
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council

Thursday, 18 November 2021 at 06:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/VzY-2XO_H_PHM88HbwlItqgHFgV9GasuBJNdEpuQfqzf3lZH9owq21bGgsTb7LbbMqUp-OqlgW9ilAOa.NGML75F64okFUxNe

Zoom Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/MqRYwQq0JDueDm8w6-zRL7GiCCAKFKX4hgc7qEzIF987JUydYFILElu6SQ1o_rt8w8K_MJPGT1wi6I9R.AWdol8SkfgWE_RM6

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Olga Cavalli (absent)

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Antonia Chu, Greg Dibiasse, Kristian Ørmen (apology, temp alternate Owen Smigelski)

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Kurt Pritz, Sebastien Ducos

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evan

Non-Contracted Parties House

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.

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Mark Datysgeld, Philippe Fouquart, Thomas Rickert, John McElwaine, Flip Petillion

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Juan Manuel Rojas (absent), Stephanie Perrin, Manju Chen, Wisdom Donkor, Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Farell Folly

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Jeff Neuman: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon: ccNSO observer

Guests:

Dr Ajay Data – Chair of the UASG

Maria Kolesnikova – ccTLD

Seda Akbulut – ICANN Org

Sarmad Hussain – ICANN Org

Karen Lentz – ICANN Org

Isabelle Colas – ICANN Org

Lars Hoffmann – ICANN Org

Theresa Swinehart – ICANN Org

ICANN Staff

David Olive - Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional (apology)

Marika Konings - Vice President, Policy Development Support

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Community Operations, Planning and Engagement

Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director

Steve Chan - Senior Director

Berry Cobb - Policy Consultant

Emily Barabas - Policy Senior Manager

Ariel Liang - Policy Senior Specialist (apology)

Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Director (apology)

Nathalie Peregrine - Manager, Operations Support

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Specialist (GNSO)

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 18th of November 2021. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you ever so much. Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kurt Pritz.

KURT PRITZ: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Greg Dibiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kristian Ørmen has sent his apologies and we have Owen Smigelski as temporary alternate. Owen Smigelski.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Desiree Miloshevic.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Mark Datysgeld.

MARK DATYSGELD: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: John McElwaine.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here. Hi Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hi Flip. Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Wisdom Donkor. I don't see Wisdom in the Zoom room yet. Stephanie Perrin. Same thing for Stephanie. I will reach out to them. Farell Folly.

FARELL FOLLY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maju Chen.

MANJU CHEN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Juan Manuel Rojas. I don't see Juan in the Zoom room yet. Olga Cavalli. Same thing for Olga. Jeffrey Neuman.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Present. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Justine. Maarten Simon.

MAARTEN SIMON: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. We will have guest speakers on our call today, Dr. Ajay Data and Maria Kolesnikova from the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, as well as Sarmad Hussain and [inaudible] from ICANN Org. For item seven, we'll also have Karen Lentz, Isabelle Colas, and Lars Hoffmann joining us from ICANN Org.

Staff today on the call, we have Steve Chan, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Emily Barabas, Terri Agnew, myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking as this call is being recorded. We're also in a Zoom webinar room. Councilors are panelists, can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once they have remembered to set their chats to "everyone" and not just "hosts and panelists."

A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers. This means that they do not have access to their microphones nor to typing in the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior.

Thank you ever so much. Over to you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening from Normandy, France here. Hope you're all well. It's pitch dark here. I know a number of you worked very late my time last night, so hope you had a good night's sleep, albeit short. So let's move on with our agenda. Any updates to our statements of interest, anyone? Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Hi there. So I updated my SOI to indicate that I had been appointed to the Standing Selection Committee and I also just did some general edits and cleanups. So it's very fascinating, please read. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Paul. Any other update? Okay, seeing no hands, any change you'd like to make to the agenda? Seeing no hand, thank you, we'll now move on with our note of acknowledgement of the minutes that you will see on the screen for our September call as well as the part one and two of our call in October. So we'll just note that and then move on to item two of the agenda and go through our project review. I'll just refer to Berry's e-mail on the 9th of November that Berry circulated, the radar and the project list, to the Council e-mail list. Berry, would you like to take us through that?

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Philippe. I think we're going to be cutting this a little bit short today. So instead of going through specifics per the e-mail that I'd sent out earlier last week, I thought I'd just talk a little bit about some of the structural changes to a few of the products and how we might review this stuff moving forward.

First, Steve, if you can bring up the Action Decision Radar, one of the two things that I'd like to just mention here, there was one add that I included here in the unplanned section which relates to the letter that we have received about the modifying of gTLD consensus policies. And that of course is here on the agenda.

As part of this, as well as other aspects coming out of ICANN 72, we formed a few small teams across varying topics. Rec 12 and a few others. I think given the amount of activity that these small teams are consuming, it does warrant a change that I'll be making for the next iteration of our portfolio tool under the operations program where we're going to start listing out the small teams as they come and go.

Mostly it's just an inventory item, but depending on what kind of topic takes place, they do consume resources, so I think it's worthy of starting to keep track of those in a small corner of our toolset.

The second thing I'd like to mention about the ADR which we'll do going forward is we've reset the Action Decision Radar for the 2021-2022 Council year. So you'll notice that the top page and the second page are still pretty much the same, only updated from ICANN 72. But the pages below it that contain an archive of the actions or decisions that were made from the prior Council year

over on the Wiki page where this is stored, I've created a separate link that is kind of just a close out for that prior Council year.

I'll also note that we're doing the same thing for the action items, that we have a dedicated Wiki page for the action items, and that has also been reset for the new Council year as well. But just to give you an indicator about the amount of activity that that entails, for 2020-2021 Council year, there were 122 action items that were performed over that timeframe, most of which is performed by Council leadership and staff. And what we're going to be looking to do is continue the monitoring and tracking of all of these action items.

One of the downsides is it's difficult to measure the amount of resources involved in the closure of these action items, but prior to us starting the Google sheet version which is what we're using now, we've never really had that kind of visibility before when we were just tracking it in a more static nature on the Wiki. So I think that's going to be more eye opening as we move through this new year and the years to come.

The last thing that I'll just point out, the action items page, this is going to slightly change as well. We've decided to sunset the Google sheet form. We're moving it into our new toolset and from one Council meeting to the next or at regular intervals, the Council action items will be posted at the top of this page and as necessary, either through leadership calls or on the Council will be reviewing those through a PDF. But what this does help to do is align the tracking of those action items with the full tool suite. So we're trying to corral everything into this Smartsheets platform.

The two final things that I have to mention is really just over on to the project list now—and again, I'm not really going into details of any of the projects, but one of the things that has been forefront in some of the Council discussions when looking at the projects list is you're starting to see at the—as of right now, we have three in-flight PDPs or EPDPs, policy development processes, two of which, the EPDP on IDNs and the transfer policy, based on our current project plans, are anticipated to go into 2023. So it's a fair assumption that those two will continue for all of 2022.

The curative rights for the IGOs working group is planned to conclude at the end of the year, and conceivably in 2022 with the activities around the RPM phase two and the policy status report, and then eventually getting together a charter drafting team for that policy effort. There's a decent chance where a good chunk of 2022, we may only have two active policy development processes, which I think given the workload over the past several years is a good thing, but don't let it fool you, there's still a lot of work on our plate that is not policy-related. Whether that has to do with implementation of review recommendations or Work Stream 2 and those kinds of things. And we can get into the details of some of that down the road.

But the last thing I wanted to draw your attention to which I think is in alignment with what the Council discussed during ICANN 72 is when you scroll down after Council deliberations, we've got several PDPs and EPDPs that are just sent to the Board or are sitting with the Board for their action and once those take place, then of course, they move into the final phase which is implementation. So there's a big bulk of work that's shifting from

one area to the next, and I think that that really coincides with what the Council mentioned before.

And then the final final thing that I'll mention based on some discussions the Council's had recently, I think we'll be considering how the Council will review through this agenda item number two for our Council meetings, and perhaps trying to take that or look for opportunities to take that offline from the Council meeting agendas but still try to accomplish the same aspects of vigorous studying and review of our projects that we have that are in flight as well as looking for our pipeline of work that's in front of us and over the five-year strategic plan. I don't think any formal decisions have been made yet, but there's initial discussions about maybe forming a small team to look at that in advance of ICANN meetings and tease out some of the more important things, either to help inform the agenda or to, as I mentioned, just a different kind of scrutiny about how we manage our workload and our projects.

So I think with that, I'll stop there and turn it back to you, Philippe. Happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Berry. And just to follow up on what you just said, indeed, there's been a lot of discussion during our SPS sessions on how we can capitalize on this, and with small, incremental changes, trying to use this opportunity to do the prioritization, for example, or resource assessment that is necessary for good project management, either here during this time, the Council calls, or offline as Berry mentioned, so with a view not to add any

more meetings but possibly do this every two, three months. Again, use this opportunity to do those things that are necessary, such as prioritization and resource assessment. Any questions?

Okay. Seeing no hands, let's move on to item three, and that's our consent agenda. Any change you'd like to make to this consent agenda? Okay, seeing no hand, just want to make sure, Nathalie, that we're all set with the seconders of the motions. And if we are, I think you can take us through the vote.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Philippe. I can confirm that all motions have got a seconder. Just noting also for the record before we start on the consent agenda vote that Juan Manuel Rojas is not on the call. And we'll begin with the vote. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion? Please say aye. Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say aye?

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. With no abstention, no objection, the motion passes. Philippe, over to you. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. I should probably have read the two motions and one confirmation that were under our consent agenda, but I'm

sure you've all read what you voted on. So my apologies, blame it on the early morning here.

With this, we'll move on to item four of our agenda, and this is the revision made to the job description for NomCom, which is, as you would recall, generally done on an annual basis, slightly late on this at least as far as the official timeline is concerned. We've initiated those revisions before the AGM and set up a small team to work on this. And there were—especially at the last meeting—concerns raised over the revisions that were made to the job description. So we'll go through them.

I would just note that there have been recent messages to the list. So in the event that we cannot vote on this, there's no requirement for a formal vote. However, the timeline is a bit short on this because NomCom is expected to start by mid-December, I think officially, which means that the applicants are actually considering applying as we speak. So we need to bear that in mind moving forward with our changes. And the small team was led by Tomslin, so I will hand over to you, Tomslin, to help go through the text that we have and the changes that were agreed and those that are still under discussion. Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Philippe. Like you mentioned, there was a small group set up for this, and the small group met—well, we were not exactly able to meet because we could not find a good time that suited everyone, so we settled to working on e-mail, which was a bit challenging, but we were able to get something out before the

meeting so that councilors can at least review before we vote on it today.

The original Council version sought to emphasize respect of the Council structure independence and diversity. The way it was accomplished in the previous text of that job description was preference for unaffiliated candidates.

Last Council meeting, that didn't go down well, so the small team had a proposed final version which sought to retain some of those elements but instead of proposing a way of dealing with or achieving that independence and diversity, it proposed qualities and traits that NomCom can and should use when seeking candidates.

It's on that version that, like Philippe mentioned, there has been input from the mailing list. The NCSG made two comments on the text. One was regarding the requirement for experience. Basically said experience is perceived as limiting and therefore, it seems to limit only GNSO participants, people who already are participating in the GNSO to be candidates and therefore leave out potential candidates who are not members within the GNSO organization.

And then the second comment was regarding the NCSG requested text to be put back which had previously been removed. The text basically was balancing views of stakeholder groups and Cs and the wider community, and that they are not intended to represent their current or previous affiliation.

So those were the two comments from the NCSG, and I also note that ALAC liaison made a comment on the list as well talking

about the independence. So those were the two comments so far received on the list. Maybe I'll stop there to see if there are any comments. Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. Flip, please go ahead.

FLIP PETILLION: Good morning, everybody. I want to thank Steve Chan for the work he has done on this, because actually, only a few people took action even in the small team, and he had the courage and the guts to hold the pen and to be very concrete and constructive. So thank you, Steve, for that.

Personally, I was happy with the text that was prepared—I think it was on the 16th of November—where Steve managed to balance the input that we got on the list. Personally, I have not had an opportunity to discuss this with IPC through members of meeting of IPC. I saw the latest comments yesterday night. As discussed yesterday in a completely different context, I would very much appreciate if comments would actually be made sooner, earlier, and that people would, if they have an opportunity to participate in small groups, effectively and efficiently participate and not wait to send in comments at the last minute. But that's a procedural thing for everybody and it's a general problem of the Council.

But just to repeat, I think that the text that is in front of you is balanced now, because it comes from my mouth and I was the one who made quite some comments several weeks ago. So we managed—that's what Council is supposed to do, I think—to

come to some sort of a compromise in the sense of everybody wins, everybody loses something, and that is the result in this text that Steve has shared with everybody. Thank you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Flip. Any other comment on this revised job description? Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: I actually do agree with Stephanie's revision. It seems unnecessarily narrow and perhaps there's a risk of favoring insiders. I think the NomCom can do its job within those parameters. I think Stephanie's text makes sense.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Greg. So maybe Stephanie, for those of us—or councilors I did read your e-mail, but if you would briefly take us through the changes that you circulated on the list, I think it was yesterday, that would probably help people understand the subtlety between what came out of the small team that didn't meet and what you suggested. So Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. The version that I had proposed—and I do apologize, apparently it was hard to read my—I was just working on the marked up redline version, but I must have not saved the appropriate setting. Every time Word changes, I mess up.

Anyway, let me read what the two versions are. So starting at job description, the NomCom is seeking accomplished persons of integrity, objectivity and intelligence with an interest—has been crossed out and replaced with experience, and I would say delete that and retain “with an interest” in the multi-stakeholder policymaking process and within the GNSO community.

Well, the within the GNSO community is fine if it’s interest. If you make it experience, you effectively are barring people without that experience. And I would urge everybody to remember that the whole point of the NomCom is to bring fresh talent into the ICANN multi-stakeholder community. Or so I thought.

Now, next line is while GNSO Council members should have a deep understanding of the GNSO structure, existing ICANN consensus policies and contracts between ICANN and registries and registrars, preference will be given to candidates with a demonstrable ability to manage the policy development process towards the best interest of the entire GNSO community rather than solely for a specific GNSO stakeholder group or constituency. That is fine, although once again, stating that there will be a preference and a bias is maybe not a great thing, unless you clarify that that ability can be gained in just about any kind of multilateral—particularly global—community.

NomCom appointed members are expected to act with integrity and independently. Voting NomCom-appointed members are encouraged to engage with the Council reps of their appointed house and all NomCom appointed members are encouraged to engaged with—need an S on members—the GNSO community more broadly.

And then the next bit is deleted. And that is balance the interest of their stakeholder group or constituency with the GNSO and the global community. Voting appointees are not meant to represent their current or previously affiliated ICANN community group and are encouraged to engage with the Council reps of their appointed house. That has been deleted, and that's really important. It has been repeated below in a separate paragraph, but I would say it bears repetition and I would put it back in again, because otherwise, the sentence reads, to understand the concerns and views so the NomCom appointee may be an informed and effective councilor.

Anyway, those are our comments. And we only have one representative on the NomCom. We're concerned that the goal is not being achieved if we put too much emphasis on basically what can be described as an insider community of existing ICANN stakeholders whereas there are folks outside our immediate community who understand well what ICANN does and what the GNSO does but just haven't participated previously.

Thank you. That's the text. I hope you can at least catch that in the transcript.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Stephanie. So noting the inputs in the chat, we'll do two things. We'll discuss the proposed changes and, maybe not most of all, but the important assumption for a vote is that people know what we're voting on. So it has to be clear, the final text of this would have to be clear. If it's not, then we'll find a way out, but

we all appreciate the notes in the chat. That's a prerequisite for a vote.

And it's going to be difficult to do wordsmithing during this call. Nonetheless, there are two changes in the proposed revision that you just sent yesterday, I think. Retaining interest and keeping the part that was deleted relative to the affiliation. I think most people would be, on the principle, familiar with those two elements. I'd like to have a discussion on this and we'll consider how we can approach our agreement on the final text after that. Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Thanks, Philippe. Just a procedural point. Because this is a vote—and going back to what we were discussing in the SPS for the last couple of days—the BC directed and we circulated the text as agreed by the small group and got approval from the BC to vote on that text. If we make this amendment, I'm afraid I don't really know what you want me to do because the only thing I can do is abstain. As Flip said, unfortunately, because the comment is coming very late, we have not had the opportunity to go back to our constituency and discuss it with them.

But on a personal level, I very much appreciate the comments that came in and I appreciate the discussion as always, but to me, being on Council is not knowing roughly that the ICANN community exists and having had experience in some kind of multi-stakeholder model. We want councilors actually managing the policy process and we need people who understand how ICANN and in particular the GNSO works.

So on a personal level, I'm afraid I don't like the suggestions because I simply don't think they'll work, although I should underscore that as far as I'm aware, this document is the Council's opinion, it's not binding on the NomCom in any way, so I'm not sure what the practical effect would be.

But to go back to procedure, I'm afraid that if this is fundamentally changed—which is what this is—I'm in a bind here because I don't have voting instructions. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Marie. I would just note that there were other comments along those lines on the procedural part in the chat. So I see Mark, you have your hand up, [inaudible] substance and procedure.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. I'll just put into words what I have been writing a lot, so might as well quickly verbalize that.

My concern is, what can exactly somebody who's not involved in the GNSO and somebody who's not deeply involved in ICANN contribute to the kinds of discussion we're having? The type of discussion carried out within the GNSO Council is not about general knowledge of procedure. ICANN has a very rigid structure, a chain of contracts overlapping PDPs that feed into each other. It's complex for people who are within the system.

I'm very skeptical as to how much somebody who is not in the system could contribute. We could do it for appearance, we could

do it for looks, like, hey, we're bringing new people in, but other than that, our pool realistically is within our community. There's no external pool for us to draw from, it's an imaginary pool. Our community is the pool. Otherwise, how will we get these people to substantially contribute to discussions and be able to bring something different, and be able to help us solve issues and move things along? They won't. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Mark. I think you touched the essence of what we need to come up with. I think people have different appreciations of what the ask is to NomCom, although as Marie said, it's really up to them to exercise that. But it's no small divergence here. So want to make sure that we're aware of the nature of the revisions that we're going to be putting to NomCom for this. So next is Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I just would like us to be reminded that the current situation is not nice, I mean the situation with the depletion of volunteers. Despite the previous couple of years where—two years ago when some people were attracted to ICANN meetings, partially because of meetings taking place as in ... yeah, various [sides] of interest, and also involving the local attendees who participated in ICANN, got involved, got some interest, found the constituency which feeds them, maybe via applying or maybe became a staff member of some registry or registrar, going into active participation.

We have situation where almost no additional people are involved, and we see depletion and it's dynamic. It's less and less people each meeting. And thus if we say that those who are aware of the process are bad, who is going to be those who replace?

We shouldn't use abstract ideas without applying the resulting model to what we have as incoming data, because from the formal perspective, if we say someone who never was involved in the process would be nice, but in reality, you might have issues finding those. And if we say that it shouldn't be affiliated with GNSO, so applying logic, who do you have in the end? Those who study ICANN environment from academia perspective potentially, but how many? Maybe [inaudible] of people on the planet [and At-Large.]

So I'm not sure that applying two years old ideas to the current situation will work positively. That's why I think that views of those who are aware of how things work is not as bad as it looks. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maxim. Greg, you're next.

GREG DIBIASE: I was just going to say I definitely understand the issue with the steep learning curve and it's hard to get up to speed, but I think there's also an aspect of independence here. So if we're looking for a truly independent councilor, it might be easier to find someone that hasn't had experience, or not necessarily has had experience.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Greg. Any other comment on this? Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Philippe. Since I've read the motion changes last night and also seconded the motion, to me, it sounds that a person with an interest has definitely a willingness to learn everything, and the multi-stakeholder process is very complex. We work in this process, we know that it is, but I would find it—I'm very supportive of getting young people in—or of any age, really—who have deep interest in the ICANN model.

So for me, it's a very desired characteristic of person who has some experience, but I would give preference to those who have deep interest and the NomCom could assess that, so putting a lot of faith in the NomCom members to assess the willingness, capability and integrity of a person. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Desiree. Farell, you're next.

FARELL FOLLY: Hello, Philippe. Thanks. What I would like to mention here, I think there is a difference between the content of the job description and the criteria that the NomCom will use to select candidates. So I think the change Stephanie is suggesting here is more to broaden the pool of candidates, the pool of people who can apply. But nothing will prevent the NomCom to use experience criteria

[inaudible] the applicant. So I just want to draw attention on that and make a clear difference about the [change] that will just, let's say, bring more people to apply who are different from the criteria that the NomCom can use to rank skills of the candidate afterwards.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Farell. And the point was made earlier, I would add to this, that in addition to the nuance you're making with regards to criteria versus job description, the point was made it's also a question by Maxim, I think, of how you accommodate that with the applicants that NomCom would have at that point in time. So point well taken. Thank you. Back to Flip now.

FLIP PETILLION: Just very briefly, if we have to take this back to our groups, constituencies, I think we should think of an alternative for "interest," because I feel it's confusing people. It has a different meaning in Europe. An interest—I'm actually trying to find other words, but I don't find any. And I'm sure other people, like Sebastien, will be smarter than I am to find in their vocabulary the right word because I think it's a misleading word, "interest."

I think Stephanie means that people need to show some sort of curiosity or fascination for it instead of, how would I put it, monetary, financial interest. I think this is really something we should reflect upon when we take it back. Just a suggestion. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Flip. Mindful of time, given where we are now and given the proposed changes that were made yesterday and the reaction to those on the call, I think there are two options for us. I think we can all appreciate the need for a vote to be done on stable text. So I do not think that we can take our votes on the basis of the revised text that was circulated yesterday.

So with this—and given the comments that were made at this call—either we take a vote on the initial motion and come what may, or so that people can use the guidance that their respective SGs and Cs gave them, or we use the time between now and probably early December because as I said, the recruitment would start in mid-December for NomCom, or—so that’s the second option—we use that time to accommodate the comments that were made during this call on those last changes. So these are the two options. I'll just give you my personal preference for the latter, but I will turn to the floor for guidance. And Tomslin in particular, because if we were to do that second option, we need to withdraw the motion.

And indeed, that would not be a vote, but on the nonobjection principle by e-mail. Thanks, Maxim. So with this, I'd like to turn to Tomslin and to the floor as to the preference you would have.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Philippe. I just wanted to add, to your point, that the Council has in the past revised the NomCom job description through a nonobjection vote. So I think if we have to go back and revise the text, that would be the way to go. We'll have to go back to how the Council has done in the past, and that'll give us some

time between now and the end of November, I believe, to get an agreeable text, and we wrote an e-mail. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. Thank you, Tomslin. Back to you, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. I think we've got a couple of different points. We've got the point that we seem to have different understandings of what the text means, and I think we've also got the point, as Tomslin just mentioned, that—and also as John mentioned in the chat—I'm not sure that we as a Council know what the NomCom asked for and needs. And I'm wondering if it would help all of us if we got somebody from NomCom leadership who was involved in this outreach to actually come and talk to us and explain what it is they're after if we think that would be helpful.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Marie. So yes, I think that's a good idea, to include even informally some input from NomCom leadership on that particular point. So I'd like to formally, first, ask you, Tomslin, whether you're comfortable with withdrawing the motion. As I said, what we might do, should you accept, from here, is to review the text and trying to accommodate the proposed changes circulated yesterday, and along with the comments that were made during this meeting, you'll be helped by staff, Tomslin, to do just that, circulate this as quickly as possible, appreciating the time of the year, to the list and we can move on with this on a nonobjection basis, hopefully.

So I appreciate that it's somewhat late in the process, but this is where we are. So as I said, those are the only two options before us at this point. So Tomslin, on the withdrawal.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, [would that be] a withdrawal or deferral, Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Given what we said about the timeline, there will not be a vote at the next Council call, but I'll turn to staff as to—and we don't need a vote for this. So my understanding is that it would be a withdrawal of the motion. We would just acknowledge the revised version. But maybe from a purely procedural standpoint, I'll turn to Steve, Maybe. Would you clarify that? Yes, exactly, Paul, it would not trigger a vote later. A deferral would mean that it's only deferred, so we would have to take a vote. But in that case, we would just withdraw the motion with the understanding that we'll circulate revised text later on and just try to have no objection on the revision, without a vote. That's my understanding. Steve, would you like to clarify that? Sorry to put you on the spot, but is my understanding correct, Steve? You have your hand up. I can't hear you. Or you can put whether I'm right or wrong in the chat. So what we're heading to is that the motion would be withdrawn and we would not take a vote then but just try and have no objection by e-mail on the changes. Marika, while Steve, you're working on it.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks. I see that Steve is still struggling, so I may try to speak for him. And he can of course correct me if I'm wrong. At least from a staff perspective, there's no need to withdraw the motion because you can also decide on this via an e-mail vote. Maybe you want to keep that option open. Of course, if you're able to come to a view that everyone supports, you could forego the formal voice and also kind of proceed with a nonobjection. But if there is a need to make a decision, even if maybe not everyone is fully onboard, the e-mail vote would allow you to do that.

There is a requirement to announce that e-mail vote with a seven-day advance warning, so that does give you a bit of time to work through this, but there still needs to be this notice provided. So that might be a path you may want to consider.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Marika. Any other input? I'll just give you my personal preference. Given the nature of what we're talking about here—and I think I mentioned that in our last meeting, having a vote on this despite the somewhat—I wouldn't say opposed, but significantly different positions that we have on this, it seems to me a bit of an overkill, maybe. But I'll let people decide which option you would prefer. But mindful of—I would go for a nonobjection personally. Just a personal preference. Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Philippe. I was just going to say I'm happy to withdraw the motion and go with the nonobjection.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. So let's do that then. There was support in the chat for this option, so the motion is withdrawn, and then the next steps are you, Tomslin, with staff's help, take the revisions that were circulated to the list yesterday and accommodate on the two proposed changes, the interest versus experience as well as the elements relative to the affiliation of the candidates. And take that onboard as well as the comments that were made during this meeting, and try and come up with balanced text. So we can circulate this as soon as possible on the Council list and see whether we can have a nonobjection approach on this and provide NomCom with our updated guidance in due time. Tomslin, [inaudible].

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Philippe, nothing else other than to thank everyone for the discussion. That was helpful in knowing how to proceed. So thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. And thanks for the good work, and thanks to those who were involved in the small team. And if necessary, I think it would be good if we could have a quick call on those revisions just to wrap up with this.

Thanks, everyone, and I think we can move on with our agenda. And the next item is our discussion and updates from the Universal Acceptance Steering Group whose mission is to promote the support for all domain names and e-mail addresses' address format in software applications. So that's obviously

important for the work we do in the GNSO, notably on IDNs and the new gTLDs.

And there might be a few things that we can do to help either through the PDP or as a community to help the work of the UASG. So we have two guests today to [inaudible] Data and Maria Kolesnikova. So welcome to our Council call, and I'll give them the floor. Ajay.

AJAY DATA:

Thank you, Philippe. Thank you very much, everyone. Pleasure to see faces virtually, all known faces, a lot of them have been working with UA, and looking forward to physical meetings very soon. So thank you for that opportunity to meet all of you. Recognizing the importance of UA and the entire ecosystem is very important. Next slide, please.

So the purpose of coming to you here is to talk about what we can do together to make a difference. Next slide, please. For the people who are new, the scope of UA could be repeated for a few people. Scope of UA is very simple: to ensure that all domain names and e-mail addresses work in all software applications. It is as simple as that.

It doesn't sound very complicated, but there are some examples on the screen. These are the examples which sometimes do not work and require attention. An example of domain names and e-mail addresses. Example of domain names tells you the new generic top-level domains which are coming in like [inaudible], there could be any other strings, like long top-level domain names

which could be up to 63 characters after the dot. [We all know that, so we require] that attention. And the IDN string, which is non-ASCII top-level domain name or domain name. These are the three examples. And then associated e-mail addresses. Of course, the right to left script also comes in, the mixing of scripts also comes in play. So this is all the UA issue which is there.

And to solve the issue, there's a five-pillar strategy for UA, which is very simple to understand and use. Accept, validate, process, store and display. And [a long 20 seconds should tell about it.] So let's say there's a GNSO website and I want to type in my Hindi e-mail address there. If the website allows me to type it in, then the accept pillar [inaudible] okay.

But will it validate it okay, that e-mail address? If it doesn't, then it fails there. If it fails there, then all the processes will obviously fail because it doesn't validate it through. So if the software application which enables the acceptance of my Hindi e-mail address or for that matter, any e-mail address as example below and follow on the five steps, that becomes a UA-ready software or website. That's what we're talking today and we are looking to discuss how to progress further. Next slide, please.

How UA works and why it is important. I'm going to take two slides to just share that very quickly. UA has many benefits. Obviously, because then you are bringing new domain names and new end users, so everybody, businesses generally who are looking for new end users and the registrants both have new business opportunity, because the large number of population is looking to [inaudible] their choices of Internet in their own language.

End users can obviously have better access to Internet because those people who do not speak English at all or are not comfortable at all would like to have access of internet in their own language, and they can use it very powerfully and trustfully. And we all know more than 70% of the world do not speak English as a first language, and that's the reason this new end user stream is looking forward to come online.

And names, obviously, domain name industry has an opportunity for providing a lot more options for people to adopt domain names and innovation and competition around this. Next slide, please.

So with this, it is important to understand how UA works. UASG with two types of working groups: technology side and outreach side. Technology side is about measurement working group, technology working group and EAI working group. This is where the technology work happens. Measurement working group decides and picks out which tool or which application needs to be measured for UA measurements and what requires remediation effort.

The moment remediation effort comes in, technology working group takes over and they issue a statement of work or discuss about how to remediate and make it UA ready. So for example, if a python library gets measured by the measurement working group that this requires an update for adopting, even making a software in python which is UA ready, technology working group will issue a statement of work and ensure that the library gets built for UA readiness in python itself so that developers can use it.

And EAI working group, as the name suggests, is all about e-mail service providers and e-mail software providers where we talk about making all the software and services UA ready.

And outreach is about reaching out to the stakeholders. Communication working group makes presentations, documents, websites and ensures that the content is available to the end users. Whatever work technology people do, our communication working group makes sure [this work] available on the website, whether it is a case study, a video interview, a blog, all things come into there.

Local initiatives are a very interesting one, and I would request everyone's 30-second attention there. We as a leadership understood that this is a global work, and we, three to four elected people cannot understand really the whole world what works there. And I was seeing the example in the previous discussion also. This requires a lot of different mindsets to come together. And what works in each region definitely does not work in different region, probably may not work in different region.

So we require a local initiative. So we created a local initiatives team where local initiative, for example, India or China or Russia, let's say these three examples, community in these countries gets together and what works there for UA, they decide, and they run an initiative in their own country for UA awareness, talking to the government, making an event, talking to the product companies, the corporate, banks or any popular website, ensure that they're UA ready. They do their region.

So we support them from UA financially and technically, and we recognize this as a UA local initiative team there in that region. We have many local initiatives going on, and we would encourage any region which would like to do UA initiative in your region, we would be very happy to discuss and have a local initiative in your own region for UA initiatives.

Ambassadors are something which we appoint to promote and talk about UA at a personal level. So local initiatives working group and team, UA is about personal level. So we are always open and looking forward to appoint ambassadors, and there's ambassador program available on UASG.tech website. If you are interested and you think you would like to work as an ambassador for UA, we would be very happy to look at the application and appoint worldwide ambassadors.

We already have many ambassadors available, and we would be very happy to communicate with you. And this is the message I would like to leave to all of you when we end this discussion. Next slide, please.

We have these stakeholders. So these stakeholders are normally targeted by local initiatives, ambassadors and UASG leadership. Technology enablers and developers. The example I gave you of python, java, .NET are the platforms providers, and developers, the people who develop applications on them.

E-mail service providers and software, top-level domain registries and registrars, this is a stakeholder we added this year. Academia, government policymakers, these all are targeted audience for us and we decide every year an action plan. So

there's an action plan available in this presentation. There's a link available. It's also available on our main UASG.tech website. You may like to visit and download that presentation if you would like to see what we are doing for each stakeholder in each working group. You'll know it very well. Thank you, Sarmad, for posting the link. Next slide, please.

So this is [inaudible] for all of you. So what we think—and of course, this is not the full list, what we expect from GNSO. GNSO already recognizes [in your] gTLD agreement that there's an issue. So UA challenge is recognized already in your base agreement. But we need to do something about it.

What we can do is basically to encourage members to update their systems to support UA. How do we do it is something which we need to discuss. How do we encourage them? How do we encourage members to promote UA in their associated businesses? So if you're a registry and then how do we take it to registrars and then to the end users, or the associated businesses who provide software?

And how [can we include] UA aspect in internal discussion? And this is where we require your support. Can we have a continued dialogue within GNSO about UA? So we'll be very happy to participate and come if you invite us, but it does not require us to be invited. Could we have a GNSO discussing about UA internally in every meeting as part of the discussion so there's a progress within GNSO and help develop awareness of UA issues and convince all the stakeholders? You are all leaders here— influencing leaders, if I may say—and if you say something, that'll be heard. And this is where we are looking for your support to

create more awareness. UA as a critical issue and we need to all work together to bring next billion people online. Next slide, please.

This is my last slide for all of you, and this is where after that, we would like to discuss with you how to progress further. So these are the points which we think require attention and we can work together for furthering UA. We have many members already, including Philippe, Maxim, Flip. We all have discussed, seen in the past, and we have seen that UA is an important issue. You all have participated there. So we thank you for understanding UA and we would require that you continue discussing within GNSO in a much more aggressive way and not [ignorant] way.

So if we can have a little bit of discussion around under your leadership there, under your plan there, that would be very helpful. So we thank you for part of UA and part of taking GNSO discussion.

We would also like that members who are interested to work for UA, they determine the solutions and guide us. How do we create documents? If you think there's a particular software which requires attention and do the measurement of it and find the remediation, UA would be able to help with work. This is one example I'm just giving. Could be like that, could be many members.

And also, it is very important how do we bring in people to ensure that all the software which GNSO uses are also UA ready and also being supported technically from the perspective. ICANN 71 we think was a very important one. We initiated that discussion.

And this is where we started talking about how do we start making systems UA ready. And we require you to seek the support and input and feedback from you how do we support you back, what do you need. If you can tell us where [inaudible] from GNSO perspective, we would be happy to take it up and maybe come back—we need your inputs there, basically. And also, we would require all the stakeholders to reach out to—which are registrars, registries commercial and noncommercial, SGs, to inform their members about UA readiness [and the challenge available] and encourage them to be UA ready.

And there's a kind of mailer. If you send out mails, a report, quarterly, weekly newsletter, if you can talk about UA and let everybody know, that would be very helpful to let everybody know, this is what they start looking at and start talking about.

And the last point. We recently discussed that we'd require a continuous dialogue. So we require, this meeting next time, if somebody could volunteer or GNSO leadership can appoint a liaison officer, liaison member to UA, so we know who to reach out to and he can attend our meetings, we intend to create a liaison working group where all the liaison SOs and ACs may have a liaison officer and we interact and exchange information more actively by inviting into the meetings and having a planned meeting with them rather than us coming in and discussing with everybody on very small issues.

So there are smaller issues which can be discussed with an officer and then he can come back to you and discuss with the meetings. That would be a continuous dialogue. Next slide, please.

So I think this is all from my slide. The last slide is all about connecting, how the members connect. If you're still not connected with social media, Twitter to remain updated or the website, or you want to subscribe to our mailing list, all our open, we have no selection process who can or can't join. So you're all welcome to join. And if you just want to write an e-mail, we'll take you through the membership process and we will onboard you, whether you are interested in mentorship, in local initiatives, please reach out to us. We are very happy to help. That's all from my presentation. And my question now, with the last slide if you can go back to the previous slide, and I would like to open a discussion, request Philippe to probably lead or anybody who'd like to discuss this here, how do we progress together here? And if there are any suggestions from you, from the members, we'd like to hear. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Ajay. Happy to do that. I'll just open the floor for questions for Ajay, or comments. Let's go to Kurt first.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks so much for the presentation, Dr. Data, and your leadership in the UA. I've participated in it somewhat, followed it since its inception. So I appreciate the work that's been going on.

I work for a sort of small registry, and even today from time to time, we get a note from one of our registrants that says I've got a [inaudible] e-mail, I submitted it to my bank and they wouldn't take it.

So two things. One is, on that most mundane type of UA issue—I know [you like] and e-mail and left to right scripts, right to left scripts, it gets very confusing. But on this most mundane type of UA issue, are there any statistics, measurements or indications that we could give to registrants that have this problem, that indicate the problem is being solved?

And the second part of the question is when you asked what can you do, I think some stock answers that registries and registrars can provide to registrants when facing this, especially smaller registries and registrars face it very rarely and don't have the wherewithal to answer it immediately and freak out and it results in some sort of a research project. So yeah, do you have any statistics or any [inaudible] we can give to these people who are complaining? And then maybe even have some stock answers for some frequently asked questions. Thanks again for your work.

AJAY DATA:

Thank you, Kurt. Very important question and describes exactly what we're talking. So there are two things here. One is about websites, one about e-mail addresses. We have the [strategies] for both and it's a continuous effort which we do.

You can see on the chat Sarmad just shared a document, [inaudible] document about the acceptance of e-mail addresses, websites globally. And the numbers are not very bad for ccTLDs, two characters after the dot. More problems are about long top-level domain names. I would agree that this is not 100% solved for sure. We are missing the percentages of domain names accepting

two characters also is a challenge, as you are rightly saying, and this requires attention.

If people will see this thing is very easily solvable, but they're just not [giving it attention.] So the numbers of ccTLD is more than 95% being accepted for two-characters, but for long top-level domain name, this number is not [true.] For IDNs, it is less than 10%. So this is a challenge which we have.

[We would ideally expect] 100% everywhere, and thus we cannot accept the situation where one domain name or one e-mail ID is not accepted. That's where we all are together on it. So thank you for raising this issue, and the stats are on your screen. We'll be happy to share more data if required [inaudible] website also. I'm sure Sarmad will be able to share that link also where we have the report of top 1000 websites and how they responded to the UA issues. We have that. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Ajay, and thanks, Kurt, for the question. If you would just provide us with that update that we can share with Council on the various documents and measurements that you have on the support of new gTLDs, IDNs, etc., where it's not supported, why—I'm not sure that that's mundane, but indeed, the least you can ask when you sell a domain name is that they're usable on the Internet.

And I know for a fact that as far as ISPs are concerned, it's a really difficult issue to tackle. Sometimes it's a matter of something being developed at the very obscure end of a company by a

developer you're not in touch with. So that's a really tough one. So appreciate any information you might have.

As you know, within the BC, the ISPCP, there are associations as well that can help reach out to the industry at large. I know you took that initiative already to reach out to those people. We'll carry on with that. And before we move on mindful of time, to your question of having a UA contact, we'll take that onboard and get back to you. We'll take that as an action point to provide you with that contact.

As you said, that's a moving target for a number of reasons, because there are, as we know, new gTLDs on the way. So new issues will arise as we move along. Obviously, there are systems in development, so it's a continuing process and initiative that we're talking about here. So we'll definitely be in touch and have regular updates, but I'm sure that the councilors of our constituencies here will be happy to reach out for you to get in touch with their respective entities. So thanks, Ajay. Back to you for a conclusion.

AJAY DATA:

Thank you very much, Philippe. I think this is great assurance from you. And you know it, you have participated in UA meetings very actively in the past, so you know the issues very well. We would be very happy to share those documents. My colleagues have already heard that, noted that, so we'll be sending you the reports of measurement and the progress report of UA for your sharing to the GNSO members. That'll be very helpful also for all of them. And please also mention that we would be very happy to

answer any queries, and if required, we would be happy to come and discuss more technically if required at all. Please feel free to reach out to us, we are always available to do so.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Ajay. And noting Jeff's comment in the chat as well whether that's a Council contact that you'd like to have, GNSO contact, or SG/C contact. We'll take that onboard as an action point to get back to you on this. Thanks again, Ajay, for the presentation on this critical topic again.

Stepping back a little, I think it's important that the ecosystem embark with those new formats or new namespaces that we're developing, otherwise our work is completely useless. So thanks again for this, Ajay, and [inaudible] get back to you soon.

AJAY DATA: Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: So moving on with our agenda to item six, and we're slightly behind schedule. In terms of audience here, since we haven't got a lot of observers—I think most of you are guests—I'll just briefly mention what councilors are already familiar with. We're reaching the end of our strategic planning session here. We've had four sessions altogether with a focus on virtual effectiveness this year. We're working on how we can work more efficiently in these virtual times of ours. And the initial takeaway of those sessions is that given that [inaudible] to our activities, we're looking to incremental

changes to our current procedures and work methods, without inducing extra workload on the community. I think as we alluded to earlier in this meeting, looking into how we can approach our project management more efficiently in terms of assessing the available resources in terms of using our review of the project management suite to approach prioritization for instance through a small team for example.

During these sessions, we also address the question of how newcomers within Council who unfortunately joined in during this pandemic time can be helped by those more experienced councilors to approach their role. So that's really in two, three minutes the initial takeaway from this. We will have a wrap up. I believe that's next week. Or is it? My memory doesn't serve me well here. With the takeaways from this and action items moving forward, and we'll come back to you on this with our plenary session.

So very quickly, mindful of time, in three minutes, that's where we are today with the SPS. Thank you, Nathalie. The wrap up is on the 24th of November. With this, I'd suggest we'll have plenty of time for a follow-up on this, so we'll move on to item seven of our agenda and our discussion on the thought paper called modifying consensus policy that was distributed last month or earlier this month to consider what procedures are in place for modifying consensus policy or whether there are gaps, shortcoming, ambiguities in the procedures we have. We have convened a small team on this at our last meeting, so this is work in progress.

We'll have an introduction of the topic by staff, and Sebastien, I think you lead the small team, so maybe you'd like to keep

updated with this, those who were not within that small team, and we'll hand over to [inaudible]. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Philippe. So we had a first meeting of the small team. I had to look back at my calendar to discover it was only Monday. It feels like about three weeks ago, but that's what a dense week is about.

And so obviously, after just a first one-hour call, we didn't get into the depth of it. It was my understanding that maybe Theresa would participate in the call today and somebody would be able to answer a few questions because there were a few questions for the group before we can really go further.

But before that, maybe briefly, we have a few members in the group. John McElwaine, Maxim Alzoba, Stephanie Perrin who was unable to join us, Thomas Rickert, and Antonia Chu. I also note that Steve DeBianco was dispatched from the BC to participate. We reached out to all the different SGs and Cs to see if anybody wanted to participate that wasn't sitting on Council right now, given the importance of the topic and the repercussions on the entire community.

Again, as you explained, we are looking at this letter from Theresa received shortly before our last ICANN meeting. Leadership has sent already an e-mail back mentioning the fact that the six-week deadline given to us for the response was too short and we wouldn't be able to respond in that time. And this is where the questions immediately arose during the meeting on Monday.

And again, sorry, I'm a bit lost here, I'm not sure if we we're going to get answers now or if we just state those questions and get answers later, but essentially, the main question was to understand from Theresa or her team where this came from, if this was a thought exercise directly from her team, if this was asked by the Board. It seems to be there to support a Board discussion, but where the elements were from. I see your hand, Marika, but maybe I'll ask the three questions and then we can get answers on all three.

The second question is it seems to refer to events or topical discussion that happened in the last year or so. We could think of, for example, one or two recommendations resulting from EPDP phase one. We could think of the IGO INGO. Of course, the paper doesn't designate anything specific, and rightly so, but we would be interested to understand what elements of the clockwork is grinding here and we're trying to fix, it would help.

The understanding is that this is not a group to discuss the political implication of this or that decision, that we were talking about processes here, but it would be interesting to understand which process is raising concern and through what particular discussion.

The last one was also the expected impact of these recommendations or whatever else we might add to it. Is this just a question of changing our operating procedures internally within the GNSO, or is there a perceived impact beyond that in the ICANN bylaws and more general documentation?

Marika, you wanted to intervene.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Sebastien. I know it's still early morning for some of you, but I just wanted to flag that we actually have our ICANN Org colleagues on the call to introduce the paper and hopefully answer some of the questions that you raised that we have shared with them in advance of this meeting.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Maybe we should give them the voice now. Who wants to take this?

KAREN LENTZ: I can start if you'd like. I'm going to hand it over to Isabelle in a moment. But to a couple of the earlier questions that you raised, the origin of this is really sort of a collection of observations and experiences, questions we've had from a variety of conversations. So there wasn't one particular decision or triggering event, it was an attempt to write down what we knew, because when you talk about changing policies, that can mean a lot of different things and as you'll see, it varies depending on where we are in the lifecycle.

And then I also wanted to make clear that we didn't intend to share this with a deadline. We estimated how long it might take for the group to come together and provide feedback. But we're open to the—what we're most interested in is having a discussion and getting feedback, so we're at your disposal for an appropriate amount of time to do that.

So I'm going to hand it over to Isabelle Colas who's going to give you a brief review of the paper and then she'll also touch on some of the questions that you mentioned. Isabelle.

ISABELLE COLAS:

Thank you, Karen, Philippe, Sebastien and the GNSO Council for the invitation to discuss this topic. My name is Isabelle Colas-Adeshina. I'll give a background introduction into this thought exercise. Next slide, please.

So as far as the background goes, as the policy work through the ICANN stakeholder model continues to expand and become more intertwined, such as policies considering registration data, we identified issues within the implementation phase where new policy recommendations impact existing consensus policies and eventually require them to be either modified or amended. An example of this would be the EPDP phase one Recommendation 27 where [inaudible] asked for a review of existing policies and procedures that are impacted by the EPDP phase one recommendations.

As our work continues to expand, we found that there is an increased possibility that these types of issues may occur more frequently with new processes and procedures put in place, such as the Operational Design Phase or the ODP. In acknowledging these possibilities, ICANN Org and the Board have had ongoing discussions on where processes, process documentations and community discussions may be needed on gaps within the broader lifecycle of the policy development.

Specifically, the ICANN Board is interested in understanding what procedures are in place to modify and amend existing policies. So as part of these ongoing discussions on the policy lifecycle, ICANN Org developed this thought exercise to share with the community for information and discussion as well as to gain input on the existing processes available.

And this exercise really aims to provide an overview of the available procedures in place to modify, amend existing policies, aids in identifying gaps in procedures for further clarification and discussion, and aims to support alignment among ICANN Org and the ICANN Board, GNSO Council and the community on the available steps and procedures when it comes to modifying our consensus policy if needed. Next slide, please.

So I'll go a bit deeper into the paper itself. As I previously mentioned, the thought paper really aims to provide a general overview of the available procedures to modify the existing policies, as well as the possible gaps or ambiguities and the opportunities for additional collaboration to address them.

The paper is divided into three specific sections that discuss three topics. There's the roles and responsibilities of the GNSO Council, ICANN Board and the IRT within each phase of the policy development cycle, such as the policy development process when the PDP recommendations are transmitted to the ICANN Board for approval. If [equitable,] the Board would initiate the Operational Design Phase and then lastly, a transition from the policy development to the implementation once the policy recommendations have been adopted by the ICANN Board.

The second section further describes the processes and procedures in place to modify an existing policy and it touches on the procedures such as the GNSO Council PDP manual and then the consensus policy implementation framework such as the CPIF, as well as how these procedures have been applied in different stages of the policy lifecycle to modify any consensus policy or policy recommendations.

And then lastly, the final section illustrates the possible gaps that we identified and then the available mechanisms to address them. Next slide, please.

So the following two slides, I will go a bit more into sections two and three of the paper. Section two further describes, as I mentioned, how the existing policies have been modified and the mechanisms used to modify the existing policies. As you know, this section is further divided into three subsections where each topic illustrates varying circumstances where an existing policy may require modification.

The first topic relates to policy recommendations before Board approval where the GNSO Council is able to modify policy recommendations prior to any Board approval. An example of this would be the IGO INGO protections where the GNSO Council reconvened this working group to consider modifications to the original consensus policy recommendations to address GAC advice.

The second topic focuses on the PDP recommendations when they're in-between the Board approval and the policy effective date. This typically is used during the implementation phase

where the PDP recommendations have been approved by the ICANN Board but yet to be fully implemented.

This is where we found that the current available process documentations don't appear to address such case where an existing policy needs to be amended during the course of implementation. And then lastly, the final topic of this section illustrates when an existing consensus policy requires modification after it's already been implemented through a direct or indirect policy change.

And then for the purposes of this paper, we came up with a definition of a direct policy change which is essentially when a PDP is initiated to focus on a specific consensus policy, an example of this would be the inter registrar transfer policy where several PDPs were initiated to address areas of the policy that required improvements which resulted in new policy recommendations which superseded the previous policy recommendations.

And then an indirect policy change is when the PDP has been initiated to focus on a specific consensus policy but ultimately, the new policy recommendations require amendments to one or more existing policy recommendations. An example of this would be the EPDP phase one recommendations where several of those impacted various existing policies and procedures. Next slide, please.

Thank you. The last section of this paper, as we mentioned, really just wants to illustrate the identified gaps that we found within

these procedures and then we tried to identify possible solutions or mechanisms in how we could address them.

In particular, this section is relevant to the implementation of new policy recommendations, specifically when there is a need to either update the policy recommendations based on issued identified during the implementation phase or if there's a need to change an existing consensus policy if new policy recommendations suggests changes are required to it.

This section as you'll see also includes a table that describes the various gaps throughout the policy lifecycle along with the solutions that I tied to them, but I'll note that we haven't identified any additional gaps outside of what's already addressed in this paper. And what we did find is that the examples that we shared illustrate a further opportunity that exists for the community to continue discussions and incorporate clarifying questions or directions in the relevant processes. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So as I mentioned and Karen mentioned as well, as the GNSO Council processes continue to be interwoven with those of the Board and ICANN Org and the consensus policy lifecycle, and in the spirit of exchanging ideas and just having a conversation observation, we're really just seeking input from the GNSO Council prior to sharing this to the Board.

As far as the deadline, there is no deadline. The initial six-week timeframe that we provided was a suggestion, and then we're open to additional time frame if the six weeks is not feasible for the GNSO Council.

Lastly, as far as outcome, once the Council and ICANN Board are in agreement with the identified gaps or agree that the gaps actually exist, further discussion can take place to align on whether any Org or GNSO procedures need to be modified. Thanks. I'll now pass it over to either Karen or Philippe to open up for any discussions.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Isabelle, and thanks for the update. Thanks, Sebastien. Mindful of time—Thomas, I see you have your hand up, but it's nine minutes to the hour. My suggestion was that this be taken onboard by the small team to review if Isabelle or someone from staff could join in the next call to make sure that we're in sync in terms of what's expected, etc. both from staff, the review of the paper with a view to providing this with the Board as quickly as possible. So that would be probably the most efficient way of approaching this. So thanks, Karen, Isabelle, Sebastien for the update. And any question can be asked either to the small team or the list. And Thomas, if you had a question, feel free to do so.

Thanks again, people. So we'll move on with our agenda. I know it's late in the night for people on the East Coast or South America, so we'll try to finish five minutes over at most. So to the AOB, you see we have three items. My suggestion would be, just very quickly on the first item, the updates on the response to the Board regarding the IDN implementation guidelines v4, would probably want to have an update on the list on this from the CPH and how we can approach this moving forward with the Board. We'll take that to the list.

To item two, you have the project plan that we need to acknowledge, project plan from the registration data policy scoping team. We're not going to do this now. But please note the reference in the agenda. If you have any concern over this, please share them on the list by the end of the week and we'll take that on Board. It should be straightforward. But please have a look. We're not going to do this in one minute, but you have three days to do that. If you have any concern, share them on the list.

I'll note that the two other items are updates on the ongoing ODPs. Just to clear out the last one, you will note that Janis sent an update to the list just yesterday. I'll just refer to his e-mail. Please review those elements and especially the assumptions that are made on—I forget the recommendation numbers but you will have that on the e-mail that I sent yesterday. But I don't think we can go into the substance here. Again, if you have any concern on this or you think that we should have a call to review the elements relative to the ODP in a specific call, please say so.

I'll just note that there's a webinar later today. Is it 16:00 UTC? That you can attend. With this, and for the last remaining five, ten minutes, I'll hand over to Jeff for item 8.3, the report on the SubPro ODP.

I think it's useful for us to spend a few minutes on this. It's the first of its kind and want to make sure we're on track in terms of the kind of information that council will need and the feedback that can be expected from our liaison, Jeff, to this role as link with the ODP team. So again, referring to the e-mail that Jeff shared with the list I think it was yesterday, maybe it's the right time to hand over to you, Jeff to introduce some of these elements and how

you would approach that and the things that you would expect from Council.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Sure. And actually, there was just another e-mail that I think Phillip, you just forward to the Council list as well. So what I discussed with Karen Lentz who's leading the ICANN Org ODP team is that hopefully by the document deadline of each Council meeting, to the extent that there are issues that we need to discuss during a Council meeting, we hope to provide those issues by the document deadline and any background. But if there are not anticipated discussions that we think need to be had during a Council meeting, then I'll just send an update by the Monday or Tuesday prior to the Thursday Council meeting like I did this time around.

There are a couple of items, I think, that the Council should review and discuss. The first is a guidance paper that I believe Steve sent around earlier this week that talks about the expectations of the ODP liaison, and I think the Council should look at that and provide any feedback—sorry, Steve, it's from Caitlin, sorry to Caitlin as well— so that lays out the guidance from the kind of ICANN Org perspective and it really is mostly a recitation of what was in the role description and also what's reflected in what Janis currently provides for the SSAD ODP.

There were some discussions during the wrap up session from the Council members that they may have wanted some additional transparency in things other than just questions that are posed by ICANN Org during the ODP.

So right now, the way the role is framed is that if and when ICANN Org has questions that come up during the ODP, that's when they will contact the ODP liaison and then liaison essentially presents those questions and perhaps proposed responses to the Council, and then the Council approves those.

But the Council was discussing during the wrap up that they may want additional transparency into the other items that the ODP is covering, not just where they have questions. Again, that's for the Council to have that discussion and then of course, have that discussion with ICANN Org if there are additional things that you all expect from the liaison.

So that's number one, is to review that paper. Number two is the first set of questions from ICANN Org on the ODP were sent to me this evening and I quickly did some research and drafted proposed responses and sent that via Philippe to the Council list. Please do review that. I think the Council needs to discuss how it can provide a timely response to the ODP team and not necessarily wait to ratify it, let's say, at the next Council meeting which is several weeks away. So the Council may want to discuss the process in which we send a response back to the ICANN Org.

And then finally, this is a more minor issue, but historically, Janis has sent an update or sends any e-mails through GNSO Council leadership, and it's GNSO Council leadership that sends it to the Council list. If this is the process the Council wants to follow going forward, that's great, or if it wants to give Council liaisons posting privileges directly to the Council list to get these questions or whatever gets—to basically do it a bit quicker and not burden Council leadership with just forwarding the message on.

So all those are for the Council to discuss. Sorry I took a couple extra minutes, but that's where I think we are.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. That's all right. I think these are important questions. As I said, we'll take five minutes to do this. But as initial feedback to those three questions that Jeff asked on the broader context of the ODP framework and how we can provide additional transparency too on the proposed responses to the SubPro ODP team, any comments or initial feedback at this point? Thanks, Jeff, on the process to do the second part, the review of the responses.

As Jeff said, the approach we've taken so far is for the liaison to provide the assumptions relative to the questions for clarification to the Council list. We didn't quite go into the substance of those assumptions so far, with one exception, I think, on the SSAD ODP. But if people would have ideas on how we can approach this, even from a work method, tool perspective, whether we want to have a dedicated webpage or something to track those assumptions, that would be welcome.

So I don't want to take too much of our time. Seeing no hand at this point, please do look at both the e-mail that I shared on Jeff's behalf with the list yesterday as well as the follow-up earlier today, and review and provide your comments with the list. I think leadership may come with a proposal on that second question on how we can approach this as transparently as possible to make sure that Council provides the feedback that's necessary to the liaison and ultimately to the ODP team.

So thanks, everyone. Mindful of time—I know it’s really late for the people on the East Coast and South America. So with this, for the last minute, any other comment, last note? Otherwise, I will just thank everyone for their time and effort in the wee hours of the day for some of you and wish you a very pleasant and restful rest of your day or night for that matter, and we’ll speak to you soon. Thanks, everyone. Bye all.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for attending this GNSO Council meeting which is now adjourned. Have an excellent rest of your days and evenings. Take care, everybody. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]