

---

MONTREAL – GNSO Council Wrap-Up  
Thursday, November 7, 2019 – 12:15 to 13:15 EDT  
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Thursday, November 7, 2019 at ICANN 66 in Montreal. This is the GNSO Council Wrap-Up at 12:15 in Hall 511-C.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. For the GNSO councilors only, if you could step over and grab your lunch and get back to the table so the meeting can start.

KEITH DRAZEK: Good afternoon, everyone. We'll get started in one minute. If any councilors have not yet gotten lunch, there is a boxed lunch over there and we'll get started in one minute. Thank you.

All right. If we could please begin the recording, thank you very much.

So, good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Council Wrap-Up meeting. Our GNSO wrap-up meeting of ICANN 66. For everybody's benefit, this is essentially our taking stock session to review the discussions that we had here in Montreal and to map out any work ahead—immediate work—or to assess how things went this particular week and decide if there's anything that we want to change or do differently as we head into the next ICANN meeting. So, feel free to jump in and weigh in. An opportunity for us to have a good dialogue. So, if we could go to the next slide and look at our agenda.

---

**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.**

---

I'll just run through these real quick. So, the topics for our wrap-up session today, as compiled by leadership and staff—and I should note Pam is not here right now because she's covering a separate session focused on planning for ICANN 67. Unfortunately, that session is always scheduled at the same time as our wrap-up session, so we sort of have to divide and conquer. So that's why Pam is not here.

So, first topic for today will be a review of ICANN 66, any changes that we should be considering for 67, any items that we missed or didn't cover.

Then just a quick review of some small teams that we have convened and may need to reconvene or call for new volunteers. One is the subsequent procedures ccNSO coordination on string similarity and confusingly similar issues. That's something we discussed with the ccNSO. Need to follow-up on that and make sure that that connection happens.

We'll need to coordinate our GNSO Council response to the GAC Communique. Julf will help lead that effort but we'll call for volunteers. SCBO, that's our Standing Committee on Budget and Operations. We need to refresh that group and find a new chair. We've gone through a change in Council and Councilors, and this is a really important one, particularly with the financial plan and operating plan that is out for public comment. Berry, did you want to add something there?

---

BERRY COBB

Thank you, Keith. I don't know if you're just reviewing the agenda, but I would like a few points on the CBO if I need to come back, or just do it now? It'll be short and sweet.

KEITH DRAZEK:

If you don't mind, let me just get through the initial agenda, but don't go far, because it's an important one for sure. Thank you.

SSC, that's the Standing Selection Committee. This is the group that we have—a standing committee—that we've identified to go through appointments. So, if and when the GNSO or the GNSO Council needs to appoint members to other groups, that we have a group that's standing, to be able to review applications and statements of interest, etc.

And then we need the drafting team for the RPM charter addendum for the IGO curative rights issue. IGO protections, Paul McGrady was leading that effort. We had a couple of folks engaged. I think Martin was involved in that as well, so we need to reconvene a small group to review the proposed changes that we received from the GAC and the IGOs.

We will talk about the additional budget requests and the deadline there. We'll talk about the upcoming email vote on the GNSO's approval action on the fundamental bylaw change that we discussed yesterday. A reminder to book travel for the strategic planning session, review and confirm the GNSO Council meeting dates and rotation times, and confirm doing a GNSO Council dinner, in terms of date and time.

---

Is there anything else that we should discuss? Would anybody like to add anything to the agenda for today’s wrap-up session? Michele, thank you.

MICHELE NEYLON:

I’ve got a mouth full of food, so this sounds terrible, sorry.

I suppose maybe looking at the strategic planning session, because I mean we have [inaudible] booking travel, but I think also thinking about it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thanks, Michele. I think that’s a good point. So, we’ll add a little bit more substantive discussion of the strategic planning session.

Okay. Let’s go ahead and get right to business then. So, would anybody like to suggest any observations, or suggest any changes to the GNSO Council’s sort of engagement or GNSO Council engagement generally? Any thoughts about this week? Any suggestions for next time? Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON:

Michele again, this time without a mouthful of food. I thought it was useful to do some of the policy updates in advance of the meeting, because traditionally, this kind of death by PowerPoint thing that we’ve gone through was a bit painful. Being able to do that a bit in advance I think was helpful.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Michele. And that's a trend I think we started to see ICANN-wide is the desire to do webinars and some engagement prior to the actual face-to-face ICANN meeting, and we as the GNSO Council have done the same over the last couple of meetings, to schedule a webinar, have at a minimum updates from to PDP working group leadership to make sure that they've identified sort of a status update.

And really what that's intended to do, is to make sure that when we do have our face-to-face meeting, if there are any challenges, or obstacles, or problems that need to be worked through, that we as the GNSO Council—as the policy process manager—are aware of them, can discuss them ahead of time, and that the face-to-face time can be used to maximum benefit. So, thank you, Michele. I think that's an important observation and something we will certainly continue to do. And if there are other things that we need to consider adding to that, or those conversations, then we can certainly do that. Okay, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I wonder if it's possible to ensure that the financial session doesn't overlap with GNSO session. I believe it's possible to plan in advance a few months, because having it at the same time is not helpful.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Maxim. So specifically you're referring to the community-wide update from ICANN Org's finance department, and I think that makes sense. It does seem like that has fallen during the council working session, and so I take that on. Maybe we'll make a note of that will staff

---

as we get into planning for ICANN 67, and let's make sure that when Pam joins us either later, or next, that we flag that for her as well, as we're talking about 67 planning. Okay, Marika?

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thanks, Keith. Just a note on that one, I think that is one of the reasons as well that finance reaches out to the different groups and presents, because they know it is not always possible to avoid overlap—but note taken. I think it's one of those sessions as well some people may have already heard various times, depending on which groups you're in, because I think they've also been doing a bit of a tour. It may be worth part of that planning, if the webinar is in advance are helpful, the finance update may be one of those.

If that information is provided in advance, you could actually focus the meeting more on the actual questions and discussions, instead of having to sit through a lot of slides. I don't know if it's also where the Council could maybe proactively reach some of those groups, which often come with a lot of slides and updates, and say, "Hey, give that to us in advance," and we can even do that in the form of a webinar or specific sessions where you give us updates, and at least we can think about the questions and use the time really for the dialogue that's usually more difficult through the phone.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Marika. That's a good suggestion. I am curious, though. It seems like a 15-minute update here—15 or 20 minutes, whatever we

---

have with finance in this group ...I guess my question is, is it the same presentation that they give to the whole room? It seems like if you've got an hour-long slot, or maybe more in a big room, that it may be a little bit more in-depth, but I'm not sure about that. But, I think you're absolutely right, to the extent we can get the update ahead of time, whether it's during a Council meeting or a separate call. That would give us the ability to consider it, the SCBO, our standing committee on budget and operations could coordinate some questions or some feedback going into the face-to-face.

Berry is up, and then we'll come to Philip.

BERRY COBB:

It was on my list to mention, but I'll at least interject with this one. There's actually two conflicts. Was one Saturday, which was the SCBO being invited to the SOPC, and we'll be working for ICANN 67, to try to get the two groups together, if that's something that's doable. Then there was a second conflict with the Council meeting yesterday in the main finance session. The main finance session really gets into the details of the budget in those kinds of aspects, as opposed to the quick 10- or 20-minute presentation. So, there's really two conflicts that we need to try to cure there, so thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Berry. And the SOPC for our newcomers, is the ccNSO's version of our standing committee on budget and operations. We've engaged with the ccNSO occasionally, and we'd like to do it more

---

often on comparing notes, and questions about budget issues and finance stuff. Okay, Philip?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Just on that question of having a presentation from finance, and maybe it might be discordant, but I don't feel frustrated, really. They're two great, caring, going around the constituencies, we had ample occasions of asking questions. I appreciate that. It's always useful to have other people's questions, but really it was just fit for purpose this time. It's always a give-and-take anyway in these situations. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Indeed, thanks, Philippe. Would anybody else like to speak to this? Again, any changes or consideration for ICANN 67? If not, we'll move on. Okay. And we can certainly continue to discuss that, but things will start to get locked in fairly soon.

Okay. So, let's discuss the small teams. We've got a number of different small teams. I ran through them fairly quickly. I'm sorry, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes, thank you. Are we going to have the open mic session for ICANN 67?

KEITH DRAZEK: For the GNSO Council meeting? Absolutely, we try to have every meeting. There have been a couple of meetings where we've run out of



---

time, and it's only been 5fiveminutes, which is unfortunate. This time we had a longer period and nobody wanted to speak. Our plan and our regular practice is to have an open mic at each one of the formal Council meetings. Thank you.

Okay. Small team update. Subsequent procedure, ccNSO. I need to put ... Essentially I think it was Jeff Neuman from the GNSO side and subsequent procedure leadership in touch with his counterpart Giovanni from the ccNSO to discuss this issue of string similarity and confusingly similar issues, to make sure that as the ccNSO embarks on its policy work, and our ongoing policy work in the GNSO on the issue, that they're at least informing one another and try to figure out if there's an opportunity for more direct engagement, or sharing of views, or participation in each other's groups, that kind of thing.

It's unclear how that actually plays out moving forward, but at least the conversation needs to begin. So, I have an action item to follow up by email, make sure that that connection has been made, and the conversation can begin. Questions, comments? I don't see any.

Next is the GNSO's Council's coordination response to the GAC Communique. Julf has sent the final GAC Communique to the list, so if you haven't seen it, feel free to take a look. I think, as Julf has noted, there are no surprises following what was discussed during our Council session and his latest update, but we will be calling for a group of volunteers to come together to work with Julf and identify if there are any things, or any items or topics of concern for the GNSO Council, and the GNSO that we would like to flag.

---

And essentially this is not a response from the GNSO Council to the GAC, it's actually our assessment of the GAC's Communique, anything we would like to tell the Board that would be important for their consideration, or their knowledge or understanding of any impacts on GNSO recommendations or policies and procedures.

So, just so everybody understands, we're not responding directly to the GAC. That's not really our role to comment back to them on a piece of advice that they're essentially sending to the Board. So, Julf, would you like to speak to that briefly?

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you, Keith. Just to clarify, the final Communique hasn't been sent to a mailing list yet, because we don't have it yet. We only get it officially when it's published. There's no way we can get an early look at that, but it's based on what was discussed, was what was recorded.

And yes, as Keith said, the Communique isn't really directed to the Board, but the Board actually asks for our input when they consider that Communique, and that's why we comment on it. So, I think I would really, really appreciate you guys volunteering to help me draft a response. I'm coordinating it, but I'm hopefully not actually doing the content, which I hope people who are more familiar with the specific PDPs that they're commenting on would help me draft. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Julf. And I'd like to ask, do we happen to know when the Board and the GAC are likely to meet, as it relates to the

---

Communique? I know that's not always clear ahead of time. Marika?  
Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Thanks, Keith, I don't think there's a set date yet, but I think they usually aim for six weeks after the ICANN meeting, but we can follow up on that.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much. So we need to make this a priority, make sure that we identify any items that we want to address, and try to get that to the Board prior to the engagement with the GAC, and that will mean that we'll have to go through a formal approval process to make sure that we're all on board with the content of that. So, the sooner we can get the substance nailed down, the better for our processes and procedures. Okay, questions, comments? Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Can we sign up as volunteers for that now or not?

KEITH DRAZEK: We'll send an email to the list, and anybody can respond, but if there's a show of hands interested parties at this point, feel free to put your hand up and we'll take a note, but we'll send an email to the list. All right, Michele's volunteering, Tatiana's volunteering. We'll send a note to the list. Everybody can respond and we'll pull it together. Very good,

---

Okay. Next item. And Berry, I'll invite you back to the microphone. This is the SCBO call for volunteers. Again, this is our standing committee on budget and operations. This is the group that's responsible for pulling together our comments and making essentially a recommendation back to the Council as a whole for any comments we'd like to make, or questions we'd like to raise related to the budget and operating plan. I think because we're at the annual global meeting, there are some documents that we need to review and make sure that we're commenting on. I'll follow up on that point in a moment, but Berry, go right ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Keith. So, in terms of the call for volunteers, you may have seen a message go out to the Council, the Council members that are on the SCBO currently. You don't need to take any action, unless you want to be taken off. I strongly discourage that. If you do want to be on, let us know, but I have Philippe, Osvaldo, Martin, Erika, Michele, and Maxim. And then of course the Council leadership are on there as well.

As Keith noted, we do need a new chair, and thanks to Ayden for running the helm for a couple of years. If no one stands up, I guess it kind of defaults back on to Council leadership. I know they aren't very busy, but I think they would still like to spread the load elsewhere and not lead that.

Just a quick highlight on when we did meet with the SOPC. There are basically four actions that staff will mostly be doing in the near term. We talked about the possibility of liaising between the two groups, or

---

actually having a liaison. In the interim, the leadership of both of those groups will be cross-pollinated to their email addresses. We're going to look to schedule a virtual meeting sometime in January, so we can look to collaborate on the Council positions, and the ccNSO positions as it relates to the five-year strat plan, and fiscal year '21,

We're going to look for a possible time in which both groups can meet in Cancun. That's going to be a challenge given the other scheduling, but we'll give it a shot.

And then lastly, formalizing a possible liaison between the two groups, and that's something that really the SCBO and the Council really needs to make a decision on, on how formal you want to make that.

Lastly, I just wanted to say that the IANA PTI Comment is open now. As soon as I get back next week, I'll be sending out a blank template for the SCBO to consider, as well as a link to what was published or submitted last year. And we will schedule a call before the close of that just to review it. This one isn't very contentious, so it's kind of a nice warm up to the bigger aspect, but the good news is that you won't be busy until mid-December. The bad news is that the documents don't get released until mid-December, and it really compresses the timeframe to digest a lot of that material, so we're definitely going to be busy there, so thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Berry, just one follow up question. The mid-December timeframe, which set of documents is that?

---

**BERRY COBB:** It's both. My understanding, finance and operations had said December 13th or 14th for both the five year operating plan and budget, as well as the fiscal year '21 budget and operating plan.

**KEITH DRAZEK:** Very good, thanks for that reminder, and this is really important. I'll note—and if I'm mistaken here or off-base in any way, I'm sure I'll be corrected—but as a decisional participant in the empowered community, and I think we talked about this a little over the weekend or recently, as the GNSO, we have the obligation and the responsibility, or the potential to approve or reject budgets, right? And it may be one or the other, but essentially, we have an opportunity to raise questions or concerns about the budget. But if we don't, it actually prevents us from exercising the power to reject later on.

So, in order to have the standing to be able to go through a budget rejection process, we have to comment on it. We have to flag those concerns. We can't just sit back and wait, and think that at some point in the future we'll have the opportunity to engage. Maybe I'll just turn to Marika or Steve to confirm that I have that right. Yeah.

So this is important, this review of the budget, and making sure that we've flagged any concerns from our respective stakeholder groups and constituencies and bubbled it up to Council, or directly from the stakeholder groups and constituencies and Council reviewing what

---

might impact us, and our concerns, and impacting our ability to do our work. Berry, you want to follow up?

BERRY COBB:

Yes. Sorry about that, I forgot one small aspect. What is unique to our group is we do allow subject matter experts from the respective groups to also participate on this. There was a separate call for volunteers sent to your group's leadership. I'll make sure Nathalie sends out a follow up to that, but we need actual, physical confirmation from your group's leadership of who's going to be representing. If we don't get proper notification, we'll downgrade those to email observer only. So, it's very important that we get that actual, physical confirmation. Thank you. Marie? Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thank you, Berry. Sorry, if I can just confirm this. So the SMEs that we have on the group at the moment, we need to reconfirm them to you. We can do that pretty much immediately. I just want to be sure that that's what you need.

BERRY COBB:

That is correct. I believe I have Chris, Jimson, and Tim Smith.

---

MARIE PATTULLO:                    Yeah, that’s right. Thank you so much. I’ll make sure that happens. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:                    Thanks, Berry. And just to note, Berry has done a great job in supporting the Council over the last year, plus in this effort about the SCBO and the budget and operations. He’s obviously involved extensively in the coordination, but it’s not his job to populate the document with substance, right? That’s the role of Council, and we shouldn’t be leaning on him, or expecting Berry or staff at all to sort of carry the load here. This is our responsibility as Councilors. So, thank you.

Okay. Let’s move on. Next item is the SSC. This is the Standing Selection Committee. As I noted at the beginning, it’s the group that performs the function of recommending to Council the appointment of GNSO, either councilors or individuals, to various groups—various working groups—when needed. And so this is another group that we’re going to need to recast as it relates to the change in the composition of the Council. Any further comment on that, anything else? Yes, please, Emily?

EMILY BARABAS:                    Thanks, Keith. So the SSC has been running for a little over two years now, and SSC members can serve for a max of two consecutive terms. So this is sort of a moment where a number of people who were on the original SSC are now terming out and will be replaced, so messages have gone out to the SG’s and C’s leadership, to work towards appointing within three weeks after the AGM new members where



---

appropriate, or reconfirming members where they are still eligible to serve.

So this is just a reminder that that's coming and those decisions need to be made. And Rafik has generously offered I think to stay on as our ex officio Council leadership representative to help usher in the transition, as we're getting a number of new members. And we'll also be needing to appoint a new chair, as Susan Kawaguchi is leaving as well. So that's just a reminder about all of that as well. So, thanks to Rafik for continuing to help us out in continuing on.

There aren't any SSC assignments on the horizon that we're expecting, but it is possible that a replacement candidate will need to be identified, so it still is an important function for the committee to stay in place and be available when needed, when called upon. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Emily, and thank you Rafik for volunteering to continue to do that. And just for our newcomers, the SSC does not need to be comprised of councilors. Councilors are eligible to participate, but it's actually open to other parts of the GNSO community. So, thank you Emily.

Okay. Any questions or comments on the SSC? Okay, thank you.

And then the final small team that we're discussing today is the drafting team for the RPM charter addendum on IPO Protections. This is the one that we discussed recently that Paul McGrady helped to shepherd before. Martin is interested. I think we talked about it a little bit, I don't

---

know if John was also interested in participating. But anyway, we'll send out a note asking for input.

But really this one I think this one is fairly straightforward, in that we've got a draft of the draft addendum, we shared it with the GAC and the IGOs, they brought it back and provided us some red lines and feedback, and essentially what we're doing now is reviewing those proposed red lines, and essentially trying to come up with a compromise that will incorporate or include the IGOs in the working group once it's established, while still respecting and protecting the GNSO's purview and the composition that we need to ensure that a GNSO PDP working group, or a sub-team is properly composed. Anyway, thanks for that. We'll send out a note asking for any interested parties there. Any questions on the sub-teams?

Okay, seeing none, next is a heads up that we have a deadline of 31st of January for any additional budget requests. Not sure if Steve or Marika, anybody would like to speak to this one, in terms of the budget request process, or sort of what we're looking at here. Sorry to put you on the spot. i'm looking for a little help.

[STEVE]:

I guess I could first say which ones we've had for last year, if that's helpful. There was a travel pilot for PDP leadership. there was a consensus-building playbook, and then of course there was the strategic planning session. So those were the three last year.

---

I think just based on the timing, what has worked fairly well in the past is that, there will be some draft proposals that are put forth by Council Leadership, or maybe Council more broadly, now that you're all being made aware of it now. And those have traditionally been discussed at the SPS and agreed to, and then immediately submitted at the close of the SPS. So, that's sort of the cadence that has taken place the last couple of years. Whether or not you guys want to do the same ABRs or something different is obviously for you to decide. But just for context, those are the three, and that's the deadline for submission. Thanks.

MARIKA KONINGS:

And if I can maybe just add something. The ABRs have been used basically as a way to test new ideas or new approaches. It's typically things that are not funded by the regular budget, but where the group feels may be benefit in having kind of a pilot, and some of those pilots then eventually get transferred into the normal budget.

So, think of this as one where you may want to creatively think are there things you think the Council should undertake, or should think about as something to request budget for, and kind of be able to tie that as well, of course, to the work, strategic plan and your justification. Looking maybe looking as well at you Rafik, as Pam is not here, but is there anything coming out of the PDP 3.0 that is worth further exploring, or where some funds could help in doing something different or testing something out? So I think that's something for the group to consider, and maybe brainstorm a little about.

---

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks to you both, Steve and Marika. That’s really helpful context. I guess I have a follow-up question, and I should probably know the answer, but is there a time when we could expect the strategic planning session to be moved from ABRs to like a permanent budget, or is there a time we can expect that that will be a regular thing, rather than something that we have to request every year?

MARIKA KONINGS: I think that the practice has been over three or four years, especially if something has been demonstrated to work well, but I think the challenge is a little bit that the budget process and the ABRs go a little bit in parallel. So I think it’s fully within the Council’s remit or purview to, for example, put in your comments that there’s a certain aspect that has been funded through ABRs, think for example the council strategic Planning session, as part of the standard budget, but I would at least recommend that until you have that confirmation, to also put in your ABR.

But I think at least from what I’ve seen, I think it’s three or four years, but especially if it has also been demonstrated that it makes a difference, it has an impact, and as such, it should really become a part of the regular budget. But again, factoring in that adding something to the budget may also mean that something else needs to go, if we’re operating on a flat budget.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Great, thanks. That’s really helpful, and if I’m not mistaken, this coming January will be our third, is that correct? The third strategic planning session? Okay Third, yeah, thank you.

All right. Notd. Any questions or comments about that? And I guess the call to action here is if there’s anything we think we’d like to request as a Council, for our engagement going into the next year, in terms of additional budget items or expenses, think about them. Let’s discuss them. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADI:

I just wanted to- so basically, for the additional budget request, from my experience, we sometimes put it so it’s really close to the deadline, and then drafting it would be a bit difficult. I think if we could have a focal point who is kind of telling the group “let’s look at this” or come up with drafts that the group can look at, that would be great. And, I volunteer.

The other thing that I wanted to suggest is that the Board is doing stuff about global public interest, and they are having webinars. I think they are trying to come up with a process to discuss and define global public interest, and if we don’t have anyone who is following that—I think Elsa is following it, but I think someone we can go to, or who can brief us whenever something is happening, so that we can prepare before Board tells us what they are doing. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Farzaneh. That's a good point. There was a session on the global public interest framework here this week. Avri ran that for the Board. We were aware of the publication of the framework, what was it a month ago or thereabouts? And the Council did submit comments on that at the time. But I think you're right to the extent that the Board continues to have this as a focus and move this forward, it would be good to have somebody on Council sort of on-point, or even a small group working together to sort of coordinate our awareness and our feedback and input to that process.

I think that will be an important one for us to a Council to follow, as it could potentially impact our management of PDP Working Groups and process, but also for our respective stakeholder groups to respond directly, if warranted. Thank you. Okay, let's move on then.

Next item is the heads up on the upcoming email vote. So, as we discussed during our Council meeting and over the weekend, there has been a fundamental bylaw amendment proposed by the ccNSO related to their appointment of IANA function review team members, essentially transitioning from a requirement in the bylaws for them to identify two ccNSO representatives and one non-CCNSO ccTLD manager for appointment of their three slots to the IANA Function Review Team. And that has gone through the process. We had the community action forum here this week. The Board has already approved it, and now it's up to the empowered community to essentially affirm or validate that that's what's approved or not.

---

So we as the GNSO Council, as a decisional participant in the empowered community need to cast our vote. We've discussed this for several months—many months even—and there's been no indication of anybody having concerns with this. It's non-controversial. And we will have an email vote to approve this proposed fundamental bylaw amendment before our next meeting on the 19th of December, so sometime in the next 21 days. I think starting today, I think the clock starts today. We have 21 days to conclude that vote and perform the function that we have as the decisional participant. Any questions? Okay. So, watch for the notice and we will get that out to the list, and we'll conduct the email vote within the necessary timeframe. Yes, Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADII:

Sorry, I'm making too many interventions, I will stop. For the IANA naming function review composition when the ccNSO could not appoint a non-member, when that was going on, I raised concerns that we shouldn't just change the bylaws just because they could not find anyone, so is this vote about changing the bylaws? Can we somehow record our concerns somewhere that we shouldn't ... Just because they could not find a non-member, I think changing the bylaws just to kind of accommodate their request is ... I don't think that was the right action.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Farzaneh. So, in this particular case, this process has been underway for ... We're probably talking six months now if I'm not

---

mistaken, just in terms of from beginning to end. It has already gone through the Board approval process. We had the community action forum this week, where we had the opportunity to raise concerns or raise questions, and the Council had not come to an agreement, or really discussed any concerns in that regard.

I know there were questions about whether this was something, going back many months, whether this was really necessary and if it was appropriate, but I think where we are today is that there's a general consensus that this is okay and that they had problem being able to identify or challenging being able to identify somebody, and it was holding up the ability of the IANA Functions Review Team to begin.

If I'm not mistaken, the IANA Functions Review Team is about a year late, or a year delayed right now, because of that issue. And so, I understand the sensitivity of changing bylaws under these circumstances, but from the ccNSO's perspective, when the bylaws were drafted, it carried in language from previous years in different places that wanted to provide the ability for ccTLD managers, who weren't members of the ccNSO to participate, but the ccNSO has actually grown in membership over time, to the point where it's getting increasingly hard to find interested non-ccNSO members, and they recognized—I think the ccNSO recognized—that this was not just a problem for now, but it was going to be problem for the future. So, I think that's just a little bit of the context. Yes, please?



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And please be aware that whenever the ccNSO forms a group, and also with regard to the [inaudible]—I can't pronounce all of these abbreviations anymore today. But it always invites non-members always. So, it's always open for non-members and it's not automatically that it only appoints members of this ccNSO in this position. So that will remain the same afterwards.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks very much, and that's an important point is it's not precluding or preventing non-ccNSO members from participating. It's simply changing the requirement that there be one, which was causing as we've seen almost a year delay, if not more, on the formation of that team. James, go right ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. I just wanted to give a really quick update on this that, yeah, it was actually 18 months delayed for the IFRT. I'm liaison to the IFRT from the CSC. But I also [inaudible] that there is actually three more occurrences of this restriction in the bylaws, so I would suggest that probably now, before we end up in another IFRT scenario, that it's probably the right time for the ccNSO and GNSO Council to start beginning a discussion about changing the other bylaws, where we have the same restriction, so it doesn't become an issue of delay again.

---

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, James, and thanks, Farzaneh for raising this as a question, because obviously changes to the fundamental bylaws are not something that we take lightly.

I do think, though, that in this case, we've proven as a community that we have a process and we were able to follow it, and that the process has in fact been followed.

I should note, to James' point, though, I know within the Registry Stakeholder Group, for example, the registries have identified also some concerns about some of the geographic requirements of appointments to the same team, to the IANA Functions Review Team. And we did not raise this in time or in conjunction to be considered with the ccNSO's proposed changes, but there could be as James noted, other instances in the bylaws in different places, or even in this instance, where we as a GNSO might want to consider and propose changes. I'm not saying that we need to focus on that now, and each group should probably look at, "Hey, where do we want to consider changes to the bylaws?" and try to do them in batches, rather than one off. Anyway, just to put a marker down there. But thanks for raising that. Questions, comments? Yes, Maxim and then Ariel.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Actually, the problem was non-ccSNO members would be even more severe, because currently they're talking about adding IDN ccTLDs to the ccNSO to the process on how to do that, and the pool of non-CCNSO members will deplete even more.

---

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Maxim. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel from staff. So, staff just wants to remind the Council that the drafting team has developed a guideline for these kind of approval action post-community forum, so there's supposed to be a period for the GNSO Community to provide input, and then the input can be delivered through the Councilors, and that's completed before the vote actually starts, and we actually have a timetable for when these actions should be completed. So, we're happy to share that to provide some guidance to Council.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Ariel. That's really helpful, and a reminder that we actually did approve those guidelines this meeting, so they're now in effect. Ariel, the timelines that you've described, are we planning to use that now for this process? So essentially a notice would go out to Councilors and to the stakeholder groups and constituencies to sort of initiate the call for input on this question?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I think it would be a good opportunity to use this as a trial run and see how the process works. So, just to give you a preview that we can send a notice today and then the GNSO community input period will

---

end on the 22nd of November, and then the Council vote needs to happen no later than the 27th. So, we still have some time.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Ariel, that's really helpful. I guess then between the 22nd which is the deadline for feedback from the stakeholder groups and our constituencies, and the 27th when the email vote would take place, there is the opportunity—not that I expect we'll need it this time, but there's an opportunity for a Council discussion if we need it to consider the input. I guess that's sort of a question in terms of process moving forward.

ARIEL LIANG:

I haven't thought very deeply about that step yet, but I think the first step is to at least give the GNSO community an opportunity to provide input, and then the Councilors can review the input, and then make decisions based on that input.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Ariel. That's very helpful. And thanks for your work supporting that effort of the drafting team for the guidelines and the framework. Thank you to all of you, and Julie, of course, yeah. Okay. So, I think we're covered on that one.

Next is a reminder to book your travel for the strategic planning session, if you haven't done so already, I think there's three or four folks. And

---

I've had conversations with a couple of people about next steps on that, but please if you haven't done it, please do so.

Let's take this opportunity to respond to Michele's suggestion about discussing the strategic planning session. Leadership has been working with staff to work on developing a proposed agenda and going through that. I don't recall if we've actually shared that more broadly, or it's still at the leadership level.

But essentially, at a high level—and then I will turn to staff for any help here—we have three days, and it's going to be a little bit different than we've done in the past for returning Councilors, where we're actually going to frontload some of the basic GNSO Council 101 updates into I think a webinar ahead of time. There's going to be some homework and required reading up front, but the plan this time is not to repeat some of the things that we've done in the past in the first day, but actually use the time for more substantive discussions.

And certainly one of the things that we're going to find time for, and make time for is this prioritization of work for 2020. It's going to be a critical component of what we're going to talk about, and we're going to need to come out of the strategic planning session with some agreement about the things that we're going to do, what we're going to prioritize, and perhaps simply what we're not going to do, because we won't be able to find the time and do it right. So, just in terms of context, any further thoughts from staff? And Rafik, feel free to jump in on this one as well as it relates to planning for the SPS. Yes, Philippe, thank you.

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Just a question, really. Is the intent to sort of—I wouldn't call that general high-level presentation we had, especially during the last two meetings, but that we could [inaudible] the logic of what would fall within the GNSO Council, what wouldn't, etc., which I found very useful. I'm thinking about a presentation from Becky, for instance, that we had [inaudible]. I'm just wondering, that's also planned for this time?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Philippe. I think some of that we will try to accomplish prior to the actual face-to-face, during a webinar. Do I have that right? Yeah, thanks. I see Marika nodding her head yes. And Rafik, feel free to jump in here, but yeah, I think we're going to try to front load some of that early and actually have more substantive discussions in the face-to-face, but Rafik go ahead.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Keith. Yeah, as you said, I think we are trying to do a lot of preparation through a webinar before the SPS, to use fully the three days, and also I think to try new things, maybe more think about doing how we will do the prioritization or how we will manage the workload, so we will try. As Keith said, now it's high level, we just started to discuss the agenda and hopefully we can share that soon, and to introduce any input from the Council.

KEITH DRAZEK: Philippe, did you have a follow up? And then I'll go to Carlton. Okay, Carlton?

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, chair. Speaking to prioritization of the issues, I recall that you circulated a list of priorities for you, at a point you were discussing being Council chair, and I wanted to know whether or not we could reprise that list as a substrate to maybe add some additional topics to that list.

KEITH DRAZEK: We will certainly circulate the list of all the work obligations, work tracks, all the things that are on our list for prioritization, and certainly look for input from councilors and your stakeholder groups and constituencies, in terms of helping to order them appropriately. And if things need to be added, there's certainly the opportunity to do that, too. Did that answer your question? Okay, thanks, Carlton. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you. It just came to my mind, because I'm not traveling, would that be any opportunity for those [inaudible] people who cannot attend just to dial-in, at least for some sessions? I know you'd rather prefer to have them in the closed room without remote participation, but maybe will I be able to join some of the strategic sessions remotely? I don't mean presentations from Becky and all that, but where we're really discussing something in the thick of it, I can try and accommodate my schedule, if there would be any possibility to dial me in. Would this be possible? I understand that making it for one person would be quite silly, but at least—

---

KEITH DRAZEK: So, thank you, Tatiana, and it's a good question, and we'll follow up with staff in terms of figuring out what's possible and what we can do in terms of remote. I mean, of course the goal is to have everybody in the room, and if you start opening up remote participation, people might start deciding not to come, so we have to be cautious about how we approach that.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, Keith. This is what I was going to say, maybe just a couple of sessions where we are really in the thick of it, others can be in the room, but then again, it's just a kind ask, because I know they cannot impose this just because of one person being absent. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Understood, Tatiana, and to have you participating in those sessions would be very valuable, and so if we can accommodate that, we will. Thank you. Okay, Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: I'd just like to say for the avoidance of doubt, Tatiana, that Michele and I will Skype you in from underneath the Lemon Tree during the [inaudible] session.

TATIANA TROPINA: I would love to join the [inaudible] session, so I Skype. Thank you.



---

[SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET]: I will have to Skype you in somewhere very far from the Lemon Tree, because of my citrus allergy.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right. Thanks, everybody. I think we're starting to run short on time here and the EPDP team has a meeting in here next, so we're going to have to wrap up on time. I have that right? Okay. So let's just get to the next couple of items.

GNSO Council 2020 meeting dates and rotation times. That's been sent to the list so you have that in your inbox. We probably don't have time to look at it right now, but just to note, please review, and please understand the plan for the GNSO Council's formal meeting dates for 2020.

And then finally, we just need to for planning purposes, confirm that we will be doing the GNSO Council dinner at ICANN 67 on Sunday, the 7<sup>th</sup> of March. We're not?

MICHELE NEYLON: No, because the 7<sup>th</sup> of March isn't a Sunday.

KEITH DRAZEK: It's not? Interesting, so whatever day, I guess it's Sunday, right? Yeah, so we will be doing the ICANN 67 dinner on the Sunday, unless we decide to change that, because of date confusion.

---

MICHELE NEYLON: The Sunday is the 8<sup>th</sup> of March.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Michele. Okay, any other comments, questions, anything else to discuss today for our wrap-up session? Any questions in particular from our new and incoming councilors? Anything that you would like to ask? We have a few minutes. Anything from—oh yes, Sebastien, go right ahead.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I was approached last night by Stefan and I can never say his last name, but from [DotAS], who asked me, as we have elected you chair, you sort of offered yourself for a position, and yet again an acronym that I do not know and I never heard about, but he offered to come and meet us next ICANN to explain exactly the roles and responsibilities of that function, because he felt we may not be completely enlightened about it, so I just wanted to pass the message on.

KEITH DRAZEK: Very good. So, just for context, it's essentially the representative to the empowered community administration. So, the GNSO as a decisional participant in the empowered community, coming out of the IANA transition and the new bylaws, we basically have to act as a body, the GNSO, and there needs to be an individual appointed to be the

---

representative of that body to be able to essentially engage and conduct the vote, when needed, and all of that.

And so, I guess traditionally since this has come into effect over the last couple of cycles, the GNSO chair has been the person performing that function, but certainly I think going into the strategic planning session, this is actually one of the topics that we will be discussing, sort of an update, an overview, an explanation and engagement about what it means to be the GNSO and what our responsibilities are as a decisional participant in this construct. So, I'm certainly happy to have additional participation, but that's definitely a plan for the SPS.

Okay. Any other business? Any other comments?

Thank you all very much. We will now conclude the GNSO Council's formal meeting of the ICANN 66, and look forward to working with you in the coming year. So, thanks.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**