
ICANN76 | CF – GNSO Council Wrap-Up
Thursday, March 16, 2023 – 13:15 to 14:30 CUN

GREG DIBIASE: All right, everyone, let's get this started. Can we start the recording, please, if there's a recording?

DEVAN REED: Hello, and welcome to the GNSO Council Wrap-Up session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud and put in the proper form as noted in the chat. Questions and comments will be read aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or 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 multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be

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.

removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.
With that, I hand the floor over to Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Hello, everyone. This is Greg DiBiase. Welcome to the last GNSO session of this week, our wrap-up. We have a relatively short agenda. Let's get into it.

So our first topic is the SubPro Small Team assignment. I've noted a couple of volunteers that have sent requests to join the team over the e-mail list. And then I think, Steve, we're about to send out a small team assignment form, do you want to speak to that?

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks, Greg. This is Steve, from staff for the transcript. There's a draft assignment form, it takes into account what the very informal pre-small team, I guess, agreed on to this morning—or discussed this morning, I guess, is maybe a better way to put it. So it's been circulated to the Council leadership team. If you're okay with it, I can send it ASAP. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, I'm okay with sending. I think, John, you took a look.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Yeah, I'm good with it with that one revision that we talked about.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Sorry. To be clear, this captures the first stage of the small team, the Triage stage.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Greg. Indeed, it's just limited to the Triage step. It doesn't include any follow-on steps at all. Yeah, I can send out now, if you'd like. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Do we have an updated list of councilors? Or do we need to discuss that now? Or maybe I'll say when should we stop accepting new councilors and decide on a final team? Maybe it's the question. Does anyone have thoughts on that?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. I would be straightforward. If you come into the group, you're really welcome. But we ain't relitigating what you guys have already decided. So I wouldn't put a bar on it. It's just we're not going to go back and repeat ourselves.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, great. Any other comments on the small team, noting that we have an assignment form coming out? We have a number of people that have volunteered. Sorry. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY: I don't know if we're using the Zoom hand raising or not. It's fine if we're not. I don't know if this is being recorded or not. So do we have a

roster of people who have volunteered so far, because I volunteered but other than that note from Susan saying that there was going to be a meeting, but no further information from whoever was running that meeting about where it was going to be. I just want to make sure that I'm on whatever list there is that staff set up or if this is being done by off staff. That is fine, too, as long as everybody's on that list. I'm not really sure what's, what's happening on that front. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Steve and Marika, do we have a list? Or maybe we can send that out with the small team form?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. We have all the responses on the Council list. I think we are intending to use that as our, I guess, signal that you want to join the small team. I can add it actually to the small team form for posterity. And we'll probably add it to the new Small Team Transparency section on the wiki also. Actually, that's maybe a better place to capture, now thinking about it. So we'll get it from the Council list and we'll make sure we add it to the wiki. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: All right, now I'm in the Zoom Room. Susan, is that an old hand?

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. I just want to quickly update everyone on what the pre-small team did this morning. Perhaps we were a little enthusiastic. But what we did do was just a group of those who had volunteered on the

list on the Council list, which is I think where we were all told to volunteer, sort of got together this morning just to have a preliminary look through the task. I'm really sorry if we didn't manage to capture everyone, it was kind of a moving process. I certainly didn't intend to exclude anyone. But the people who met were me, Kurt, Tomslin. Anne was on the virtual. I'm forgetting someone. Justine briefly before she had to go off and do something else. We also had got Bruna at the time. Subsequent to that, there have obviously been a couple of more volunteers on the e-mail list who post dated or get together.

But it really was very informal. We were doing just a really quick and dirty exercise of if we ran through the 38, do any of these look like—to paraphrase, there were a bunch of them that are quite tough, meaty questions that could well end up being meaty questions where the Board has to just make a decision. There are a bunch of them where we felt that there was more information needed, either we need to give clarification to the Board that maybe their interpretation perhaps isn't correct or we don't quite understand between the small group of us. We weren't necessarily all in agreement on what the Board's problem was. So there was a bunch where we think we might need a bit more interaction with the Board before we truly understand what the question is. Another block of ones which I think we've called application issues, but I don't necessarily think we finished the Triage exercise, if I'm honest. I think we could all do with spending a bit more time. We obviously have a bigger group now. We'll also have some Terms of Reference or whatever the document is called. But it was it was a really quick first pass just for us to feel like we were making some progress.

So I'm not in any way in charge. But I would guess that we'd quite like probably if we can to have a meeting next week while we've got some momentum. And I don't think it will need too many meetings before we've done that Triage exercise, but it's possible we might need to meet with the Board, either meet or have a phone call with or send a list of questions to, and then have a meeting with the Board on some of those where we're not totally clear what the issue is. Again, apologies to Paul, and if there's anyone else who inadvertently got missed, it certainly wasn't the intention to exclude anyone. We were a bit keen to kind of take advantage of being here and tried to make a start.

PAUL MCGRADY:

I had a beautiful breakfast by the ocean so I was fine.

GREG DIBIASE:

Sure. Thanks, Susan. I love the enthusiasm. I think that makes sense. But maybe just we'll make sure that in the next meeting, we'll be sure to recap everything that was discussed and make sure everyone's on the same page. But I'm assuming we'll do that as a matter of course. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE:

Thanks so much. I just want to express my appreciation to Steve for drafting so quickly for the assignment form that should be reviewed by all of Council. Also, I wanted to emphasize, as I said on the list, that I think that one of the first things that the small team does need to do is, in addition to getting the final approval of Council on the

assignment form, would be to review the transparency guidelines and make determinations about whether it's probably, if it's a very short term thing, which we all hope it is, maybe staff facilitation is the most appropriate on the Triage team and to talk about the other questions that are raised in the transparency guidelines. I think that should be sorted out by the small team even before looking at the categories that were proposed as "buckets". And certainly everyone on the small team needs to have input into those buckets and what they mean and what the potential issues are before we go further. I certainly support Susan's idea that a formally convened meeting of the entire small team for next week would be just great. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Anne. I think we're definitely on the same page regarding transparency, and that makes sense to me for something for the small team to address up front. Great. So it looks like we're formalizing this first stage of the small team. And there's eagerness for meetings, which I think is great. Any other thoughts on the small team before we let this bird fly?

Okay. Moving on to SubPro IRT composition. We had a question I think posed to us by ICANN staff. There's concerns about making this IRT potentially more efficient, given the very large number of recommendations that staff is facing to implement. One idea that was brought up, I believe, by staff was changing to an open and representative model as opposed to purely open model. I think that's right. Steve sent out some material on what that distinction means. Hopefully, councilors were able to read it since our last meeting, but I

think we need to open up the floor and decide what our recommendation would be so the IRT can get to work as soon as possible. Do I have all that right? So open the floor if anyone has read the document and has thoughts on whether an open representative model might be preferable to an open model in this specific instance. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Sorry, guys. It takes me a while. I'm actually not even at home. I haven't read the full document so I apologize. But normally, when you think of a representative model, there's votes or consensus determinations on things. That's usually not the case with an IRT. So, Steve, sorry if it's in the document, but can you just explain when the representative would be called in to action, if that makes sense. Just before you answer, I'll note that the IDN group is set up similarly but I can't think of a time where the representatives have been called into action yet. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Noting there does appear to be a pretty comprehensive list in the document. I'll let Steve possibly give a high level summary.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Greg. Thanks, Jeff, for the question. As Greg is pointing out, what Lars and team did was try to parse out the different scenarios where it would actually make a difference, distinguishing between the open and representative aspects. Once you scroll through the list,

what you'll see is that it's in very, very limited instances where the representative aspect would actually matter.

So if you look at the IDNs example, it's actually a good thing you haven't had to ask for the representative aspect, it's usually when you're needing to get to a point where you need official positions from all the groups. And so that's sort of the analogy for the IRT is that when there is, I guess, disagreeing about the intent of the recommendations, if that does happen, that's when the representative aspect would be called into play. So you're actually getting the positions that are the official positions of the representative groups. But just about every other instance, the participant and the members will be participating on essentially equal footing. I hope that helps. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Steve, that makes sense. This approach makes sense to me. I would defer to the staff document, but that's just my personal opinion. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN:

It's okay. I'm just thinking through it. It's different than when there'll be people at the end of this attacking it. It just scares me to do things that are very different. But if there's disagreement among the participants in ICANN, isn't that something that would normally come back to the Council as a whole? And then wouldn't the Council as a whole have to figure out how to deal with that, and whether that's going back to the original policy group or constituting a new one? What kind of disagreements are you thinking about that this would

apply to that would be different than the normal disagreements that have to go back to the full Council? Sorry. Hopefully, that made sense.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. Sorry for the dialogue here. I actually wish Lars was here. I probably should have warned them ahead of time, so not his fault, obviously. But just, I guess, to try to answer the question. Sorry. I just blanked. Can you repeat the question? Sorry.

GREG DIBIASE: Go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: I can restate real quick. Yeah. If there's a difference between the staff and what the IRT participants feel, if it's subject to interpretation, that goes back to the Council as a whole. And then the Council as a whole has a couple of options at its disposal of what to do. I'm just trying to understand the differences when you go to the representatives—and it's not a substitute for going back to the Council, I'm just not sure how that fits in with the whole [CPS] model.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Jeff. Essentially, that representative structure helps determining when something needs to be, I guess, raised to the Council. So if there is an issue that arises, that essentially helps get to a more efficient outcome of understanding when an item needs to be raised to the Council, if that makes sense. So if everything's going swimmingly, then you don't actually need to utilize the representative

structure. But it helps assessing the need to raise to Council. I'm looking at my staff colleagues to see if they agree. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. I would support any mechanism that make raising things to Council more efficient. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks. I do appreciate Jeff's concern as he's raising this question in that, I believe, unless my memory is very bad, that the existing operating procedures provide for any Council member to raise a policy issue at the Council level if that policy issue arises in discussions with the IRT and with staff. So that's actually what I was referring to in the meeting when we talked about the policy status review for the Policy and Implementation Working Group recommendations. I think that those procedures that are already in the operating procedures for GNSO would essentially—I'm going to use the word "trump" but probably not—take precedence over this representative structure that we're talking about here, unless I miss my guess. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. I also want to note Justine's helpful comment in the chat that Sections 10 or 11 are what's proposed in the document from Lars. John?

JOHN MCELWAINE: I think the intention to this is to make sure that with a representative nature that all the various constituents of the community are involved

in this type of decision-making. So it's not going to look any different. In other words, a participant is going to raise an issue with the work of the IRT. But then if that boils up to the level of needing to have Council intervention, discussion, etc., it's going to be at a representative level, so that we're bypassing the situation where it kind of gets worked out. And then another constituency comes up with a problem or an issue with it. So it's intended, I think, to just make sure that there is widespread community resolution of any disputes.

GREG DIBIASE:

Steve?

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Greg. I think what might be helpful is to take one quick step back and look at the IRT guidelines as they are now. I might be testing my memory, but the way that I understand it is the IRT itself needs to agree that an issue is essentially an impasse, that staff and the IRT members can agree on the implementation and maybe the intent of the recommendations. Then the liaison takes the item off to the Council for discussion. Hopefully, that serves as good context. Now, when you think about what Lars and team are proposing, which I would just add it's draft. If the Council doesn't want to do this, they're fine, but it was a suggestion to potentially make this more efficient.

So stepping back, what I was just talking about, the idea is that to try to assess the level of support to bring an item to the full Council, that representative structure is intended to make that more efficient. I think that at its core level, what they're trying to do with thinking a

little bit outside the box with the structure, which it seems to sort of align with the way that the IRT guidelines already work anyway, it's just a different way to structure the membership. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Steve. Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. Last comment on this. In the Registry Stakeholder Group last time around, the Registries created an applicant group to try to get applicant concerns voiced. Applicants are not an official stakeholder group, constituency, AC, or anything like that. I don't know how to solve this and I don't know how we would find someone to represent applicants, but I think that applicants should have a voice even though they're not considered a constituency or stakeholder group or something like that, because they tend to look at issues from a very different perspective. So yes, I understand applicants can join as participants. And that probably will be okay if the group does really consider everyone's opinion and take it into consideration. I just want to bring that up because, like I said, the Registries have done similar things to make sure applicants' voices are heard. Perhaps we should just make note of that and try to, in the deliberations, make sure that their voices are raised.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Jeff. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Just for clarification, this was a summary that Steve had prepared of how this would all work. Could you just confirm that, Steve? Is that where this document comes from?

STEVE CHAN: The document that I was referring to was actually preferred by my colleagues in GDS, and I distributed it yesterday, I want to say.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Okay. I think that as to paragraph 11, it would be good to clarify that. There's nothing about that that overrides existing GNSO operating procedures because, as I mentioned, I think hopefully others can confirm, the truth is that this representative group could not prevent a policy issue from coming to Council's attention under the existing operating procedures. Because any single councilor can raise a policy issue. So this group, as far as I know, under the operating procedures, could not say to the liaison, "Don't take that to Council." Now, I absolutely am very much in favor of how the liaison role is described here to try to resolve things before they would reach that level. But there's nothing in paragraph 11 that should have the power to override the existing operating procedures.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Anne. I would doubt that's the case. But I'm sure we could make it explicit rather easily.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: That'd be a good idea.

GREG DIBIASE: Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Very quickly, when we were we to consider expert advice or external advice, who would we be considering what sorts of experts would be ideal for this, and under what circumstances would it be useful? I suppose this is, in some sense, directed to Jeff. But I would also like to understand if the Council has a position on this. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: I'm not sure. Is that a question related to the document we're talking about now? Is there a reference to outside experts? Or is this in relation to Jeff's general advice?

MARK DATYSGELD: Both. But I would say that when I read expert advice, I don't know exactly what is implied by that. So perhaps this is something Jeff would like to clarify.

GREG DIBIASE: Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Quickly, I believe the IRT guidelines general call for experts to weigh in. But I think there's a lot of things the IRT is going to work on like specific technical criteria or whatever it is. And there is some guidance in the SubPro Final Report on certain areas that call for outside expert

advice. Some of its already being dealt with in applicant support. But there's other areas too, I can't recall them. It's in the IRT guidelines anyway. It shouldn't take up too much time here talking about it. I think Steve can confirm. But it is generally in the IRT guidelines that outside experts should be called in, as appropriate.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Jeff. I see Steve is confirming. But that comment doesn't necessarily a bearing on whether we support this specific IRT doc?

JEFF NEUMAN: No, no.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Then noted, and bringing us back to what we came here is whether we can support this or not. Maybe I'll ask if anyone objects to staff trying this route. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: It's not an objection. It's just that with the friendly amendment, that the clarification requested in paragraph 11, that the representative model does not in any way override the existing operating procedures. Others, by the way, who were on SubPro will be familiar with this because we had to recite that type of language in the SubPro Final Report in relation to some other issues. Sometimes people aren't aware of what those operating procedures say. And so I would appreciate adding that friendly amendment that the representative

model is not intended to override other avenues within the operating procedures.

GREG DIBIASE:

Okay. I think we can ask staff to bring that back. That doesn't seem controversial to me, but if staff thinks it is, they'll get back to us. So with Anne's amendment—and I'll call again if anyone objects to giving staff the thumbs up to go forward with this approach. Great.

Okay. Anything else on this topic? Oh, sorry. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Greg. Will we get another document which relates to—I remember staff talking about parallel streams. Because I don't believe we've agreed yet on how many parallel streams we should have within the IRT. They mentioned three, possibly. I was wondering whether we'll also get a formal proposal of how many though the Council can allow or can support. Because, obviously, it's something that the constituencies or stakeholder groups would also need to probably staff and would like to consider how many we can actually practically work with in parallel. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks. I do not know the answer to that. I would assume there's not an answer quite yet because Steph was figuring it out. But yeah. So I'll have staff note that that is something we'd like more clarity around when it's decided that capture the issue.

STEVE CHAN: That's for the implementation team to develop. One of the things they need to do is develop a comprehensive implementation plan, and I'm sure whether or not it's going to be done in streams or sub-teams will be part of that. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks. Just clarification. So if we're going to go with the rep and open model, are we making a decision on how many reps? Was that Tomslin's question? I couldn't quite get because of the echo. So I think if we're going to go with the rep and open model, the Council still needs to determine what's the number of reps.

GREG DIBIASE: I think it's in the document.

JUSTINE CHEW: There is no mention of the number but there is a reference to the IDNs EPDP as a suggested model, and there it's up to three reps. Just clarifying.

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. I don't know the answer. John, Steve? I guess we need Lars in this room.

STEVE CHAN: I would just say that that's a good question. It's for our GDS colleagues to make a determination, I suppose, and put it forward and make sure that there's no disagreement with that part as well. So we'll make sure that your question gets over to our colleagues. Thanks for raising.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Justine. And then maybe we can leave our thumbs up as tentative, pending that information. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I was going to put my hand down. But I was just going to respond to your question, Justine, that it's sort of related because I was concerned about how many representatives can actually staff multiple streams in the IRT. So it's sort of related things.

GREG DIBIASE: Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: I think that Tomslin raises a very good point. And also, I know that a point that was made in the chat that Council should review this document again before final approval. Hopefully that can be done either informally so that can happen quickly.

But on Steve's point, I think the number of representatives in the representative portion of the model to the IRT is a determination that would be made by Council itself, ultimately, rather than be made by ICANN staff. So maybe Steve could work with staff to see what their

proposal is on that. I know the three sub-teams' idea is very much afoot and everyone wants to work quickly. So that would definitely affect if those three teams are working at the same time, as Tomslin points out, how many reps would be appropriate to come from Council to be able to work with those teams? So if Steve could work that issue with staff, and then come back to us with a document that's more final, I'm very happy that Justine and Tomslin have raised these questions here today. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks. Steve?

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks. Maybe to provide one clarification, first confirmation, I'm happy to work with Lars. They are colleagues and actually friends so that's good. So we'll be happy to discuss with them. But what I did want to point out is that before we get caught up in the representative nature, there's nothing barring staffing of these sub-teams, if that's indeed what they end up doing. Nothing's barring the open part of that from being inclusive of the much wider and broader group. So it's really, like I said, the representative structure only arises when there's something that needs to be brought up to the Council. So if you're just going about the course of doing your work during the implementation, this representative structure will not be relevant. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Steve. John?

JOHN MCELWAINE: So we made a decision but there's been no objection to an open and representative model, and people are asking for some additional details, it's maybe a question to staff, is what we're asking for really a draft call for volunteers. Is that the document that typically lays out what the group—how it will be constituted? Okay. So I think that's perhaps where we're at in terms of status. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, John. So I think we can probably defer that conversation to when we have that document. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. But I thought that document was just going to go out. I mean, I don't know. The point I was going to make was just that you only need one representative for each group. And that representative can change depending on when there's a need, if there's a need for representativeness.

This is sort of like backwards of what SubPro tried to do, which was when people joined SubPro a while after, we said, "You know what, it would help to have someone be able to speak for the group," and then that's when some people were nominated for it. I think this call should really emphasize the open nature, and then later on, it could say, of the people that join, each group should appoint one person, maybe even an alternate or whatever, if, and only if, the representative model part of it is needed. I think we're making a lot of it. When all you really need to say is at the time representatives are needed, which may not

be ever, that's when you have that representative. If we do it at the beginning, we're going to get into all these debates, whether it's one or two or whatever. That's just my proposal. That's what we tried in SubPro. But I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Jeff. Tomslin?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I just wanted to be clear that I wasn't actually referring to the representative model but only concerned about how many streams we might be interested in having someone present while the work is done. Whether it's open or representative, it wasn't of concern to me. So even in the open model, I'm still concerned about how many volunteers can be present from one constituency, for example. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Tomslin. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks. I don't think there's any limit on how many people from a constituency can be present in an IRT because that's what the open model means and what it calls for.

With respect to Jeff's comment, he's talking about the type of situation where the designated representative doesn't need to participate in any meetings at all and would just be called in in the

case of some sort of dispute. I'd like to suggest that it would be much better for representatives to actually participate in these teams and know what's going on and be present and hear all the debates before they would be ... There is a time commitment here to being a designated representative and keeping up with what's going on, and that that should be part of what we're doing rather than—

GREG DIBIASE: Anne, I'm not sure Jeff said that. Jeff, do you want to clarify? I don't think—

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, that's not what I was saying at all. I was just saying that when it comes time for representatives to be needed, that's when each group would go back and go, "You know what, this issue, so-and-so from this constituency has been very involved in this issue. This person could be the representative in that limited circumstance." It has nothing to do with the amount of participation. Hopefully, it's never needed is the point. But if it's needed, then each constituency or each group will know who is the best person that's involved in that work track or that stream or whatever. And this way, you're not designating at the beginning representatives that have to be at every single work stream at every single meeting. I just think it's a more efficient way to do things, especially if we're not really envisioning, hopefully—knock on wood—using the representatives.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Jeff. Desiree?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you. I think the last thing that Jeff just said has helped me think of it differently. Because I see that the open model would have an opportunity for more clarification if there is good moderation. So yeah, I'm happy to further discuss it. But I think this was something that has made me think that I'm preferring an open model.

GREG DIBIASE: Sorry, Desiree. I didn't capture the end of that. You're not in support?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: No, in support. In support because it seems—

GREG DIBIASE: Is this called open representative?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Right.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay, got it.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Okay. You got it. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Sorry. Thank you. Okay, great. Let us move to agenda item three, GNSO Council review of the GAC communiqué. I believe we had

volunteers to do this last time around. I can't recall how this works. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: I volunteer to lead that effort. The communiqué is still not out but it should be out very soon.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Mark. Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Hi. I volunteer as well. And just noting, I think—I can't remember which day it was when we met with the GAC. We got sort of clear indication from the GAC chair that they actually would welcome our input on the non-advice stuff, so on the matters of importance. So, hopefully that's helpful for us when we're doing that response.

GREG DIBIASE: Mark, is that a new hand?

MARK DATYSGELD: New hand. Yeah. I would like to reiterate exactly what Susan said in the GAC session. I think our vice chairs are present there. They were very explicit in saying that they were looking towards not only receiving direct input on the communiqué, but if the Council wants to express some other concern during that response, they would be willing to take it. So this is something for the councilors to consider if

anything comes up that you would like the GAC to know. Perhaps it's something we should discuss as this unfolds. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. I'm now speaking in my official role. Let's just collect some names, I heard Mark and Susan, and I'm sure there's others that are just not able to see. But of course, when that comes out, I'll help along the way and make sure that we understand what's going on. So, obviously, I'm here to help you guys do this. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Emily?

EMILY BARABAS: Thanks, Greg. Hi, everyone. Emily from staff. The leadership team is currently reviewing a new template document that we're hoping will help the small group organize its thoughts around those issues of importance and think about who they want to speak to, what channels might be appropriate for communicating that information, and so forth. So we'll share that with all of you soon. For those who may find interest in certain elements of the communiqué and want to be involved but don't know that yet, perhaps we'll also send an e-mail to the list after the communiqué is out and folks have had a chance to review it to gather any other interested individuals into the group as well. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Emily. Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. First, I just want to say I volunteered to review too, and second, I wanted to ask a clarifying question. We start with reviewing the communiqué, right? We don't start with the purpose of responding, that communiqué. We review and then if we see there are things we have to respond, we kind of respond. If there's nothing ... Because several times, it's always the points we have already kind of clarified and pointed out, then we don't really respond because there were records showing our attitude about it. Is that what we're doing on this review team?

JEFF NEUMAN: So to clarify, we do respond. If it's advice, we certainly respond even if it's just to point out the previous documents with our position. I think this is more to respond to what's usually called issues of importance to the GAC. This is up to the Council if it wants to say anything or not. I would argue that it is valuable even to point to pass statements, simply because all of this goes to the Board at the same time, and then the Board has their call with the GAC to go over the communiqué and our information would help the Board. I think Becky and Matthew also at the Strategic Planning session said it would be helpful as well.

GREG DIBIASE: Does that answer your question, Manju?

MANJU CHEN: Not really, because it's just what Jeff always said. I guess the point is we have to respond when we're reviewing communiqué, and that's good for me.

GREG DIBIASE: I think that's right. I think there'll be a small team determination. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Good point, Manju. But this time I think that they put a little more emphasis in wanting us to answer a thing that this is the message that at least I seem to get from them that they would like more input from us. So yeah, we move ahead with that, but maybe we try to see if we can contribute a little more. Otherwise, we just do it like, "Okay, we're okay with this. Here are the previous documents." So we're not going to try to find anything there. But if we do, maybe we show some goodwill as they're showing to us. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: I think that's something we can determine when we get the communiqué and review it. Anything else on the GAC communiqué?

All right, that brings us into AOB. Does anyone have any topics they would like to raise? Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yesterday when the CSG met with the CPH, there was agreement around the table that we seem to be seeing some more pragmatism inside the Org and get things done. And since we have agreed at the SPS that we will talk about some positive things every now and then, I thought that I should ask Council colleagues whether they think that we should maybe send an encouraging note to the ICANN leadership and let them know that we appreciate that there seems to be a little bit of a cultural change, that we're getting more stuff done, and that we applaud them for this and hope that we can keep plowing forward.

GREG DIBIASE: Any comments on Thomas's suggestion? Frankly, that makes sense to me and I agree with that sentiment. It does seem like ICANN staff and a lot of various parties within ICANN do seem to be a little more pragmatic recently. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. Yeah, I was in that session. I'll echo what Thomas said. It seems that there has been very good reception of this line of thinking, of this way of moving forward, and greater willingness for collaboration, I think. And this is something that we, as councilors, at the end of the day, we embody a lot of our communities in some ways. So it is something that is worth for us to keep striving for and perhaps discussing every once in a while how we can keep that momentum. But because it looks like we'll get more things accomplished that way even if it's from a pragmatic standpoint, not just a goodwill standpoint, we'll get more things accomplished if we follow this track. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. I just put a comment in chat, a hand on a separate topic and a proxy for Berry. So I just wanted to make sure that the conversation on this topic was done first.

GREG DIBIASE: Sorry. Thomas, is that an old hand? Great, I think that's a great suggestion, Thomas. Maybe let's start with leadership, thinking about a way to put that into writing. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: I think it doesn't have to be something big. If we make it too big, it sounds like these have been lazy bastards all the time and nothing got done. So we don't want it to have negative implications. Just a note of encouragement.

GREG DIBIASE: I'm not proposing a small team convene on this one. If, Thomas, you want to draft, that's a excellent suggestion in the chat. And you'd like to take a stab at the first draft?

THOMAS RICKERT: I was aware that this could happen, so I'm okay with it.

GREG DIBIASE: Sandbagging Thomas over there. Great. Steve? On to Berry? Berry.

BERRY COBB: Just very quick, all the councilors should have received an e-mail today to the topic that we had discussed from the town hall. If you can take action on that sooner rather than later, it'll be much appreciated. It's in the context of preparing for launching ICANN Join. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Susan? Berry, I think Susan has a question for you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Question for Berry, yes. Thank you so much. I'm really glad you raised that. We're supposed to give you our ID or something, and I don't really know what that is. I mean, is that going to turn out to just be my e-mail address?

BERRY COBB: It's the same e-mail address, user ID that you use to register for an ICANN meeting. There's screenshots at the bottom. So if you go to the link, it will probably pre-populate, but whatever e-mail address you're using to register for an ICANN meeting, that is your ICANN account, and that's the ID we need.

SUSAN PAYNE: Right. So it is just my e-mail address. Brilliant.

GREG DIBIASE:

Great. Any other business? Susan is that a new hand? Okay. Well, if no one objects, I'll bring this meeting to a close. I want to say, personally, thank you for all your support. This was a great meeting. John and I stepped in to help Seb but we felt very supported by all of you. I think it was a really successful meeting. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]