

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona  
GNSO – NCSG Meeting Session 2  
Tuesday 23 October 2018 at 1700 CEST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:  
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Farzaneh Badii: (Maya), we will start the session now. Yes.

Okay. Thank you, everyone. So now, this is Farzaneh Badii. This is the second segment of NCSG Open Session at ICANN63. We have the NomCom Implement - what was it?

Man: Implementation Planning Team.

Farzaneh Badii: Implementation Planning Team. As I told you, NomCom went under a review and their recommendations under this group that looks at how their recommendation should be implemented. And it's, as I said, it's a very important issue for us because we are hoping that as a result of the - these recommendations when they are implemented, we won't be underrepresented on NomCom.

And the other issue that we have, we want a more transparent NomCom, and we want so many other things. So if - with that, what we're going to do, I will pass to...

Tom Barrett: Yes. Thank you for that intro. This is Tom Barrett. I'm co-chair of the NomCom Review Team. And we want to give you a quick update on where we are on the process.

We are following the Review Guidebook that the ICANN Staff has put together. By the way, I'm supported here by (Angie) and Lars. (Angie) has a handout for you that summarizes where our review is.

So we're at Step 5 of 7, meaning that we've gone through all the planning stages, we went out to an independent evaluator who came - who interviewed hundreds of ICANN community members, came back with a draft report or 27 recommendations. That went out for public comment. So we had a dozen public comments from various SOs, including this group here. So you guys provided some great feedback on our draft report.

The IE went through those public comments and decided to incorporate some of those public comments into their report. That was done in June. The review working party then started what we call the feasibility and initial implementation phase where we looked at each of the 27 recommendations to decide do they seem feasible, if so, what were the - perhaps a high level implementation look like.

So to give you an idea - I'm jumping ahead of the slides. I don't know if you have control of the slides, (Angie).

There you go. Perfect.

So the way this - the timeline works for the remainder of this review, once we finish up the feasibility report, let's say by the end of the year, we then present that to the OEC Committee of the ICANN Board. They'll then determine if they support that feasibility study and then make a recommendation to the board.

Once the board approves the feasibility study, we then go into what's called the Implementation Phase where we get into details about how to implement each of these 27 recommendations.

So what you have in front of you is what we call our scorecard. And could I just clarify how much time we have?

Farzaneh Badii: You have until 5:30.

Tom Barrett: Until 5:30. Okay. So we have some time. Perfect.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes, we need discussions.

Tom Barrett: Yes. Absolutely.

So I want to bring your attention to our scorecard which on one page will summarize all 27 recommendations. And we have grouped the 27 recommendations into five buckets or categories. So there's a series about skills and training. There's a series of recommendations about the recruitment effort. There's recommendations on evaluation, things related to the charter and recommendations related to how the NomCom interacts with the community.

If I had to give you some overarching themes about what's coming out of all these recommendations, I would summarize it in two or three ways. One is that there's a desire among the communities to professionalize the NomCom process, right? So that is we are trying to attract some high-caliber candidates to serve on the board, which is now a \$300-million-a-year organization. We have to appear to be professional from start to finish in terms of that recruitment process. Not only the outreach, but for example if they're not selected, how do we give them feedback on why they weren't selected and perhaps encourage them to apply again the following year. So

we need to - we want to get professional - become a professional recruiting process and organization.

Two, the NomCom is not very efficient. There's a term in the US called "Groundhog Day," which means that, you know that is a movie called "Groundhog Day" where you wake up every day, nothing has changed, it's just like yesterday, right? The NomCom is very much like that. They have no institutional memory. They have this mystique of everything is very confidential, including what questions they asked last year. That's confidential, too. So they reinvent the wheel every year. And very little share is done from year to year about what took place previously.

So to make it more efficient, we want to start to build up a knowledge base of non-confidential information and make sure that is shared from NomCom to NomCom. It can certainly be refined, but there's no reason for NomCom to reinvent itself every year.

But the other overarching theme here is how to make the NomCom more accountable and transparent. There are - just because of the NomCom, the fact it has no institutional memory, oftentimes it thinks it has to invent a new way of doing things. So it might decide we're going to change how we evaluate candidates this year or we're going to - we're not going to use that outside consultant for evaluation, we'll do it ourselves. And there's a concern within other folks in the community that they do that without any accountability. They don't give any notice that they're doing things differently. They don't get feedback from the community that perhaps we want - we need to do something different this year. And so there's no accountability in terms of what changes the NomCom might be doing from year to year.

So there's a desire for a consistent process, making sure the community is empowered community, has agreed to that process and it doesn't change - it's not changed by the NomCom willy-nilly from year-to-year.

So those are kind of the overarching themes that I think had come out of this review.

Peer group gave us some feedback specifically on some comments. So we could walk through those if that would be of interest. So for example, Recommendation 1 talks about formalizing a job description for NomCom members. And so the idea here is that anyone sending a NomCom appointee to the NomCom should understand - should make it clear to whoever is applying for that position what the role entails, what skill set is ideal for that type of person. They don't actually represent that SO, but they work in a personal capacity. But they should have an understanding of what it means to be a board member. And that's the type of person they're trying to select for the ICANN Board or for GNSO, et cetera.

Recommendation 2, which you commented on, had to do with...

Farzaneh Badii: (If I can).

Tom Barrett): Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: So Recommendation 1 was about diversity so that NomCom members should be - the appointees should be diverse. And when we say independent of the NomCom appointee, we have had trouble before that our - so NomCom appointees shouldn't - is not - sorry, it's not NomCom appointee. So the person that we appoint to NomCom, they - there's a rule that they should be independent, without - like free up interest of their stakeholder group or constituency representing - not represent the group.

That has kind of opened the way to arguing that our - the person that we appoint cannot really talk to us about issues at NomCom. And we had that problem before. So I wanted to know whether there was a definition of independence that's - there was definition of independent, whether you are working on this or not.

Tom Barrett: So there's two issues there. One is they are - they should not be coming back and reporting information that's confidential. So they shouldn't tell you, "Oh, these five candidates have applied," right? And so - and it's not their job. For example, let's say I served in the NomCom for two years as a contracted party, right? I can't be told by my constituency, "Hey, if there's anyone applying for a contracted party, you better vote for them." Right? So they can't give me direction in terms of what candidates to support.

So part of the problem here frankly is that a lot of the information that they might want to share is really not confidential. It might just be, so what kind of candidates are you looking for, right? What's questions are you guys asking of these candidates? Today, that's considered confidential by the NomCom. And so the other recommendation I've talked about building institutional memory, which suddenly force that information to be public and then obviously it can be shared by the NomCom saying, "Yes, this is what we're doing; you can go look at the wiki and see it for yourself." So there's nothing confidential there. And so they're not violating their confidentiality pledge because we force that data to be public.

That makes sense?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Tom Barrett: There are overlapping recommendations here. So there's even a Recommendation 17 of the charter that says, okay, we're happy with the diversity of the NomCom, right? Let's not try to change that. And so - and the reason I say the IE came up with that recommendation is that in the case of - my case, it happened from the Registrar Constituency, we only have one representative. You can't say you want diversity unless you're saying, okay, one year, let's say its male; next year is female and alternate. Or one year is from North America; the next year is from America. And the problem we're trying to impose that on a single SO is they run out of volunteers, right? They

have - their volunteers get exhausted and sometimes they have to beg people to take these positions. So requiring diversity at the SO level does not work well for some SOs and they can't always find people to fit the diversity that is required.

So you'll see diversity in two different places there.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Tom Barrett: That makes sense?

So some other questions, which I think was interesting, you talked about, you know, we have some charter changes. They - and perhaps they should be two-year terms instead of one-year term. So again it helps with the institutional memory. In fact, that would mean we want to stagger the election of the NomCom members so they don't all expire in the same year. So half of them would be one year, half would be the other year.

One of the issues which I know you're interested in is this idea of representation on the NomCom. You know, there's...

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Tom Barrett: ...specifically, you feel like Academia should have a seat on the NomCom.

So...

((Crosstalk))

Tom Barrett: I'm sorry?

Farzaneh Badii: We have only one (unintelligible).

Tom Barrett: Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: So the issue is that - Farzaneh Badii speaking for the record.

The issue is that we only have one representative on. Well not one representative; we can only appoint yet the one appointee to NomCom while the whole Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and it's at the constituency level even. So the problem is that other stakeholder groups have, you know, sometimes like four.

Tom Barrett: Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: So are we addressing that and how?

Tom Barrett: So you're absolutely right. You're not the only one. So for example, the CCNSO says, "How come we only have one while the GNSO has five, right, and why has the ALAC had five, et cetera?" So the recommendation which is under a charter says rebalancing is supposed to happen every five years. We recommend it does happen now. What it doesn't say is what that rebalancing should look like. And it's possible that the result is no change, right?

So rebalancing I think in our view means what criteria should be used to determine representation of the NomCom, right? So that's not - it can't be driven by this group. It has to be driven by the community. You know, who should be represented on the NomCom? And so we're not going to decide it either, right, because it's not our decision to make. So I think the recommendation is we should do a rebalancing of the NomCom. We agree with that. We don't know what the answer is. They might decide someone else isn't represented. They might decide, okay, let's add five more seats and represent five more bodies. Again, so whatever process that is, we agree should take place. But we don't know what the end result will be. The end result might be no change. There might be five less people. Right? Who knows?



Farzaneh Badii: Thank you. So when is this council or group going to be convened because...

Tom Barrett: The rebalancing?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Tom Barrett: So the timeline is we present a feasibility to the board. We say yes, we think we should rebalance the NomCom for that. One example. The next phase is what's called Implementation which happens after, let's say after the March meeting. And as part of that implementation, they'll take - someone will take this one recommendation saying let's rebalance the board and they'll have to say, well, what does it mean to rebalance - I'm sorry, rebalance the NomCom, what does that mean? So how long does it take for a PDP? I mean this is a community-driven process, right? So it's a cross-community process. They have to decide how should - who should be represented on the NomCom. Those - that can take a long time.

Farzaneh Badii: And when will it convene...

((Crosstalk))

Tom Barrett: Well, the implementation plan would start after approval by the board. So let's say - I think what I've heard, if we can get approval of our feasibility report - if we can get it submitted by the end of the year, it could well be approved by the March-April time frame, in which case you convene a working party or the implementation plan. This has 27 recommendations. So one of them will have to be carved off and say let's figure out how to do this one recommendation. I would say next summer, it'll be convened. And it could - my guess, may take a year.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay, thank you.

Tom Barrett: I'm just making that up, but...

Farzaneh Badii: Farzaneh Badii speaking. I will go to you, (Raul), but I had the impression that this was going to be prioritized and convened immediately after the approval because we have - the more we have been saying to the board that we are underrepresented, they say, "Oh NomCom, go to NomCom Review and just comment." And we have been commenting, we have been very active and it sounds very uncertain when this group is going to finish and when we are going to actually get the first (share at it).

Tom Barrett: Right. So just to your point...

Farzaneh Badii: (Raul)?

Tom Barrett: ...it has been prioritized. It's in our...

((Crosstalk))

Tom Barrett: It's our recommendation to do - to look at how to do a rebalancing. But I can't tell you what the outcome of that would be.

No, wait.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay.

Tom Barrett: So you do it.

(Raul): Okay. (Raul) for the record.

Yes, like (Farzi) said, as far as I know, the wording is that the rebalancing needs to happen immediately. I think that doesn't mean that there will be no change. It sounds preposterous. And also think of the rebalancing for - I represent NPOC and we were the only constituency in ICANN who doesn't

have a seat in the NomCom. And I actually talk to (Herb) about this and he thinks as well that there is an obvious fairness issue here.

Tom Barrett: Yes. Yes, I just want to be clear about our role, like we don't...

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Tom Barrett: It's not within our power to give you a seat on the NomCom.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Tom Barrett: Or give anyone else's seat on the NomCom, right?

((Crosstalk))

Tom Barrett: Even I'm not sure it's within the power of the - so the board will agree let's go through a rebalancing exercise. But the community has to decide. All the constituencies have to decide. They do their bottom-up, right, grassroots stakeholder consensus building to decide who is represented on the NomCom. I don't think one person is trying to make that decision.

Farzaneh Badii: Just to clear out things, the desperation is not addressed at you...

Tom Barrett: No, but I'm trying to give you - I'm trying to be realistic in terms of...

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Tom Barrett: ...there's no one person within ICANN that can decide this, right? The chairman of the board cannot decide this. The CEO of ICANN cannot decide this. This is not how ICANN works. Right? They can't make those kind of snap decisions. So it's not - it is being made a priority because it's being done as part of this review, but I don't know what the outcome of that would be.

And as you know, there're some things that go nowhere. Many working groups end up doing nothing. And that's just the way ICANN works.

So I want to set expectations that this could be a long process.

Farzaneh Badii: Go ahead.

(Raul): Yes. As far as I know, I think the - basically the best reason, why, I've heard, why NPOC doesn't have the seat in NomCom is due to the historical reasons, because it was only NCUC at the time. Perhaps, NCSG and NPOC were created sort of parallel in that first - the review previously.

Tom Barrett: Right.

(Raul): So that is really the only valid reason why we don't have a seat.

Tom Barrett: So as you know, other SOs have their own argument. So you all get to - you all get your voice. You all get to voice your opinion. And somehow the consensus is reached.

So - but we are - it is a recommendation saying we should do it now, not wait five years. So at least we'll get closure on this issue.

(Raul): And if I can just add one more thing.

Farzaneh Badii: (Raul), say your name.

(Raul): Sorry. (Raul) for the record.

If you're looking at rebalancing, I think it could be quite easy to start with nonexistent constituency which is the small or large businesses.

Tom Barrett: So, again, I haven't been through this sort of rebalancing exercise before. But if I had to speculate how I would manage this if I was, you know, chair of this group or the implementation phase is I would form a cross-constituency working group. And, again, we're going to come up with the answer. We need the empowered community to come up with the answer of what should NomCom be constituted on, what party should have a seat at the table. And as you can imagine, they all will have differing opinions. And it's not just the seat you're interested in; other people want seats, too.

So they - that has to all be considered as part of the rebalancing exercise.

Farzaneh Badii: Elsa?

Elsa Saade: Yes, Elsa Saade for the record.

So there must be a reason behind - a very valid reason behind the want to rebalance. And with those reasons, there probably was a certain amount of visions towards what the shape of NomCom will be. So do you have some kind of, like, visions that you are going to be providing to the review team that's going to be reconvened soon? Are there certain balances that you're thinking - rebalance strategies that you're thinking of? Are there certain shapes of the NomCom that you're thinking of going forward? Any recommendations?

Tom Barrett: I would ask you to suggest some. I would welcome your suggestions on what criteria or strategies you would suggest.

Elsa Saade: So just to understand, there is no clear vision or...

Tom Barrett: As of today, the working team in reviewing this recommendation, you know, they first decide yes, this is a good idea, we discussed that at length. We know about your interest or other interest as well. We - as part of our feasibility study, we simply say "Yes, this recommendation is feasible,"

meaning we can go through a rebalancing exercise. We also try to put down a high level implementation plan for every recommendation. Not in detail, but high level enough to communicate to the board how they might proceed with this.

And so we would - and so I know you care about this issue a lot. So we would welcome your input to help us put into that feasibility how you might implement a rebalancing of the NomCom.

So we don't have anything yet.

Woman: Okay.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you.

Tom Barrett: Yes, Lars. Go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you. Lars Hoffman, I'm from ICANN Staff and supporting the NomCom Review Implementation Planning Team.

Just to be sure that the process right now is essentially - the recommendation was, as Tom said, the NomCom should be rebalanced. No further details on that. Not to what extent of who should be more or less represented. And so the team right now says to the recommendation essentially that's a good idea or that's a bad idea.

By the looks of it of the discussion, the team says that's a good idea, it should be rebalanced. It is not the job of the team at this moment to determine how the rebalancing should take place. They do not have the remit to do those at the moment. Once the board has approved the recommendation to rebalance the team, then it will be kicked back to the community to determine if and how it will be rebalanced. At that point, obviously you as well as the rest of the community will be involved in how that should be done.

The timing for that will depend on how quickly the community works on that. So if you - you know, if there's a team that's put together and said, "Look, here's the first thing we should do and here's how we're going to do it," everybody agrees, then I - I mean, this is not my job, but I wouldn't see no reason why that couldn't be implemented within a couple of months. If there was a long discussion and nobody can agree, then maybe it'll be dragged out for longer.

But at the moment, there is no proposal on the table. And if there were, then the board would most certainly not accept that because that should be done afterwards.

Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: I was going to say we have to - we have (unintelligible).

Tom Barrett: So thank you very much. So as I say, we have - we're in the final few months of our feasibility report. There - I know this recommendation and perhaps others you're very passionate about, we would welcome your suggestions on how you might follow - what process you might follow to do a rebalancing. And we'll - we could - if it looks right, we could submit that as part of our report to the board. So we would welcome your input on that.

Farzaneh Badii: Thanks.

Tom Barrett: Thank you, everybody.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you.

So now we go to the Security, Stability, Resiliency Review Team. SSR2 has resumed its work I think in August.

Russ Housley: Right.

Farzaneh Badii: And just introduce yourself and that.

Russ Housley: Good afternoon. I'm Russ Housley. I was selected to be the SSR2 chair going forward.

And who's running the slides? Yes, I can.

So as we do this, I would like you to think about two questions or perspectives because we need your input. First one is, are we planning to cover all of the things you think we ought to cover? If not, please reach out to us. And as the material and focus of our team, what do you think it ought to be?

All right. So the agenda for today is what - where the team is, what our scope in terms of reference are, how we're going about our work and our timeline, our outreach and, as I just said, your input is requested.

So the SSR2 team was reconvened in August. And that is following a pause that took place in October 2017, so just about a year. At our first meeting after that was again August in Washington. We welcomed five new members. A bunch of other folks had left. And so we are - we now have a team that's fully up to speed. And we selected the leadership. We chose to structure as one chair and three vice chairs. And the review team sat down and talked about all the work and information that had been gathered up to that point. So that was part of getting everyone up to speed. And then we updated our scope in terms of reference. We updated our work plan and now we're moving forward with the work itself. And throughout the process, we would welcome more input.

So the updated scope in terms of reference were sent to the board in the SO and AC chairs in - last month. That link has on the slide if you want to see it in



detail. But basically it describes the focus of our work which is absolutely guided by the - our Section 4.6(c) of the Bylaws. It's very clear about what an SSR team does.

The scope in terms of reference includes the timeline that we are trying to meet, which I have on our later slide. It talks about the responsibilities of the leadership and the other members of the team, how we're going to make decisions and conduct our work, our commitment to that plan and to the outreach and that the work follows the Bylaws. And on the slide there I quoted a piece of the Bylaws that I think is a guiding piece here. I won't read it to you.

Next slide. I'm sorry.

So, the Bylaws says we have three things we must do and one thing we may do. The first thing is that we have to go back and look at the recommendations from SSR1 and how the implementation went and whether that implementation had the intended effect.

So that's the part of the work we're in the middle of doing now. But actually what we must do is look at ICANN's key security, stability and resiliency activities, the SSR activities and see how they're going. And we need to look at the activities that impact the stability, security and resilience of the DNS that is focusing on the ones where ICANN contributes to or facilitates that work. And then the thing we may do is look at challenges to the security and resilient operation of unique identifiers.

So we're hoping to do some work in that space and I'm hoping that the timeline allows.

So here's the timeline. As I said going into this meeting, we finished our scope in terms of reference and work plan and outreach plan. Here, we're doing face-to-face meetings, getting work done and engaging with the

community. Before the next meeting in Kobe, we're going to finish gathering the facts and drafting our recommendations. At Kobe, we plan to have face-to-face presentations of that draft report, engaging with everyone in the community.

Following Kobe, we will have the public comment period which is required by the Bylaws. So that's got to be at least 40 days. And then before the following meeting, we will have updated the document based on the public recommendations and deliver it to the board and present to the community the final recommendations.

So there's a bunch of ways you can get involved. We can share engagement session like this. You can send e-mail to the e-mail address on the screen with the warning that that is a publicly archived mail list. And there's a group that you can join, observers of the review team. All of our meetings are open. And if you send e-mail to the mssi-secretariat, they could sign you up to do that. And finally, there's a open wiki which has tons and tons of stuff in; tons and tons to the point you might not be able to find what you want.

And that's where we stand at the moment. If you have any questions, please ask.

Farzaneh Badii: Thanks very much.

Are there any questions?

Yes, (Amer)?

(Amer): So, thanks. This is (Amer). Thank you very much for being here with us.

Would you mind going back to Slide Number 7? Yes, there. I was wondering if you could take a minute to explain the difference between the second, third and fourth bullets because to me, I'm no SSR expert, but I'm asking because

it has come up in the context of the EPDP on the Temporary Specification for Registration Data and I'm just wondering what the distinction is between the second, third and fourth bullets. That'll be really helpful. Thanks.

Russ Housley: So basically what is ICANN as an organization doing is the second one. And the third one is how is the DNS itself operating in terms of the pieces of it that ICANN touches, the roots especially.

Man: And the fourth?

Russ Housley: And the fourth has to do with broadening it to be anything dealing with unique identifiers where there's a security challenge which would include IP addresses and so on.

(Amer): Would you mind elaborating on what you mean by broadening beyond IP addresses?

Russ Housley: No. Broadening is - and the first two seem to really focus on domain name-...

(Amer): Okay.

Russ Housley: ...related things and - whereas the broadening has to do with what challenges might come in the path that seems obvious or likely to the review team. So, is there a new kind of unique identifier coming along that we ought to deal with or is there a new security threat that we need to deal with, those kinds of things.

(Amer): And do you have practical examples? Sorry, I keep coming back.

Russ Housley: Not yet. That is the work that had not yet even begun when the pause happened.

Fair?

(Amer): Thank you.

Russ Housley: Yes.

David Cake: Just to offer a...

Woman: Your name.

David Cake: Sorry, David Cake.

Just to offer a practical example, one thing might be - there's a whole bunch that we should do with the DNS or the HTTPS. But maybe it was the sort of thing security team might look at as, again, an example. But of course I'm not telling you what to do.

Yes, (unintelligible), so having been on SSR1, you've got a pretty tight...

Russ Housley: Yes, we do.

David Cake: You've got a very tight - do you think your team is appropriately resourced? Do you think you're going to need, you know, like a face-to-face or something like that? There's a lot to do in a pretty short space of time.

Russ Housley: There's no doubt we will need a face-to-face between now and Kobe to make that schedule happen. We haven't figured out when or where exactly, but late January or early February would be my guess.

The resources, I think we have some really qualified people on the team now if they all have the time to do it, yes. When we got together in Washington, we all said, "Let's put together an aggressive schedule." Knowing it's an aggressive schedule, if we slip a meeting, we're hurting less than if we put together a leisurely schedule and then we slip a meeting.

Farzaneh Badii: Farzaneh speaking. I had a question.

So I wanted to know when you - so you - did you change the terms of reference from the - did you just resume or did you change the terms of reference from the previous one?

Russ Housley: There were changes but they weren't huge. We just made it tighter in terms of how the words in the bylaws are much - you know, it's like why are those words slightly different? Let's just use the ones in the bylaws, that kind of thing, yes.

Farzaneh Badii: Very good idea. Thank you. Okay. So I have another question which - so there's - so, of course, words of the bylaws have the Annex G1 and Annex G2 as well, which is, of course, in ICANN mission, are all the ICANNs in Annex G1 and Annex G2 related to the security, stability, resiliency or some of them are? Do you know?

Russ Housley: I don't remember exactly which of those sections but been reading 4.6 a lot which is about specific reviews and 4.6c is about SSR reviews. But basically, we are totally staying within the box defined by the ICANN remit because we're supposed to make suggestions to ICANN and ICANN's board not to - not elsewhere.

Farzaneh Badii: Okay. Great. Yes, thank you very much because I think Annex G, the G1 and G2 have some language about dispute resolution but I guess if they are not related to SSR, then you will not get it.

Russ Housley: Mm-hm.

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Okay. Well, great. Anyone has any question?

No. That runs really smoothly.

Russ Housley: Okay.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

Russ Housley: You're welcome.

Farzaneh Badii: I was so happy to see (unintelligible) - to see that you accepted...

((Crosstalk))

Russ Housley: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Farzaneh Badii: Yes.

Russ Housley: Thanks.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much.

So, okay, everyone, we have actually - we are going to start our meeting with ALAC at 6 o'clock. And because our room is really small, we should go to ALAC's room which is, (Maya)...

(Maya): Yes.

Farzaneh Badii: It's 116 at 6:00. And if you can go in numbers so that it wouldn't be just five of us there. If we can, like, be like eight, nine members to meet with them, that would be great. So at 6:00 in ALAC's room, 116, can we tell the remote participants? Thank you.

And, okay, so now at 6 o'clock now. I mean, it's not 6 o'clock, in 15 minutes. So you can just take your time. If you want to discuss anything, do you want to discuss anything or do you want to take a break and then just meet in ALAC's room?

You don't have (unintelligible). Wow. Okay, go ahead, Elsa.

Elsa Saade: Just some points about the outreach that I couldn't make before, I just wanted to point out the fellowship and the changes that they're doing to it and the fact that we will somehow have a say in what kind of fellows are going to be joining us after that review is done. So until due, we'd have more targeted kind of individuals from the fellowship who would join us and help. So I just wanted to point that out because discussions were just roaming around mentorship and all and this could be of added value to us going forward, the fact that the fellowship is becoming more and more precise. So, yes. Thanks.

Stephanie Perrin: Stephanie Perrin for the record. And I'm so glad to have this time because our current chair brutality cut me off when I wanted to comment on this mentorship.

That was a joke, folks. I think this is a great opportunity for us to specify what kinds of skills we're looking for, for people to have when they come in. Not that we don't want a broad full spectrum of people but it would be really helpful if we had people who had certain abilities already. We can try to explain what ICANN does -- you need a lot of help on that -- and we can try to bring people sort of up a bridge to get them so that they understand what's going on in the PDPs and we can show them a ramp, you know, a ramp in and a pass and what to read but we haven't got time to digest things. We are not lecturers in a university here, preparing PowerPoint slides. If I may have an old geezer moment here, in my day, you had to take your own darn notes at school. You didn't have a prof producing PowerPoint slides for you and

students stomping off and giving bad ratings if they didn't have slides. So there, (unintelligible).

But here at ICANN, I totally support what (Amer) said. We have no time to digest stuff for you. I'm happy to tell people what to read. But then when I take one look at it and it's 165 pages and they come back and say "Well, can you kind of give me a summary of that?" no, no. No, you got to read it. That's what the job is, you know.

So, yes. That's what I wanted to say.

Martin Sutton: Just a clarification that...

Woman: Say your name.

Martin Sutton: Yes. This is Martin Sutton for the record. That the GNSO representing a person that will go to this election committee will represent the whole GNSO. So he will represent all of stakeholders. He's only one for support organization. So, it won't be - I mean, of course, that person will be chosen by the council and will be very neutral and will receive inputs from all of us but we do not have a direct control over here in the business. It's not only (unintelligible). You will have to answer - I understand we only have one representative for the whole GNSO, not a representative committee.

Farzaneh Badii: Sorry, Farzaneh speaking. What are we exactly talking about? About our - oh, the fellow - oh, of course, yes, yes. I'm sorry.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, sorry, my bad. Thank you for the clarification, Martin, yes. Perfect. But still we can affect that, no? Yes.

(Colleen): Hi. I've - so this a comment kind of directed to the newcomers. I see, like, a couple of you all.



I think that it also is important to notice that the people that you see here right now are the people who are most engaged generally. So they are people who are a bit time poor. But the NCSG is quite big and it's not monolithic. So there are other people who might be - have more time like maybe people who are taking a break for whatever reason but who could tell you some points to engage and then there are like primers and other resources that are available.

And then I just wanted to echo I really like (Michael's) suggestion about shadowing. So if people can just kind of like follow you around at a meeting or just attend the different session and then having what we do as (Mike's) team sometimes that have asynchronous remote work time, so you can be on the Skype call or something and not necessarily talking but kind of working in the same space around the same documents. So if a question pops up, you can ask it in real-time as if you were in the same room. So maybe we could explore some of these kinds of options. That way, you could kind of be a fly on a wall when people are working and that might kill two birds with one stone. Thank you.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you very much, (Colleen). This is Farzaneh speaking.

I'd like to say goodbye because I have not - you're not going to get the time after. I like to say goodbye. So it was a very fulfilling year. Thank you very much. And I hope that - so I hope that you follow up on all these great ideas you have and just, you know, implement them and help Stephanie build NCSG and, you know, further because, you know, we did build it and the ones before us. But I'm very happy that we have a very wise and competent treasurer at the helm of NCSG and it's going to be a great year.

And, yes. And that's about it. Thank you.

END