

Questions/comments:

1. We envision the creation of a GNSO-ccNSO Special IFR Initiation Coordination Team (**SICT**) – see paragraph 5.2. We say that as soon as the CSC informs the ccNSO and GNSO Councils about a performance issue as defined in the CSC Remedial Action Procedure, the two Councils shall as soon as possible each appoint three (3) members including the Chairs to the SICT. Well, these CSC procedures involve going first to the PTI Board, then the ICANN CEO, and then to the ICANN Board. The GRC wonders when specifically should the SICT be established and they suggest that it not be until the ICANN Board is engaged in the matter. (Note – The CSC will inform the Councils of every escalation step in the RAP.)
 - a. Question: Do we agree? What do we think?
2. In reading through paragraph 5.3, the GRC was not quite sure whether the respective Councils would have to make one joint statement or two – and how the interplay takes place between posting input on the various websites and jointly releasing a statement through the SICT.
 - a. Question: Can we clarify how this process works?
 - b. Related question: Can we two groups jointly map out the timeline of the SICT to test its viability? (For instance, we allow up to 30 days for input from SOs and ACs (see last sentence of paragraph 4.4) and then perhaps allow for the time needed for public comment – will these time periods work?)
3. For the work and deliberations involved in paragraphs 5.4 through 5.6 (this is a considerable amount of work) the document places most of the onus on the SICT. THE GRC wonders if this is too much to load onto the SICT and whether some of this should be shifted to the respective Councils – and what that balance would look like in a bit more detail. Moreover, given the ramifications of the decisions involved which decision should be on the plate of the full Councils and which on the plate of the coordination team?
 - a. Question: What do we think?
4. With respect to considerations of a Special IFR itself, the GRC noted that other avenues exist through which to address PTI issues – for instance (1) possible removal of director(s) and (2) the ability to bring an IRP relating to PTI service complaints and/or ICANN’s failure to enforce its rights under the IANA Naming Functions Contract – and mediation is also available.
 - a. Question: Should this document note the fact that Councils will possibly be looking at alternative courses of action and thus we should be careful to check on that possibility to factor it into our calculations?
5. Finally, the document should perhaps make reference to ongoing steps by CSC to resolve the issue. What happens if the PTI/IANA issue is resolved along the way – should we address closing down the SIFR and SICT. (Note – once the CSC informs the Councils at the end of the RAP the role of the CSC is very limited – see the [RAP process \[icann.org\]](https://www.icann.org/rap-process).)