

---

MONTREAL – GNSO - RySG Membership meeting 1 of 2  
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 08:30 to 10:15 EDT  
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Tuesday, November 5, 2019 at ICANN 66 in Montreal. This is the GNSO RySG Membership Meeting 1 of 2 at 8:30 in Hall 511-C.

DONNA AUSTIN: Good morning, everybody. If people can take their seats, we'll get started. We're already ten minutes behind. I think people thought we were starting at 9:00.

Welcome, everybody. My name is Donna Austin. I'm the chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting for ICANN 66 Montreal. We have a reasonably full agenda today. Because this is an annual general meeting, we're having some turnover in our volunteer positions. So we'd like to start the morning by recognizing the service from some of our members that are stepping out of their roles and recognizing those that are stepping in.

So, thank you to Rubens Kuhl who served on the GNSO Council for the last four years. I know how challenging that can be, so we very much appreciate your service. So, thanks, Rubens, for the time and the contribution. Welcome, [Sid], who will be stepping into Rubens' shoes moving forward. Has that switchover happened or it happens tomorrow? Yeah. Okay.

---

**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: We have also a similar musical chair happening at the GeoTLD group level. So, I'm stepping down from the ExCom and Nacho Amadoz who is not listening will be stepping in my seat.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Congratulations, Nacho. Jon Nevett, who I don't see in the room was our member on the Nominating Committee for the past two years, I believe. Jon has stepped down from that role I think when that process finished.

Kristine Dorrain since has stepped into that role and I think she's learning this week that it's quite an effort, so thank you, Kristine, for being willing to step into that.

Elaine Pruis, who I don't see in the room, but Elaine represented the Registry Stakeholder Group on the Customer Standing Committee for the last three years and recently stood down. I'm pleased to be able to tell folks that Dmitry Burkov from [inaudible] has formally been appointed into that role. So, it's a bit of a process that we had to go through to get there, but Dmitry will be taking Elaine's place which is terrific for us. So, thanks, Dmitry for being willing to step into that role.

Also, Erica Varlese, who I saw just walked in – there she is. Erica started as the chair for what was Evolution 4 Working Group which was going to be a reasonably simple project, we thought, but has run into some complications and I'm not sure how long that effort has been running but I think it might be two years and Erica has had to step down from that. As the collective of the ExCom sitting up here said that we'll take

---

that on. So, hopefully, we can wrap that up. But, Erica, thank you very much. I know it was a lot of time and effort. So, thank you for that.

So, if we can just recognize everybody and their service, that would be great. Thank you.

I just want to use this opportunity to encourage folks who aren't really sure how to get involved in some of the efforts that we have going on to either reach out to Beth or Sam, myself or Jonathan. If there's something that you're interested in becoming involved in, reach out to us and have a chat, see what the work involves because one of the things that we are running into is that we're running out of resources. Obviously, the EPDP team is six people that have committed to that, obviously three on the front like are working pretty hard and I know they've had a long week already. We also have a support team that sits behind those six. That's a significant effort. Even the four of us and the rest of the ExCom that sit up here, it's not something we do once a fortnight. It's something that we're constantly talking and trying to understand what we need to move forward. The planning for these meetings takes quite a bit of time and effort.

We've just kicked off the RAA amendment, so there's a number of people that have volunteered to be involved in that. We had the PIC DRP effort. I think Jonathan has been involved in some of the budget ops stuff that goes through the GNSO Council. We have our councilors, so obviously Keith is chair. The council role in itself is a considerable commitment but to take on chair is a big one as well.

---

So, we really do need to see some new blood, I suppose in the volunteers stepping forward. So, if you're interested in becoming involved, then by all means, have a chat to any of us and we'd be willing to see people come through.

Erica is a little bit of a shining light because she came in from nothing and has really stepped up and made a terrific contribution. It is possible and we will support you along the way, so if you're interested, come and talk to us.

Some of you will be aware that at the beginning of this week on Saturday, Graeme and I did a presentation to the ICANN Board. It was about the domain name market and the industry. It was 60 minutes for the two of us so it was a pretty compressed period of time. I have sent the deck and the recording for that meeting to the list, so you all have that available. It was audio streamed but it wasn't possible for people to be in the room.

My understanding, and the feedback that I've gotten, is that it was really well-received. Obviously, we have a large number of new board members, so it's important that we take the opportunities that we have to educate them and inform them about the industry. And I believe there is a willingness to continue that dialogue and that education, so I think some of that falls on us to look for opportunities where we can engage more with the Board in terms of education about what are gTLDs and what the different types of models that we're operating and some of the challenges that we face. I think it's really important that

---

they understand those things. And it seems that they're willing to engage with us.

But I think it's important for us that it's not just something we do once a year. I think GDD Summit is coming up in May, so my understanding is that the Board workshop is happening just before the GDD Summit so there may be an opportunity for ... We usually have five or six board members, but maybe because of the timing and the location there might be more staying on for that first day of the GDD Summit. So there may be an opportunity to do more of that engagement with the Board on the industry and how we work and our operations, those kinds of things, so that they have a little bit of a better understanding.

So, the feedback has been good. I'm not the expert in this industry, so my aim is that moving forward we have more people engaged in that conversation with the Board so it's not just Graeme and I that are the mouthpiece. It really has to be a collective conversation, I think, with the Board so they get the full picture. Any questions about that? Okay, I don't see any hands.

So, we're going to administrative business. Jonathan, do you have a treasurer's report for us?

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks, Donna. I don't have anything formal prepared. I suppose I'd just like to pick up on one point you made previously about just encouraging everyone to participate in the volunteer way no matter how small, if it's joining up in one of the groups. As you said, Donna, I'll

---

try and do the work, [inaudible] the work on the ICANN finances and that sort of thing.

I am signed up to the GNSO ... What the GNSO has got is a standing committee on the budget and that group is really for the work of the GNSO Council on preparing its responses to budgetary and strategic planning comments. But it's useful to understand what other groups are seeing and doing. So, from our point of view, it's further information and understanding what's happening, and from there, their point of view, they want others to contribute. I think they call them ... There's a name. They bring in expertise into that group who aren't necessarily on the Council.

The ccNSO also has a group called the SOPC. I think it's the Strategic and Operational Planning Committee and I've been in ... I just attend those meetings and I've got an informal role but I think they'll formalize that slightly more and put me on the mailing list for that now.

So, I'm really giving you an update in two areas. One, the kind of work I'm doing on finances in general, and two, thinking ... So, we might run a little finance group to look at comments on the IANA budget which is coming up shortly. And anything like that, if you don't feel confident or haven't been involved or just haven't been involved for a while, it's very easy to just join up, sign up to one of those groups and you can be a bit of a lurker initially and not necessarily have to participate too much. But we'd love people to put their individual toe in the water and work with us a bit on these various things.

---

So, I've sort of taken a segue from what Donna was talking about and hijacked the Treasurer's Report component of that partly because I actually don't have a lot to say on the Treasurer's Report side of things.

There's really two issues that we care about and that's obviously collecting the money and not spending too much. In general, the only area where I feel we've got exposure to spending too much is potentially on legal fees in and around the Evo 4 Working Group, so we've just got to keep very tight on any questions or issues we raise there and try and focus those. Other than that, I think we're in pretty good shape.

The collection side of things, Sue, perhaps you can help me where we are with the latest. We have around just over 80 memberships and when we last reported to you, we had about 30 uncollected but I suspect that's moved forward. Sue, maybe you can give an update on that.

SUE SCHULER:

Yes. I collected 13 invoices in the last week. Invoices were due six days ago. I still have 23 outstanding invoices totaling just over \$40,000 out of our budget. So, those of you that are late in your payments, you will be getting a letter from me next week. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

We don't and we will be very unlikely to name and shame, but one of the issues there is that, as I think I said to you when we met last, these invoices go into a certain part of an organization. They are very unlikely to for the Registry Stakeholder Group rep is even aware of them. It's

---

possible your finance function is joined up enough that they come and talk to the registry rep and say, “Is this something you know about? Should I pay for it?” But it just may be helpful if you’re unsure if your organization has paid, just to check with Sue, see what you can do to help [inaudible] particularly in a large organization that may be an issue. Anyway, do what you can to help simply make the collection task less difficult.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Actually, it might be easier next time, when you ask your accountant about it, financial department to pay, to request the swift text message which they can’t obtain until they’ve paid. So, with your letter, please attach this. Yes, please, forward me the text of the swift message from the bank and it will help ensure you have feedback.

SUE SCHULER:

Okay. Thanks, Jonathan. Beth?

BETH BACON:

Good morning, everyone. So, I am taking up the Evolution 4 Working Group and I will likely do a subpar job if we are comparing me to Erica who has just powered through. And if anything looks like it’s smoothly coming together, it’s because I’ve not ruined her work. It’s not because I’m doing anything.

What we have now is we met earlier this week, the small group that’s been working on amending the bylaws, and we have come to the



---

decision that it makes much more sense practically and will give us a lot more flexibility as a stakeholder group if we have lean and mean bylaws, as an organization should. Our bylaws are enormous and very complicated, and it came from a historical product of moving bylaws and having incorporation documents and we became a grown-up organization.

So, we're really trying to clean that up. Right now we have a draft that is bylaws and then operational procedures. One of the benefits is that the bylaws have to go through the process of being approved by the Board. The operational procedures, right now we have it drafted so that it would be a vote of the stakeholder group to change those, so it's still a pretty high bar. But it's not a Board process of years long.

So, we think that will give us a lot more flexibility as a stakeholder group as our business models change, as our membership grows, hopefully, and as we change as a group and as ICANN grows as well. So, we think it's a very practical approach. We think it gives us a lot more movement.

We also do have one addition which is the delegation form. There was some discussion about the delegation form before and concerns about how it would impact different organizations. If we have any issues with folks still not being able to sign some [inaudible] I'm allowed to vote in this organization, then I think that we have some flexibility. We've spoken to our counsel about how to finagle our way around that a little bit. It's not being recorded, right, Sue, when I say things like that?

---

So, I think we have a draft form that will accompany your membership. We'll probably, Sue, incorporate it into the membership packet when people sign on and then update it.

So, we will have all those drafts soon for you. We're cleaning them up. But in the future you will see a new form for delegation, bylaws, separate operating procedures. And when we get those cleaned up, we'll send them around for everyone to take a look and we look forward to your comments and suggestions, and if you have any – if you see anything in there with regards to our processes and operating procedures, now is the time to have your feelings heard. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Beth. Any questions for Beth? I feel like this room is too big for us.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: It's also too early.

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I hope it's too early, too. Sam, public comments?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Donna. Good morning, everyone. So, I'm going to go through two things here. We're going to go through the open public comments. Sue, if you could get the matrix up, that would be great. In the meantime, I want to remind everyone that on the schedule for

---

tomorrow – yeah, tomorrow is Wednesday. Tomorrow at 5:00 PM we are going to be hosting a comments workshop. This is going to be a follow-up to the one we held in Kobe. We didn't hold one in Morocco because we didn't have as robust attendance as we did in Kobe so we decided to hold the follow-up here.

I got a lot out of that session. I thought it was a really productive conversation. I like to think that the folks who are in the room felt the same way. So, this is going to be a follow-up tying up some of the loose ends from that, going through some of the changes that you guys had suggested that we started to put into action and moving forward with some of the other ones that we haven't really gotten off the ground just yet.

So, like I said, that's tomorrow at 5:00. I do have some materials that I'm going to circulate to anyone who is planning to come. So, if you are going to be there, if you could just find me at some point over the course of the day, let me know you're going to be there and I'll send those out to you guys tonight. Kristine is going to be there, so if I'm not enough of a draw, Kristine will be there. Make sure you come by.

So now we can move on to the open public comments. We got five in the hopper here. And as far as I know, we haven't really discussed too many of them beyond number three here, the draft PTI and IANA operating plan and budget. So, Jonathan just mentioned those ones a couple of minutes ago. He's going to be taking the lead on reviewing those.

---

We're looking for volunteers for all of them, any of them that you guys find particularly interesting. The deadlines are a little ... We still have a little bit of runway but these first two, especially the RDS review final report, that's like a bit meaty and that is coming up about two weeks after we all get back home from this meeting. So, if folks are interested in this, please let me know and we'll put a little team together. I'll probably get a draft working based off earlier comments that we submitted on this review team's initial report. It's like three days before Thanksgiving, for those who celebrate it.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks. Yesterday, I circulated to the list some recommendations from the ... No, sorry, I've got my review teams mixed up. Just delete reference to that. Thanks.

BETH BACON:

Well, made it to 9:00 before we had an acronym mix-up. So, 30 minutes in. Guys, I think that's commendable. I'm trying to wake you guys up a little bit. Come on, dudes.

All right. So, Donna sent an email to the list about the SSR2, Security Stability Review Team stuff, so please review those. Not related to comment periods. Just review them because it's interesting.

Actually, I'll leave it here. I'm not going to walk through all of these in detail. I think it's pretty clear what some of these are about. We'll do calls for volunteers. If there's something that you're particularly interested in, just let me know. As always – I say this all the time, I'm

---

going to say it again because I have the mic and I'm drunk with power – you don't need to take on the full responsibility of drafting from start to finish when you volunteer to work on these. We have [Wim] who is an excellent resource. He'll help you get them done. You can send bullets. You can give us a call and just kind of spitball some ideas.

Don't be afraid to get involved and share your thoughts and opinions when it comes to comments because we'll make it pretty easy for you to do so. Thanks in advance. [Wim], go ahead.

[WIM DEGEZELLE]:

Welcome and thank you to everybody that has helped on comments since the last meeting. I just wanted to say a short word. I'm here this week and I'm always happy to get feedback on how we can deal with comments and how it could be made easier for you.

We have the workshop tomorrow but I'm always happy to help with small details that can be very useful for you and you never think of. I mean, you can look at the matrix. You can come up and say, "The color you use is very ugly. Please change it." Or something more practical and interesting for you.

But I'm here, so don't be afraid to come up to me and give some ideas. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

We are moving way too fast.

---

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I wouldn't mind a quick question. I missed how we were going to operate the comments workshop. What's the form of that and how does that work? I'm just wondering whether we can try and if we'll get anything on the PTI or [inaudible] just miss it?

BETH BACON: As far as the structure of the workshop tomorrow, I'm planning the session to be less about specific items that are up for comment. It's less of a brainstorming session and more general feedback about the way we put together comments. So, I have a rough agenda with some slides. That's one of the things I'll be circulating to anyone who is planning to attend. I don't want to spam the full list because I know some folks aren't here and things like that. But we have time on the agenda. If we want to spend some time talking about any of these topics, we can. It's totally up to you, Donna.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: For what it's worth, my opinion, it's worth probably sending it to the whole list just in case people are not here but are here. I don't think it's the spam. It's a useful piece of information for the membership.

DONNA AUSTIN: One thing I will mention is that Sam and [Wim] in most cases end up being the primary drafter on a lot of these comments, and as we know, there's always three or four that are out for – documents that are out for comment at the one time.

---

Some of them, it's a progression of the topic, so getting yourself up to speed with what it's about isn't that difficult. But with some of them, the recent public interest document that came out was a discussion document. So, it's a reasonably meaty document. So, there's a lot of time that Sam and [Wim] have to put into understanding that and then developing what they think are comments that would be reflect the views of the stakeholder group. That's a lot to do.

So, what we're trying to get to is a place where Sam is obviously managing the process and [Wim] is terrific in doing the drafting but we really do need more input into the content because we do want it to be reflecting of a stakeholder group comment, because if it comes back to us and they say, "Well, what do you mean by that?" it's all on Sam and we may think, "How come we didn't know about this?" or, "Why is that approach we took?" So, we really do need to try to own the comments a little bit better. Sam and [Wim] are doing a terrific job and a lot of the time they're the only ones that are doing it.

So, we really do need to try to get some diversity across the stakeholder group. Obviously, there's topics that we have more interest in than others and maybe we need to be a little bit more willing to just say, "Well, we really don't have an interest in this topic, so we're not going to waste our time in doing the comment." And that's part of the comments workshop that I think Sam is going to look to address those types of issues as well.

So, we are a membership of 80-plus. I think 83-84. But we're not necessarily reflecting the views of all the 80 members. We're reflecting

---

the views of a few. And to make this stakeholder group work properly, I think it would be better if we can reflect some of the diversity that we have amongst us and make the comments a little bit more representative of that.

so, I guess it's a little bit of a theme. Please contribute. Please feel free to put your hand up. It may take a little while to flesh out where we are on a topic because we had those differences of opinion but I think it's important to have that discussion and have a comment that reflects the view of the stakeholder group rather than Sam and [Wim's] best effort at what they think it is. So, it really helps Sam and [Wim] in the job that they do.

And the public comment process is something that people look to see, well, what are the registries thinking about something? And they can go back to that and have a look. So, it is an important tool in the ICANN community, I suppose, to get a sense of what the registry's views are on a certain topic. So, I really encourage people to don't be afraid. We really welcome your input. So, when Sam puts something out and says, "I need a volunteer for this," don't be afraid to put your hand up. Sam will help you and [Wim] will help you through the process. So, it really is a call for action, I suppose, to the rest of the membership. We need some help with the heavy lifting. Thanks. Kristine?

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks. I just wanted to echo that and then to tie it back to something you said earlier is getting people volunteered. Like, really easy, low-bar way to get involved is to help by writing a comment because you don't



---

have to say anything at the mic or risk really embarrassing yourself much at all. There's only a few people that are participating in the comment anyway, so it's only a few people that are going to read what you write to start with. You'll get some public cred. People will say thank you for your help, which is always fun and great.

So, it's a really low-bar way to spend a little time, deep dive on a subject. You might have to go do some research. You might have to learn about the topic you're going to comment on. But it's a low barrier to entry and it's a great way to get involved and a way that's not going to come at a huge personal cost to you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

That's a good point, Kristine. Thank you. So, Keith, I think we'll move on to you for Council update, please. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Donna. Good morning, everybody. Keith Drazek here to provide an update on the work of the GNSO Council so far this meeting and to preview the formal meeting that we have tomorrow and certainly welcome Maxim and Rubens to jump in as well as the other stakeholder group councilors.

I guess Sunday – losing track of my days. Sunday was the GNSO Council working day and we had quite an intensive day of prep and discussions in our work session including some meetings with other parts of the community, including the GAC and the ... I guess we met with the

---

ccNSO Council yesterday. We had a meeting with the Board over lunch on Sunday.

But essentially the topics that we discussed during the working session were we received an update from the IDN scoping team. That's a group that's being led by Edmon Chung with participation from other members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. And this is the group that the GNSO chartered or sort of pulled together to try to develop some advice for the Council to try to figure out how we'll proceed on considering issues related to IDN variance and IDN guidelines, trying to assess what belongs in a policy track, what can live outside of a policy track and what role the GNSO Council has in terms of trying to charter the work of a policy group focused on IDNs and IDN variance.

And importantly, in reflecting on the ICANN Board's resolution from Kobe to coordinate with the ccTLDs and the ccNSO on the questions of IDN variance at the top level. So, we received an update there. We're expecting a report from that group and some advice from that group to the Council sometime in December which will inform the work and discussions that we'll have in January at our strategic planning session.

We also had a discussion on the topic of IGO protections. Very briefly, this is a discussion about how we amend the RPM PDP Working Group charter to incorporate the recommendation five that was referred by the Council back in April. We've had some exchange with the GAC in terms of language on a draft charter addendum and we had a follow-up conversation with the GAC during our face-to-face meeting on that topic, specifically.

---

I think we have a path forward but we still have probably another round of exchanges of edits, but at the end of the day, it's the GNSO Council's decision as to how to charter that group and how to move that forward. But we rec that critically important on that topic for the GAC and the IGOs in particular to participate in that follow-on effort.

We had a meeting with ICANN Org Finance team. Becky Nash ... Sorry, Donna, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Just a question with that new group. So, that will be a new group of volunteers or will that come out of the ...? Okay.

KEITH DRAZEK:

It's a good question. The expectation is that it will be a new group of volunteers. There could be some overlap. We won't prevent somebody from the RPM group participating in that dedicated work team but the expectation, it will be a new group of targeted and focused volunteers just to work on that issue. So, the expectation plan and hope is that, as we charter that, it won't interfere with the conclusion of the phase one RPM work or with the initiation and conduct of the phase two work. So, we hope that URS will conclude in phase one and we'll be able to begin the UDRP related work while still allowing the subset or this dedicated team to actually focus on the IGO protection issue. So, great question. Thanks, Donna. If anybody else has questions along the way, please let me know.

---

We received an update from ICANN Finance. Becky Nash essentially gave an overview of looking ahead to the next fiscal year budgeting and operating plan. I don't think there was anything particularly noteworthy from that but a good update and a good discussion.

We had a visit from the ATRT-3 co-chairs gave an update on their work. We then had a Council discussion on our plans to deal with the EPDP Phase 1 recommendation 12. That was one of the recommendations that the ICANN Board did not accept in full. And essentially we have a bylaw requirement to engage and go through a process to determine whether the Council will reaffirm the original recommendation or to accept the Board's non-acceptance. And I think where we are on that one is likely to instead of ... Following conversations with the Board, I think the expectation is that we will provide some additional implementation guidance and reaffirm and basically say, no, we are reaffirming the original recommendation but we are augmenting it with some implementation guidance that should address the concerns that were raised by the Board about the possible negative impact on registrants from the deletion of this data field. I know that's fairly involved but that's essentially where we are. So, I think we have a path forward with the Board to resolve this in the relatively near future.

We had our meeting with the GAC. Talked quite a bit about the IGO protections issue. There was a little bit of discussion about subsequent procedures and work track five. And I'll just note that in my interaction this week with the community, including that session with the GAC and also a follow-on engagement that I had with the ALAC later in the day, it appears that other parts of the community are pretty pleased with

---

how work track five went, even if not everybody is happy with the outcome. I think it seems that the community feels a positive ... They have a positive feeling about having been included, having been able to participate, and that consensus was reached with this work track group. So, just reporting out what I'm hearing.

We had a visit with Brian Cote focused on the multi-stakeholder model evolution effort that he's running, and then also sort of piggybacked on that, an update from Rafik and Pam on the PDP 3.0 work. That seems to be progressing well. And there definitely is some overlap between Brian's multi-stakeholder model evolution discussion and the work of the GNSO's PDP 3.0 team. So, we actually identified and mapped where that overlap exists and it may be that turns out that the GNSO at least, as part of the community, is pretty well ahead of the rest because of that work on PDP 3.0. And there may be an opportunity for that work to inform the discussions of the rest of the community around evolving the multi-stakeholder model.

I just want to take a note in conversations this week with Cherine and with other folks. I think there's been a lot of concern community-wide, really, about the expectations of the community in that multi-stakeholder model evolution effort, nothing that with all the other work that we have going on, including at the GNSO in terms of all the PDPs and everything else and now the discussions about DNS abuse and security threats and global public interest framework and all of the things that are sort of being layered on top of us, I think there was a concern that this MSM evolution topic was going to have some urgency

---

or drive a lot of additional responsibilities and obligations to the community.

In a conversation I had with Cherine, he said all that's being developed right now is a roadmap for the future and that this MSM evolution piece is something that is expected to take place over the course of the five years of the strategic plan. So, there's not an expectation at the Board level or anywhere else that by July 1<sup>st</sup> when the strategic plan goes into effect, that somehow we need to complete this work.

So, really, again, reinforcing that as that conversation takes place, as Brian Cute tomorrow or Thursday I think presents to the community the latest step in this process, it's not like by July of next year or February of next year we suddenly have to have resolved all of these improvement questions. It's really more of identifying things for the work of the next five years underneath that strategic plan.

So, I hope that provides a little bit of comfort. It certainly made me feel better about the whole process.

Then, finally, we received an update from the bylaws drafting team and Heather Forest. This is a group that was pulled together by Council to help essentially give some guidance and some templates and a framework for how the GNSO will involve itself in the empowered community and when we are in a position of having to engage as a decisional participant, to take some action as an empowered community member.

---

Heather and that small team did fantastic work and very complex interpretation of the bylaws to come up with essentially a roadmap for the Council's use moving forward, if and when we ever end up in that situation. So, I just want to give a shout-out to Heather and those who participated in that effort including some Registry Stakeholder Group colleagues to get us to that point. That's actually the one formal vote that we have as Council tomorrow on our agenda is to approve that package of guidance and templates as it relates to the GNSO's role as a decisional participant in the empowered community.

Let me pause there and see if there are any questions so far and then I'll talk very briefly about the agenda for tomorrow. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

I understand but would like confirmation for those of us that have an implementation roadmap to February that the February deadline on phase one for the EPDP will be pushed and that a letter has been send to the Council. Will there be some announcement made this week about it?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Sebastien. The answer is there was an expectation or the plan coming out of EPDP Phase 1 was to have the new consensus policy implemented by February 29<sup>th</sup> of 2020. But there's also a six-month notice requirement for contracted parties that has already essentially been passed. So, a letter was sent to the Council basically notifying that

---

the hoped-for deadline of February 29<sup>th</sup> will be missed and that that implementation phase will be pushed out for phase one.

I don't think there's any sort of formal announcement made but we have been notified and thanks for flagging that because it's probably something I had not forwarded to the stakeholder group list. But I'll go back and do that. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Was there anything that you wanted to flag from the meeting with the Board? Was there anything substantial or significant that came through there that you recall?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Jonathan. The primary topic... Well, there are really essentially two topics on the agenda with the Board. The first was a discussion about recommendation 12 and the Council's engagement with the Board and next steps to try to figure out how we sort of resolve that bylaw process to either reaffirm or to accept the Board's non-acceptance. So, we had that dialogue, that exchange, and I think that helped us understand what the path forward is and it seems that, at this point, the Council and the Board are sort of in the same place in terms of reaffirming with some augmented implementation guidance on that point. So, that was most of the time.

Then, Cherine essentially took the topic that the Board submitted was an update on strategic plan, financial operating plan, and the multi-stakeholder model evolution. It's essentially the same theme that



---

you've heard from Cherine in his opening remarks in his speech during the welcoming ceremony. I think what you'll hear or have heard quite a bit recently. I don't think there was anything otherwise particularly noteworthy that came from it but those were the two topics.

Any other questions? Edmon, please.

EDMON CHUNG:

I'm interested in the MSM evolution piece. You mentioned that the idea is not – at least the output from Brian Cute's work is going to be more like part of the strategic plan. And if I heard you correctly, then that means that, over time, the SO and ACs, as they review their own processes might take a look at that document and start incorporating them in versus at one point there was some worries or thoughts about that being a document that would be pushed down to be implemented, so to speak. Am I hearing the right thing?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Edmon. It's a great question. A great clarifying question. As I understand the process – and I did have a separate chat with Brian Cute last night, yesterday evening or whatever – the plan right now is I think today he will be posting essentially the next version of this framework, based on the input that's been received so far.

There will be a session on Thursday which will invite further input on the latest version and he'll then sometime in December publish another version that will then be put out for public comment, like a formal public comment period.

---

Whatever comes out the other end is essentially not going to be dictated to us but it's the framework that identifies here are the pieces that have been identified community-wide that need attention. I know one of them is how do we define and/or agree to consensus or reach consensus? Another is about prioritization. The community needs to prioritize our work better, to be more efficient. So, I think there's like six or eight different topics.

So, to answer your question this is expected to be a community engagement, community led effort. Nothing is going to be finalized and imposed upon us but the community, obviously with the help of the Board triggering this and getting Brian to lead this effort, to figure out what do we as a community need to do to improve our own pieces. So, the Board has a responsibility, Org has a responsibility, but we as the community have a responsibility to tighten up our act and do better in certain areas and this is hopefully the roadmap to help us get there.

Obviously, the GNSO will have views. Other parts of the community will have views and their own responsibilities for managing their own processes. But there will be probably a thread of certain things that crossover, that address the entire community, not just in our silos and figure out how we take that forward.

I'll just say I think it'll be important for us all to keep an eye on this thing, make sure it doesn't jump the tracks and that we contribute to it. But I think overall this is going to be a helpful framework for the community broadly. I was very much relieved to hear that there wasn't an expectation that, as of July 1<sup>st</sup> when the strat plan goes into place, that

---

there's some expectation that that work will be done. It's an identification of the things that need to be addressed under the umbrella of that five-year strategic plan, if that's helpful. I hope I answered the question. Yes, Kristine?

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks. I think that was really helpful. To the point in that I have participated in the sessions, I have helped draft the comment, I have read other people's comments. I have the summary report of public comments in front of me and until two minutes ago I still did not understand what this was about. It was frustrating and it felt very top-down to me. So, that was really helpful.

If you talk to Brian again, I would tell him he has a marketing problem. Nobody understands what this is about. The process feels wonky. It feels dictated. Even reading the summary report of the comments, because the request for – I'm not even going to say comments because it wasn't an official request for comments but what they had asked for last was a ranking of the issues and I know we had decided what we weren't going to through and rank the issues because [inaudible]. We were going to compartmentalize them. Everybody did it so differently in the staff report.

This is not a reflection on staff. They had crap to work with and they did a pretty good job with what they had but it doesn't really capture what we said at all. It doesn't get our points out. I know that there are other stakeholder groups that don't feel it reflected their perceptions as well.

---

I think there are other people who sort of followed the rules with how Brian wanted the comments, so their comments were better reflected.

So, I don't know what else we can say about it but your statement was the clearest, most distinct summary of what this is about and I think that is a problem. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Krisitne. My summary had the benefit of a conversation or two with Cherine this week expressing my concerns from a Council perspective about the prioritization question and the workload with everything else going on that I listed, including the Council work. There were probably 20 things that I ran through with Cherine and I was concerned because he was using the July 1<sup>st</sup> date. Even Cherine this week was using that July 1<sup>st</sup> date as that when the strat plan goes into effect.

And I asked the question. I was like, "Is there any expectation at the Board level of this MSM evolution work being complete or needing to be complete by then?" He was like, "No, no, no, no. This just the roadmap for what needs to take place during that five-year period." I breathed a sigh of relief, in a sense.

But you're right, in terms of the marketing problem. That's not getting out there. That's not being explained well.

---

SAM DEMETRIOU:

I absolutely want to agree. I think the thing that's been particularly challenging is that we understand now that the end product for Brian's work at least is a plan that will then have to go and be followed and executed on. It feels like a lot of work to go into developing just a plan for then how you're going to do your work, which is a little bit [inaudible].

The one thing I will say about our comments and how they've been taken. There's been more than one. And the one thing I was encouraged by was, in the first round of comments, when there were like 58 issues that were asked to be commented on and ranked, that was when we kind of did our grouping and one of the things we, as the Registry Stakeholder Group, highlighted was one of the big issues in the community is prioritizing the work and scoping the work appropriately instead of trying to boil the ocean, to use a very overused phrase, every time we take on a new project.

And I think that has been very well taken and reflected throughout the different iterations as they've narrowed the list of issues that need to get addressed. Those ones have always been kind of front and center. So, I am a little bit encouraged by that.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Kristine; and thanks, Sam. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Actually, there is a bit of lack of transparency around this project. For example, me and Michele asked ICANN staff about the cost of the

---

project. The answer was very shady. Basically, we took it from the budget. And I don't think that we will have an answer until we send approved by registry constituency request saying to the Council to check how much does it cost. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Go ahead, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Keith. I think one of the things that's happened with this project is that when it kicked off there was a lot of interest in it and people were excited by it and then I think it's lost its way. I think Brian has tried to ... He was adjusting in response to the responses that he was getting and then I think it's kind of lost its way which was a bit of a challenge for Brian I think that he was doing this largely solo. I think it might have been helpful if he could have had a smaller team to work with him to help with some of the things. I think Marrakech was a bit of a wash with public session that he had there. I think it might have lost its way a little bit. Maybe that goes to Kristine's marketing thing.

I did listen to the ATRT-3 update during Council session and I was encouraged by where that seems to be heading and it seems that it's focusing a fair amount on the prioritization issue as well. So, it seems that maybe what makes sense, and to Cherine's point that this doesn't have to be implemented right away, is give the ATRT-3 some time to finish their product, and once the PDP 3.0 is starting to make some

---

progress, then once those two things are in play, see what's left of the multi-stakeholder effort and what ends up there.

But I think one of the challenges that I'm cognizant of within the ICANN community now that it's much bigger is how do we overcome that silo piece? So, we've tried this week. We had half-an-hour with the GAC which is good but it's not really tremendous engagement but it's a start. I did try to get some time with the ALAC but I think at the ATLAS Summit or whatever they have is preoccupied a lot of their time.

But I'm wondering how we do a better job of interacting with the community. Obviously, we have the Council and that seems to be the construct that we work within the GNSO and that's helpful. But I think we have to find other ways to reach across and better educate the community about what it is we do on a day-to-day basis I think will be helpful. A little bit more of that education we're doing with the Board about the industry. We should be looking for opportunities to do that perhaps in other parts of the community as well. And even some engagement with the cc's. I'm sure we can benefit from some engagement with them as well about things that they're doing in certain areas that we might be able to benefit from and maybe vice-versa.

But I think part of the challenge that perhaps Brian was seeing is that we are more comfortable in our silos and in our own rooms. When there's an issue come up, we look to the Board to solve the problem but we need to find a way within the community to try to solve those problems ourselves. And I think that's part of what Goran was trying to

---

get us to do with his DNS abuse issue, even though I think he created the hoopla around it and now he's stepping back. But we need to find a way to engage across the community better.

Jonathan has had quite a time of it trying to organize the plenary session. Jonathan has taken a very strong lead in that and people are coming very late to the party. Whether it's a resourcing issue, timing, I don't know but just organizing those plenary sessions can be very, very painful and require a lot of time and effort and I don't know that we've really ... We're trying plenary sessions for the first time here. Or maybe there was one in Marrakech but I don't know that we're really hitting the mark in what was intended for community interaction in those sessions.

If anyone has got any ideas or if there is something that you're actually doing now in engineering with other parts of the community that perhaps we can leverage on, it might be worth trying.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Just one quick comment on that. It strikes me that I neglected to get on this agenda anywhere. We will go through another planning cycle. Hard to believe it will go straight back into at the end of this meeting planning for the next one and I'm sure there will be ... Just to be clear on those plenary sessions, I think this is the first time we've had a plenary session. I don't properly understand what the definition of a plenary session is. Thanks, Keith, I'm sure you can help. Originally, there were high-interest and cross-community sessions. So, maybe it would be



---

good to articulate how those three fit together and why they've ended up being the plenary sessions.

But regardless, if we feel there's a particular topic that we'd like to motivate for, my impression of last time is that getting it on the table now is a good way to get it out.

And we may not have anything. It's perfectly acceptable if we don't. But if anyone has an idea and there's some sort of momentum of consensus within our group about something that the entire community could be focused on in a plenary session at the forthcoming meeting, ICANN 67, by all means, flag it, because I can at least early get it out there and get people thinking about it and we can follow it up with a formal proposal. But that seems to be a good way of getting a little bit of early momentum behind something. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Jonathan. A couple of different points there. I'll respond to your last question first. And Jonathan is right. The meeting planning meeting of the SO, AC, SG, and C leaders or their designees happens on Thursday, I think. There's a fairly short deadline now of just a couple of weeks or a few weeks for that group to come together and agree what the topics will be for the coming ICANN meeting. The high-interest topics, as they've been called in the past. So, we should think about that a little bit if there's anything that we, the registries, or the contracted party house would like to put forward.

---

They used to be called high-interest topic sessions or cross-community sessions. I think the difference between those two was a cross-community session was supposed to have representation of all the different groups in the community, have a non-conflicted session on a particular topic. A high-interest topic I think is maybe a little bit looser in terms of the participation but it was a topic where the entire community was expected to be interested.

The common thread is that they were scheduled to be not conflicted with any other meetings, so that the entire community, any interested parties, would be able to participate without having a conflict on the schedule.

Now, there was confusion about those two things and what they meant and all of that, so we the SO, AC, SG leaders have evolved to just calling them plenary sessions which means, essentially, not conflicted.

So, I think it's open for suggestion as to what the topics are and how they're structured. Is it a panel discussion? Do you have lots of different groups expressing their views? Is it an update to the community with engagement? I think the definition is pretty loose at this point, but essentially, a plenary session means it's not conflicted in the ICANN meeting schedule. So, I hope that helps.

And just following on that, yesterday we also had a plenary session which was essentially a community update or an update to the community on the EPDP Phase 2 work. It was an opportunity for the community to engage. It was actually a session proposed by the GAC because they wanted to have a discussion around the importance of a

---

UAM (Unified Access Model) and Manal and I agreed that we would work together to pull that session together because the EPDP is chartered under the GNSO. So, to the extent it's a discussion of that topic with the work of the community in that area, we agreed that we'd work together. We did. And I volunteered to moderate it and that was the session from yesterday.

Again, that was an example of an update to the community and an input opportunity from the community back to the chartering group and the folks doing the work.

Anything else? Donna, I can just give a quick overview of the agenda but ... Yeah, go ahead, Alan.

ALAN WOODS:

Myself, Matt, and Mark just had a brief powwow there. Perhaps on the topic of sessions, just to give a feedback that the full-day PDP sessions are very grueling and probably far too long because past a certain point it's just not productive anymore.

Obviously, it's a scheduling issue, but at the same time, if we could break it up into something like two half-day sessions if we have to do them, it's much better. It's more likely for us to maintain productivity throughout those days and be able to move things along faster. So, just wanted to give a bit of feedback on that.

---

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Alan, and that's really helpful. So, the GNSO largely manages that process for the PDP so I guess that's good feedback for Keith to take back to staff.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. Absolutely. We were constrained a little bit in this meeting because Janis had to leave early. He left last night so we had to front load a lot of the work of the EPDP in particular. And I think Rafik is going to chair the wrap-up session later in the week. So, understood completely and we'll take that on Board in terms of trying to break it up. So, you have a little bit of an opportunity to breath in between and actually catch up and talk about work and be able to come back prepared for the next session. So, fully get it.

So, Donna, if I may, I'll just go through the agenda for tomorrow's Council meeting. So, we have three items on the consent agenda. One is to reconfirm Julf Helsingius, the GNSO Council liaison to the GAC. We will also approve the amended IANA naming function SLAs regarding IDNs, IDN tables, and label generation rule sets related to IDNs. This was something that, if I recall correctly, came out recommendation from the CSC. So, that's on there.

Then, we have also identified a GNSO-appointed co-chair for the IANA Functions Review Team. So, there was a question. We didn't have any volunteers for a while. The NCSG put somebody forward from the group of appointed of members, so we'll approve that person. [Tomslin Samlarto] is his name.

---

We have a Council vote, as I noted earlier, on the templates and guidelines for the decisional participant and the empowered community. I talked about that already. That's the only vote that we have.

Then, we'll further discuss the IGO protections and RPM charter amendment. We will discuss, again, the recommendation 12 situation with the Board that we talked about. Update on PDP 3.0 and any other business.

So, it's a fairly light Council agenda, relatively speaking, but we did most of the work during the working session on Sunday. And I'll just note we actually have, because this is the annual global meeting, we have newcomers and outgoing councilors. It's actually quite a bit of a turnover. We have six outgoing and six incoming councilors. So, that's quite a bit of turnover. And of course thanks to Rubens for his service on the Council, as one of those six outgoing. So, thank you very much, Rubens on our behalf.

I think that's it. It's a lot of work. Very much appreciated. So, I think that's pretty much it. I guess the only other thing is that I will be reappointed as the chair for my last term. I will be termed out a year from now and both Rafik and Pam have been returned as the vice chairs which is great news for me. So, that's my update. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay. Thanks, Keith. We're a little bit ahead of schedule. I just wonder if folks wouldn't mind if we can talk a little bit about the planning for

---

the next meeting. I know it seems a little bit premature, as Jonathan said, but something occurred to me while we were having that discussion and that is that some of you may have attended the event that INTA held earlier in the week on Sunday I think which, Mark, I understand you were involved in some of the planning for that.

I was having a conversation with Maarten and Susan I think about it, and the structure of that event I think was good because it wasn't long-winded panel discussions or anything like that. It was short and sharp, to the point. There was a lot of information that was shared and I think it was done in two hours, two-and-a-half.

That type of format seems to be maybe a better way to have discussions about topics of interest rather than talking heads on a panel and just having the six people up there. I think you were able to cover a lot in those two-and-a-half hours because it was kept short and sweet but you were moving people out. So, you were actually getting different views put out there on a single topic.

So, one of the challenges with planning, whether it was a cross-community session or a high-interest topic or plenary session is you kind of have to meet with ICANN – you have to conform with whatever ICANN tells you you have this amount of time and you can only do things in a certain way because that's the way we have the meeting room set up. But maybe if there's more thought about, well, what are we trying to get out of the session and what's the best way to engage with the community on these topics, then I think the format that INTA had was much better because, even with the round tables that you had

---

in the room, there's more engagement during discussions of topics, so you actually have an opportunity to interact with people you may not necessarily sit at a table with.

So, I think, Jonathan, to the extent that it's possible to take that kind of feedback into the meeting. I know it pushes the envelope because ICANN feels these constraints [in the] way that they set up meeting rooms. But I don't know. I think you were at that thing earlier in the week and I just found that format is probably more helpful to engagement on a topic than what we usually have which is the big room and people sitting in the audience. So, just wanted to put that out there.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Yeah. It's a good point. The challenge – and I don't want to come ... I willingly do that. I thought the session was good. It worked well. The time keeping was exceptional and that's not to avoid the fact that the content was substantial as well. But it was a two-and-a-half hour session and we only get 90 minutes which is one factor in terms of putting ... I think there were ... Were there three panels?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yeah. So, there were three panels. The first panel, security, was 30 minutes. The [trust to notify] was 30 and 30 minutes [inaudible]. It was 40/30.

---

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah. So, we could do a 30/30/30 with maybe 20-minute panels and then 10-minute discussion. Just the turnover as well, keeping it ... Rather than this ... We'll see how it goes. For the high-interest topic here, the DNS abuse one, which is of a similar subject, it would be very interesting to see how, to sort of compare and contrast tone, style, substance between what will take place on Wednesday which is somewhat constrained by, as Donna said, the ICANN format versus what happened in the INTA event on Sunday. So, Bruce is ... I went to his planning session. Bruce Tonkin is the moderator for that session and that is going to be divided into approximately three parts but with some initial presentations and a discussion section and a way forward section. So, it will be interesting to see how that goes and whether we can then ... That'll create a good reference point as well. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: We're 30 minutes ahead. Sorry, JC.

JC: Commenting on the INTA meeting which was very interesting and substantial, as you said. It was not an ICANN meeting. So, maybe that's something we should look into ourselves. They've rented a room in the Westin and they've used their own formats, making the presentations a lot more useful or eventful. Maybe in the current climate we could want to try and emulate this and have our own format irrespective of what ICANN constraints could be. That's a thought.



---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just to respond to that, JC – and you mentioned this and I talked to Lori after the session as well and she brought this up. They had wanted to hold it under on the general schedule for this meeting. But I think this speaks to what you were talking about about the constraints with meeting planning and it being a little bit too [inaudible] of an exercise. We have our 90-minute blocks and we must have our breaks. They wouldn't bend on having the event be held under the banner of a specific constituency. And INTA – Lori, specifically – her whole point was wanting to go across different community groups, so people wouldn't feel like, "Oh, it's the IPC's event on this topic."

I don't really have a good answer except that from what I've been hearing from Jonathan, and Donna before Jonathan took this over, is the meeting planning, I think it's a relatively small group. It tends to be kind of the same people and there's not a lot of impetus to kind of shake things up and do things a little bit differently.

I don't know how we fix that beyond just trying to get some new blood, new life in there. I mean, I think we're really trying. So, Jonathan has been doing a great job. And on the ExCom, we're cheering him on to be like, "No, take over the session. You should just go ahead and plan it."

But it's a little bit tough. I think it's something that we should spend some time thinking about because we all spend 18 days of our lives at these meetings year after year. We should make them useful for ourselves.

---

BETH BACON:

I was 100% agree. I think one of my suggestions is – and maybe Jonathan can give us a little peek into whether this might be a long-term effort. But because we would like a cross-community session that’s not necessarily a cross-community session in the traditional ICANN sense of the word, maybe this is time that we reach out to our BC and IPC and ALAC friends and just say, “Hey, we’d like to have ....” Use one of our blocks and one of us will use one of our blocks. Even our Registry Stakeholder Group falls a little bit into this trap. We might have an issue that is registry relevant but not necessarily a Registry Stakeholder Group initiative but something that we would like to talk about and that touches other groups as well and we would like their input. It goes to even when we ... We sent out our community letter and we couldn’t figure out a good way to do it.

So, I think that, perhaps, we take this on and say let’s try and reach out to our friends in the registrars and the ALAC and the IPC an BC and see if we can say, “Is there a 90-minute slot where we can just pick our issue dejour and use it?”

DONNA AUSTIN:

If I can just respond to that. One of the frustrations I was having within the planning committee is it’s really driven by staff. And it’s really hard to get any movement to do anything differently because they are so entrenched. But it’s also difficult to get some of the other SO/AC people to think outside the square as well. But we certainly can do what you’re suggesting.

---

BETH BACON: I 100% recognize that and maybe that's why we start digging in now and make it kind of a groundswell effort. And ICANN staff in the back, I love you very much. But maybe do it without ICANN staff or plan it and present it.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just wanted a question to clarify – sorry, Maarten – just to understand. Beth, I'm not sure I fully understood that. So, your idea would be they are called high-interest topics now and unconflicted sessions. What was your idea? That one SO, AC, or SG could, in a sense, own one of those sessions at any given ICANN meeting?

BETH BACON: I 100% didn't hear what you said.

DONNA AUSTIN: I think what Beth is saying ... So, when we do the planning, and Sue shares most of the load on this. But for instance we had a 90-minute session set aside earlier in the week. We just had a placeholder there. We didn't know what we were going to do with it but we could just say to ALAC and the GAC and whatever, "We think it would really good to have a discussion on this topic. We've got this time set aside. Do you think you could carve out that time on your schedule and we could have a conversation about this topic?" So, it doesn't actually go through the planning committee. We're kind of back-dooring it, I think.

---

BETH BACON:

Well, now that I'm paying attention again. Back in the game. I apologize. I think that if we have 90 minutes and it doesn't necessarily go through the planning committee but we just say, "These are our 90 minutes," and we can label it whatever we want and just use the time. It's our time and it doesn't have to be ... And I know that in the past it's been sensitive and challenging to have something that might say a Registry Stakeholder Group block or a title, so it sounds like we're sponsoring it. But I don't really have a problem with that personally. I think that the stakeholder group is for us to discuss issues with everybody. So, I think it's a forum and I think we could use it that way when we decide that it's appropriate. So, I'd be happy to start sneaking around with our IPC and ALAC friends and the GAC and seeing if we can get some really spiffy panels going. The INTA thing was well-paced. It was really good and we could just steal it.

[MARTIN]:

Thanks. I was going to say very much similar to what Beth was referring to. But just adding on to that, I don't think we need to sneak around. I think there is, from the event on Sunday morning, representatives across the different constituencies that were engaged, enjoyed it, had strong feedback and we should leverage that very quickly to feedback and if that is this week, even at the session at the DNS abuse, just as comments towards the end that we've heard some sessions, one of them on Sunday that was outside, [inaudible], was beneficial. We enjoyed it. Rich content. Pace was good. And it was less of the ICANN [inaudible] that draws back. Why can't we feed that back in as a recommendation to a different type of session, so we're not tied down

---

to what perhaps we've had in the past by cross-community sessions and very structured or agreed approaches? There needs to be some flexibility and to encourage that multi-stakeholder engagement. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Martin. I think this has been a good discussion and I will ... These are all really good ideas and I think we could make it work but we need the people to do the work to make it work and that is sometimes where we struggle, I think. So, if we want to take it on, I'm happy to take it on and see if we can get something going for Cancun. But that's what we need. We need the people to do the work to get it done because the challenge that I think Jonathan is coming up against is Mary on ICANN staff is trying to get people moving. She's potentially going down the wrong path, so Jonathan has to pull that back. But if we had the non-planning planning committee that excludes staff, we might get a little bit further along. But again, we're going back to that volunteer issue a little bit. We do need people to do the work if we're going to pull this off.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

I have to realize that I'm probably volunteering myself and I'm trying desperately not to make eye contact with Donna while she's asking about resources. But I think that maybe if we could start just brainstorming some topics that we might want to do in Cancun, [inaudible] get our extra 90-minute block and just start doing it. Donna, I would love to hear your ideas on sessions. She's going to spearhead that. See what I did there?

DONNA AUSTIN:

I suspect DNS abuse might still be around then, so there's one. So, I'm reluctant to get into the DNS abuse discussion because I think people might be coming in at 10:30 for that. We're 15 minutes ahead of schedule. Does everyone want an extra-long break and we'll come back at 10:30?

Okay, everybody. Go get the food while it's available. We do have to work through lunch, so here's your extra 15 minutes, folks. See you back here at 10:30.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**