been tried. There has been opinions but never legally tested which that's important because it makes a benchmark on where we start this process.

So the first one is if we end up being noncompliant then the - a DPA will take us - make a decision that will end up in court. That's the way it's going to be so of course that's something we try to avoid. The second question was about - sorry?

Stephanie Perrin: Just a follow-up question because I absolutely agree with you. And as I wrote my comments it did occur to me that possibly the best thing to do given the impasse over Whois is to come up with a model that is wrong on all of the key points we argue about, at least wrong in my view, put it forward and have it taken to court and then we get all these things solved. What do you think of that as an option?

Göran Marby: Because that will be setting me up that I will voluntarily break a law which I have a feeling that you're - I don't think that's the smart thing to do but even it will be fun if I wasn't me. I can always set up someone else but I can't and I shouldn't do that.

But seriously and often in this discussion and I'm - we have discussed this and I love our discussions is the - there is another thing that guides me as well which I've said many times before is that yes we don't have overarching Whois policy that is sort of - which is the fundamental of why we have a Whois system the balances between the right to privacy and the need for information. We haven't done that which is prerequisite for the law itself.

But we have in our in different places in our policies and letting into our contracts we have points that points that the contract parties has to do something.

That is written in stone for me because I cannot change on a whim something that the community has agreed upon. Regardless of what I think about it or if I have feelings about it that has to be my benchmark.

So what we are looking at is really the – we are not a regulator. And believe me I'm a recovering regulator and I know what a regulator is. We have a set of rules and a contract that we enforce but if those – if the law says sort of supersedes that we cannot enforce them.

The problem with this law or the opportunity for this law and I don't judge on the law itself is that right now and for a very long time we don't know the exact borders of it. I call it because I have the best sense of humor in the world don't I Akram, yes, I call this the mother-in-law not because of my mother-in-law because of the relationship with my mother.

It's about behavior. The law wants us to change how we behave. So I remember I was a teenager I said, "I want to go out tonight." And my mother said, "Yes you can do that as long as you behave." So I went out and behaved and apparently we have different measures of behavior. She could actually slap me – she didn't do that but she can actually slap me afterwards and say, "You didn't behave."

That is the fine point of this law is that we have to figure out a way how to behave and that has to be acceptable by the DPAs in Europe. And we don't know the exact measurements of that. We you seldom hear us say, you know, this is exactly how it is because it's – we don't know exactly as it is. What is

the – and that increases a risk for us all in this. And that is one of the problems to sort of because I am bound by the policies set by the community.

And I hope you agree that that's the way the ICANN CEO should act on policies please? I shouldn't skip my - your policies just because I think it's worth it to do it. You do agree with that fundamental notion?

Man: Yes.

Göran Marby: Please thank you. At least Akram agrees...

Man: I agree.

Göran Marby: ...because next time I will do something that you don't like. Though the principle is there. So we have a legislation that has an impact on our ability to enforce that through our contracts. It's a compliance issue.

My job is to find the sweet spot in between those where I think that we can fulfill the obligations of the law at the same time I don't diverge too far away from the community upset.

And that's why I always said that this is an interim solution because the community has to go back and figure out a policy. The ICANN policy work has to continue to take into account GDPR in Europe and in other places into this policymaking process. We've never done this before.

There's two things that is really, really, really which is new for us in this process. One is the fact that we have a legislation that have a direct impact on our ability to make policies. It's not going to be the first – last time it's going to continue and we have to figure out a way of doing that. That's one of them.

And the other thing is the ICANN org as an organization has to make a decision because we are and I'm – I don't have legal here I – there isn't exact definition of this and I shouldn't trail off it. Oh he's here.

He can help with we also have a responsibility for that which means that I as the CEO actually have to make a decision which is unusual in the circumstances that I have to – I'm forced to make that decision.

Third and the founding mothers of ICANN never thought about it when I actually have to make a decision like that. That's what makes this process so unusual. So to answer the – that's just background that I would like to set before I proceed to answer the questions.

Accreditation yes. From the Webinar we did this morning does anyone listen? Are you alive? Could you interact with me?

Man: Yes. Yes.

Göran Marby: Shit - I feel like a president or CEO here. I thought I was having a dialogue. Do we actually record my bad words as well? Anything I say I just got a pill here from (Casio). I don't - to give my throat. It was a Brazilian pill. This is going to be interesting, stop laughing.

We described this morning that if you look we, you know, we talked about models and we seem to refer everything to models. So we have the GAC model, we have the whatever other models and we have one, two, three, four or something models.



But what we describe to you this morning is that there was - that there was a bit – there is a comment from all the comments we have more or less they say one thing, that is going to be a tiered or layered access. How many years have you discussed that in the ICANN community, 13 years.

So in one month in six months we set up a process that we're able to reach a conclusion and you can describe, you know, we can discuss it with where actually after six months came up with something that you've been discussing for 13 years tiered access.

That is a big, big thing. We went out in December and said, "This is the way it's going to be." And we also got some good input from Article 29 who pointed it out so it was easier. So of course that has to be accreditation model.

So now we tiered it up and now someone has access to it under the compliance. And that's true. We have to figure that out. What I've said right now is that what I want you - and I've been talking about civil society well it's interest, property and antispam, and anti-abuse and - wondering is someone for something by the way? The people that should come together and actually figured that out.

I've been – there are some people in this room who knows that I've sort of been begging for the last couple of weeks saying, "Go and talk to each other because you're actually closer than you think you are because you agreed on the underlying principles."

If you could find in agreement over the sort of borders about that I will be very happy because I will take that on board. If you don't do that I still have to make a decision in a couple of weeks.

So I'm going to share with you something that happened today which we don't know how to formulate right now. After our conversation this morning the Article 29 groups has reached out to us and asked that we're going to have a meeting in the middle of February with them to go through some – we don't know more about it right now but to have it more sort of formal than interactions we've had.

We don't know what it means. And I think it's important to get even further input from them before we have the final say. We will come back to you with more information but I got this email are about 45 minutes ago so we haven't really set it up yet but I want to share that with you.

The other thing we're doing which I shared is that we're going to send a letter to the DPAs copying the US government and the three commissioners that we say we have agreed on the biggest things that's a tiered access model but we need time to figure out the current accreditation model and also to implement that on the other side and to have a dialogue so we don't only feel pressure pressured by time because you're well aware of that there are different sides of this discussion.

Sometimes when I speak to privacy they also want to have anti-abuse. We want to go after bad domain laws. It's the same set of information that we use in front of it. It's a balanced discussion we need to have. And...

Farzaneh Badii: Three more minutes.

Göran Marby: ... (unintelligible) that what we had we - was used to having some law firm we - all the questions we asked you got to see as well. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. So I think you've answered all the questions. We have three more minutes for the segment of Noncommercial Stakeholder Group to discuss the question. Also I - anything else you want to add Göran or we can just go to the next segment on commercial stake?

Göran Marby: Could I have a GDPR free zone?

Farzaneh Badii: No but don't worry at 2 o'clock we are going to be talking about SSR2 which is much more interesting and also capacity building. So we can move to CSG Brian go ahead.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you so much. We're going to divide our time up a little bit differently. We're going to give each of our constituencies a few minutes to ask questions and hopefully get answers. Why don't we start with our ISPCP colleagues?

Christian Dawson: Sure. And I think that we are probably going to take the least time. So as a little bit of background we are dovetailing off of the last comments. And the IS PCP of the three groups is the one that didn't submit their own comments to this process.

We polled our members and we've decided that we weren't going to submit a single comment but we encouraged people to make their own. And there has been a great deal of members that have stepped forward and provided support for the eco model as well so that's a commonality year. Many of us are fans of that process.

And so really the only question that we have beyond wanting to make it known to you that there is that general support is after having seen the Webinar this morning which was focused to a great extent on issues surrounding Whois ensuring that when you're taking a look at the

comprehensive models you're taking a look at all components of them because obviously they encompass far more when it comes to GDPR compliance.

One of the things that drew many of us in the IP - ISPCP to the eco model is that it seemed so comprehensive and flexible. Thank you.

Göran Marby: I don't know if it was a question but flexibility is not allowed in the law. That's - and I'm not going to comment on any models in that sense but it could be so. If you don't have a good explanation why you do something you have to show less information.

And that is something that I - you know, we have to take into account. And that's why I now (unintelligible) call it a pizza. We have the same sort of pizza we're talking about topics. If you take one model and you take something out you actually end up with another model.

There are diversities within the model but there are also many commonalities. So I stopped talking about the models. I'm talking about the topics. If someone can figure out a better analogy than a pizza I would be very happy even if I like pizza but you get what I'm saying.

We already agreed on the pizza itself. That's have some sort of accreditation on a tiered access model and then we can flavor this pizza differently but we're actually much closer because we are on the same pizza now.

So there are things and the flexibility doesn't exist in this sense because if you have to register, two parties that actually ends up differently the law will be applied the same way in the jurisdiction of the euro which means that you

with the flexibility in the system you can actually cause problems for someone and that is I think something you have to take into account.

There is a time for discussion. There is also a time where you actually have to fix certain things. And so let's talk about the topics, which topics you like. You think for instance that it should be for, you know, it should the jurisdiction should be global and that some for technical reasons we should change the Whois system so we have a tiered access everywhere.

That's what you like when you like a special model. You have an idea about the information flow between the different parties.

Let's talk about those, not right now but let's you talk about those things because I think that when you talk to people about who presents another model you're agreeing that 80%. So it's not before against a certain model. It's the model, the things within the model which are so important, just want to share that.

Brian Winderfeldt: Great, thank you so much. Would like to call on the BC to ask their question.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Brian. Göran, Steve DelBianco for the Business Constituency. Over the last seven days as you're well aware of BC in conjunction with the IPC has been really busy trying to get our arms around both the interim and long term process. And we want to thank you and JJ for participating in the four-hour Webinar we held last Wednesday.

On Monday we submitted comments on the Whois models. Yesterday we submitted a narrative along with the IPC, a narrative to the Article 29 working party shared with everybody in this room to try to help them appreciate and

understand on the expectation and hope that they'll come forth with some sort of directional guidance. And you reinforce that today with respect to them at least wanting to have a dialogue.

And then finally today we the BC co-lead an hour and a half session with everyone in this room and Stephanie Perrin on how does the community answer the challenge of replacing the interim model with community driven processes because the memo you put out said that the interim does not replace. It's temporary.

It doesn't replace community work in three areas right, with certification of privacy and proxy providers, updates to the procedure for Whois conflict with law. And JJ you mentioned that on the call this morning that would be the mechanism they'd use.

And the third is the RDS PDP long stalled but we believe in the BC for reasons you've given Göran the ocean of convergence upon some sort of a tiered access is the way to go. So we went through that and came up with a different conclusion I think that the NCSG did.

The BC believes that the presence of an interim model that is wholly satisfactory to no one might well be an appropriate interim that would motivate the compromise that has been lacking for 13 years on the convergence for the RDS PDP.

We believe we should work harder on the implementation of privacy and proxy providers with an eye towards whether that implementation will actually achieve GDPR compliance in certain ways and if not how could we potentially consider ways of improving it.

But all of these would go to the community in the hands of council is the manager for policy Heather. So it would go through council but the community itself should respond and needs to stay focused on that to replace the interim that you're putting into place now.

So my question for you would be the BC put in comments the other day where we set our preference if we had to pick one would be Model 1 but the BC accepts the idea of tiered access. And my question would be is can you acknowledge the need for centralized standardized certification authentication?

And without that being in place we need a fallback, an interim step to the interim where we can self-certify or something similar until we have a standardized authentication service. Thank you.

John Jeffery: So I think that's a very well-articulated question and I think it's an important one. The – as we talked about this morning and as you just said this is intended to be an interim compliance model, not a permanent policy solution. And accordingly whatever we can do to facilitate the policy discussion and make sure that it's launched and meaningful and educated we're certainly in support of. And if I - I may have lost the second part of your question.

Steve DelBianco: Looking for an acknowledgment that is the interim model includes certification for access that until standardized certification is available we need something much easier to implement in the interim such as self-certification.

That's the element of Model 1 we jumped on because while Model 2 is a good point of arrival we're not there yet. And Göran agreement in principle to tiered

access is still quite a distance away from having agreement with the contract parties and GNSO counseling community.

John Jeffery: Here's what we...

Steve DelBianco: ...about what certification...

((Crosstalk))

John Jeffery: So I understand your question now. So here's what we can certainly identify that we understand the complexity of the problem of certification. And that's exactly the kind of comment we're soliciting additional feedback on to understand how that line in the matrix this morning works and what would be possible ways for us to be able to certify and be compliant with the law which is of course one of the challenges as well when we think about the self-certification model or any certification model.

Steve DelBianco: And JJ that probably suggests that when you make your decision after consulting the community and make your decision on an interim model it might be that the interim model not only might be a hybrid of other approaches but it might have a first and a second phase to it.

The interim model may have a phase during which some easier certification's available until the centralized certification is turned on. I'm getting nods for those who are following in Adobe.

John Jeffery: And we very much appreciate your presentation of that. And I think that's certainly something that's going to be taken into consideration and something we'd want to make sure you had in writing so that we could make sure that's part of the public record and part of the discussion as we proceed forward.



Steve DelBianco: Thank you. It's in the BC comments which were brief and to the point. And then I - since I have seconds left I'll point out that Dustin Philips at ICANN wiki during this morning's Webinar came up with a pizza metaphor represented on ICANN wiki. So that's all to you Göran.

Göran Marby: I should probably learn how to guard my tongue. But I still like the analogy. I like pizza and yes if anyone could come up I challenged Duncan and his team to come up with a better one but so far they haven't.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you Steve. That was excellent. I'd like to call on Vicky Sheckler as our last constituency for the IPC to ask her question.

Vicky Sheckler: Thank you. Thank you for joining us especially when you're feeling poorly I appreciate it. We had three general questions. First if you could let us know how you're going to look at all the comments that you've received, all the models that you've received and how you're going to deliberate about them, how you're going to choose or reject what you see and how that information would be shared with the community?

Second, it would be great to know what criteria you're looking at and trying to select the different aspects of the model and how that criteria was based? And finally we were wondering about what additional legal advice you're going to be seeking in connection with any or all of the models? Thank you.

Göran Marby: I have to admit I didn't really hear the first part.

Vicky Sheckler: We're just hoping to get a better sense of how you're going to take in all the comments and consider the comments so that there's a sense of satisfaction if you will within the community that all the comments were considered

knowing you're going to have to reject some of them. I mean that's understandable. Sorry.

Göran Marby: All right we...

Woman: You have to (unintelligible). Yes.

Göran Marby: I hope we've - you know, one of the things that we you saw this flowchart this morning those axles. And then you know someone has to make a decision and if you - there's no agreement in the community I have to make a decision.

You immediately realize that whatever I come up with no one is going to be happy. So my job from now on is to distribute sort of misery evenly. I didn't really like that, saying it but that's actually what it is. I mean there is – the lack of agreements within the community and I'm forced legally to make a decision.

You're really envious of my job right now aren't you? You're happy that I have it. I mean that's the point. I mean that's really - at someone because I have to sign my name on a decision where I wouldn't say that because I don't want to do that put my own organization at risk because I'm the legal – under the current assumption blah, blah, blah I'm legally – I have to obey the law as well.

So I'm in this. And no one else can make that decision for me because it's actually, you know, the way we are incorporated I have to make it. So we are seeking - no, we are seeking your advice in that. There are a couple of lawyers in this room I think who provides that.

But more and we also have our own internal counseling. We also have – we did a Hamilton. We are really building this. And I - I'm the first – I think I stood up and talked about this first time in South Africa when I said first thing I want to agree on we are late. We are late. We should have started this a long time ago, ten years ago says Akram. Who gets hired?

I mean it's – and yes I'm forcing a process. I had to invent the process but I wanted to be as transparent as possible on the decision. I asked that we have to - wait a minute, this is a decision I have to make. Is it compliance. And still we invented sorry to say that the process for community interaction and dialogue during something that is primarily internally in compliance. And then we did that with good faith because we thought you should be included in this discussion.

And we moved. I think that the Whois discussion has moved over this period. But one of the first thing we actually had to address was the fact that how do we set - the law says that you have to have reasons why you do. You have to be able to explain why you're doing this. So we started with the use cases and to some – and also you have provided the rationale by your input to us about both the need for information and the right for privacy.

And I actually in this room you know that for the civil society I have talked to you as well and asked you to provide information and when I thought it lacked I actually asked you again make sure that you come in, your voice is heard as well. I've done the same thing with intellectual property, I've done the same thing with any part because it - because I thought it was important to have a balanced voice.

I'm not taking sides in the discussion I'm trying to facilitate it. But in the end I have to make that decision because it's a compliance issue both for me as an

organization but also implementing policies the way we can implement policies in our contracts.

And we do – I can't do this halfhearted. I can't do this lightheaded. I don't even know what that means. But I, you know, I need to have a proper legal advice to find which I'm not supposed to say, the sweet spot with the policies you have set in the community with the obligations that the law says. I need to find that range and that's what we're looking for.

And again I'm really, really helping. I know there's a lot of history in this one. I know there is a lot of interest from different arenas and there's a lot of legends about it. But believe me, me and my team is working hard to understand the different parts. We can come up with something that is as close as possible to what we have today in account of what the law says.

There is a scale 100% to zero. It's not going to be 100%. It's not going to be zero. It's going to be somewhere in between. That's where we are. And that's why we've – I'm having 200 telephone calls. I, you know, there are people in this room that I know that I called up and thanked them to talk to each other. And I've said I put myself on any train or put myself on any flight especially my team to help discussions within the community to do this because I'd rather not take that decision.

I will always be responsible for my organization but I still think that you guys in this room for instance are better off taking - fine-tuning some of those things that I am. You're forcing me to take a decision that I don't want to do. But I have – I'm going to do it.

Vicky Sheckler: Thank you very much. Brian is there anything additional that you'd like to ask?

Brian Winterfeldt: No. I think that was super helpful. We really appreciate your answering our questions. And I'm being very candid and we appreciate the fact that you're being very transparent with the process.

And we also appreciate all the pizza analogies. So I think that actually we are maybe a few minutes ahead of schedule but we do have two other topics. Before we move on we maybe have a couple minutes left. Does anyone have any other GDPR related questions? Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin. Yes I hate to flog this horse any longer because it's been all morning GDPR but I'm wondering as you make this decision I mean I can see a number of fiduciary responsibilities that you have the foremost in my mind being to the contracted parties because that's a major access of ICANN's operation is the contracts they have with the registrars and the registries and of course the escrow agent.

Would those responsibilities not trump some of the other asks, even our own as speaking as civil society? Thanks.

Göran Marby: To be honest I don't really know how to answer this question because the sort of premise of the question is that I take – I have a - because of some business reasons I don't have I will take more – someone into more account. Again and you know this so you're testing me again and that's fine.

The things that I have to take into account are the policies set by the community, what's in our bylaws, the what you decided and the implications of the law. That's what I'm looking at.

It's not anything else. I don't do this. I don't run a business. I don't do this because I don't sell domain names. I'm not here to do - I'm here to facilitate the discussion in general but in the end I have to make a decision. So believe me or not that's what I'm trying to do.

And if I, you know, scrutinize me and you saw in this picture this morning that you will probably disagree with me as some of those points when we make this decision and that's fine. You should disagree with me. You should please channel that not only to anger against me but also in the policymaking process where you have the ability to change and tell me exactly what I do as long as it's in the remit of the law because that's the caveat we now have to – that's the reality we now have to live with that governments around the world for good intentions will make laws that has an effect on our ability or your ability to make policies.

And we are working on a method we don't – not there yet but sharing information about what we know about the proposals around the world so we can get that into the community so you at least know about it. We are - without we telling you if it's right or wrong so you at least know about it.

We talked about there are other countries want to do GDPR. We have the e-privacies discussions. There are discussions about hate speech. There are discussions about surveillance, there is encryptions, there are privates. And some of them even if they are in sort of other topics could actually have an effect on our abilities to make policy for the domain name system.

And so we avoid this short period of time where we have to make a lot of decisions which I don't like. I'm Swedish so I like to take a long time to make decisions. Thank you.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you so much. Thank you Stephanie. Dean last question.

Dean Marks: Thank you Brian, Dean Marks. One question I had correct that there's this consensus building around tiered access on some of the models that have been proposed both by the community and by ICANN. There were certain data elements that were – would be generally considered personal data elements, a registrant name or an address physical or email address.

And some of those models, a limited set of those elements had been proposed to remain publicly accessible in Whois. My question is whether in seeking guidance from DPAs and Article 29 is there still on the table discussion of potentially certain of those elements remaining publicly accessible?

Göran Marby: I'll start and maybe JJ. We haven't decided anything. We have not decided anything more than it's going to be a tiered access model and some sort of accreditation which we've gone ahead and said. All I mean would - so if someone asked me which model do you prefer? I've gone beyond. I'm in the pizza. I'm on the toppings.

So we're taking those topping things out and we look at them and we say, "Okay we have to do legal – take the jurisdiction part, you know, this is a law that only affects European citizens on the other hand it could be hard to actually know where people are." So how do you filter those things out?

And we have to look at those things, you know, point by point. That's why we also - one of the - maybe I wasn't clear about that this morning is that look at the – if we now forget to talk about the eco model or the GAC model or the Model 2B or whatever they're called take all those things. The things you agree upon you already agree upon but take all those things and discuss them and come with advice that is very, very helpful because they are free.

What is private information? How do you do the accreditation system? What information can you store and cannot store? There are actually a couple of them that we have to fine-tune. We have not decided anything. We're sharing everything we do in - right now in real-time with you. JJ?

John Jeffery: Yes I think the question's very good and it's one of the elements that we noted this morning was still important that there are certain fields that are in question and are different in the models in terms of what's public and what would be made accessible through the tiered model. And so I think those kinds of comments are still very valuable. And of course we would be seeking any guidance we can get from the DPAs or others if we could have more clarity around that.

Dean Marks: Thanks. And the one other point I wanted to make was that I think there is a willingness to try to work together to come up with Göran what you had asked, you know, if we could get greater consensus within the community.

I think part of the challenge has been as different parts of the community have proposed their models are been discussing the models the time deadlines -- and this is not your fault -- but have been so short that if you're trying to get your model and, you know, within ten days it doesn't leave a lot of time to start reaching out to people around the world to say, "Hey can we sit down and analyze each other's models and see where the common points are."

I think if we got two or three more weeks maybe will be able to do that but who knows if that will be timely enough for you. But I don't think it's a matter of there being a willingness. I think it's been a time issue.



Göran Marby: We are, you know, I - when I got this question last week I said, "Go and speak to the contracted parties." It's not in, you know, it's very much in the hands of your dialogues. And by the way I just want to mention again I have the flu and if I sound too harsh it's because I have a flu not because

I don't enjoying myself (sic). You're raising very good questions. I must end note this one and try to be – you – the questions you're raising are very, very essential because we are now down to some of the more tricky parts of this discussion.

We will never say stop. You know, we will not saying that you're not, you know, if you want to comment any of the pieces saying that this - I mean take the jurisdiction thing. I mean just taking a sample you take that part – you take that piece out of the pie going away from the pizza now and say that this is something that, you know, you have - for this reason you have a very strong opinion about that one or the transfer of data or why this information is needed or the other way around, why doesn't this particular information in the blocks is – needs to be behind this sort of tiered access.

Please provide us with a – we will not say no. We will, you know, it's not we're going to - and we're going to provide that information. We're going to put it on our Web site because we are in a running flow right now. That's what I said.

The DPAs has just come back and said they would like to continue to dialogue with us. And we told them I mean I met them a couple of weeks ago. We had a fantastic meeting with them and then we - both me and JJ got food poisoned. Yes.

Man: Pizza.

Göran Marby: We didn't eat pizza. The last question I asked was what is the timeframe for us to implement it? I have a multi-stakeholder model behind me. The more I can engage with them is better it is. And they can't give me a formal answer. This is – I've got a point here - yes for I'm talking too much but a couple of things that is important to know.

Today the DPAs cannot give those guidance in legal terms because they don't have the legal power to do that. They will have the ability to do that when this new portion of the law is enacted because the Article 29 group will disappear and turn into something that is called a board. And that board can actually give guidance. So we have a Catch-22.

They're also in transition period in a sense because they haven't elected the new chairs of the board. So they're still running under the old Article 29 which is a voluntary group.

The other thing of this is just for you to know how right now the DPAs can individually have an opinion, you know, about something that happens in the country.

After the – this piece of legislation is enacted because of the board they have to be much more in tune which means that two DPAs cannot diverge from their opinion about this. They have to have a common understanding.

And the way it's going to happen is that one DPA in the country will with high probability be the ones who go to sort of if someone goes after us they're going to do that in one individual country and the other ones will accept. It's sort of built into the system that that's going to happen. But it doesn't end there.

In Germany I think how many DPAs do they have there? They have one for – sorry? Seventeen DPAs in Germany. So the way the it is setup is that if a DPA don't agree they issue a decision but it doesn't end there because if you don't agree with it you take it to court. And then you have at least three layers of court system in that country and then it probably ends up fairly early on in the European Court.

The European Court is the one that has the final say about everything. They're the ones who finally writes and they have - they are the only ones who legally can tell all other court systems this is the way it is, final done.

I'm going to take an example data retention. The European court actually looked at that and said, "Oh it was me who actually brought it there," said, "You are, you know, you're out. You can't do this this again." And everybody else has to agree with that legally, legislative and implementation-wise.

So worst case scenario we will all live in insecurity for five years at least. Some of those cases going up there has taken seven or eight years. I did a competition thing in my previous job that was ten years old because they never come around to make a decision about it. So but good to understand. It's like a budget in the way which I know you want to ask me about. There are mechanics around this as well that we have to take into account unfortunately or fortunately. I think I'm done with GDPR for today.

Brian Winterfeldt: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Göran Marby: (Unintelligible) anything else like the weather or it's nice if I like ice cream or what is my preferred pizza or anything?

Brian Winterfeldt: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Göran Marby: (Casio) what was those pills you gave me?

Brian Winterfeldt: Truth serum. So we very much appreciate your time. We actually are out of time for your favorite topic and we do have two other topics, not the weather or pizza building but we do have capacity building and SSR2 questions. So I think we're going to be dividing the remaining time between those.

I think the format is just going to be an open question period from attendees. I think I'm going to quickly moderate the SSR2 session and then I'm going to hand it over to my co-moderator to handle capacity building. So I want to go ahead and open the floor to SSR2 questions. Kiran?

Kiran Malacharuvil: Sorry I didn't realize I would be the only one. Get closer to the mic they said. Sorry too close?

Brian Winterfeldt: You're good.

Kiran Malacharuvil: My name is Kiran Malacharuvil. I am the Secretary of the IPC. My question about SSR2 as it relates to your office and your function will you confirm to us as a community that when SSR2 is unsuspending you will direct appropriate resources to having the independent review adequately supported by staff with subject matter knowledge, willingness and authority to assist the review team in substantive and administrative matters such as project

management, producing summary notes of calls and meetings and generating initial draft documents?

Göran Marby: Yes.

Kiran Malacharuvil: Yes. That was the easiest.

Göran Marby: We always do this. I mean that's exactly what we do all reviews so of course.

Kiran Malacharuvil: So I think - sorry I guess it's not that easy. It never is.

Göran Marby: Then the answer is no.

Kiran Malacharuvil: I think that in all fairness there were some questions and concerns about that during this process. And so while of course the obvious answer for that is yes it would be very helpful for you to sort of make note of those specific asks and coordinate with the SSR2 Review Team and the SO AC leaders to make sure that our expectations of what staff support is and your expectations of what staff support are aligned this time so as not to create some of the issues that we saw prior to the suspension of the SSR2 Review Team.

Göran Marby: Okay.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you so much. Additional questions on SSR2? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks. I'm not sure if Göran is the right person maybe to respond to this since we have Teresa so with the MSI supporting the review teams. I think one thing when the - forgets there is always debate is suspension or (Pause) made by the board or the OEC what we understood there is kind of concern of about wasting resources. But I mean in how that was kind of

evaluated what we mean by wasting of resources? I mean this is the concern I guess. It's not just for the Review Team but can be for any groups that how this was assessed and evaluated.

I think for the community we are still discussing it how to in particular the SO, AC leaders taking the lead to work out how we can resume the work for the SSR2. But just I want to know how that was evaluated because I think that can be a slippery slope somehow.

Göran Marby: If I – when it comes to the (Pause) of the SSR2 we have several board members. And we talked about that in the - where were we, Abu Dhabi meeting as well. So I'm here in the capacity of CEO and not as a member of the board.

Doesn't know – doesn't mean that I take full collective responsibility for it which I think was a good decision by the board (Pause) it but some of those questions about the (pausing) it itself should be directed to the board. When it comes to - let me answer the questions in general because it was a more general question than SSR2.

Yes we are actually we are - let me say this like this. When we look at the reviews we had a concern that is much more than monetary. We are and I think in the next budget cycle we talk about 11 or 12 reviews mandated by you. And I'm asking myself not from, you know, a money perspective in that terms but human resource perspective from you are you - because those reviews are substantial.

They are important. They're important to what we do but the fatigue, the thing we ask – we have decided that you should do and spend resources on is that the right thing to do?

So we're trying to start a discussion together with you not about - it's not about money in itself. Money is important but it's really about do we have – have we planned this the right way? Are we doing too many reviews at the same time? Is there a risk because of we're having so many reviews that we spread ourselves thin so the output is not good?

And when the, you know, when the output comes do we have resources in a short period of time to actually implement them? How do we make sure that reviews comes up, stays in scope and doesn't contradict with each other? So it's sort it's more than just a money question when it comes to review.

And we've been - now in the budget process becomes sort of almost a cliché that we have to – we have to budget reviews that we know we basically know is probably not going to happen or they're going to take much longer time because we're running too many reviews at the same time which means that not everybody can, you know, be in them.

We have reviews with fairly few amount of people in them and therefore they take a longer time. I would love to engage with the community in a discussion. And I'm not steering that. I don't, you know, it's a community decide how to do it. But I think it's time to talk about the process reviews in general not only money but fatigue in the community, quality, output of all of them as something that is essential for all of us. I hope that answers your questions because it's not only about SSR2.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Göran. But so your yes you mention about the fatigue and we have so many few but I don't think it's the community that initiated all of them or decided to initiate of them. In order there was if I'm not mistaking one of the meeting you asked it as what time it was till I think - I'm not sure NCUC chair

you give us the timeline of the review and there was a request for feedback. But the question here is not really the community that I think initiated that.

So when you are saying how you want may be to involve us the question what's the process that can maybe set up and for that purpose? For example that's again consensus here that you - we had that consultation about standard operating standard and also I think put us – burden on us to come to work on comments and but what can the - really a process for something more structural in the way that we are involved with here in terms of maybe planning, initiating and also defining the framework for the reviews because it seems here kind of insert who is initiating and if it's also - you want to talk about maybe in term of planning of resources and so on.

Göran Marby: Yes we often initiate reviews but the reason why they're there is because for instance they are mandated by bylaws. And it's our obligation to make sure that we don't break our own bylaws by, you know, for instance starting the process and ending them within a certain time.

Take - let's take me a minute just it is much worse than that because on top of the reviews we also have the budget process. It takes 15 months to do a 12-month budget. And we are actually starting that process when we're start of – we don't - we haven't really started off the budget cycle for one year before we started budget cycle for next year. And that is a strain for the community as well. We talked about that a little bit over lunch.

And then above that just to tell - if you think that you are okay right now when we have the policy work, the reviews, the budget work of one not very distant future we have to start the next iteration of the ICANN strategy work as well. So – and I'm worried that we are actually exhausting you money-wise



but also timewise. So I, you know, I would be grateful and happy to manage those discussions -- a review about reviews.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. So we will go to our next agenda item which is about – our next question is about capacity building. And Renata will pose that question to you. Go ahead Renata.

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: Hi Renata from NCUC. Yes our members discussed about the changing landscape of GDPR. And having somatic workshops with experts in ICANN meetings could be interesting for discussing evolving themes. And given the changing landscape of investments in capacity building in ICANN such as the in FY '19 the budget reduction for Fellowship program we would like to hear comments on these and other tasks for capacity building initiatives that would be in the future of ICANN. Thank you.

Göran Marby: So your proposal is that we do meetings and conference calls about specific items? Is that...

Renata Aquino Ribeiro: (Unintelligible).

Göran Marby: Workshops. We - as long as it doesn't include traveling I'm very happy. I mean I'm, you know, we are actually trialing - I mean since I came on board we looked into different transparency measures. One of them is the (CO) report which we should be releasing the latest version any second now. We are set to pass through the board meeting.

And the other thing is that I initiated it. So in-between all ICANN meetings I have 21 calls with all the constituency leaders individually where, you know, the one so the other end is sort of that's your concern and not my concern. We

- it's unrecorded informal that we write conclusions if they are to dos. And many of you I speak on a regular basis.

And we - the GAC for instance right now we're also trialing where we do facilitation calls where we pick out one subject and we spend an hour on the call on that subject. And I'm, you know, we are here to serve you. If these are things that you like to do I will, you know, and we can plan them. I'm - you know, why not? We're here to help you.

One of the notions I'm having is that we, you know, our job is to provide you with information so you can make your own judgment to make decisions. We try, you know, we heard a funny story from - we actually had a meeting - JJ had a meeting in Brussels with someone who said, "How can you go out and say that in public that can actually hurt you?" And JJ's answer was, "That's ICANN." We always publish the information even if it could hurt us whatever us is. So I'm long answer yes.

Farzaneh Badii: Question. Go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks Paul McGrady here, member of IPC. On the issue of capacity building we've spent quite a bit of time at the GNSO council sessions at the beginning of the week talking about management of PDPs and the like. And I know that there are some who believe that ICANN needs further outreach to develop number of volunteers at, you know, involved in the community.

But with PDPs running some of them running 100 plus members and that we heard a really great number, one of the groups around the table here -- not the IPC -- their membership has grown like 140 people or something like that in the last little bit.

So I understand people asking questions about fellowship programs and that kind of stuff and that's fine.

My question of capacity building it's not so much to do with do we need more people but rather for 100 plus volunteers that are involved in these PDPs what can the community be doing better from staff point of view to help bring those people in, educate them about the ICANN process, educate them about the need to come in with an attitude of looking for solutions, a willingness to compromise, being efficient with time, not raising the same issues over and over and over again that have been settled.

We're experiencing a lot of that in PDPs. I think it's leading to a lot of burnout especially amongst what we would say the regular kinds of, you know, the folks who regularly volunteer over the last decade or so here at ICANN.

And also a flip side of the question is what can staff do to help us get that – those volunteers in the best position to be efficient in that time because, you know, with all these PDPs, with all these review teams we are going to – we are starting to feel a little bit of burnout.

But I'm – I don't think the solution necessarily and it could be, but the solution isn't necessarily more of the same. I think it's better of the same. So that's sort of an open-ended question but any suggestions you have for us as we try to solve that issue as a community would be appreciated.

And since I have the microphone great Webinar this morning. I thought it was excellent -- good straight talk, good answers -- a really good use of the time.  
Thank you.

Göran Marby: It's - I'm struggling here because I don't some discussions belongs very firmly within the community and one of them is how you do your job to create policies. And I'm, you know, I can always have opinions and my staff. We can always have opinions.

But I'm trying not to have opinions about how you do things. It's sort of important mentally for me because I'm here to facilitate a discussion rather than participate with it.

With that said I think that we - one of the reasons why we did the flowcharts, the project that I'm not allowed to call Hubba Bubba for trademark reasons is because I wanted to understand how the process actually works. And for me there was a couple of things that stood out. One of them is that we actually (hold) in the processes.

That's why we came up with the impasse notion for instance that we now have a process for if we can't implement something because there is not really a consensus within the community on the implementation we actually bring it back to the community. And that's been actually working I think quite nicely because we has started creation I'll call it debate about that.

Another thing that occurred to me was that I'm hesitant to use this because it's actually a good example, the EU in Greek where our dear friends in cNSO and their friends at (NASAC) actually came up with something and I was sort of sitting in a meeting and realizing that I didn't - they were never happy with each other.

And I wonder why passionate, competent, fantastic people who are disagreeing and it turns out they never spoke to each other. So we created

those sort of models which are, you know, we put peoples in corners and we didn't have an area for people to talk about.

When we got them in the room and I going to give (Chris) and (Ram) a big credit for that. We put them in a room then I said to them, "Let's agree it's my fault and after that we could engage with the board and we can actually solve that issue quite easily. It was just about a communication."

So and when people have been asking me, "Why did you do the flow, what do you want to do next with the flowcharts," it's really about that's you now. We provided with the material. We provided you with the information server. I think it's the community should maybe engage in a discussion about did we end up in the right place?

There are of course organization people who want to have a very slow and complicated process because that could suit their interest. There are other ones who want to have a very fast process because that could suit their interest. But I – I'm a strong believer in we'll just take on one in the sense that usually there is a consensus evolving from those discussions. So the only advice I would say is that they're going to fix whatever you think is the problem.

Farzaneh Badii: And go ahead please.

Martin Silva Valent: Hello, Martin. I have like two quick ones. One is to build upon the what (Paul) said that first capacity building programs is they're not only about bringing people to the working group itself. That was already inclusion to make the working groups more purpose (unintelligible) as well. So it's not only about the number we have in the working group but making more diverse.

And sometimes we have a lot of different programs. And one of them actually is the on boarding program that was asked if that does with the question of the committee was sort of like that they ask for ICANN staff for help, help us to understand what now they call the stakeholder journey how someone actually arrives through a working group and start drafting things and engagement in a meaningful way.

So the more the program is something that is going on now is community driven but ICANN staff is giving us all the resources so that each community itself can do it. And IPC has its own member's inside the onboarding program trying to develop them.

So just to mention something that wasn't mentioned and there is – there are capacity building programs working right now in those in – with that sort of mentality of committee asking ICANN staff for help (I think) a staff giving that help. So that complements the information for Paul pulled out.

And there is probably more for the ICANN staff is I see a lot of different programs that of course they address different things. The Fellowship has a much more broad scope than the NexGen has. The onboarding is much more specific towards getting people to the actual engagement on policy perhaps for GNSOs communities. These again regional plans and strategies also has a lot of capacity building workshops, showcases, Webinars.

But sometimes they do lack to see if there is a general view of how all these pieces come to the pass off outreach and capacity building and if there's a general view on these different goals because sometimes it seems that these goals were identified one by one in a long period of time and they were - they were answers built for that questions or concerns over time but there was no general review of all of that.

And you can see that because in our ways different parts of ICANN are taking different outreach and different capacity building things and I don't know sometimes it seems sometimes they are like overlapping or not entirely coherent in the way they manage that. I understand the reason why that is but my question is like do you have a full understanding on all those programs that some of them are very community driven, some are not so? Thanks.

Göran Marby: I would be lying if I said I'm the expert on all the outreach we're doing collectively with the - also together with what we do with our own constituencies but also for instance where we incorporate with organizations like ISOC for instance. My thinking about all of this is not a - we've been growing ICANN together for several years based on increased funding.

And I don't know if I've made this (unintelligible) when I studied political science it was always said that the most popular politicians of all time was always in the 50s and 60s because they had after the second world war they often had a growing pot sort of to distribute between people.

And then of course the 70s came and suddenly it (shrank). You don't hear about much many popular 70s politicians because they were actually facing that - they couldn't give the same, you know, growing to everybody. Of course they fixed that with inflation so in the 80s we all (unintelligible) but we got more but we didn't. And then you pay that in the 90s. It seemed to go in cycle this one.

And we are sort of and between us when they asked me to do this job they never told me that I'm going to be like a politician in the 70s because we're now facing a reality where we don't see increasing funding coming into ICANN. And I'm using the word funding enough revenue because money is

much more closely connected to your decisions than you might think. If you actually – if you go through the budget we - and line by line you will see there is a direct connection with the support of the community and where we use the money that is provided to us.

That's why we exist to provide services to you. So I'm, you know, we are not in a - we still the budget cycle for FY '19 we expected \$135 million in funding which is a fair amount of money.

But I think - so I think about it - I think about it for sort of two (unintelligible). It's I think it's time for us or you to start thinking about what is the core, what are we supposed to do, what is the most essential?

And that's why we also provided with you more information in the budget. We added more narrative. We added our proposals for where we wanted, you know, the sort of most strategic important things we think to be debated by you and so we can have that - and I know it's hard to have that conversation because you will have - (unintelligible) this is this is the most important thing to do and no, this is the most important thing to do and there is no agreement because this is the amount of money we now have.

But I think that we've grown up enough to sort of have that balances. That means that we have to question things. We have to question some of the things that we take for natural because now we have to attach a bill to it as well. We - you know, I'm - sometimes when I say those things I know that people think but I'm now going to make a judgment.

I'm not making a judgment. I'm just saying that, you know, for instance the fact that we move around the ICANN meetings in the world, that's a decision



by you. To go to some places it's much more expensive than to go to other places.

For instance going to (Kyoto) -- and I'm really looking forward to it myself personally -- the translation cost increases a lot because we always - we have a decision that where we translate for the local participants as well which means we add on Japanese and there are - it's expensive to be there.

Traveling is expensive but we still go there. And that's a good thing I think. But then we have to think about what - is that more important than anything else and that's just sort of dialogue we need to find to each other.

And we can always debate, you know, we're going to have, you know, if you take the - you know, we will spend enough - the same amount of money more or less on traveling but because of the expense of going somewhere we can't ship as many. And those kinds of discussions we sort of have to have to balance with each other what is the most important for ICANN to do.

So it's not a fruit basket discussion. It's not like I have an enormous pile of money where I sit in the office and I distribute and free willy every day. The money are locked up in promises to you. We have to discuss what we're supposed to deliver. It's an overarching question, it's a fundamental question, it's a systematic question.

Community has a veto power in many of those questions because we cannot, you know, even after the budget is taken the empowered community has a right to look at it again. You have an obligation because of that as well to look into it. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes go - so we have another question on the capacity building and then we will go to general question until 2:30 which is in six minutes. Go ahead Ayden.

Ayden Ferdeline: Thanks Farzi, Ayden Ferdeline, NCSG. Thanks for joining us today. And I was really I guess inspired by your comment just in that we have question things. And I think that's great and we do need to question things.

And I know that whenever I'm on a different social media platform and I see posts by ICANN account there often seems to be a presence of ICANN staff at different conferences. And it's not always immediately obvious to me why ICANN would be sponsoring this event in Belarus, in Thailand and wherever.

I have actually been counting and it's generally four - three to four programs a week that ICANN is hosting around the world often with a very loose connection to the domain name system. And so I really wonder about that.

So I wonder both about the capacity building for the community and how ICANN internally assesses its effectiveness but I also wonder a lot about the external engagement that ICANN does and what controls are in place, how, you know, how judgments are made as to whether or not it makes sense to send multiple ICANN staff is there.

So if you could speak to that please just about measuring effectiveness or of capacity building in general I'd appreciate that. Thanks.

Göran Marby: In the ICANN strategy it says that we have to be - we have to globalize our self. And that's what is global. It's sort of hard to define. And domain name system doesn't exist just in free space. It actually exists - there has to be networks there. The has to be - I - my way of saying this is that ICANN is not

the Internet but we do provide the most common user interface to the Internet for the domain name system.

So we are often in places where we're seen as a part of something else. One I think that we all believe at least I believe how important it is to bring that notion of diversity into ICANN's world. I don't know how many different countries we are representing in this room right now.

Most people of the world doesn't have what we're having, you know, sitting in a room with a Wi-Fi connected with a high-speed Internet or a functioning sort of surrounding with this.

We're often part of discussions where, you know, they are the beginning of this sort of Internet. We, you know, for us, you know, I've been – I've used Internet since 1992. I'm sort of done.

But in many, many countries around the world who doesn't even have been English as a notion they, you know, this thing to read from right to the left with a . somewhere for many of those users, potential users of the Internet it's essential that we help them to do that.

I don't know how to calculate the efficiency in our mission. I've - I had never figured it out. So the way we do it is that you know about what we're doing and you can ask the questions.

And we can always think to ourselves and say that, "Okay that was maybe not the smartest thing to do but we did it for a good cause." But anything we do, we report back and we try to translate that back and we tried to work with local parties to do that.

And what I have I actually have a very good job. I enjoy my job. When I come out sometimes and I speak to people in countries that I've never been exposed to before and I hear some of the stories what the change Internet can do -- and we are not the Internet but we are helping them to get access to information -- it makes me really proud to be in this environment.

I don't have to do that in Washington because they sort of it's already fixed. I don't have to do that in my home country Sweden where we now have 300 people are called excess Internet and we think that's a problem. Basically true they're doing a law that is against a law not to have Internet access, yes.

But there are many places in the world they've not even -- they talking about issues that is so different from ours. And we also have to be respectful of we have something to learn. And often we're there to learn to make sure that those (impressers) comes back. But I want, you know, I want to jump on something and just finish this off.

One of the things we are looking at is how many people we have in the room to be honest. So for instance this time too we're going to do something dramatic going into the next ICANN meeting. I'm only sending 177 people to support the ICANN meeting but 177 only.

In Abu Dhabi there were 200 and something people because we have and I about it, you know, start of it we have a lot of IT. Every time you walk into a room you have IT sitting there. Then you have translation sitting there. That you have some - actually an administrator in the room was there in the first place so you have coffee and everything else going around there that looks sort of logistics of it.

And then my team actually have to sleep sometime so sometimes your meeting starts at 7 o'clock so we have to be in the room like 5:30 to 4:00 to 6:00 to set everything up and then they work half day and then they go to sleep and we have some other team coming in.

And then we have the fantastic people of David policy team are actually sitting around and writing notes and making sure that a meeting runs smoothly are (unintelligible) based. And then we make sure that you have dinner in the evening and we do all of the logistics. So that takes a lot of people as well to do those things and we do them gladly because it's our job.

But when you have more sessions we have to be more people. The thing I'm only sending 177. It's a good thing we also hire some local support as well to help us. It is a big machine that we are trying to help us because it's our job. Efficiency is not what we're looking for because that's a business expression. We're trying to provide the best support we can give to you in any given instant. Do we fail, yes. But I would say speaking on behalf of my team we tried to do the right thing.

Farzaneh Badii: We came to the end of our session. Thank you very much Göran and John and others who took the time to attend this session. And we really appreciate that. With that do you have any remarks? Okay so we can adjourn. Thanks.

Göran Marby: Can I say thank you? It was fun.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes sure.

END