

---

MARRAKECH – GNSO Council Wrap-Up  
Thursday, June 27, 2019 – 12:15 to 13:15 WET  
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, everyone. We will start in one or two minutes, so, please ... I guess, Terri, we can take the lunch box and go to take your seat. Okay, so we have only one hour for the wrap, so please take your lunch box and take to your seat, so we can start on time. I am here for one hour, so you'll have to live with that now. Okay, so let's start the meeting. So, as usual, we have our ... Okay, sorry. Did the record start yet, or not? Sorry?

Okay, thank you. So, I said, as usual, we have our wrap session at the end of the ICANN meeting, and as you can see in the agenda we got several action items to follow up from our meeting this week. So, checking first if you have any comment on the agenda. Otherwise, we will start to go through it. Okay, seeing none.

So, the first one is about the review of the GAC advice, that I think the usual activity we have after each ICANN meeting. But I think maybe here, the question for us is we need, probably, to assess first if we need to respond, and after that we have a team of volunteers from the council to work on the response in timely manners to have our response reviewed and approved by the council during one of our calls, and to send it to the board as

---

**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.**

---

input. So, I'm not sure if the GAC advice, how say ... Our  
communique was already – not yet. Yes, Julf, you want to add  
something?

JOHAN HELSINGIUS: Oh, I was going to say yes. It's not out yet, so we don't yet have  
the actual text. But seems there's no really strong advice this  
time, it's mostly just repeating the older things, so there's not  
going to be too much that we need to actually do. We do, of  
course, need to look at it.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Julf. Pam, you want to add something ?

PAM LITTLE: No, maybe we talk about it ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you collect team members, now, Rafik? Do you volunteer to  
help with the GAC advice?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, I think what idea we had is to kind of assess if we need to  
respond, but I guess, meantime, since we don't know yet about

---

the content we can have, tentatively, the team of volunteers that want to work on the response. So, I guess, Paul, you want to volunteer? Okay? So, taking a note of this. Who else wants to join this team?

MARTIN VALENT: I have a comment on that if I'm allowed. I volunteer, too.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Martin. Yes, Julf, and then Michele.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I want to volunteer, just put me on the list.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Permanent!

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Julf, please go ahead.

---

JOHAN HELSINGIUS:           Everybody volunteering, we really need people who actually take the pen and actually do something. It's not just reviewing it. We need to write a response.

PAM LITTLE:                    Yes, I want to echo what Julf is saying. And also, could we maybe see the draft a bit early, rather than leaving it until the last minute? Because usually ... So, allow counselors time to review, or take back to the stakeholder group, so we don't have the last-minute scramble as we sometimes did. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:                Okay, thanks, Pam. Okay, Michele, one sec. I think we have now this small team, and we can start quickly. Yes, Michele, please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:              Thanks, Rafik. I suppose, look, to make this a bit simpler. If we see that the communique contains something new, or something that we definitely need to react to, then obviously that would trigger that entire process.

And to Pam's point about no nasty surprises, or whatever, we generally work in a Google Doc of some kind, so what I'd suggest is that as soon as we start working on it, that we share the link to

---

the Google Doc, and just make sure people are aware. Look, this is living, it's not done yet, but you can see where we're going with it. That might just help to alleviate that issue.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Michele. I think that's very good to share a kind of initial draft, and as said, just leaving the document so everyone should be aware about the work in progress. Yes, you want to speak?

TATIANA TROPINA: I just want to be in the team.

RAFIK DAMMAK: One more. Okay, thanks. So, we have Paul, Martin, Michele, Tatiana, and, I think, Julf. Okay, so that's done, so I guess we can move to the next item, which is about the next steps for ATRT3. So, this is coming after our meeting with them in Sunday. I believe it's about two matters. The first is that we heard that Erica Varlese, I think she's from the registries, probably she will continue, but she should be replaced at some time in the future. And so ... Sorry? Please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: : August. She will be needing to leave by the end of August.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:                   Okay, thank you. So, we need to decide here if and how to replace Erica. Usually, we went through the Selection Standing Committee, but I guess one question here is if we still have any candidate applicants or candidates left there that can replace since we've already done that a while ago already. Okay, any comment or question here? Yes, Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO:               Thanks, Rafik. I don't have the e-mail in front of me, but my memory was the Standing Selection Committee had some people in reserve anyway. Have we been through the reserve list? We have, Pam's nodding.

RAFIK DAMMAK:                   This is my recollection. So, I think we already went, but we can double check. But still, we also have to double check if they are still interested. So, I think it's two steps, to check what we have, and if they are interested. And this is showing that we will go again through the Selection Standing Committee. Yes, Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO:               Because it seems to me that if the SSC did make that cut, that deliberation, that work, on our behalf, that unless something has

---

drastically changed, I think it would be appropriate first to go to whoever it was that was notified, which I don't remember who it was, if there is somebody on the reserve list. I think that should be our first check. It's just transparency of procedure. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, I'm also saying just to check if they are still interested to be ... I mean, it was a while ago and people probably changed their mind. It's okay, we can do that first. Yes, Pam.

PAM LITTLE: So, maybe that's an action item? Staff can help us check whether there's still anyone on the reserve to fill this seat. The other thing to check might be whether the replacement needs to come from the Registry Stakeholder Group because I understand Erica is from the Registry Stakeholder Group or other diversity requirements, so let's so that, if we can. Thanks. Cheryl.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Cheryl. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As long as all of the councilors have finished on that deliberation, I just wanted to ... Wearing my ATRT3 co-chair hat, a couple of

---

points for your consideration. The first of which is ... And unless the published reserve list has changed, to the best of my knowledge, those on the reserve list have had absolutely zero following or activity with all of our public and open meetings. And so, I would like you to also consider if you do choose to replace, that there would be perhaps people who may be sought, if people are not available, or you do wish to replace, that have in fact been following the ATRT3.

Because we now are about to finish the data acquisition and data analysis phase, and that's a ramped-up activity, not entry-level activity. So, when you're making your deliberations you might want to consider that. And of course, you're not required, just to remind you, to make a replacement, should you choose not to.

Because, of course, you still have, I believe, four people, with between three and seven being your seating options. So, you're above your minimum seating anyway. So, leaving all the deliberations there, just because you're on the reserve list, if you've had insufficient interest in the activity to even join a single call, that might be a worthwhile conversation to have, thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Cheryl. Point taken. I think also when someone is joining in the middle of the work, there is an expectation he or she

---

has to catch up on the work. Okay. So, we will take this in consideration. Any further comment or question on this? I think not. I guess we can move to the next. So, this is all the kind of ... We have a proposal for several small teams to cover a different area. So, we have the first one, input in the RP standing panel, and we have Flip and [inaudible], so to check here if anyone else wants to join this effort.

MICHELE NEYLON: [inaudible], sorry.

RAFIK DAMMAK: No, the IRP standing panel.

GREG SHATAN: As a point of clarification, I think there may also be involved in this is getting additional volunteers to serve on the IRP-IOT, which still has several open issues before it gets to the issue of selecting a standing panel. So, the SOs, I think, should be making a call out to the stakeholder groups and constituencies to nominate people for expressions of interest for this.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Greg. I think what happens is we send a reminder to all [ACNC] Chairs about populating the IOT. So, this is more about to respond to the question and so on. Okay, yes, Pam.

PAM LITTLE: So, Greg, I don't know whether you are aware. The letter from the Chair of the Board Governance Committee actually has gone out to our SO and AC leaders, and so I hope the SO and AC leaders would then further distribute that to their stakeholder groups. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Pam. I think at least for GNSO, we share the reminder. Okay.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Rafik. As a practical matter, it might make sense to try to assign a council-lead to each of these small teams, just to help make sure things stay on track. But also, from the staff side, we're happy to assign a staff member to each one of the projects, just to help steward things as well.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Steve. We will do so. And so, you take note for who from the staff will support, and we will ensure that we have a lead for each team. So, Flip, you are volunteering. Okay, that's good. So, nobody else wants to join? Okay. So, the next one is about IDNs. So, we have Rubens, Maxim, Philippe and [Inman]. Yes, Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: You can shove me down for that one.

RAFIK DAMMAK: And you'll speak in plain English?

MICHELE NEYLON: Beg your pardon. You may add my name to the list of volunteers.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you, Michele. Okay, so the question here, if we need to have additional volunteers outside the council at this stage? If so, how? Yes, Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Rafik. Trying my best to speak clearly and plainly. Based on the meeting we had yesterday evening with the ccNSO, one of

---

the action items coming out of that way, I believe, to put together some kind of mailing list between us and them. Based on the conversations that we had, I will say yesterday, but it could've been earlier this week, I'm a bit confused, with respect to the IDNs, while we're looking at it as a single topic, realistically it's multiple topics.

So, I think what we have been discussing, or at least I've been suggesting anyway, was to try and break it out a little bit into more discreet parts, because some parts are super technical, some parts aren't. I think we need to coordinate a bit with the ccNSO. I'm looking at Steve because I like looking at Steve, and he seems to be ... Are you going to say something? No, okay. But I think that's probably what we need to do there, is to try and do a little bit more organization around the topics and themes.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Michele. And just saying what ... You are making this comment also wondering if you want to take the lead here for this team?

MICHELE NEYLON:

I would probably defer to Edmon on a lot of this stuff, as he really is a subject matter expert, and I would never even try to be a subject matter expert in IDNs. I'm more than happy to, as the

---

GNSO Council, to take that kind of lead if you wish, but I would not pretend to challenge Edmon.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Michele. Just to ensure that someone that progress is made to report to the council. Okay. Steve, you want to add something?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Rafik. I guess just to clarify, the purpose of this small team is really mostly a scoping exercise, to your point, Michele, to basically determine what the council wants to address. And then I guess, secondarily from that is it makes it much easier to determine the right vehicle to actually address the issues that are identified. So, that's my understanding, at least. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Steve. Yes, Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: No, thanks. That's helpful. I think part of the thing is that there are other activities in other parts of the ICANN circus that are pending on the outcomes of what we're doing here. And there's also some interesting research coming out of the security community

---

around some of the IDN attacks that have been ongoing over the last couple of years, which were also quite interesting, that we definitely need to be looking at.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Michele. Okay, so the next team is the CCTRT recommendation, and we have only Pam who volunteered. I guess you will take the lead. Carlos also wants to volunteer. Okay. We have one more. Anyone else wants to join this team? Yes, Pam?

PAM LITTLE:

So, can I just maybe add a little bit of detail? There are five recommendations passed through from the board to the GNSO. One of them is about privacy, one of them is about abuse, two of them is about rights protection mechanism, one is about definition for global self. So, what we, this small team, hopefully, would be able to do is figure out what to do with any of those. And maybe we initiate PDP, maybe we find a home for that. Maybe we just do nothing.

So, that's the plan at the moment, and I hope there won't be too much work involved, but there will be some conference call or discussion. So, please, I hope we have a bit of diversity in our

---

small group, so not just Carlos and I making a decision. Okay. Michele? Thank you.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Speaking as slowly and as clearly as possible. There's a couple ... I remember it's coming back to me now. Some of the language coming out of that was quite confusing because we're saying about the privacy. The privacy topic isn't to do with Whois, and that confused the hell out of me because I couldn't understand what data they were talking about.

Now, if you went looking for diversity, you're already in there. So, if I add myself in there then that's two registrars. But if you can't find anybody else, please feel free to put my name down. But if we want diversity ... Okay. Is there anybody who's not linked to the contracted party house who wants to actually help on this one?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, I think we have Carlos.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ:

Please remember that about half of the report has dealt with the question about trust. So, the trust chapter developed very interesting ideas about trustfulness, let's say, to put it short. So, I

---

think it would be very interesting for fellows at the NCSG and other groups to take a look. There is quite a lot of material there, and there is an important projection about those issues that sound very strange in a competition report.

But please remember, it's competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust. And most of the issues that Pam has mentioned are more related to the section of consumer trust. That's the explanation of why you have those issues there.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Carlos. Pam, you want to add something?

PAM LITTLE:

Okay, well I'm comforted by the fact that Carlos was a member of the CCTRT, so hopefully you have all that background and knowledge as well. But if anyone else is interested in signing up to the small team, please just let staff know, and we can go from there. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Michele. Okay. Any further comment or question here? Okay, so let's move to the next team, is the [IGNGO] charter drafting, and we have Martin and Paul. Anyone else wants to join

---

this team? It's a lot of fun, it's about scoping and chartering. Okay, so who wants to lead this one?

PAUL MCGRADY:

Unless Martin also would like to lead it, I'm happy to. And we've got a lot of notes coming away from this, and staff volunteered to help us, so I think we can get started quickly on that. There is some urgency to get this one done. On that note, I'm viewing this as phase 2a, rather than as phase 1b, and so that's sort of how we're thinking about it right now.

Obviously, the team will have to decide if they agree with me or not. The idea is that this one will be able to run parallel with the end of phase one, and maybe even be done by the beginning of phase two. But, if not, run parallel with the beginning of phase two. Hopefully, we'll get a fairly quick outcome on this one. Missing is E. I've asked months ago that we put together a team to look at the charter for phase two, to see if it's still fit for purpose.

We think we've got a lot of things we've learned from RPM phase one that will make phase two of the RPMs more efficient and less dramatic, and I know that there was some small movement towards that point, but I do think that that needs to be ... I think we have a missing E. I think that needs to get done, and I think

---

that waiting until the end of phase one, to start that work, is a mistake in terms of managing that PDP.

So, I guess I'll just say that again. I would like to see some energy behind that effort. I'm happy to participate on the team. So, I've sort of hijacked your agenda there. Probably should've done it under any other business, but yet, there it is. Thanks. And just a reminder that ... And this will cheer many people around the table. I'm done at the next meeting, so if you want me participating in looking at that charter for phase two, let's get going. If you don't want me participating in the charter for phase two, let's keep not going. Alright, thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, we have a queue here. So, we have Carlos, Michele, and Martin.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ:

Yes. Paul, I heard the Chair explaining that we have two scenarios. If the board accepts the first four recommendations, then we will proceed on to the existing RPM. If not, we still have to discuss other options, like starting a whole new process. Is that correct? Is that your understanding, Paul?

---

PAUL MCGRADY:

So, that's not my understanding. We have sent four policy nuggets to the board, they either accept them or they don't. If they don't, then there are things that might happen following on from that. If they do, then they're policy. We have a fifth nugget that we've rejected and are essentially remanding to an unformed team, basically saying, here's this recommendation number five. It stank, we didn't like it. Look at it again and if it's not the recommendation number five, what should it be that will actually address the problems that have been raised by the IGOs?

And that's the narrow thing that this new phase 2a would be looking at. If phase 2a comes up as something that would have some effect on recommendations one through four, then recommendations one through four, as the then current policy, would be amended by the new policy that this team develops.

But if they come up with something that has no effect on one through four, one through four would just stand. So, I don't think that this work is dependent on what the board does. And in fact, we heard from ... Who was it? Somebody in the room, a board member, that the board may just sit back and wait on one through four, to see what happens. Audrey, yes.

So, yes, I don't think we have to ... This is not a re-look at one through four and five, this is a re-look at five, and if five doesn't

---

do it, which we've already essentially said it doesn't, because we've rejected it. Then if not recommendation five, then what?

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much, Paul.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Paul. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: I just going to have to find a new foil. With no Paul McGrady, who am I going to troll during GNSO Council meetings? I just hope that the IPC put forward somebody who is worthy.

PAUL MCGRADY: There can only be one.

MICHELE NEYLON: Highlander references aside, I now have an image in my head of losing my head or something.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Michele, for this substantive intervention. Martin?

---

MARTIN VALENT: Not that I have much content to give us, Michele, but just say that I'm happy to follow the leader of Paul in this, and I think I speak for us saying we are eager to work together in this very fun charting and scoping issue. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Martin. So, Paul, we are taking note of your comments, I think, just maybe to make it clear whether we agree on it, and how we will follow up. Okay, so nobody else wants to join this team? I guess we can move to the next agenda item. And this is what correspondence we received in the last week, just prior to ICANN meeting.

So, we have two. I think one is coming from Goran, and so ICANN Org is about request for clarification, data [courtesy] and phase two of the expedite policy development process. And the other one, I think, is coming from Cyrus, regarding the implementation of a new round of gTLDs. So, we'll see with them. I don't think we had any discussion on, and probably we need to discuss the next steps and how we will respond to both of them. So, for the first one. Any comment? Yes, Pam?

---

PAM LITTLE: Hi. I was just wondering whether this is one that we should perhaps have a conversation with the EPDP team, see what they think about this? Is that something to consider?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Pam. I think so. I think probably we need their feedback, since it's related to their work, and it will impact their work to some extent, and it's an early question for them. So, I guess wearing here the hat of the GNSO Council, is happy, maybe to kind of carry this, and check probably some input or feedback from the EPDP team. But I guess we need also to think about the next steps after that because probably we need to respond by a letter to that correspondence. But for now, we can maybe have that action item to consult with the EPDP team.

Any further comment here, or? Okay. So, with regards to the other letter from Cyrus. Okay, no question here. Yes, Paul? Cyrus ... I'm not sure. It was like around one week?

PAUL MCGRADY: Cyrus' letter talking about how ICANN Org is getting ramped up to get ready for the new round of gTLDs. And the issue is a comment on some of the assumptions that are in the letter, in terms of the bandwidth that they are going to have. I do think, and I'm going to speak this into the universe, and it's going to be very

---

controversial, so here goes. I do think that there is a gating issue in relationship to this. Not so much what staff is preparing to do, but when they should actually get underway.

Because I think that not only in relationship to SubPro, but I do think that since we're smack-dab in the middle of this EPDP and GDPR, from my point of view, there's a big question about whether or not we should introduce 1,500 additional top levels if we don't have that issue solved.

And so, I do think we need to think a little bit about what's the timing of SubPro, what's the timing of EPDP, other things that will affect round two and its advisability. And before we respond to Cyrus, just ask ourselves, are those issues ... Are there things that staff should be aware of, that we know, that will affect the timing of when to kick this off? Right? Because it's not just how much you ramp up, it's when you ramp up. And if you ramp up too soon, then you're idle, and you spend a lot of money sitting around, that's not a good outcome for the purse. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Paul. So, I see Michele and then Marie.

---

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. I don't disagree with Paul, which is surprising. The Registrar Stakeholder Group circulated the Cyrus letter internally, so we have been getting some feedback from our members. What I think is probably causing a degree of confusion, potentially, is that some people are looking at this through the eyes of ... Oh, you know. This policy development process and the SubPro thing, and where's the line between policy decisions versus operational decisions, etc.

So, I think we probably will have some kind of feedback on that that we can channel back. What I'm not 100% clear on is what's the mechanism for that? Because the letter was sent to multiple places. So, is this open for public comment? Is this open? Are we meant to send a formal response to it, or are we meant to kind of stick this in the pile of random letters that we've received from ICANN staff? I'm just trying to understand what we're meant to do with it.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Michele. I think this is a perfect one to ask the constituencies and stakeholder groups to respond directly. I don't think this was something that the council ...

MICHELE NEYLON: But how? But how, is my question, as in ...

---

PAUL MCGRADY: Directly to Cyrus.

MICHELE NEYLON: Okay. Yes.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Michele. Yes, it seems kind of ad-hoc, public comment kind of thing. But we need to respond. Yes, Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Sorry. This is one of the things that, I think this came up a few months ago, and I think it's something that has been causing consternation across the entire ICANN community, where the ICANN corporate is being quite inconsistent in how it asks for input and feedback, and how it collates and collects that input and feedback. We're all used to the concept of the public comments, but then you have this kind of thing where somebody writes a blog post, and somehow, you're meant to provide feedback to it, or you get a letter that's sent either specifically to the council, or it's channeled through something else.

And it's not particularly helpful, because then you're not sure ... Where are we being asked for input? Where we're not being asked

---

for input? And then if they go off and do something and we haven't provided input, then we're ready to yell and scream at them. It's just, this is not particularly helpful, I think, is what I'm trying to get at.

So, if it is open for public comment, even if there's just a note on the public comment page to say we're getting it through the SGs and Cs, something. I just find it a bit frustrating, that's all.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Michele. Point taken. I think what the case you mentioned was in fact both the IRP, it was in a blog, and we may have missed that. Marie and then Pam.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Rafik. At the risk of keeping the agreement going, I agree with Michele, who agreed with Paul. I'd also like to point out I am not putting myself forward as the volunteer to be Michele's whipping boy in the next council, so as long as that's clear. On this point, like Michele, like Paul, we sent it to the BC, and I'm assuming, like everyone, nobody really had time to read it properly. Everyone was getting ready to come here.

But the quick feedback we did get from some members was, hang on, what about SubPro? And we had always understood within

---

the BC that the point of not just SubPro, but other reviews on how the first round worked were to find out how the first round worked and if anything needed to be changed before we launched the second round.

So, while I completely take Michele's point, also, about the separation of policy and operation, it did strike our members as a little premature. So, again, yes, it's an assumption document. But there are still so many moving parts here, that we weren't quite sure how far down the line Org is with taking these assumptions into action. And should we not maybe be waiting for the outcome of the reviews? Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Marie. We have Pam, and then Steve.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you. So, I was just going to agree to whatever has been said. I think this will be more appropriate for the stakeholder group or constituency to engage directly with Cyrus. And Cyrus' letter seemed to be quite casual. He is basically saying if you're interested let me know and I would be happy to arrange a mutually convenient time for discussion. So, that's what he was asking. Thank you.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:                      Okay, thanks, Pam. Steve?

STEVE CHAN:                      Thanks, Rafik. This is Steve. Some of you might have been aware that they already started some of the outreach to some of the groups. They've met with the SubPro group already, they met with the GAC, and I think they met with the ALAC as well. So, it might be a good idea to have them come to you guys as well. Because it seems like there's a lot of questions about what they're proposing, and what kind of information they are seeking.

So, to that extent, maybe it makes sense for them to come present to the council, potentially, or maybe the stakeholder groups and constituencies themselves, but to have them come speak to you and to talk about their intentions, which from my understanding is to really start at the pre-planning purpose, which is actually something that's accounted for within the consensus policy implementation framework, or the CPIF.

The set of assumptions is to try to ... Well, I'm not sure I want to go into too much detail, because they'll talk to this, but there's not dollars allocated in the budget to do any implementational work for gTLDs. So, what they're trying to do is to come to an agreement with the community on a base of assumptions to do

---

some of that pre-planned work and allocate some resources within ICANN Org to be able to make sure that they're able to ramp up the next round in a more expeditious fashion. So, I guess in your terms of suggestions, maybe you invite them to the council to talk to you. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Steve. So, we have Flip, and then Carlos.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you, Rafik. I very much welcome the suggestion made by Steve, and I would suggest that we do not wait until Montreal, but that we do that in the next monthly, or second next monthly meeting, please. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Flip. I think that's doable. Carlos?

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Steve. You had made it more complex now. If we're talking about assigning resources, we have gotten wind that there is a monster exercise called the Brian Cute Show, that is dealing with the resource assignment for the strategic period ahead.

---

So, my urgent question and I fully agree with Flip; please explain to us. If this is a priority, I guess it should be very high in the list of the Brian Cute Show. Is it included, or not? Should we address our comments together with the Brian Cute priority list, or not? I fully understand where you are coming from, but we have a formal exercise, a strategic planning exercise.

We have an informal strategic planning exercise by Brian Cute, and then we get letters, you know? So, special chapters, and so on. So, I have to go back to the initial comments, to Michele. How do the parts fit together? And this is more urgent than just finding where do we commence? How does that feed with the strategy, the strategic consultation, and SubPro and everything else? Thank you very much.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you, Carlos. I see two things here. So, we should encourage the [ACNC] to respond, if they deem that necessary. On the other hand, at least we can have Cyrus and his team to come in the maybe next monthly call, at least to listen to them. So, that doesn't engage us to respond to our comments. So, we can do that. Okay, any further ...? Oh, Cheryl. You probably will have the last word here.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just putting on two hats at once. I'm hearing some things that seem to me that ATRT3 might be concerned about. The confusion of, you know, do we respond to a letter, do we respond to public comments, etc. So, you won't be surprised if you hear me, having heard that, take some furthering of that. And I would certainly support in the next meeting, or whenever, having the interaction, because having gone through a couple of these presentations with them, it really is a trying to be prepared.

It's a preparedness exercise, and I think if you all go through and find out what is or is not your comfort levels with it, that may help. But it is a preparedness exercise so that a time to ram up post your reaction to the Subsequent Procedures' report is not long. It is so that there's a predictability. And so, I think if you all have that interaction, it would be a very good thing indeed. But I'm also hearing stuff that ... How we do things and how confusion reigns, whether it's a blog or a public comment, and how good public comments are and what happens with them is an issue still.

Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Cheryl. So, I guess we can move to the next agenda item, and that's about ICANN66 meeting planning. So, maybe we can start with the easy thing, is whether to have an informal dinner and if someone wants to volunteer to organize it if yes. So, I think

---

the question here is ... I guess everyone probably finds having this informal council dinner good and interesting, but probably we can discuss if we need it for every ICANN meeting. Yes, Pam. Please, go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Sorry, you can finish. Hi. I feel we should have an informal dinner among our council members, for two reasons. One is, it's in Montreal. I hope we have some people who are familiar with the local best restaurants or outings, so we could explore. But the most important thing is we do have some outgoing councilors. I personally would think would be nice to be able to farewell our going councilors. And maybe we can consider inviting some of the incoming councilors if that's appropriate? Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Pam. Yes, Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Pam actually hit the nail on the head. The informal events are non-confrontational. They're more relaxed, it's a time for people to actually mingle. And who knows, after a couple of adult beverages some people might find that they get along a lot better. So, I'm all for that. I think part of the frustration that some people

---

might have around this is that sometimes people don't turn up, or not everybody has been able to turn up. I've gone to pretty much every single one. I missed the one at this meeting because I was sent an invite to something before the dates and times of the GNSO Council thing was arranged, and I accepted an invite. But I think it is a very good idea.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Michele. Just a thing about turning up is, we have sometimes this problem of late cancellation that add more burden for those who are organizing and so on, so that's why we're thinking if there's any issue, and so what we need to do. Yes, Flip?

FLIP PETILLION:

Thank you, Rafik. If possible, could we have the agenda of the planned session much more in advance than usual? It helps us actually accept or refuse other engagements, and also it helps us maybe find other ways to travel, also. Just an example, I'm here one day in advance and I need to stay two other days before I can go home, because of flights that were available or not available. And had I known the schedule before, I could have made other flight arrangements.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:                    Okay, sorry for ...

FLIP PETILLION:                    And mine is just an example. I know other people have the same problem.

RAFIK DAMMAK:                    Sorry, Flip. To be honest I'm quite confused about your comment because we're talking about dinner, but I think you were asking about the dates for the meetings, something like that?

PAUL MCGRADY:                    I'm going to drop in. I don't want to speak for Flip, but I think what he's maybe saying is that the dates are not necessarily the schedule, right? Because I've booked flights in for the dates, and then I found out that there were pre-meetings, day zero, day negative one. And you're three days into an ICANN meeting sometimes, especially for the larger meetings. This policy meeting is more discreet.

But it really would be good to know as early as possible what the real days of the meeting are. Do we need to be here a day before, two days before? Is something going to slip into a day after? Things like that. So, just looking at the dates itself, if you are conservative, you arrive early, and you leave late. So, I arrived on

---

Saturday and I'm leaving Saturday, and just because ... To be safe, that we didn't miss something.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Paul. Maybe I can try to respond to this. I don't think for GNSO we made any changes in term of our usual schedule, and we shared the block schedule the early stage to get input, and also help for AC/NC to organize themselves. So, I'm not aware of any day zero or something. So, I'm not sure what the issue, but I guess we can try to improve. I understand one problem is that we have to do the travel arrangement before any kind of initial scheduling. But I think the usual day ... I mean, the days have the same every time. We didn't make any big change. Yes, Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA:

I just want to bring it home about the council dinner. Yes, I missed a couple of them, and I'm really not the most sociable person in the world, but I would strongly support having them, thank you. But, yes, if we could share the date for the council dinner, or agree on it a bit in advance, this would be cool. So, this time I couldn't go because I already committed to go to a conflicting event much earlier, and I would like to thank Rafik for organizing the last two, and staff for helping, and it really is a big thing. Thank you.

---

PAUL MCGRADY: Let's just face it, we're all super popular, and so people send us invites weeks and weeks in advance, so.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Good for you are so popular. Okay, understood. So, I think for the day of the council dinner is usually the same, depending on which ICANN meeting. If it's one, like the AGM, or the ... I forget the other name. Community, whatever. It's on Saturday, but because the policy forum is on Monday. But okay, we can try to ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] Saturday again.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. Okay, so I see that people are happy to keep this informal dinner, and we have the suggestion, maybe like an AGM to have the incoming. So, just I want really to ask people when we start organizing and the headcount is really important. Different country, they want to have the number at least one week before, so late cancellation kind of can be an issue for whoever's organizing. Okay.

So, if no comment on this, we can move more to the meeting itself, and if there is any input you want to add for the planning. So, we have Keith in the kick-off planning meeting, and probably

---

he will share later on some updates what's going on there. But if you have any input or suggestions, that's a good time to do so. Yes, Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: I want to flag my favorite once again. Can we get rid of high-interest topic sessions? Thank you very much.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sorry, Tatiana, what did you say?

TATIANA TROPINA: I always say this, I think it's the third or fourth time I'm saying it. Could we please don't schedule a high-interest topic session? I know that I'm saying this again and again, but maybe my voice will be finally heard somewhere. At least there would be one less of them, thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I understand what you are saying, Tatiana. The problem, they die hard. So, we can keep asking. But let's be kind of ... There is something [important], maybe not everybody notices it for this time. There was a really strong effort to limit the number. It was not easy, but there was an effort. The problem is we are not just

---

alone in this planning. We have other SO and AC, they are quite interested to have this high-interest topic. I mean, the planning is not really my area. It's more Pam who is following. And Pam, after we have Rubens, do you want to?

PAM LITTLE:

Yes, just briefly. Actually, wasn't me, it's actually Keith because there's so much at stake. Everyone wants to propose their high-interest topic, everyone considers their topic is of high interest. So, there was so many proposed at the beginning. I think it was seven or eight, and Keith really fought hard to reduce it to now three hits in one cross-community.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes, so, I think then the question here, what we want for the AGM, and if we need to do more to keep the number limited, and also how to improve the organization. So, if you have any feedback also about the session for this meeting ... I mean, any concerns, or did you see any improvement? Yes, sorry, Tatiana. We have Rubens before.

---

RUBENS KUHL: Should we just remain that GAC interest topics? Because it's not high-interest topics, it's just what GAC wants to hear about. Let's name it for what it is.

RAFIK DAMMAK: To be honest, it's not just the GAC. Okay, Tatiana, then Michele.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you. I know that IGM is going to be the same. It's hard to avoid conflicts. But if we could at least avoid GNSO conflicts with EPDP, like, for example, you sitting here, or Aidan, while you are also on the EPDP, in fact. So, to avoid GNSO Council conflicts with some major things, this would be great. But I understand that this is not really avoidable. But maybe we can try.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Tatiana. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Okay, so on this entire thing about the high-interest topics cross-community, whatever the hell they're calling them. This time around, I think the number of sessions was moving definitely in the right direction. And I disagree, there are topics that are of high interest for the entire community. Things like

---

DOH, DOT. A lot of people have not been talking about this. They don't know about it, and it's going to hit them like a ... I don't know, I'm trying to think of a polite analogy. There are cases where it is actually something new, something that people are not aware of.

I fully agree that the let's relitigate and have 15 people up on a bloody panel, telling us what they've been saying for the last 15 years on Whois, or RPMs, or something like that is absolutely pointless. But something where it actually a genuinely new topic, something that people need to talk about, I totally am supportive of.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Michele. So, I think the discussion we always have is how to improve this, and to get real high-interest and cross-community session. Yes, Tatiana. And also doing here a time-check, we have five minutes left, and still, we need to go through the AOB. Yes, Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you. I actually don't mind having one or two of them. I just know that it's just because it's a policy meeting, there was a reduced amount. But I believe at the IGM we will get them in the full swing again.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks, Michele. I think that's noted, so we'll ... I think this point will help for the planning, and we'll be clear about organizing the high-interest topics and cross-community sessions. Okay, any further comment or question here? So, let's move to the AOB. So, the first one is about council liaison replacement for the reconvened Working Group, Red Cross IRT.

We have Keith there, so I understand maybe he wants to leave here, I mean, to be replaced. Anyone want to volunteer to take over for an IRT for the reconvened Working Group on Red Cross? Come on, Michele. You volunteered for several, so continue on that course.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Rafik, I must respectfully, with the utmost and deepest respect, decline your kind offer to throw myself onto a large sword. I have a slightly more energetic desire for self-preservation but thank you all the same.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Michele. I asked you to speak in plain English, not Oxford English, so ... Tatiana.

---

TATIANA TROPINA: I didn't raise my hand to volunteer, but I was wondering if we could pick up a person, a new councilor, at the next AGM.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks. More seriously, I think an IRT is just ... We need someone to monitor the discussion and just to report to the council if there is any concern or issue. Yes, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Rafik. I don't know if it's going to reassure anyone, but they meet once a month. This is limited to just the reconvened Working Group or reconvened IRT on the Red Cross names. They're working from a finite, defined list.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Who is Chair?

STEVE CHAN: It's staff-led. Dennis Chang is leading implementation effort. And I see Heather. You're volunteering?

HEATHER FORREST: I would do. No, I just back up what Steve says. The work is done on this, really truly. Keith took it over from me, I mean, I was on

---

the PDP, the IRT. It's nothing, guys. Put your hands up for this one and avoid a bigger bullet.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, so ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There's an even bigger short of [inaudible].

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, so who wants to volunteer? So, let's get this gone, guys. Okay, Tatiana. Thanks. Okay, so we are on time, and our last item is just to remind everyone to attend the high-interest session on the impacts of EPDP phase one. So, it will be at 15:50, that's this afternoon, so just reminding you to attend. I think it's important for us to hear about any impact and other policy and probably that ... It's of import for us in our work as the GNSO Council.

Okay, so I ... Yes, I understand that you want to add? We have Pam, Darcy, and, I think, Philippe. And Paul, okay. And this in on one minute. Okay, so Pam first.

PAM LITTLE: Just very quickly, this is actually a cross-community session, not a high-interest topic, Rafik, and Keith will be leading this session,

---

and so it would be talking about seeking input from the community about how to deal with those policies and ICANN procedures that are impacted by EPDP one recommendations. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Pam. Darcy?

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Thanks, Rafik. I was going to suggest that the Brian Cate Show needs to take a roadshow and come our way. So, I would suggest that we need to probably have him present to us what he's intending to do. I think there's a lot of resourcing that's going to go on in there. I'm also going to suggest to the PDP 3.0 group, we probably need to share with him what we're doing to make sure that he's not off doing something else on the same pieces.

And probably have a more detailed discussion with him to ensure that we're not duplicating efforts because that seems to be a theme around here in the ICANN circus. I like that new phrase. So, just a suggestion. I don't think it needs to happen, necessarily, next month with Brian, but I really don't think we should wait until Montreal, either.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Darcy. Just to double check here for the action item, you are suggesting that the Council meet with Brian Cote some time maybe in summer, before AGM? And the second one is more like we, the PDP 3.0 to work with him just to present the work? So, I got it right?

DARCY SOUTHWELL: Yes.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Okay. Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. I'd like to refer to the e-mail I sent to the list yesterday afternoon on the SSR2. I appreciate that you didn't have the time to read that. It was circulated on the ccNSO list. And for those of you that haven't read that, it essentially describes the state of affair of the team, and the termination of a contract, on which we have very little detail. I was just wondering whether anyone here would have some detail on the background? We had a chat with Marie on this, and I think that would be useful. Thank you.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Philippe. I mean, I just skimmed quickly the letter, but I'm hearing you and wondering if we need maybe to ask those from GNSO and the SSR too if they can share any update and to know more from their perspective. Okay. So, Michele, I guess you want to respond to this? And Paul, you will have the last word the last word for the AOB.

MICHELE NEYLON:

I'm not sure if we want to give Paul the last word. That's always a dangerous thing to do, but okay. It is almost the last meeting, and we'll finally shake off his mortal coil, or something like that. No, on this entire thing, on the SSR2, I think this is going to be one of those situations where we're going to have difficulty getting clear responses from ICANN corporate, and we will probably end up with them saying something like, this is an HR matter, or this is blah, blah, blah.

Which I can understand at one level, but the transcript of various calls that were held would say otherwise. And that multiple versions of the events morphed across two or three meetings. And there is the ICANN corporate version of reality, there's the version of reality that members of the team have seen, and then there is the version of reality the person involved sees.

---

I'm not sure exactly how we can deal with this, because I can easily see a situation where if we try to deal with this next thing, I know we're all going to be threatened with legal action or something like that. So, I'm just not sure how we can deal with it. But this SSR2 is a mess. I mean, it's been one mess after another. I don't know what we can do about that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Michele. Scott?

SCOTT MCCORMICK: So, as a member of the SSR2 review team, it's fairly clearly stated, with the background as well, what's going on currently. We were originally planning on having a draft report out this meeting. Just the members that are here at this meeting, we've come to believe that if we get the resource that we need, we can then target for Montreal.

So, there's been several roadblocks over the course of time. I came onto the team a year ago. Obviously, after the pause, and all of that. If we can get ICANN Org to actually get us the resource that we requested, and not have a cap on ten hours a week, like they did with the previous, then I think we can actually resolve this, and get this report out.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Scott. So, I guess everyone should have that opportunity to review the letter, and I guess we should follow up on this, probably getting more updates when they understand the situation. But thanks again for this. Seems, Paul, you will have the last word. And please be careful of what you say.

PAUL MCGRADY: Just an action item for leadership, which is I think it would be very helpful if you guys could take a look at who the various liaisons are out there and take a look at who's dropping off council after Montreal and consider filling those spots now so that people can get ramped up with the other liaison in place. Most everybody's voted in because of travel requirements.

We all know who's up next anyways, and so we can look to incoming councilors. They don't know any better, they can just be voluntold. So, there's an important window here between now and Montreal. It'd be great if you guys didn't let slip. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Paul. And I think one topic we discussed, before I think of the SPS, about the handover between liaison and to ensure that happens. So, probably is better to get people knowing about the

---

position they want to volunteer and prepare them for it. Okay, thanks again. So, we are not doing bad for time, but yes. We reached the end of this meeting. Thanks, everyone, and safe travel back home.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**