
ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO Council Wrap-Up
Thursday, September 22, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 KUL

ARIEL LANG:

Hello, and welcome to the GNSO Council Wrap-up session. Please note, this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Standards of Behavior. During this council working session, priority will be given to questions or comments submitted in the chat by counselors.

Counselors, kindly state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace, and then mute your microphone when you are done speaking. This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official nor authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I'll hand the floor with its Sebastien Ducos. Please go ahead.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Hi, everybody. This is Sebastien Ducos, and we are in our final meeting for this ICANN for the GNSO in our wrap-up session. We don't typically run a roll call in these sessions, so with that, I hope that everybody was able to check the agenda.

I saw some comments coming through, particularly in terms of volunteering for certain positions, but I want to make sure that everybody is able to add particularly AOB, if anybody wants to add one right now before we proceed. Again, this is the wrap-up session, so [00:01:56 - inaudible].

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien, this is Natalie, Paul has his hand up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see that and I'll let Paul to take the mic, but I can't hear him.

PAUL MCGRADY: Oh, thank you. Sorry, I didn't hear you say that. I just have a question about number two, which is I don't see a GGP liaison on there. Are we having one of those? I sent an email earlier indicating that I would be happy to serve, but I don't see it on the list. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So I'm hearing and understanding my audio is not great. Can somebody from staff answer Paul there and I will switch internet very, very quickly.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Paul. This is Steve from staff. Maybe it's not for me to answer, but I don't see any harm in having a liaison from the council. So I can add it right now, and if anyone objects to the-- I don't see why anyone would, so thank you, I guess is what I would say.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Steve.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. I hope you can hear me now? I'm seeing the screen moving and everything, but I can't hear a thing, so I don't know if it's because all mics are muted. Audio's good, says Merike. So, perfect. I guess that Steve entering the role of liaison for the GDP in noting Paul's name has resolved this issue.

So, we're going to go through all the positions that are open. Not all the position need to be filled immediately. If we can't find somebody today, we'll send it to the list, but we have already a

number of them that are being filled, just wanted to have that noted.

So for the first one, the registration data accuracy scoping team, unless anybody is aching to raise their hand for it today, I would suggest that because first and foremost, we need to find a new chair for this, we can park this for today.

So, again, if somebody in the room is really thrilled by the idea of doing this, and I'm sorry I'm not diminishing it any way, but if anybody's interested, I'm ready to take it. No emergency here that I see.

The second one, so for the CCOICI, indeed Olga Cavalli was chair and she is moving to a new role, but has confirmed to me that she's willing to stay to finish on the worksheet through assignment. It's on the one item left if I remember well.

So thank you very much, Olga, if you're here and we'll see how we go afterwards for the role, but right now, Olga's there. The EPDP on IDNs, [00:06:09 - inaudible] was the liaison, I suppose that you are still on, but an audited chat would be fantastic.

The PDP on transfer policy which was with Greg, same thing. Greg, if you can confirm that you're happy to stay, I see your hand up.

GREG DIBIASE: Oh, sorry. I was actually planning on stepping down from that. I was seeing if one of my registrar counselors was interested, but if anyone else's speak up. If not, I'll circle back. Anybody? Okay. I'll stay for the time then.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: We will circle back in. We'll circle back in the list, and thank you, I guess Steve for noting this down. The IRT on registration data policy implementation. So that is essentially the SSAD Light, and now the WDS, whatever name it will have at the end.

I'm happy to stay on. I'm actually committed to the small team that I would -- oh, no, sorry, sorry, we're talking about something different. We're talking about the IRT which is in the closing phase in the sense that it's on the public comment right now. So I'm happy-- yes, sorry, I got it wrong.

I'm happy to stay on that, assuming that it won't run for much, much longer hopefully, because it did run for very long. The GNSO Standard Committee on ICANN Budget and Operations, and so that's part of a later discussion, I think on item seven. Yes, exactly. Thank you, Steve.

So indeed, Philippe was [00:08:36 - inaudible], but I think that we have somebody new to do this. If John wants to confirm -- Greg, your hand is still up, but I assume that it's an old hand. So John

McElwaine, do you want to confirm that you're ready to do this?

John, I see your hand up. Please.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Yes, Sebastien. John McElwaine for the record. So as Osvaldo has volunteered to be a part of that and I put into the chat, I'm definitely willing. That was my offer to whoever was going to be involved in that committee was that I, having been on it for a while, and it's pretty technical, I would stay significantly involved to help get that person up to speed. So I'm definitely still willing to do that, but I know that there'll be some additional discussions about the structure of that committee later on. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, John. The standing selection committee. So it will need to be except you're still a member of the council leadership. Greg, John, I'm looking to you guys to fill this in. Again, if nobody's rushing to the mic for this, we can resolve this after the call. I see no answers. The GNSO Council liaison to the ccNSO, so that was me and I wanted to step down for it.

We received an email from Desiree volunteering to take that seat. I think that you will be a fantastic liaison. They're good bunch of people. I really enjoyed working with them, and I can say that

you'll find a place there. So if we can put that in, Desiree, are willing to confirm that you're good for it?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC EVANS: Yes, this is Desiree for the record. Thank you Sebastien, and I confirm I'm happy to take that on. I'm familiar with ccNSO and I think it would be very good to take that role on.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, thank you. That's exactly why I think that you would be great. There's a caveat about it. The last two liaison ended up as GNSO chairs, so watch out. The GAC liaison, so Jeff has been confirmed. We discussed this two days ago, or whenever it was, so I'm getting dates all messed up. So this has already been confirmed and there's a process there that we discussed for the future. Jeff, are you also willing to continue with the SubPro ODP?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: This is Jeff Neuman. Yes.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. There was also on the mailing list, Anne offered her assistance, and so maybe something to work out between you. I'll leave Jeff's name normally here, but I see Jeff's hand up. Please go.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes, thanks. So I believe Anne's referring to where we get questions. There's a small team that, at least for question set four and five, that helped out with some of the answers. If we do get questions, I'm happy to have Anne or anyone else help out. The GNSO Council liaison to SubPro ODP was selected by the Standing Selection Committee, so it's not something someone just steps into.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Clear. Thank you very much. Last but not least, as discussed earlier as I was switching connections, Paul McGrady offered to raise a hand for the GUP liaison. Indeed, when I saw you email Paul, I wasn't sure if we had that role, but if everybody agrees to it, then that is fine. I see Greg's hand first.

GREG DIBIASE: So, sorry, going back to the GNSO Standing Committee, that's needs to be an ExCom member. I volunteer for that one.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Greg. Thank you very much. Then I see Sarah's hand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes. Good afternoon. It's good morning here. I just wanted to clarify that when Natalie had gone over various small teams with me in orientation is when I noted that there was a small team dedicated to communications with the ODP, and although I think there probably aren't any outstanding questions but there probably could be in the future. I wasn't trying to replace Jeff, certainly not.

I am ultimately interested in acting as council liaison to the IRT in part because this is an area where I at least have some background in terms of having been active on the SubPro. So as Jeff was saying, yes, we hope that will kick off soon, so.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Well, thank you very much for the pre-volunteering.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sometime next year.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Hopefully. Let's work on it. Well, thank you very much for the pre-volunteering, and that was noted. As just said, when questions appear, we bank on a small team to answer them and your name will definitely be on there. I guess this closes this question, so that leaves Registration Data Accuracy, but we said they wasn't

urgent. It leaves Transfer Policy Review. So Greg's seat there needs to be replaced. We'll find a replacement as soon as possible. Jeff, your hands up? No, your hands is down. Marika, your hands up.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, thanks Sebastien. We haven't added it here, but I just wanted to maybe mention it because, of course, in relation to the Registration Data Accuracy scoping team, there's also the question of finding a replacement chair. That maybe partly dependent on what the council decides on the recommendations, but I just wanted to flag it.

I think the last time around we did go through an expression of interest process, which, of course, took some time to put out, get people to respond to, and I think council leadership then reviewed applications, which I believe was only one. So that may also be something to factor in as the council considers that topic.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. This I guess closes this particular topic and is, I see no further hands on it. I think that we can move to item three in our agenda, which is the Whois Disclosure System. So, very briefly, and I don't want to get too much into the weeds with us here.

As we [00:17:49 - inaudible] off and as everybody was traveling or getting about to start, we had a session on Saturday where a number of issues were uncovered. I honestly think that we're not very far, the paper that staff produced, the work they did was fantastic.

There may have been a few assumptions that were taken and that are not in line with the thinking. The whole exercises is to try to find that sweet spot where requesters and contract with parties, registrars mainly in the first stage or solely in first stage have a tool that is workable and that is acceptable, otherwise people are just not going to use it.

At the same time, a tool that brings the data that we need to find out and be able to gauge the interest for such a tool in the community and the usage and all these things. Then do that safely and legally taking in view of GDPR.

After all the work done on GDPR, we're not going to start hoarding data just because it's fun to have it. So we needed to do it in a responsible manner. So this is essentially what the team has been trying to figure out with-- the small team has been trying to figure out with the staff, Eleeza Agopian and team to try to find that sweet spot this week.

We're not entirely there, but I'm hopeful that we'll find that. There are also a number of things that people have raised them

and wanted to see in the tool, and that we'll have to agree to postpone into another phase. Again, the idea is to have a tool, let's say in the next year, but understanding that then that would be an iterative process, that that tool would be there feeding us back with information, and that yearly we'd be able to go back and add features and et cetera, if that's still the plan.

So finding out everything that needs to be in there on day one, everything that can wait a bit, and making sure that we stay within what staff is willing to commit to roughly within the budget that they proposed and roughly within the timeline, which are pretty much the same metric as a very large portion of that budget is based on development time.

Now we are as a small team, still agreeing to coming back to council by the next meeting with recommendations, that the recommendations may not be to go forward. The recommendation may be to not go forward or may be that we need more time.

I want to make absolutely sure with the small team that if we need more time and clear timelines are given for our benefit, but also for the board and staff, and in order to have something to present on the 20th of October which our next meeting, we have a 10 October deadline.

I'll work with a small team in preparing those recommendations. I will ask all counselors to liaise with their group, liaise with their representative on the small team, and in many cases these are not counselors, just so that everybody's on the same page and the small team gets fed back all the information that needs to come back from the community now.

We will then prepare the recommendation for the 10th of October in discussion also with our policy staff, our GNSO policy staff. I think that we really want to meet that deadline of the 10th of October in order to have a resolution to work with by our next meeting on the 20th.

Again, I don't preempt that resolution may be, but I do want to have that in order to move forward, or, sorry, not to move forward, but to have something formal and decisive to send back to the board in particular and staff too. I think these were all the points that I noted for this. If anybody that participated in these discussion this week wants to add anything, I'm happy to. Greg, please go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE:

Just real quick on things that might impact timing. The registrars are figuring out a time to meet with staff to go over operational issues. We're trying to do that as soon as possible, but scheduling with the big group may be difficult, but we're looking in the next

couple weeks. I don't know if that brings us within the October 10th deadline.

Then we're also kind gauging interest or doing our best to gauge interest because the small team decided that's a pretty important input when we do go back to council on whether the registrars can give us an idea of if this is something they would participate in. So, just flagging those things, hopefully we can resolve them fast, but they do factor into the time consideration.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yes, that's absolutely understood. Again, our resolution might be to say we're not ready to take a decision by October 20th, but we will be by whatever dates in the future. So don't wait until the 10th to have that meeting organized. The earlier the better, of course. That's understood and noted. Thank you, Greg, for reminding us. Anything else on this topic? Then, I'm happy to close it. Topic four was to see if we need to have a call of volunteer for the GAC Communique. Jeff, your hand is up for that.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yes, thank you. Not sure why it was crossed out, then I can't really read the full note there. My assumption is it says, I don't believe there's advice, right? Okay. So I'm going to bring up the same comment I bring up every single time.

Ultimately, it's the council's choice as to whether to respond. Historically, the council has only responded officially to advice, but that being said, we have the option as a council, I should say, you have the option as a council to respond to other sections of the Communique, for example, issues of importance or whatever they have in there.

I would strongly urge this council to, if there are items in other sections of the communique that they may want to respond to, that I would help you do so obviously as the liaison. Whether this council feels the same as other councils that they only respond to advice, I think that's a decision that this council should make, and so I was a little surprised to see it crossed out. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Jeff. So yes, indeed I was going to bring that conversation up. Yes, I personally, I have to be completely clear, I haven't read the document this time yet, so I have nothing to add to it, but thank you for bringing that conversation back. Susan, I see your hand up. Jeff, your hand is still up.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks. Susan Payne. So I put my hand up before Jeff spoke. So it was in relation to the same matter really, but it does appear that this is something that's been discussed in relation to previous

communiques, but it seemed to me that surely at a minimum, we would want to see what the communicate actually says.

I appreciate word on the street is that there's no advice, and I think that's correct, but there is certainly going to be language in matters of importance, and quite often, matters of importance are a reference back to matters that may have previously been subject to advice. So it seems to me that surely as a minimum, we'd want to have a voluntarily to look at this communicate and see whether we think there is anything that ought to be responded to.

For what it's worth, I would have thought that we ought to respond -- I would be surprised if we would take the view that just because there's no advice, it's not appropriate to respond. I would think it would be, we should look at the communicate and work out whether there's something in there we should respond to. I'd like to volunteer.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

That was going to be my next question, Susan, and thank you for doing so. So, yes, I don't think that the discussion was, we will not respond if it's not an advice. I think that the conversation was more then, if it's not, we'll respond in ad hoc fashion to those items that we see requiring our response. I think that's pretty much where we left it.

So, if you raise your hand for it, fantastic. I saw a comment from Steve saying that he doesn't think that it's been circulated yet, so let's keep an eye for it. Indeed, Susan, if you can take a first read and help us decide how we go with this, that would be fantastic. Marika, I see your hand up.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yes, thanks. Sebastien, this is Marika Konings. As Jeff repeated his point, I may also repeat what I think I've explained in previous meetings and just to give a little bit of background on where the review comes from. This was something that was developed I think partly in response to the work that the GAC GNSO Consultation Group did on enhancing collaboration, but also specifically a regress that came from the board for the GNSO to provide for the input on if and when GAC advice specifically touched up on items on which the GNSO has or had already developed policy positions or recommendations so that it would be basically a factual description or indication of what the GNSO had already done on that topic.

To that end, the specific review template was developed that they still being used, that very specifically focuses on questions such as, is this topic within the remit of the GNSO Council or the GNSO?

If so, what has been done to date, or what positions have been taken in that regard? Again, to be able to provide the board with

as well factual information on what, if anything, the GNSO's position or statements have been on that specific topic to be able to factor that in.

Of course, having said that, if the council wants to change that approach or wants to change its review template, that's, of course, fully up to the council to decide. Also noting, because I hear several people saying we need to respond, which seems to indicate more, we may need to respond to the GAC, and instead of responding to the board.

So again, if there is something different that needs to be done here, I think it's important for the council to think through who would be the audience for that and what would be the objective of that, and how to do that as well, because again, one point of thinking was in relation to the review as it's currently structured, it really would point to positions that the council has already taken and are agreed upon instead of trying to formulate responses in the form of positions or viewpoints, which, of course, is much more difficult to do and may not be appropriate either in the form of a response to the board, which again, from the council perspective should be on reporting on what has already been decided or documented.

So, I just wanted to note that, and hopefully, that provides some context to why the review is currently structured the way it is, and

again, allow the council to discuss and consider if it believes that approach should change.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for the compliment information. Tomslin, I see your hand up.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Sebastien. I just wanted to say, I support the current practice of responding only on items that touch on what the council has already taken a view on or has facts to share, and not items which the council hasn't yet had a view on and is documented. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much. Noted. Jeff, I see your hand up.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes, please.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, just go ahead. Briefly.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yes, really quick. Since Marika provided some context, I also wanted to provide some context that this item doesn't say how we respond, it just says that we respond. So if we're not responding to advice, then it doesn't necessarily have to be in the template.

I will say that some board members and certainly the GAC point of contact, which is Jorge or at least has been, has said that they would appreciate a response to items in other sections of the communique to keep the dialogue going between sessions.

Again, whether that's sent to the board or not, totally different question, but I do think that if there are areas in the communique like there were the last time that were addressed specifically to the GNSO, then to the extent, as Tomslin said, there are things that are -- sorry, I'm losing my words here, but to the extent there are things that we can report back in response, I think that we should, and then it's up to the council as to how and when. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Jeff. Yes, I think it's clear. Again, let's-- Susan, you raised a hand for this earlier, let's see what comes out, and then decide based on that. Susan, do you want to say this before we close the topic for [00:34:12 - inaudible]?

So, essentially, we're closing the subject, we'll see what the communique is and where we need to respond under what form and how we can discuss that then. Item five on our agenda is the public period is open on two topics. I don't have any personal view on this, but if any of the counselors has position opinions that they want to share for us to respond on this public comment, very welcome to.

I see no hands up. Is there any question on what those topics are and is there anybody maybe from staff willing to give a short brief on them? Maybe Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Yes, thanks, Sebastien. Not necessarily a brief, I can speak on the second item that proposed updates to the GNSO Operating Procedures, but I think you already had an update from Olga on that topic.

I think on the first one, there may have been SGC updates on this, but the question really here is, are these topics for which the council believes it as a council needs to provide input or whether it's best left to stakeholder groups and constituencies to weigh in on that?

So we just wanted to flag that these seem to be two items. The first one, holistic review, of course, that may also touch upon the

council at some point. Is it worth the effort for council to review that? Again, maybe people need some more time to think about that one.

On the second one, I think that's more particular in relation to the fact that the council will eventually need to approve the proposed updates to the GNSO Operating Procedures. So if there are any items in there that raise concerns or raise issues, it'll be really helpful if either the council or individual council members either through public comment or through talking to those that are participating in the CCOICI and the GNSO.

So I taskforce already relay that instead of waiting for those items to come to the council, and then identify that there may be potential issues or concerns. So I just wanted to provide that context.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you Marika, for the context. Regarding the comment you made and Paul also made in the chat, in any case, a comment from the GNSO council is only that comment from us as a counselor, it doesn't preclude anybody from commenting. There are names specifically, [00:37:20 - inaudible] remain with their own voice and able to comment.

If council sees in its own role as council they need to comment in their own name, then let's see. I have personally on those two topics this stage, no view either way. I guess that concludes item five. Things are going smoothly. I might even finish before the hour. SPS reminder. So we have an SPS session organized for 16th December.

Yes, I have [00:38:09 - inaudible] now. I should never talk about time until it's finished. So 14, 15 December, travel notification to be sent. I don't know if there's any more to be said. Staff, maybe [00:38:25 - inaudible], I don't know if there's more to be said or just invitation to watch your inboxes for that information coming. I see Marika's hand again.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Sorry for speaking so much and getting in the way of finishing early. No, I just wanted to flag indeed, the travel notices are coming, and just to note and think for those of you that may have participated in previous SPS sessions, we do intend to make use of the full three days. We may end a little bit early on the Friday, but that would only allow if people want to travel back late at night.

We do encourage everyone not to cut it short and have to leave halfway through the meeting because this is really valuable face-to-face times. So I just want to flag that we do hope to share

further details soon about the plans and preparations that are expected to be done. As I said, you should receive travel notifications shortly and we're looking very much forward to it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I see a question from Kurt asking what the status is with the agenda and the input that we've received. Do you want to talk to this?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, I can I speak to this, and really appreciate the input that we from several of you on the survey that we did. So, I actually sat down with Melissa this week who, as you know, will be facilitating the SPS, to think through how to bring all those points to the agenda and also look back and the original objective of the SPS.

So we're working on a first draft that we first of all hope to share with the leadership team to make sure that it aligns as well with their thinking and expectations. Then, of course, share it as well with the broader council for your review and input.

To a certain degree, I think we're thinking along similar lines as how the original SPS was structured, which is very much focused as well on inducting new members and making sure everyone's fully up to speed on roles and responsibilities and how things work, also spend sufficient time on team building, getting to

know each other, but also, of course, an important part on focusing the strategic planning, what is ahead for the year, what are some of the challenges that the council may need to address, and how best to do that. So again, that's at a very, very high level, but we hope to share further details soon.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Yes, and apparently there's also questions about booking flight and hotels and funded travels and et cetera, all these things just to make sure that it is shared well in advance to make sure that people know what to do. I, for one so far, haven't traveled on the funded travel, this would've been my first time, but it didn't happen.

So I'm always keen to understand how these things work, and I understand that they've evolved since we've resumed in personal travel. Any further questions on this? Again, watch for you emails, and I'm sure that all the information will be there and there will be able to fill whatever other questions might be.

I have to apologize also. I'm very bad at following the chat at the same time as the rest, so don't ever hesitate, and this is an open invitation to raise hands and speak to any comment you may have put up that I haven't seen. This is an ongoing invitation. Item seven. Item seven is on the SCBO.

I've discussed very, very quickly the other day about the fact that we were reviewing what we believe should be done about this. This goes also to the comments that we submit and the point that just made a minute ago about the fact that we have a voice like many other people in this community that allows us to comment, but I don't see that voice to be unique or allowed us or anything like that to just ask council.

We have some responsibilities and prerogatives and need to on certain topics when we need to. I mentioned earlier in this call, has been involved with the SCBO for a number of years and invited me last year to join it actually on a slightly misunderstood idea that I would stay longer than he would, but it turns out that our terms actually started and finished exactly at the same time.

The idea of passing the baton on this work to somebody to conduct it fairly well. As John mentioned earlier in this call, this work is actually quite technical. So the work of the SCBO, I'm not very familiar with, it's essentially the work of reviewing and commenting the budget and operation planning that is shared yearly by staff, by Xavier's team.

It's usually a thick document, there's a lot of moving pieces in it, there's a lot of information that needs to be digested, there's a lot of information that needs to be recouped from previous years. Xavier and team work on a plan that is a five-year plan that is then

reviewed yearly before the next cycle happens, and et cetera, et cetera, etcetera.

In my capacity as, I don't want to say co-pilot because I was barely a wingman there, it occurred very clearly as I was seeing it that this was a job that John did fearlessly, but pretty much on his own, or sorry, not on his own, with the great help of Barry who has a lot of the background knowledge with all the work that he does with all the project management tools that we use and et cetera.

It was very much the work of John who I think very much, but that's not the point that I wanted to make. Given the background, the information it needs to be, it's not the stuff that comes out of a committee, and worse, having a committee, several heads on it, seems like a good idea in the sense that you have so many pairs of eyes looking at it at the same time, but it just promotes the idea of having to comment.

You put people in the room and say, now go and comment, they will comment, and it's not always the need for an exercise like this. More often than not, I would say almost four years out of five, it's not so much about drafting new comments on a material that is already there, but on following up on previous comments, making sure that that whatever was commented before, it's been understood, reacted on, and so on and so forth.

On the other hand, the team staff, Xavier's team, finds themselves yearly going to every part of the community, doing the same dog and pony show, presenting what they've done, presenting what they're presenting and venting people to comments, and et cetera, which is fantastic, but at the same time, because everybody only has an hour to give them or half an hour to give them, at the same time, probably skims rather than goes into details where it needs to be.

Of course, they fill them, answer questions as they come, but they tend to repeat that same executive summary, which is probably not the best use of their time or the people that listen to it.

So, to this extent, we've been working on an initiative that in particular Steve and Berry from staff put long hours into to rethink the way we would be doing this, and suggested that we should indeed dramatically reduce the SCBO to the one person or maybe the two people then actually do the job rather than mobilizing volunteer hours to look at this work not in approval because most of it is what was happening as I saw it last year, and yes, spend time on this, but probably don't put all the richness that needs to be put in there.

Then have some coordination with a different [00:49:07 - inaudible]. This is not to say that we would coordinate the responses and the comments, but coordination in receiving the

information from staff in an environment where we could actually spend more time with them, ask the right questions, go deeper where it needs to be in a more efficient way.

So this is essentially what we've been working on. Again, and I want to voice this very, very clearly, this is not about council federating or aggregating all the comments from the different Os and Cs, I don't think that it shows any purpose. I don't want to see that, I want every part of the community to keep the voice that they have, but just rationalizing a bit the way we use staff and volunteer resources to obtain the same result or even a better one.

I want to also caveat in the sense that, as I said it, there's a five-year cycle, there are a lot of things that potentially more resources that will be needed every time there's five-year cycle is being reviewed and a whole lot less every other year for the four of the years where, where in my opinion, that heavy lift of new comments are not so much needed. I hope all that makes sense. So, what we haven't done yet is to go and socialize that with the different Os and Cs.

We haven't spoken about it, so we need to go in now talk to them and see how they see it, if they're interested in doing this or if we're just barking at the wrong tree. So before going and doing

that, I wanted to make sure that the council was fully aware and on board.

Now, again, as I said, when I speak, I'm having a little trouble reading and following the chat, so if anybody wants to comment or add on, I'm thinking particularly Steve and Berry, on one hand, because you've putting the long hours on this, and John, obviously, because you're our in-house expert on this. Thank you, John, I see your hand.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

So, thanks. John McElwaine for the record. Yes, Sebastian, you described that perfectly. As most folks know, the budget documents and strategic plan are hundreds of pages long. It does require having a historical view of everything, and it wasn't just me writing it, but I was doing a big chunk of it along with help from Berry and Steve.

So I think this all makes really good sense, and again, for [00:52:25 - inaudible], I volunteered to stay on and help get you up to speed if that's-- now it's changed if you still want to do it. Yes, maybe, I don't want to put Steve on the spot, but provide a little bit more detail if he thinks appropriate as to what this would look like going forward. Thanks.

STEVEN CHAN:

Sure. Thanks, John. This is Steve. You can put me on the spot, it's okay. So yes, I guess just to try to summarize what Seb or Sebastien had tried to communicate, or no, he successfully communicated. So what we are envisioning, at least from a staff side in consultation with Sebastien and John is, the SCBO, as it is currently constructed, phases out, and what it's replaced with is, as Sebastien mentioned, is a form or town hall where the stakeholder groups and constituencies can interact with finance in an aggregated fashion.

So everyone is able to ask questions and receive information in a really efficient manner rather than the road show that Sebastien mentioned. So the point that Sebastien made is really important is that this new form or town hall, as we're referring to, they don't draft comments, the ability to draft comments that resides with the stakeholder groups and constituencies and the council.

So the form is really just information sharing and knowledge sharing avenue, but like I said, the drafting comment is at the discretion of the stakeholder groups, constituencies, and council. So, the role of John in this instance and Osvaldo would be the council subject matter experts on the budget, and then they could basically put together a recommendation to the council whether or not a comment would be warranted.

Of course, then the council could discuss and agree whether or not they think it's warranted and then draft the comment. It would be only if needed, whereas in the current incarnation of the SCBO, Sebastien mentioned, it's a foregone conclusion that a comment is going to be drafted, and so now it becomes a little more discretionary for the council based on need. So hopefully that helps.

Thanks. Of course, Berry, if you have anything to add that you think might be helpful, that'd be great as well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Berry, I see your hand. Please keep in mind that we still have an AOB and four minutes to go and Marika was right, I jinxed myself. Go ahead, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Berry Cobb for the record. Just to follow on, I think it is time to evolve the group. As Steve noted, any kind of change from here doesn't prevent any stakeholder group and/or the council from forming comments.

I think one of the challenges in the past is that given the diversity at the council level, any specific items related to the budget or operating plan were at a very high level, and the engagement from the GNSO community members, there was a disconnect

between the council's remit versus what a stakeholder group or constituency might comment on. So, I think we're hopeful that this town hall format may break down some of the barriers or challenges that we've faced in the past. I'll stop there. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Berry. So, before I close item, I just wanted to make sure that having heard all this, is Osvaldo is still on board. I don't know if he's was able to nod in room or not, but I guess I'll leave it to John to confirm that. Which leaves us two minutes for the PP improvement, confirm the next steps. I guess it would be for you to take that Marika. I'm putting on your spot.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, I was just responding to Paul in the chat on another topic. Yes, I think on this one we just wanted to confirm, it seemed that there was general support, or at least no objection to this idea of scheduling a dedicated call or webinar to continue the review and hopefully agree on the next steps on these items.

So, we just wanted to make sure that everyone here is comfortable with that, and if so, we'll work with the GNSO secretary to see what an appropriate time and date might be factoring in upcoming meetings and other events.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much. Any comments on this? Again, it's hard when it's not in the room to understand if people are nodding or talking about something entirely different, which is also possible. With this said, it was our meeting for today. I will as I often do a copy of the chat to be able to read it and possibly respond to the things that I haven't seen passing by doing so in the last hour.

This I guess closes our agenda. Thank you very much again for joining and your participation and your comments and all the good talks. For those that are in Kuala Lumpur, safe travels, and I guess we can stop the recording. Thank you very much.

ARIEL LANG: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's Wrap-Up Session. Have an excellent amount of your days and evenings. You may stop the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]