MONTREAL – Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils
Monday, November 4, 2019 – 12:15 to 13:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Monday, November 4th at ICANN 66 in Montreal. This is the joint meeting of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at 12:15 in Hall 511-C

KEITH DRAZEK: Good afternoon, everyone. If we could please start the recording. Thank you very much. So, good afternoon, welcome to the joint session of the ccNSO Council and the GNSO Council here at ICANN 66 in beautiful Montreal. We have quite a few things on the agenda today, so I'll just run through them real quick. They're on the screen in front of you. But the first item on the agenda is the decision making on PTI SLA changes, specifically around SLA IDN tables processing time. Next will be a discussion of progress to develop a joint procedure to initiate special IANA functions review.

Third will be coordination policy development efforts pertaining to IDNs. That's an important topic, and I can certainly provide an update on the GNSO side discussions on that. We'll discuss CCWG auction proceeds and progress to date; anticipation of next steps.

Next will be a discussion of coordination of comment efforts around ICANN planning, and that's the coordination between our respective sort of budget and operations committees.

Sixth, evolution of the multi stakeholder model. This is the effort that was triggered in Kobe, and basically a discussion of any anticipated next steps from the ccNSO or GNSO Councils on that topic. And then AOB.

So, Katrina, I'd like to hand it over to you for any opening remarks. Any thoughts? And if you'd like to kick this first one off we could do that as well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Keith. It's always great to be here with you in this room discussing things of common interest to both groups. I think that if we talk about the first agenda item I would like to give the floor to the current chair – interim chair – of the Customer Standing Committee, Lars Johan Liman, to give us a brief update on state of [them].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. So, my name is Lars Johan-Liman. I'm the interim chair of the Customer Standing Committee. And I've just entered into this role. So I'm just one month into this. I still have a very steep learning curve in front of me. So please bear with me.

The Customer Standing Committee is the auditing function for the naming contract to the IANA. And what we do is we monitor a number of SLAs, Service Level Expectations, or agreements between the ccNSO and the GNSO and the IANA, and how to perform in regards to this contract.

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

We have over the two, three years that we've existed identified a couple of things that need amending, and we also realize that sometimes new things will show up. So we have, in dialogue with the PTI, discussed changes to IDN table, label generation – LGR, label generation rules for IDNs. And there are times where these tables need to be updated and there should be SLAs around these updates.

So we have written a proposal around this. And according to the procedures for updating the SLAs that we have now in place since I think it's March this year we seek the approval jointly of the ccNSO and the GNSO for these new SLAs. So they have been submitted to you and you should have been able to take part and see them. So we simply ask you to endorse these and so we can put them into operation. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? Yes, please, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you for this. It was just a question. So are you expecting those changes happen often or just this one time?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The change that we seek approval to is the amendment of the SLAs. And I perceive that these changes will happen seldom. But they will happen over time, definitely. We already have a couple of technical parameters that we needed to change because it was obvious that the

SLAs were ill designed. They were paper products that didn't work in reality. And new things will happen. The contract will be amended, and when that happens we'll have to seek your approval for new fixed and fixed SLAs. But it's not something that's going to happen many times every year. No.

BART BOSWINKEL: There's one in the near future as well that's on the SLAs for transfer and delegation of ccTLDs. And this is now pending public comment and once that is closed, but that is a different SLA, so not the same one. So, but in the process in the two, three years that the CSC had been working three SLAs have been identified that need to be changed and this is one where the approval of the ccNSO and GNSO Council is required to implement it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, very much, Liman, and Bart, and Katrina. So, just to note on this one … And the GNSO and Council are aware that this has been the result of quite extensive work of the CSC. And we, of course, as the GSNO have representatives on the CSC. So this is not coming as a surprise to us. And it is, in fact, on our consent agenda for our meeting on Wednesday. So I fully expect that that will be approved. There's been no indication or question otherwise.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, very much. I also would like to thank Liman for taking this role from Byron. So I understand that it probably came a little bit as an

unexpected surprise. Yes, thank you very much for taking up on this role. I also would like to thank Registry Stakeholder Group for being able to find two excellent candidates to replace two members on the CSC. So the membership of CSC currently is pretty young in terms of time served on the committee, but I'm sure that they will come up to speed really quickly, and we'll keep monitoring PTI performance and keep reporting back to the communities. Not that there are any issues.

However, if in some point in the future there is an issue, for that, CSC has developed a remedial action which has three escalation steps. The first one to the PTI director, the second one to the ICANN CEO, and if the first two escalation steps fail they go to ICANN Board. And if even ICANN Board fails to resolve the issue, then this is actually when we, as ccNSO and GNSO Councils will have to come into play and decide whether we launch, or initiate, a special IANA function review.

So unlike periodic IANA function review, which is expected to take place every five years, this special IANA function really is triggered only in case of a standing issue. And for that we needed a joint consultation procedure, something, at least to my knowledge that we've never done before, so common documents where we agree on a common procedure. We agree when we do what, and what are the results of the outcome.

And great thanks to the GNSO drafting team who started working, proposed the first draft, then we discussed it with the guidelines review committee, or the ccNSO and I believe that the current document had been circulated, definitely been circulated … Well,

that's a good question; if I circulated it to the Council? Now I don't remember. I did? Okay, good. Thank you very much, Alexandra. She's one of our new members, actually our new member of the CSC. So if she tells I sent it, it's definitely there. So, thank you.

I saw Heather earlier today, but now I don't. Oh, yeah, Heather, is there anything you'd like to say about the document? We have a roaming mic.

KEITH DRAZEK: You can join us at the table also.

KATRINA SATAKI: Absolutely, yes. I'm surprised you're not …

HEATHER FORREST: Thanks, Katrina. Look, I'll just report on behalf of the GNSO drafting team an update, which is [inaudible] that a full description of the package of documents was presented to the GNSO Council in its working session yesterday. The Council has the full suite of our documents. For the purposes of this meeting, for everyone here at this table, really the only one of those that's material is the joint consultation guidelines. We have finalized those. There were some questions raised. I can say, Katrina, that the GNSO staff had liaised with ICANN legal to have the documents reviewed.

We got back some very minor, in relation to all of our documents, not just the joint consultations – didn't get back any feedback specifically

on the joint consultations. What we understand from ICANN legal is that the package had no inconsistencies with the bylaws, which is very good news after all that work. So the Council will vote on Wednesday on the full package to the extent that the Council feels like there are follow-up issues, or questions, of course, that might then mean the vote gets deferred.

But as far as the drafting team is aware Council has everything that it needs. We will follow up with some very minor stylistic notes than anything else that legal have suggested just to clarify the bylaws. But they're not material in any way. So I believe that that formally concludes, other than the tidy up, the work of the drafting team.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Great to hear that. Yesterday during the Council prep meeting we also discussed the process, the guideline, what is expected from us. Now, when we have this finalized version we have to follow our internal process, which is that we send to the community for them to look at it. And after we receive, hopefully no comments from the community, then we can proceed forward with approval at the Council level. So, thank you very much again for this collaboration effort. Definitely not the last one, but the first one. Something to celebrate. So, thank you very much.

Next agenda item. Coordination policy development efforts pertaining to IDNs. Probably I'll start with a short update. We requested some time ago when we started developing IDN ccTLD policy, at some point we just put it on hold and went forward with this fast track process.

During this fast track process we tested all those procedures that we have there. There had been 61, I think, 61 IDN ccTLD created under this fast track process.

And now what we ask the Board, but technically we submitted the document to the Board, so we asked them not to vote on it because we want to take it back, launch a new PDP to try to add those lessons that we learned from the past track process to the document and develop this new real IDN ccTLD policy. And that policy will replace the fast track process in due time.

That's probably the main points I wanted to stress regarding this one. Keith, from your side?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, thank you very much, Katrina. And I do have an update to provide. And I see Edmon Chung is here with us who is the current chair of our IDN scoping team. Edmon, I'd welcome you to jump in at any point here, but I'll just give the quick overview.

So we're clearly aware and cognizant of the Board's resolution from Kobe that called on the GNSO and the ccNSO to keep each other informed about policy work related to IDN variance at the top level. And we've also, over the course, really since Kobe, have been looking at the issue of IDNs and policies potentially needed related to IDNs holistically.

And so we, as the GNSO Council, issued a call for members for our IDN scoping team. That group has now been working for several months.

And our expectation is that we will receive, as the council, the GNSO Council, some recommendations from that scoping team as to how to figure out the path ahead in terms of policy development, things that might not be policy, where we need to engage with you, the ccNSO in those efforts, where we need to keep each other informed, the appointment of points of contacts or liaisons to make sure that we're in sync on that particular issue, not the broader liaison but more specifically targeted on the IDN issue.

And we, as the GSNO Council, will be taking the recommendations from our IDN scoping team ideally received in December and then discussed in our prioritization discussions during our strategic planning session at the end of January.

So I would expect that sometime after the end of January we would be in a position to communicate to you sort of at least the GSNO Council's thinking about steps forward on all issues related to IDNs, including, where our policy implications and policy processes could have some overlap or connection.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Speaking about timelines I did not mention that we are planning … Well, most probably we will request issues report to be delivered probably by the end of the year, then we will be ready to launch the [inaudible] so-called CCPDP4. For you probably it's like 404. For us it's only four. Thank you. Are there any questions?

KEITH DRAZEK: Edmon, please clarify or correct anything I said. Thanks.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you.. So, actually just a couple of questions, I guess, to the ccNSO side. I hear that you're looking at an issues report. One of the questions is there is a body of documents that was produced by staff and also the body of documents that came, I guess, before. I guess the question is how much are you drawing on that from the issues report?

One of the things, I guess on the gTLD side, GNSO side, there is what we call the now infamous EPDP, Expedited PDP, which the only difference is, as I understand it, is not having an issues report, but using existing documents as the issues report. So I guess the question is how do you see that? And how do you see the existing documents being part of the input into the PDP? Because I guess staff really did a lot of work in terms of ideas and variant TLDs and various things as well. So that's one.

And the other is following on the, I guess, point of contact or observers, or mutual point of contacts and observers, between the ccPDP and the gPDP and how you see that, whether that makes sense, I guess, going forward?

KATRINA SATAKI: Sorry, I was writing down the first one. The second one, could you repeat the last part of your question?

EDMON CHUNG:	So the current general thinking is that there would be kind of like mutual points of contacts between the cc side and the g side for the coordination, because there might be areas of common interests that should be somewhat consistent across the board. Is that a similar thinking from the I guess the cc side?
KATRINA SATAKI:	Yeah. Thank you very much. Yes, I think we started talking about similar issues some time ago already when we talked, for example, about confusing similarity issues. And we strongly believe that approach to the evaluation of confusing similarity should not differ whether we talk about gTLD or we talk about ccTLD.
	Talking about the first question that you had about existing documents. As I said, basically the new PDP to develop an IDN ccTLD policy will definitely take into account the first document and everything that had been developed by reviewing the fast track process.
	Yes, we will need to coordinate heavily with the GNSO, and I'm sure that we will succeed with that, something tells me that this is going to be a successful exercise, probably previous experience working with GSNO. Yeah, first we need to identify what … At least I would like to propose, that we start identifying issues in our own silos. And then we come together with everything; okay, these are the issues from our side, these are the issues from your side, and then we try to see how we could address those issues and how we could actually basically discuss the possible solutions. Keith, any thoughts from your side?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Katrina. So just to follow on one of the things that Edmon said that in the GSNO space, at least, we have a PDP which requires an issues report. And we also have the ability to initiate an EPDP, or an Expedited PDP, that if we determine that the record and the documentation, all the work that's been done before, is sufficient, then that can take the place of an issues report, which allows us to be expedited and start things more quickly.

And so I think what Edmuon's question, what are you thinking about in terms of the resource material for your issues report? And we'll be considering the same thing. At this time the GNSO Council hasn't discussed whether we would look for an issues report, or try to go for any PDP without the issues report, but that's certainly something we're looking for input from the drafting team on, or the scoping team.

But I think you're right, Katrina, in terms of making sure that because we each have our own independent processes that would then develop a consensus policy, we need to follow our own internal processes. But I do think at some point early coming together and identifying where there's commonality and where there might be a delta is really important to do in the early stages. And maybe we could look to try to do that sort of in the early part of next year is what I'm thinking.

I see Jeff Neuman at the microphone, of the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures group. I assume you want to talk about string

similarity, which is, as I'll say, one of the additional action items that we have at the GSNO Council to engage with the ccNSO council on trying to figure out how to deal with that issue. We've talked about the IDN issues. We've tried to clarify other issues related to, for example, the Name Collision Analysis Project, and try to help the subsequent procedures group. But we do know that this issue of string similarity is one where there's common interests, or at least, similar interests between the two groups. So, Jeff, please go right ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Is this on? Hello? Yes? No? Yeah? Okay, good. Yeah. Maybe it's to give a little bit of a plug too.

So, as Keith said, I'm Jeff Neuman. I'm one of the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures PDP working group, which is a group looking at issues related to the next round of new gTLDs. And we're actually nearing completion of our work, but one of the items that we're still looking at involves string similarity. And so we haven't finalized recommendations on a lot of those aspects, especially with relation to internationalized domain names.

But what I did want to say also is that there are, although it seems like it's a similar issue, the confusing similarity is very different in a gTLD world. They don't just look at visual similarity. They look also – there's an objection process for confusing similarity which is much more than just visual. It's meaning. And it's in more similar to a trademark kind of basis.

So while there are some similarities with the fast track looking at string similarity there's also a lot of differences. And so I'm not sure how that will play in some sort of joint effort but our group is open, the subsequent procedures PDP is open. I know that certainly we had a lot of ccTLDs participate in the Work Track 5 for geographic names, but I would hope that if anyone wants to join or come into the conversations, or certainly when we go out for another public comment to comment on those issues where there is that kind of overlap. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I think several meetings ago we talked about the need to discuss things and meet, and try at least to raise these issues of common interest. Something that we could address. Anything, Giovanni, you would like to add? Because I remember from our side it was Giovanni who was point of contact.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina, and thank you, Jeff. I believe the point is that I'm aware the confusing similarity is assessed in a somehow broader and different way in the g space. At the same time in the areas that are common to both, I think there should be a common understanding and a common approach of what is done. And I think that is the area where we can cooperate and work together to make sure, because at the end what we have been saying in the cc is that consumers all around the world are the same. I mean when it comes to visual

similarity consumers are the same. So I think that is the area where we are looking forward to working together. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Wait a minute, Jeff. Before we move to the next agenda item, maybe we could decide on some specific steps that we take to make sure that we get connected?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Katrina. And I had an action item to follow up on this with you, and I clearly did not, so I have some responsibility for the delay in getting this conversation going. So I think I agree with you. I think it makes sense if we could get a small team pulled together here, perhaps while we're here in Montreal, to at least initiate the connection and the conversation. That would be very helpful, because I think this is an area, as Jeff noted, where there may be some differences in current policy. Jeff, I had a question for you. Is what you described a result of the policies that were developed in the 2012 round? Is that like where you described the objection process and sort of the differences? Just curious if you could help me understand where that came from? Because I don't recall.

JEFF NEUMAN: So the policy for the 2012 round was done in 2007 and 2008, but was further defined in the years between that time period. But yeah, the objection, it's a confusing similarity objection process, which is, of course, after the fact. There's two components in the gTLD application

phase. First there's a string similarity visual check that's done as soon as the application is submitted, or shortly thereafter.

Originally they had this tool they called the sword tool, which everyone is in favor of scrapping because it didn't really work and it was very misleading. And then once that was done – so they actually had a panel that evaluated that. Once that was done … Actually, in the 2012 it was parallel. So, while that was going on, other people could file objections based on if that string applied for was confusingly similar to an existing TLD or to another application. If it was to an existing TLD, then it would not proceed to go further. An existing TLD also included cc's and g's. And if it was similar, visually similar to an existing application, it was put in a same contention set as it moved forward.

So there were not many, to be honest, that came out to be similar. In fact none of them were kicked out for being similar to an existing top-level domain. And only two of them were found to be similar visually to each other. And that was Unicorn and Unicom, because the rn, lower case, looked like an m, lower case. But there were lots of objections after the fact.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, Jeff. So, clearly there is existing policy and also an implementation phase that has sort of defined what has happened and what is the current status, I guess, in the gTLD space. So to Katrina's point, clearly this is a fairly complex topic, and we really do need to get that conversation started. So I'll take the action here

working with you, Jeff, to figure out who from the GSNO and the subsequent procedure side should work with the ccTLD colleagues. And I assume Giovanni and whoever from your side, I'm not voluntolding you, I'm assume, at least, so that we could have that conversation here in Montreal to at least start the conversation.

JEFF NEUMAN: I'm here all week.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right, thanks Jeff. Thanks, Giovanni.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I think we're moving to the next agenda item? It's CCWG auction proceeds. Erika, maybe you?

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. I believe Ching is not with us. So let me do this therefore, briefly. Ching Chiao and I, we co-chair of the auction proceed, and one of us can give the update. So let me do this quickly. So since the last time we had this discussion, I will start from there and just update you about the most recent progresses.

So we have had the first public comment period. After the public comment period we reviewed the comments. Many of the comments we could accept. So in case you have delivered some I would assume you would be under those where we could accept those comments.

We are pretty much at the end now of the process, but we decided we haven't taken a formal decision yet, but we have an informal decision that we will go for a second public comment period simply because there are still some areas which are a little bit more complicated, and we really would love to receive another feedback concerning these items.

So the second public comment period we are expecting to have and we will start officially after as soon as possible after Montreal will focus on issues which we haven't discussed during the first public comment period. So we are not planning to open for comments concerning all areas, but we'd like to focus on those topics and items where we still haven't taken a final decision and where we would love to have feedback.

So that's where we are. We will have a meeting this week. We will finalize. That's our plan to go through all of the work plan which we have in front of us which is not much anymore. I believe we can get this done this week. We will then finalize the draft document for the second public comment period. The document is ready. Staff has done an outstanding job just to get us where we are right now. But there's still a little bit of fine tuning which we have to do.

And then we haven't decided it completely yet but we expect we want to have a survey between the members who are a member of the auction proceed just to understand where they are concerning one item which I will explain in a second. And then we may do – and I'm careful here – we may do a second survey after the … We had a chance

to review comments from the public comment period concerning this particular topic.

And then we will have the consensus call. So there is still some time, and I'm saying this and explaining this so carefully because there's still some time for communities to exchange information with their members who are part of the auction proceeds. So please use this time, really, and have this discussion.

So what is the most critical topic? The most critical topic is still about the structure. So I have mentioned this many times before. We call the structure a mechanism. We have identified originally four mechanisms. And I will repeat them so that your memory kicks in hopefully.

So the first one was the idea to in-house the mechanism inside of ICANN. The second would be a merger with a second entity. Ideally an entity which is close to the ICANN environment and understands how we work and function. The third would be a new foundation, an ICANN foundation, so not independent from ICANN, but an ICANN foundation. And the fourth would have been that the money would be given to a separate entity, and then the entity would execute the granting processes.

We had eliminated the fourth option already before we went for the first public comment period. So we have three mechanisms left. And I believe, my feeling and my sense is the main discussion is between the first mechanism and the third one. The first in-house model inside of ICANN. And the third the foundation. That's the tendency currently.

So if we are going for the survey we will exactly ask our members which of the mechanisms do you prefer. And then dependent on the outcome, if it's very close, if we have, for example, a 51% versus 49% that's too close to make a final call, but if we see there's a favor for one particular model in the survey, a 70% ranking very high, I believe we can make for the public comment probably a recommendation, let us go with one single mechanism, and that's the preferred option. If it's to call is to close, I don't think we should do it. We will then list a hierarchy depending on the outcome of the first survey.

So, that's the current process. So, we will need, really, to finalize our work and it would be fabulous if you could get engaged with your members and signal as much as possible your preferences. Back to you. Thank you so much.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Erika. Any comment from Steven who is from our side on the right side?

ERIKA MANN: I was looking for him.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, he's here.

ERIKA MANN: Oh, that's why I couldn't see him. Oh, okay.

STEVE CROCKER: It's going to be real interesting on this, which end of the day model, whether in-house or foundation oriented which seems to be to the contenders. I myself can't make up my mind.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any comments or question from the audience? Councils? No? Well, I really hope this work will be done and over soon. The sooner, the better, yeah. But I understand if you have another public comment period, so it might take some time. Thank you. Thank you for your efforts. So next is the coordination of comment efforts to ICANN planning documents.

Yesterday we had, our sitting operational planning committee had a working and we had some representatives from the GNSOs. So that was a great achievement, let's say. Probably I think the first time, right? The first time representatives from both sides were sitting at one table listening to a presentation from ICANN Org and also had this opportunity to ask questions and discuss how to move forward.

The chair our SOPC group, Giovanni, again. Any comments? Anything you'd like to stress?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina. Yes, indeed, yesterday was the first time that a representative of the GNSO committee in charge of submitting to ICANN comments on the strategy and operating plan was with us

during the meeting, Barry. And we exchanged some ideas and thoughts with him in preparation of the next public comment period that ICANN will open on the 13th of December of the fiscal year '21 operating plan and budget.

We agreed that it would be good to get some coordination so that if we find areas within the draft operating plan and budget or future strategy plans; whenever we see areas of common interests where we see that the ICANN narrative in the plan would deserve more clarity or extra information, we will make sure that we put comments in a clear way and so we coordinate our comments to reiterate the same message to ICANN.

I might say that we said that before but ICANN staff in charge of finance has done tremendous work to improve whatever they submit for the public comments. And so compared to ten years ago the work for, I guess, on both sides is much easier than it used to be and there are much more details in terms of the actions, the projects, the budget items, the finances that are allocated to the different initiatives. So, that said, we will start coordinating from the fiscal year '21 public comment which is in about one month and a few more days, and we'll see where we go from there. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Katrina. Thank you, Giovanni. Okay, I got you next, Michele. Just a quick update from the GSNO side as it relates to our standing committee on budget and operations. This annual global meeting we're actually having quite a bit of turnover in our council. Six people are leaving, six new people are coming in. We've actually, I think, seen sort of a reduction in the actual participation from non-GNSO Council members, so those from the community.

So we're going to do a recall, or a recast, of our own SCBO team and a call for new volunteers and to refresh that effort. So I very much look forward to in the coming months to be able to communicate to you all the composition of our new team and to make sure that we really do engage with you in a more proactive and regular fashion, because I think we all understand that these are important topics. I agree, we agree, that ICANN Org has done a better job. The finance team has done a better job of improving things, in large part, in response to feedback we've provided.

And so to the extent we can provide joint feedback or mirror each other's comments where we agree I think that's something we should continue to strive for. So you have our commitment to do that, recast and to communicate to you who the new team will be. Thank you. Michele, did you just have something to add?

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah, I did. Thanks, Keith. I think one of the things I supposed that we probably should be conscious of is that it's not simply a matter of looking at the budget for one fiscal year. The ICANN Board has been

talking a lot about the strategic plan for the next five years and how they've broken that out. And obviously pretty much every single line item within that plan costs money.

And those of us [inaudible] within the GSNO, the contracted parties, are getting a bit tired of footing the bill for everything. We're concerned that they're going to start upping fees or trying to find new and interesting ways to get money out of us.

At the presentation we had yesterday from ICANN finance contained a rather disturbing line or two about how they were terribly disappointed that the privacy-proxy accreditation system wasn't up and running because they see that as being a new cash cow. Whereas that was originally meant to be done purely on a cost recovery basis, it's now being viewed as a revenue opportunity which is what we predicted. And I will probably now get attacked from somebody from ICANN staff for pointing out that this isn't true at all. My god, no we have a wonderful rationale for charging you exactly the same amount of money for a privacy-proxy accreditation without actually doing anything or increasing the head count.

At a GSNO level we have limits around what we can comment on because we have to look at it firmly through the lens of the GSNO Council and the GSNO at a structural level and how those budgetary decisions impact our ability to do our work.

However, there is definitely an interest, speaking on behalf of the registrars, where we want to be able to go deeper into the ICANN finances. Because ultimately, between ourselves and the registries,

we're the ones footing the bill. But obviously at this GSNO level we can't do that.

So if there's any way so that we can coordinate with anybody who's in the ccNSO we'd be happy to do so. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Michele, I'll just follow up, and thank you for pointing that out, just to reiterate for everybody's benefit that as we, the GSNO Council, and the SCBO, our Standing Committee on Budget Op, we look at what's impactful across the council, our work, and the GSNO Council's responsibilities, and then our independent stakeholder groups and constituencies will then comment on the things that are directly impactful through them.

So, as Michele noted, appropriately, there's sort of a limit as to what the council can do, but I still think there's an opportunity for us to work together on those issues.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I think there's one more comment from Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. One of the recurring, I'd say, comments that we have been put forward to the ICANN finance team is about cost optimization. We had this in our agenda yesterday meeting. We were explained that the ICANN finance department is creating this culture of cost optimization

EN

across the organization. And they are trying to have some sort of guidelines for the different departments so that it's not as it used to be. Everything that they receive as a project is approved and it's finalized, but there is a scrutiny that is ongoing against available finances and also against, of course, the strategy. So, indeed, cost optimization is something that is at the core of our comments as well as HR. And yesterday we had quite a long explanation from ICANN finance where they stand against HR recruitment and HR management. And this is something that we will continue to look into in any future operating plan and budget as well as strategy plan.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any further comments or questions? No? That will swiftly lead us into the next agenda item which is: is there anything we can do to improve the way we work without probably increasing costs and being more efficient and effective? So evolution of the multi stakeholder model. Would you like to start that one?

KEITH DRAZEK: Sure, thank you, Katrina. So we had, during our GSNO Council working session yesterday, we did spend some time with Brian Cute who is running the multi stakeholder model evolution effort on behalf of the board that was kicked off as, I think we all remember, in Kobe, in the spring meeting. And there's been community engagement around that over the last several months.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

I believe the expectation is that Brian will be publishing, or posting, or sharing sort of the next version, the next iteration, the next step in this process this week. I believe there's a session on Thursday dedicated to that discussion and the community engagement. And it's intended to be sort of the next step in the framework, or the roadmap, of how the ICANN community broadly can look at these issues that have been identified and figure out who owns what and the path forward.We'll obviously know more once we see the presentation and have that conversation on Thursday.

One of the things that we, as the GSNO and the GSNO Council have expressed and identified is the concern about workload and prioritization and that in addition to all of the other policy work that we have on our plates we also now are talking about DNS abuse and security threats. We're talking about global public interest framework. We're talking about this evolution of this multi stakeholder model effort. And that's a lot to handle in addition to our day jobs.

But one of the things that I think has been clarified this week, and will continue to be clarified is this is expected to be – this evolution of the multi stakeholder model – is expected to be sort of an ongoing long-term process over the course of the upcoming five year strategic plan. There's not an expectation as I understand it that by July 1st because that's when the strategic plan goes into effect that suddenly we need to have everything done.

In fact we probably will be starting the things that are agreed to by the community around the middle of next year when the strategic plan goes into effect.

So we certainly had a concern I think at the GSNO level that if there was an expectation that we were going to begin and complete all of this extra work, if you will – important work, but extra work – by early next year or even July that that was unreasonable. And in our own prioritization work that was going to be terribly challenging. But as I understand it from conversations with Cherine and others that, no, no, no, there's no expectation that we, there's a deadline for any of this, it's just a matter of making sure we agree on what needs to be initiated and that at least there's a roadmap forward as to how we're going to tackle that.

And, speaking personally now, that gave me a much greater comfort with the conversations that have been kicked off and initiated and sort of what's expected of us as a community. But we'll see more on Thursday and we'll react to that. The council, as a group, we haven't determined our next steps of engagement at this time, but we're certainly looking forward to learning more about what the process puts out here this week. And if anybody else would like to jump in on that feel free. Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Keith. This is basically what was discussed yesterday by the council, and we also came to a conclusion that unless we see the report and we hear what it's all about we can't say either

yes or no to extra work to be added to our plates. So yes, we are also looking forward to the report being published, looking forward to the session. It's clear that there are issues, and many issues are common over all communities. And unless we do something we'll get thrown by all the work that we need to do.

And so, yes, that was also our thinking and that's what the council discussed. Any more comments? Rafik?

KEITH DRAZEK: Rafik, I'll just tee it up. Also during our conversation with Brian Cute yesterday we also discussed the GSNO Council's work on our PDP 3.0 improvements. That may be what Rafik wants to speak to, but our session with Brian yesterday was sort of twofold. It was his update looking ahead to Thursday, and our update related to the PDP 3.0 work and where there is overlap. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, thanks, Keith. It's about PDP 3.0. Yes, we made a comment about that. I was going to just ask ccNSO since we sent you the [3] improvement from PDP 3.0 small team asking for your input because we believe that those improvements are of interest for you and might impact you participating in the PDP. So we are looking forward to your input on them. And we think we can count on our liaison to coordinate with the ccNSO council on this.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any other comments? No? So now agenda item number seven, any other business. I have one. Yesterday morning we had the community action forum. Thanks to everyone who attended that early hour. And also, yes, I'd like to reiterate that we really need your support because in order for those bylaws amendments to come into force we need active support from decisional participants, three decisional participants. Obviously we are one of them, but we need two more, and we are seriously looking at the GSNO Council hoping for your support. So, thank you very much in advance.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Katrina. This is a topic that we've discussed on several occasions at the GSNO Council level. It's not coming as a surprise to anyone. And I see no indication of any concern that would prevent the GSNO from being supportive in this regard. We did hold the community action forum yesterday. There was the opportunity for discussion and input. Thank you, Steven, for coordinating that. So I think everything is on track. So, thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Having no objections, that's one thing. Here we need active support. So it must be an action. You have to send an email, like the secretary to empowered community administration. So this is not the question of yeah, we're fine with that, it's a question of yes, we actively support you. And that's why we ask you, once more, please, please, please support us. Yes, Steven?

STEVE CROCKER: There is a hard deadline for submission of correspondence with regards to affirmation of this if the GSNO chooses so which is a 21-day period that begins at the end of the ICANN meeting on Thursday.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks Katrina. Thanks, Steven. and we, the GSNO Council are aware that we will need to hold an electronic vote to be able to take that affirmative action because it takes place before our next official council meeting. So we've already alerted all councilors that we will be conducting an electronic vote on this to approve the fundamental bylaw request that you've identified. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Are there any other business? Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: I hate to disappoint and not have something to throw in. I suppose one of the … We are going through a process within the GNSO Council where we now meet once a year to look at our strategy for the following 12 months because we're very conscious that as a general rule we only meet in person at these kind of meetings and the schedule is hectic, so being able to step back a little, assess and make decisions, and discuss and things like that, there's just where the strategy thing comes up. So we'll be doing that exercise again in January in Los Angeles. I think, part of that, which I think Keith, or

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

Pam, or Rafik could probably speak to in greater length, would be to decide which things we can get done in the following year as opposed to us kind of reacting to things that come at us.

And I suppose the question I have, really, is how is the ccNSO kind of dealing with that? I mean, do you have some kind of strategy around what your kind of goals and expectations are? Or is it kind of a hippie kind of laid back kind of scenario, which, could be, I don't know.

KATRINA SATAKI: Do we look stressed to you?

MICHELE NEYLON: Well, I think that this is one of those fundamental things because so many of you are kind of relaxed and chilled out, whereas we're all stressed. You know, it's a different kind of vibe.

KATRINA SATAKI: Oh, it's very bad for your health to be stressed. We want to stick around for some time. What we do, we have monthly plans, we have yearly plans, the things that we want and need to do. For example, yesterday during the council workshop, we looked into one of the things I probably didn't mention. We have recommendations from our ccNSO second review. So we looked at those. We also looked at recommendations that came out of work stream 2 report, and we tried to see which areas need our urgent attention where we could, what we really need to do, what's a high priority for us.

Normally …. We rally receive a lot of interim requests. For that we have a so-called triage committee. There are three councilors that look into all incoming requests and try to identify those that are of high relevance and high interest to our community, especially when they are of high priority, and well, kind of ignore those that have no relevance at all. And, well, Nick, maybe you would like to comment?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yes, thanks, Katrina. Nick Wenban-Smith, DotUK, for the record. I'm one of the … Shakespeare I think said some people are born great and some people achieve greatness. But I was put on to the triage committee, so I'm one of the three people who look at all of the incoming requests for comments and we have quite a good system for trying to work out quickly what work is required and where we should be spending our time.

So, we have that as sort of a standing committee anyway, and that's how we're going to, I think, approach the review recommendations. It doesn't quite address, I think, your initial question, as it were. What's our strategic plan for next year, I think, in a nutshell.

I think you need to reflect a bit more that the ccNSO does not really make that many policies. So we have very few policy processes and they're well known. And we all know that they have their own sort of timelines which are ongoing, and we'll go through the whole of the next year. We have another one starting. And, I mean, that's it. So it's not a huge amount of policy workload that it needs sort of coordination and prioritization, and we do the tactical day to day stuff

through our little committee which works quite well in a lightweight way. So it's helpful.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Have we answered your question?

MICHELE NEYLON: As best as you can, I think, yes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other questions? If not then thank you very much. We have at least one action item. So we will follow up on that.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Katrina, yes we do, on the IDN and string similarity, string confusion issue; get that group together. Okay? Thanks everybody.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]