ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council Meeting

Thursday, 19 May 2022 at 20:00 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/yPgyfy2S552v9aEC6Y1Xb-G8nDNOG0ymCG_p1Ha_-pI_VjESzwFoSY-gAe-VUWbIdSrciLSl9CdXHyd4.uq9FuANXwuSPPh4P

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/eus-RD376MOlFdGnF4pdqNHRUQR9gMUhPpBIwvlByoKsQYQPYzTgi9AJIkLASsFi.ZIix9Zfio03ew6ao?startTime=1652990497000

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

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): **– Non-Voting** – Olga Cavalli
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Antonia Chu, Greg Dibiase, Theo Geurts (apologies, proxy to Greg Dibiase)
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Maxim Alzoba, Kurt Pritz, Sebastien Ducos
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evan
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Mark Datysgeld, Philippe Fouquart (apologies, proxy to Mark Ddatysgeld) , Thomas Rickert (joined late, proxy to Paul McGrady), John McElwaine, Flip Petillion
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Juan Manuel Rojas, Stephanie Perrin(apologies, proxy to Manju Chen), 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

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.

Maarten Simon: ccNSO observer (absent)

Guest:
Arinola Akinyemi - GNSO Standing Selection Committee Chair
Chris Disspain – EPDP Specific Curative Rights Protections IGOs Chair
Michael Palage - Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team Chair

ICANN Staff
David Olive - Senior Vice President, Policy Development Support and Managing Manager, ICANN Regional
Marika Konings - Vice President, Policy Development Support
Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Community Operations, Planning and Engagement (apologies)
Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director
Steve Chan - Senior Director
Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support
Emily Barabas - Policy Senior Manager (apologies)
Ariel Liang - Policy Senior Specialist
Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Director
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 19th of May 2022. 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. I don't see Maxim in the room yet, but he is intending on joining. Kurt Pritz.

KURT PRITZ: [inaudible].

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Here, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Theo Geurts has sent his apologies and assigned a proxy to Greg DiBiase. Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: 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: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Philippe Fouquart has sent his apologies. He has assigned a proxy to Mark Datysgeld. And Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Council vice chair will be chairing the session in his place. Thomas Rickert has sent his apologies for the beginning of the meeting and assigned his proxy to Paul McGrady. Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Wisdom Donkor.

WISDOM DONKOR: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Stephanie Perrin has sent her apologies and assigned a proxy to Manju Chen. Manju Chen. Manju Chen.

MANJU CHEN: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Farrell Folly.

FARELL FOLLY: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Juan Manuel Rojas.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Olga Cavalli. I don't see Olga in the Zoom room yet.

OLGA CAVALLI: Present, Nathalie. Thank you very much.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Jeffrey Neuman.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: I'm here. And just a quick note, I'm maybe on phone only for some of the call.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Jeff. Noted. Justine Chew. I do not see Justine in the Zoom room yet. Maarten Simon. And that's the case for Maarten too. Will circle back to these members.

We've got two guest speakers on our call today. We will have the GNSO Standing Selection Committee chair, Arinola Akinyemi speaking to agenda item four. We'll have a Michael Palage, the chair of the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team speaking to agenda item 10. Chris Disspain will be joining us also for the Agenda Item number five as chair of the EPDP on IGOs.

From GNSO support staff, Emily Barabbas has sent her apologies. In the room, we have David Olive, Steve Chan, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Caitlin Tubergen, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. We're in a Zoom webinar room. councilors are panelists and can activate their mics and participate in the chat. Please remember to set your chat to everyone for all to be able to read exchanges.

A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones, nor to the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standard of behavior. Thank you ever so much, Sebastien, and it's now over to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Nathalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody. Philippe's kindly asked me to chair this meeting. He had a bit of a medical emergency yesterday, but it's fine now. And so I will attempt to do as good as job as he usually does. But since this is my first time, please don't hesitate to keep me honest and interrupt if I'm doing anything wrong.

Roll call's done. Statements of Interest. Is there any updates of statements of interest anybody would like to share? Scanning quickly the list. I see a hand from Maxim Zorba, Maxim please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: It's going to be updated in the SOI file on the website. We are currently in the cross control with another registrar. It will be added from the same local market.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much, Maxim. And Maxim, yes, during roll call wasn't noted, but I see that Nathalie, you included him. Review and amendment of the agenda. So I had, in discussions with Marika earlier today, suggested to move item six maybe to the bottom of the agenda just to make sure that we have enough time for our guests and all the important discussions. Not that this is not important. But since this is more internal, we decided to take this down to the bottom of the agenda.

If we can go back up. Anyway. So the notes, the minutes of previous Councils were published, you have the links here. Does anybody have any comments or suggestion or anything that needs to be changed about those notes? And seeing no hands, I guess not.

Given the title agenda that we had, we decided this time not to spend time on the project review and action list. This is not to say that as councilors, we skip this activity. We hope that you've had time to review them and make sure that you were up to date with everything. And to this extent, does anybody have any questions they would like to raise for Berry at this stage on the action list and the projects?

Good. See no hand. This is going swimmingly. No consent agenda today, but two votes. And so if we can move to item four,

EN

the first vote, Council vote, will be a voice vote on the adoption of the revised charter for the Standing Selection Committee. And if I may ask my friend, colleague, Tomslin, to step up and present this item, that would be fantastic.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Sebastien. So this is regarding the revised charter of the Standing Selection Committee. And I note that the chair is present today to answer any questions during our discussion segment of this that councilors may have and she'll give some more details on the little changes that the selection committee decided to make on the charter. Nathalie, do we have the chair of SSC talk to the items before I go to the actual motion?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Yeah, Tomslin, for further discussion, it's better to have it before reading the resolved clauses. Correct. If there are any questions for the SSC chair, as you noted.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, thanks. Arinola, I don't know if you had anything to present or are you just going to talk the Council through what is changing and that will tee off the discussion place.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI. Thank you, Tomslin. Good day everyone. My name is Arinola Akinyemi for the record, the chair of the Standing Selection Committee. Basically, during the course of the work, the

committee identified several areas of the charter that would benefit from clarification and updates. We have a few substantive updates, which will be in sections two and four, they're basically administrative changes. These updates were necessitated to update the current charter language to reflect current recurring tasks as well as provide additional clarity about work that has already been completed.

That part of the charter, as it were, was suggested that every SSC chair, when they come on Board, would have to sit down to do some busywork. But it is of note that that particular timeline— working on the timeline for selection process has already been done. And it's a document that would serve as a resource for subsequent selection committee. So we had to change the language in the charter so that it will reflect that point and highlight it properly.

Also, if you would look at section three, it was updated to reflect the standard practice of the SSC based on interpretations of the preceding paragraph. And then we had to do some additional details—that part has more to do with recourse from a selection process if you are the candidate being reviewed.

However, a few questions came up that could be seen as—that was not clearly stated in the charter, or clearly handled by the charter, which could also be, if I'm close to the candidate, do I have to recuse myself from the selection process?

We have put it in such a way that if you have a personal relationship, professional, business or whatever relationship you have with whatever candidate that is being reviewed by the SSC at that material point in time, you disclose, and you use your better judgment to decide to recuse yourself or to go ahead and still be part of the process without prejudice.

Those are the substantive changes to the charter. And a few non substantive ones. Update to make the text gender neutral, and then the addition of relevant hyperlinks as the charter refers to some documents, like the GNSO procedures, and we felt it will be appropriate to have it there on the document so that if anyone read it, you could actually go back to those links and verify for clarity's sake. Also, we had some minor detail updates to improve clarity or to correct errors that were maybe typographical or otherwise in the previous charter. That's basically what we did. And we're hoping that that will help. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Arinola. Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. I'm sorry if I missed it, but some members of NCSG have observed the change that now the chair is eligible to participate in consensus, in selecting in this committee. I am really sorry if I missed it, it's super early here, but did you kind of explain the rationale of letting the chair participating in the consensus making, of selecting these candidates? Because there are concerns, of course, of how this kind of—because chair is really

powerful, and that they're moderating the meetings and they're facilitating the discussions, and then they actually have this responsibility of designating consensus too. So this power might kind of influence how the consensus are designated. So, can you please provide rationale of how, why you're allowing the chair to participate in consensus too? Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Manju. Arinola, would you like to answer that before we get to Maxim?

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Yes, I would like to do that. Actually, considering the chair has always been part of the consensus, that part of the charter has always been that way. What we have done differently this time around is to allow the chair to wear a double hat such that considering that the chair actually represents a constituency, one of the SGs and Cs on the committee, and we will be having full consensus. So the chair moderating the meeting, we do not think it will have any influence on the selection process. Because at that point, the chair would step down, because the fact that we came up with is that when it comes to taking consensus, the chair can step back as—for instance, I belong to the Business Constituency. I then become for the opinion or I represent the BC at that point in time of selection. So that is why we came up with that, to allow the chair to flip or the leadership generally to flip both ways. I hope that answers your question.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Arinola. I'll quickly go to Maxim noting that I think we only have two minutes left for this item. Maxim, please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: On one hand, the chair might be invited, not necessarily representing the constituency. But on the other hand, SSC acts on full consensus model. It means even if chair voted for something, but your constituency is against it, it's not going to fly anyway. So I do not see harm here. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you for the input, Maxim. I see Kurt's hand.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks very much, Tomslin. This is a question that will demonstrate my ignorance, but can you explain why appointment to the empowered community was removed from the charter?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Arinola, quickly.

ARINOLA AKINYEMI: Okay. That was removed from the charter because so far, the SSC has not been involved in the appointment of that representative to the empowered community by virtue of the fact that I believe that the leadership of the Council have always taken that as a different process, and from what we gathered from the

staff, there's a different process to do that and it doesn't involve the SSC. So we took it out.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Arinola. And thanks for the questions. Nathalie. I think we've consumed all our time on the discussion. We could, if you allow, move to the resolved clauses. Thanks. So resolved that the GNSO Council adopts the revised charter of the SSC. Two, the GNSO Council requests that the SO/AC support team sends the updated charter to the stakeholder groups and constituencies, including Nominating Committee appointees on the GNSO Council, and the GNSO Council thanks the SSC for its review of the charter and looks forward to continuing to work with the SSC on feature selection processes. Thank you. I think we can move to the voting, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Tomslin. So this will be a voice 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, will all those in favor of the motion, please say aye?

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Would all four Councilors holding proxies please say aye?

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much. With no abstention and no objection, the motion passes. Over to you, Sebastien. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much, Nathalie, and thank you, Tomslin, for handling this. Without further ado, we're going to move to the next item, which is the Council vote on the final report and recommendation from the EPDP on specific curative rights protection for IGOs. We have a bit more time for discussion here but since we've taken a bit more time, so just conscious of the clock, but I will let John McElwaine maybe lead this. John, if you could.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Yeah, so I think unless I missed it on the list and to be complying exactly with GNSO procedures, think Juan Manuel seconded the motion. And I don't think he's indicated whether he's okay with the friendly amendment that was worked out between Greg and me. So maybe if he could just indicate that's the case to start.

MARK DATYSGELD: [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Mark, I believe your mic is open. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I don't know if Juan Manuel was able to indicate whether he was all right with the friendly amendment.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, I haven't heard it either. We had a bit of an audio cut here and it sounds like you're on the phone. So one last time, Juan Manuel, can you indicate at least on the chat that you're okay with John's question? John, maybe proceed, because I think that Mark Datysgeld is trying to help us locate—Juan Manuel just confirmed on the chat that he's okay. So you're good to go.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Perfect. Okay. So then I guess to start, would people like me to read the motion, or do we want to have some discussion on it? Or can I answer any questions? I don't know. Sebastien, want me to run the queue? I see Greg's got his hand up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Go ahead, Greg. I'll let John run the queue, yes.

GREG DIBIASE: Hey. So I don't know if this is out of order or the right time to request this. But after consultation on the list, the RrSG would actually like to request a one-month deferral on this vote. Several members have raised concerns about whether this PDP adhered to GNSO instructions. So we'd like to delay the vote to determine if there's a scoping issue and discuss further amongst our stakeholder group. So I apologize for the late notice here. But we have not reached full consensus in our stakeholder group and think would like to discuss further before voting.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Anybody else have a comment concerning the request for deferral? Right, seeing no hands up, Sebastien, your lucky day, I think. I have the GNSO rules up. I believe it is up to you to decide upon the deferral and maybe somebody from staff can back me up on that, or provide any further guidance. But that's my recollection, having requested it once myself. Over to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, John. Again, staff, do keep me honest. But it was my understanding too. And in absence of Philippe, but I wouldn't want to force this down. So I think it is reasonable to accept it. This said, Greg, I just want to make sure that it's clearly understood that this is only a single month deferral, that if there are questions to be answered and asked, please use the list and John and Chris Disspain who will be able to help to make sure that all that is covered and we don't waste any more time on this. I've seen hands up and going down. I'm not very good at keeping track of

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah. So I just wanted to thank you for that and confirm that yes, we understand this is a one-month extension. And I'll be working with my fellow registrars to make sure any potential concerns are addressed expeditiously.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for that. Now taking Kurt's suggestion on the chat, but knowing that we've discussed this already a month ago, but I ask if Chris Disspain could join us. And he kindly agreed. So are there at this stage any further questions anybody might want to ask? Even if we're deferring the vote until next month.

And seeing no hand, I'd like to thank Chris very much for joining us for this. Thank you, John, for handling it. And I guess that we're going to have to wrap it and keep it for an extra month. Thank you.

Then we move on to the next item. Again, staff, stop me if I'm going too fast here. And as we decided to move items six further down, we are now up to item seven, which is the Council discussion on the impact of SSAD Light on the work. So I'll handle this myself.

As you would remember, the small team, the review of the SSAD ODA basically reached out to staff—in conjunction with the Board—reached out to staff and asked them to scope what would

be either an interim solution or a proof of concept—there was different names used for it.

Staff ended up using the word SSAD Light, but I don't know that it's the final title on this one. But they agreed to do it provided that the Board would ask them to—they were envisioning a work that would take them six weeks, but did warn that those six weeks would infringe on other work that was currently running, Namely SubPro ODP, CZDS 3.0 project and a project with EBERO [inaudible] improvements.

Now, whilst these projects are not in our hands in the sense that it's not for us to decide what is prioritized, this is for the Board to decide, obviously, but the Board has deferred to us and asked us, at least on those topics that are important to us include, but mainly SubPro, to help them decide on that prioritization.

Now, in the meantime, and because this has taken a bit of time to decide, and because of the fact that the idea was to have a scoping effort that would happen before ICANN in The Hague, but we are now running into a time window that wouldn't allow for the work to be done, to be performed by that, I have reached out to staff and offered them to postpone this until ICANN 75 until end of September, hoping that that would give them more time to finish what they were currently doing and fit this work in.

My understanding from staff's response was that it would help, it would get a bit more time obviously, but that since these other projects will be running until September and further, it wouldn't really allow them to completely clear the table for this.

So the discussion essentially is, how do we handle this? How do we offer priority advice? And particularly with regards to SubPro, how much are we ready to delay one for the other or vice versa? I see Maxim's hand up. Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about the items we see in this list, CZDS, it works somehow. Maybe the interface is not what we want, or yeah, it's not perfect, quite far from that. But it works somehow.

Speaking about EBERO, it works. And improvements is a nice thing to have, but not at the cost of another delay to a long-suffering SubPro, because with this particular program, we saw quite a delay in the past. And I don't think it's in our interests to delay it further. Because my understanding that all estimates on how much time it's going to take—I mean the SSAD Light design team—is a guess.

It's not necessarily it takes only one point half month. It could be six months, maybe longer. We don't know. So given that the item that is SubPro is a policy and it was long in the tunnel for the things to be done, I suggest we give it priority. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Maxim. So essentially leaving the priorities as are and not ask for the SSAD light to be prioritized in your opinion. Jeff.

EN

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, I would love to give a little bit more context, if I could. So this came out of a discussion that I had with the ICANN SubPro team, I guess it was about a month ago, in which they had said that they may—they're not 100% sure, the work they've already done may have delayed them a little bit. But that if you all as the Council, I'm the liaison in this case, choose to go forward with the sad Light at this point in time, it would, just for the design and fixing the previous document that was out there already, that would delay it at least six weeks. It wasn't six weeks definitively, it was at least six weeks. And then that's, again, just for the design.

If we wanted to okay it and then build it, it would be a lot more. When I asked them how much more, they couldn't tell me, which makes sense. Because obviously, it's going to depend on what the documentation for SSAD Light becomes and how to build it.

I also want to point out, because I think this is important, that it's not as if the same people are working on the day-to-day issues with the design of the SSAD and the ODP, it's just that there are a number of teams that the ODP has to confer with and get information from, get reviewed, that would also be involved in the design and implementation and build of the SSAD Light. So they wanted me to make sure that I was clear that it wasn't the same people and it's literally moving people to different projects in the sense of it was really because of all the groups that touch SubPro.

The other two items, the CZDS and EBERO, that was obviously not brought up in the context of our SubPro ODP discussions. And I was a little taken aback to see that, because I think it was in some previous documentation that may have been sent to the Council, but it strikes me as a little odd because the Council

EN

doesn't really weigh in on CZDS or EBERO, those aren't really policy items. And so to put that on the Council list to actually decide whether to prioritize those is kind of weird, so I don't know why that's there.

And also, I'd love clarification, if let's say we say CZDS or—since don't have any say in those two things, let's say we say SubPro is really important. That doesn't necessarily mean or—and we say SSAD Light can wait. I'm not saying we are going to say that. But even if we did, I'm not so sure those other two things wouldn't get delayed, wouldn't delay SubPro anyway. So I want to add that.

I also asked the question to the ODP Team. Actually, I'll just wait because that's in the next item. Sorry. I'll defer and let other people speak.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, thank you, Jeff. I was gonna suggest that. It's all good. So for clarity, staff is not suggesting that we prioritize. Because obviously, it's not our job and not within our remit. But they did want us to at least balance, I guess, SubPro and SSAD given that those were two tasks that we were in some way involved with. Paul McGrady, I see your hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Seb. Like you said, staff's not asking us to prioritize these necessarily. I have yet to see a final timeline on SubPro when that's going to be done and dusted. I know that others who've spoken already are speculating that the six weeks could be longer. What we know is what staff has said, and they've said six

EN

weeks. Six weeks in a SubPro, frankly, it's five or six years already. Six weeks is a sneeze in a hurricane.

So I do think that we should stay the course here. We are right on the cusp of taking first steps to solving a problem that has plagued the community since GDPR came out. And I don't think a six-week delay on SubPro, which again, we're years into and it looks like we'll be years to go, is a material change to SubPro. But putting this idea on ice until SubPro's done, whenever that is, would basically kill the idea. So we do need to balance those two things.

So again, as a community, we are right on the—I don't want to see us backtrack and choose defeat over victory. We have a really good opportunity to start to gather good information about these kinds of requests. And again, thank you to the staff for letting us know, but a very minor delay seems well worth it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. Point taken. I see John's hand.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks. I guess similar to what Paul is saying, if we weren't suggesting this SSAD Light and presuming the SSAD would be first approved by the Board, we would be having staff resources engaged in what I guess we would call a SSAD Heavy, so there'll be probably much more work going on. It seems to me that for a delay of 1.5 months, six weeks, that it is probably better to continue in trying to come to some resolution on the SSAD that will enable things such as a subsequent round to be offered with more confidence to the community as a whole. So thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay, thank you, John. I see Jeff's hand.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, I just wanted to do a clarification that there is a timeline for that SubPro ODP. And the timeline has a final report being done October of 2022. Sorry, I'm laughing at Maxim's [inaudible] comment.

So the other way to look at it is, look, we're only a few months, about five months away from finishing the SubPro ODP that's already been going on since the beginning of this year, and a six-week delay, the problem isn't just that it's, okay, six weeks, you're going to be working on something else. But you know it takes time to get back into a project. It's not as if they're going to just put pens down, spend everything on SSAD, and then all of a sudden pick up six weeks later and they haven't lost any time. Right?

So six weeks is the delay that they believe at this point. And it's just a belief that they could do the design document. The way to do it is we could approve SSAD Light, or say that once you're done with the ODP, you could then work on for the six weeks and still have the SSAD Light completed by or—the design completed by the end of the year. I think that is another option.

Again, it's not for me to give my opinion as to [which, control,] but just to make it clear and clarify that there is a timeline for the ODP. And it does end at this point in October. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Jeff. Good. Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Seb. Thanks, everybody, for your comments so far. Notwithstanding Maxim's earlier comment which I'm sure reflects reality, the Registries Stakeholder Group did reach out to its members for discussion on this topic at an irregularly scheduled meeting to talk about, not just SubPro, but all of these, but being an irregularly scheduled meeting, there wasn't significant participation in that.

And so the registry group has redoubled its efforts to reach out to its members to kind of understand what the effects of all these three things are so we could give a more competent response to the request. And so they're working on that. As a matter of fact, there's been some considerable effort trying to get people's opinion.

So for us, we're not ready to say do this or don't do this yet. And really hope we can have at our next scheduled meeting, which is coming up in four business days, to have this discussion and provide some meaningful input.

I will comment on some of the previous comments that there are switching costs to this. So I think since we're not ready to give full feedback, we'd rather not see a change made which introduces inefficiencies and then perhaps urge a change back. I'll also have other comments to make on this. But essentially, that's it, that before the trigger is pulled on this thing, we'd like to have the chance to give some competent feedback. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Kurt. And obviously, once discussed within the RySG, you would share those comments on the list so we don't have to wait for a full month, I assume. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we need to ask us a question. What do we do in seven weeks if the timeline is not met? Potentially, I suggest putting this item on ice. Because if the timeline is not met, most probably something is an obstacle to the process and should be further investigated. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. And finally, Paul McGrady on this, and then we will have to wrap up the question to go on to the next item

MAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Sebastien. I think that—and some of this is in chat. But Jeff and I are having a discussion about the timeline. And he keeps pointing to that it'd be six weeks delay in the ODP. And I keep saying six weeks delay to the overall deliverable of the next round is not material. You know, ODPs don't exist in a vacuum. So if there's a six-week delay to the ODP, there'll be a six-week delay to the next round, which again, I maintain is immaterial, especially compared to the opportunity for the community to get together here and do something that moves the ball forward and allows us to take a collective win together. So I hope we stay the course. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. So just to wrap this up quickly before we go to the next item, I think in any case, no work will happen on this. So the plan [inaudible] work will keep on going at least until the Board decides on this. Given our discussion, the fact that we are not coming to a clear agreement, I will assume that the Board won't do anything at least until The Hague and I'm not personally sure that I'll be able to attend, but in a way, we will find time to engage with staff, Eleeza Agopian and her team, there to make sure we fully understand the implications of each.

I don't know that everything is a completely dichotomy that you starting SSAD Light is going to stop everything else that happens. But I don't have the details on this and I don't know exactly. So we will endeavor to find out. And I guess we'll report on this on our next call.

With this, and noting that we spent quite a bit of time discussing that part of item eight, maybe I can pass it on to Jeff, who can give us an update on everything else that has to do with the ODP. Thank you, Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. So the update here is that—and I just sent a note to the Council list. There is a question set number four for the Council to consider. I'll follow the usual process of right now, it's a PDF document that I forwarded on. I will convert that to a Google document, send the Council list and start putting in my thoughts as a guide. But remember, it's ultimately the Council that needs to

agree, disagree, put in their own thoughts, whatever it is. It's not my document.

Which brings me to question set number three, which is still out there. Question set number three, I admit I haven't checked in the last couple days. But up until the last couple of days, I think I'm the only one who has put anything into that document and put my draft answers. And we've now had it for, I want to say two months.

So I think when we did question set number one and two, we sort of vowed to not take as much time and really be diligent in trying to put these responses together. So I'd really love it if everyone can go into question set number three, the document, maybe— because I'm in a car, maybe Steve or someone could post that link. Please do put in your thoughts. Again, it's not what you want to happen but what is reflected in the final report. And so if you could go into that.

Question set three, Kurt, was the string similarity one, which I remember, I know, there was some discussion on the list, but not very much. Question set four I just forwarded it to the Council. And so please, you can hold off on that one until I put it into the Google doc and put my thoughts in, or you can give your thoughts whenever you want. Again, it's for you all to put the Council thoughts in there.

Okay. And then as far as the other document that I forwarded to the group is an assumptions document. You probably saw before ICANN 73, there was an assumption document that contained some assumptions on only a few topics. This one goes into a lot more topics on assumptions that the ODP team is making.

EN

They are not really asking for comments in the sense of putting in our thoughts, but really does the council does the council think that ICANN's ODP team, do we think that they got it right? Obviously, if we think they got it wrong, then there's going to have to be some sort of explanation. But it's not like a put this out for comment to get everyone's thoughts on whether this is good or bad.

So if you can all take a look at that document. I'd love to be able to provide feedback in the next few weeks, hopefully prior to ICANN 74 at The Hague. That would be great.

And then also that ICANN'S ODP team is in the process of trying to plan both its pre-ICANN session, and I'm not sure yet as we have our call or monthly ODP call tomorrow, and I will post an update after that. But I'm not sure if they have a session as well at the ICANN meeting. There was a proposal from the ICANN ODP team to make ICANN 74 like a SubPro-themed policy meeting. But that was not accepted by the SO/AC chairs. And so now we're just hoping to get one meeting on a topic or two at the ICANN meeting to just get some feedback.

Other than that, ICANN will come out with a written halfway point document that should be posted. I guess that would be next week, if I have my time correct. And then of course, ICANN 74. And that's about the update I have for now. And like I said, after tomorrow, I will go into the discussion that we have tomorrow on with the ODP team.

And then the last item, which is probably something we need feedback on, as an action item from the last Council meeting, we

discussed the potential for doing a GNSO guidance process for issues such as applicant support and others, where the final report had recognized that there'll be a need for additional work, and in fact specified that. So I'm going to turn it over to Steve, to get—

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Jeff, if I may pause here, we still have a few minutes. Did anybody have any questions to Jeff for the ODP update before we go into the SubPro ODP? I see no hands. So I guess everything is clear. So Nathalie did post the question set number three in the chat. I hope everybody picked it up and do indeed review it. It would be very helpful. So if there is no need for questions, then I won't interrupt anymore. So indeed, as Jeff suggested, can we ask Steve to present item number nine on the SubPro GNSO guidance process?

STEVE CHAN: Sure. Thanks very much. Sebastien and Jeff. Jeff was a little eager. It's a separate agenda item, which we are on now. The purpose here is to just really provide some high level understanding and to help socialize what the GNSO guidance process is about.

Some of the things that are important to know about this is that this is the first GNSO guidance process or I guess potentially the first one ever. So like I said, the idea is to make sure that the Council understands what it is, why it's being proposed, and then also the overall structure of the way that the initiation requested is structured.

The other thing, I think, the important element about GGPs in general to know before we go into a little more detail is that GGPs do not have a separate charter. So the initiation request itself includes the scope of work. And then it also will include the operating procedures for the group, things like group structure and decision making

So the initiation requests that were circulated, it's intended to be inclusive of the things that you would normally expect to find in a charter. And then if it doesn't call it out specifically, then it's going to be referring back to the upgrade procedures. So that is just some general points about GGPs.

I think what Jeff was about to say is that this document that was generated was done in conjunction or in collaboration between staff and Jeff and Council leadership. And so that was circulated on the 4th of May.

So in terms of the detail, for the actual request itself, one of the things that Jeff started talking about a little bit is that the way it's structured is that there's two sets of topics. What we're calling group one are things that the SubPro final report, they specifically called out certain items where they envisioned substantive work to take place during the implementation review team phase of the work.

And if you recall, I think it was in question set two, the ODP team wrote back to the Council saying that some of the work struck them as borderline policy work and that kind of influenced this idea that some of this more substantive work might need to be addressed by the Council. And that's sort of the first genesis of the

idea of trying to figure out for the Council, how they might try to provide that feedback.

So the specific topic in that case was applicant support. But what you'll see in the initiation request is that we pulled out additional items where the SubPro final report specifically identified that substantive work would be likely needed in the future and envisioning that it will take place during the IRT. So that's group one.

So group two is items where the ODP team has identified where additional guidance, not is merely helpful, but more like it's necessary to help guide the implementation once and if we get to that point. That section currently is empty in the initiation request. The expectation is that ODP team will share that with [inaudible] team, staff, and we'll make sure to include that section, fill it out.

The way that the group one and group two are structured is we have a set of topics. And then at least for group one, which is the scope of things that we have so far, what we tried to do is identify a very specific task to make sure that the scope of the work is clearly understood.

And then something that we've done, tried to do consistently, and this is not just for things like GGPs, but it's for charters for other work, is to make sure that the charter or the scope of work is as narrow and well understood as possible. And that's something that we may or may not have been successful in doing. That was the intention, though, is to try to make sure that the scope is quite narrow and is achievable by the group.

And one additional reason, I guess, maybe one of the important reasons why we're trying to do that in addition to why it's always important to do that, is this GGP is sitting in the action decision radar as unplanned work. So that means that there are not community or staff resources that were previously allocated for that. So it makes it even more important that we keep this effort as tightly focused and narrow as possible.

There is one other thing that I want to flag and it's the structure of the group. And I'll pass it over to Jeff in a moment to talk a little bit more about it. But what you'll see in the group is called a steering group. It's intended to be representative nature. And the way that it's expected to work is that it's sort of similar to the committee for continuous improvement in that the steering group is able to address the work itself, if it deems it best to accomplish it that way. But it also allows for that steering group to farm out the work to a subteam, if they think that is actually more appropriate and maybe a more efficient way to get expertise to address a certain item.

So I think those are the two things I want to touch on, is just the idea of the two groups, what are within the two groups of topics. And I'll just reiterate that we're still waiting the topics for group two from our ODP team. And then like I said, the proposed structure for the membership and subsequent subteams. So with that, Seb, if you don't mind, I wouldn't mind passing it to Jeff to just talk a little bit more about the reasoning for the steering group structure. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Please do. Thank you, Steve.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, I'll make it quick because now I am driving. But again, the reason for the structure is pretty simple. I think Steve said most of it, is essentially that even in the SubPro report, it does call out that certain items, including applicant support really need to have the benefit of expert opinions and thoughts on issues like giving grants and other things like that.

So it really wasn't—the GGP work is really not necessarily to develop policy, as we all think of policy in the normal sense, but really to get further guidance from experts in certain areas that the original PDP group didn't feel qualified to set policy on. So I'll turn it back. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN: Thank you, Jeff and Steve on this. I'll open the mic for questions. And I see already Paul McGrady's hand up.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. I am still a little bit befuddled by what this thing is. And so we have in one aspect looking at issues that are fairly straightforward, like applicant assistance, which I'm not sure exactly why that wouldn't be IRT material. But then on the other hand, we have this develop criteria metrics or other measurements to help determine if applicant freedom of expression and other third-party rights were adequately balanced,

EN

which seems like a breathtaking sort of thing. These don't look like siblings. They may be cousins. I don't know.

But in any event, I guess my question is, was that really the intention? Because maybe I wasn't following along, but I thought this was about applicant support. But now we've got other things in here that really are of a very different ilk. And also, what happens with this stuff? I mean, so they deliver a report to the Council. Does Council vote to adopt whatever they say? And then if we do, where does it go? Or will this be delivered to an IRT? I don't understand what, at the end of the day, this is meant to accomplish. What's the workflow here? What's downstream? Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. Maybe I'll let Steve prepare his answer. And we take Tomslin's common or question.

STEVE CHAN: Sure, thanks. So that intention is that the group one that I mentioned, applicant support was a very good example of that. Essentially, group one is pulling out items from the SubPro final report, where it's clear from the recommendations that the group expected some level of substantive work to take place.

And so as you're seeing, there's a variation in the sort of work and tasks that might come from those things that are targeted and identified in SubPro final report. And so I guess what I would note is that the Council overall thinks that a GNSO guidance process is a good approach for tackling some of these items, but maybe

some of the items are not appropriate to include it, then that would be fully within the Council's power to add or take away certain things that they don't feel are appropriate.

So hopefully, that answers the part of your question about, I guess what it is. But the other thing that I would add is you're asking about the process, it's a good question. This is the first GGP ever, as I mentioned. I'm not an expert on it. But I think the way that it works is that the final report from the GGP is subject to Council approval. I don't remember the threshold exactly. But the next step after Council approval, assuming that happens, is actually Board approval. And then if it gets that far, then the Board would direct implementation. Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Hey, Seb, I'm so sorry, I'm not online. But can I just be added to the queue as appropriate?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. I'll let Tomslin ask his question or comment, and then I'll give you the hand, Jeff.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Seb. Actually not a question. It was just a comment to say that I think it's a good idea that we are using some of these existing tools in the policy development process to look at some of these issues. And so it's something that I definitely support that we use this process, despite it being new, in resolving some of these

issues that could not be or were not appropriate for the IRT. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Tomslin, for that comment. Jeff, it's all yours.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, thank you. So one thing I'd like to note is that so the GNSO has many different mechanisms to set policy. We often think of the PDP or EPDP as the primary ways to do that. And that's true when you're dealing with capital C, capital P, consensus policies that alter contracts for the registries, registrars, etc.

But a process like this, the GGP, which was developed specifically to handle issues where advice was needed on non-capital C, capital P, consensus policies, and of course, something like determining parameters, whatever they are, and I'm generalizing here for the new gTLDs, which doesn't have a retroactive effect on the existing contracts, is perfect for the GGP process, again, because that doesn't result in capital C, capital P, consensus policies.

And so yes, all that's required after the GGP is done is that the Council approves it pursuant to the thresholds that are in the bylaws, or the operating—it might actually be in both, the bylaws and the GNSO operating manual. And yeah, that's all that's required.

And the other thing is, if this work can be done before the Board votes overall on the SubPro policies, it could be added as an

appendix to that final report. And then finally, this was discussed at the last GNSO Council meeting. And this is what we were asked to produce, which is what something like this would look like, because the Council at that point did, or at the last meeting, did appear to want to handle some of these issues now, rather than wait for the formal IRT. Because again, the ODP was never envisioned as part of the whole process. And so by this point in time, most of the community had expected to be well within the IRT at this point. So, all that being said, I think this is a good process. I think that's what we're trying to achieve. And again, I would hope the councilors would support this. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Jeff. We are slightly ahead of schedule. So if there are any questions about this, please don't hesitate. I see one last question from Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. So yeah again, first of all, I don't know what happens next. Are we voting on doing this? Are we talking about it? I don't think we're voting on it. But is it going to happen just informally if nobody says no?

And then secondly, Jeff, I totally hear you when you say the Council seemed to be for this. But I guess in my head, it was a way to move forward work. That was clearly implementation work. But what you just talked about, though, with the small c, small p consensus policy, is that this, from your point of view, looks to be

EN

a new means or a different means of making policy outside of the PDP.

And so if it's like a pre IRT kind of thing, like that's one thing, but if we're really talking about opening up a new channel of policy work where the Council does it instead of the community, I think that we should take a minute and think that through. So I would like us to understand the theory behind all this before we pull any triggers. And Jeff, I know you're in a car now. But maybe you could put some thoughts down in an email for the list that would help us all sort it out in our heads. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. And I note to your question, comment, that Steve notes that there's definitely notebooks required for this. But we'll wait for Jeff's comments on the list. Thank you very much for this. Oh, sorry, there is most definitely a vote needed. I misread your comment, Steve. Sorry about that. Exact opposite.

So I would like then to move on to item 10, which is about the registration data accuracy scoping team update, for which we have invited Michael Palage. Go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Sebastien. Hello, everyone, I welcome the opportunity to update the Council on the work that the accuracy data scoping team has been undertaking over the last several months. What I'd like to do here is, I guess there's really three specific items I want to look at here, giving a high-level overview of the work that we have undertaken and where we are at in completing that.

The second item that I do want to address is that we are behind, unfortunately. So there will be a proposed change request that will need to be submitted to Council to recognize our delay.

And then I guess the third topic that I've informed Council is that because of the delay, I do not believe that I will be able to fulfill my obligations on assignments three and four. I have committed to the team as well as ICANN Org to make sure we bring home assignments one and two, to wrap that up.

So those are the three high level things that I would like to discuss and brief with the Council. So with regard to high level deliverables on where we are at, the original charter set forth four different assignments for the scoping team. And they were basically broken down into two components, assignment one and two, three and four.

As you could see from the agenda, assignment one was focused on enforcement and reporting, whereas assignment two was focused on potential measurements of accuracy. What we have realized is depending upon the output of assignments one and two, that would probably deliver or drive some of our work in connections with assignments three and four, future work or other changes. So that's one of the reasons we kind of bifurcated our work upfront initially.

While we have diligently worked through having basically weekly meetings, we endeavored to try to go to twice a week, but there was no will. I would say we are, like most, suffering from just COVID volunteer burnout. So we have kept to a 90-minute weekly

meeting. That has been our regular cadence and we have been able to move forward.

One of the things that I think is very important is the meeting that just took place today. There was actually some relevant information that I think I would like to bring to the Council's attention, because it was a lively topic of discussion during today's earlier meeting.

As you may be aware, at ICANN 73, Becky Burr on behalf of the Board informed the accuracy scoping team that the Board had requested ICANN Org to submit a list of questions to the European Data Protection Board to gain some insight on what could or could not be available with regard to scoping.

Today—well, over the last couple of weeks, but more specifically today, we gained further insight on what potentially is going to be submitted to the European Data Protection Board. ICANN Org right now is looking at four different scenarios are four different approaches on where they are going to seek guidance. And we have been informed that ICANN is potentially looking at doing a data privacy impact assessment in connection with one of those scenarios.

As Thomas Rickert was able to contribute in our call earlier today, he believes that one of the reasons why ICANN has perhaps been unsuccessful in its previous outreach engagements with the European Data Protection Board is the lack of detail or having one's homework done before engagement.

So we believe that this will be very helpful. And one of the things that I had basically requested of all of the different stakeholders and all the team members was to go back to their respective stakeholder groups and engage on what that scenario two would look like. And there's a potential range of scenarios in that.

So perhaps I will just hit pause there to see if there are any questions or concerns before I continue on with more details of the work of the group. Okay. Seeing no hands, I will continue then.

So, as far as timing, Becky Burr had informed us that it is the intention of ICANN Org to submit this inquiry to the European Data Protection Board within the next couple of weeks. And when we were asking about the DPIA, it appeared that this does not seem to be something that ICANN views as being protracted.

The ICANN Org, Amy who participated in today's call, specifically stated that ICANN Org was looking for the input of the accuracy scoping team to provide input. So I think it would be very helpful for the representatives to engage in a dialogue with their respective stakeholder groups to bring this back. Because I think the guidance, any actionable guidance, as that can be provided by the European Data Protection Board, would provide a lot of clarity in a number of issues aside just to the work of this group.

So that is, I think, where we are at. Just a further update, we are in the process right now of reviewing and trying to complete the assignment one and assignment two report. So that is definitely on the horizon. Unfortunately, the European Data Protection Board has kind of—How would I say this? Like all things, there are a number of distractions, which slows one down from achieving

one's original desired goal. But we continue to make progress. And we feel that if not at ICANN 74, shortly thereafter, we will be able to produce that report to the GNSO Council.

As you will see in this report, there are a number of studies that are being proposed to be looked at. And again, we will have to wait to see what the response is from the European Data Protection Board. That will probably take a couple of months based upon what we've been informed.

Therefore, what has been discussed is, does the accuracy scoping team perhaps go into a hiatus or a hibernation mode, waiting for this feedback or these other surveys or questionnaires to be reported back so that we can move forward with assignment three or four? This is obviously something that would be clearly within the remit of the Council, particularly in light of the proposed project change request that is also being discussed here. So I think that is it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much, Michael, for this. I just wanted to note you referenced a change request that has been submitted. It's posted here on the agenda. Not sure it was included in the agenda that was emailed a few days back, but is included here for those who want to review it.

Are there any questions for Michael from anyone? I see none. Well, thank you very much, Michael, for this. And we'll be looking forward to the report in a month. Thank you very much.

Now, Steve, I believe that it's your screen day we're looking at. Can we go back to item six, which we skipped early on? We have plenty of time now to go through it. I will ask him Marika to take us through it. And I believe that Marika had a presentation maybe for this topic.

MARIKA KONINGS: Yes, thank you very much, Sebastien. I prepared a couple of slides just to take the group through at a high level the paper. And I think Steve is probably pulling it up, or am I sharing, Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Marika, if you don't mind, you could share. Thanks.

MARIKA KONINGS: So as the paper also outlines here, the ICANN bylaws and the PDP manual, they do set out the prescribed steps and requirements for policy development process. But there's actually a lot of flexibility around those required steps on how a PDP can be carried out and how the different steps can be supported.

And I think you're also aware that through the GNSO reviews, as well as the initiative of PDP 3.0, there have already been a number of a number of improvements that were considered, discussed and implemented, some of which have worked really well and have become a standard practice, others that maybe didn't work as intended and have been discarded. But I think it's part of kind of the continuous improvement that I think that the

Council has demonstrated over the years in trying to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the PDP.

I think as everyone observed, a number of conversations have recently started that have highlighted that there may be other aspects of the PDP for which improvements should or could be considered. And there are also a number of projects that are on the action decision radar for the Council to deal with at some point that also focus on PDP specific items.

And so based on conversations we had a couple of meetings ago, the staff support team suggested that it might be helpful to try and bring all of those different conversations and initiatives together in a way so that it would be easier for the Council to have an overview of those different conversations, as well as trying to see if there would be a way for managing and coordinating it to really make sure as well that what is being discussed in these different conversations is implemented or dealt with in a consistent and coherent manner.

So what you see here is on the screen, and hopefully you had a chance to look at that as a graphic that also is in the paper that tries to map these different conversations and initiatives to the different steps of the PDP process. And you can hopefully see that most of these are very heavily focused on the kind of post Council adoption phase.

Obviously, there's also a linkage with earlier steps of the process. But a number of the conversations are very heavily focused on this and what happens after a vote, what happens during implementation. We've of course, already seen the operational

design phase as a new element that has been recently introduced, which again, will all try to focus on how to enhance efficiency and effectiveness within the current set of rules and procedures that exist.

So of course, as part of those conversations, I think it's also clear that not all improvements or ideas that are being put forward are equal. There are some that may require conversations, a lot of resources to kind of figure out what needs to happen and may require changes to ICANN bylaws or the PDP manual, which of course also needs to go through public comments. And of course, that's a pretty heavy undertaking.

But there are also improvements that may be fairly easy to do. They don't require changes to existing processes, and may not require many resources to do so. So our thinking is that it may be helpful to apply some kind of categorization that will allow the Council also to think about what are things that we can move forward with because they may give a tangible benefit but they don't require the heavy lift and [as such do not] impact other work that's ongoing.

But also look at and be able to plan for those items that will need to be dealt with at some point because either they're part of the review that has been already scheduled or planned or where there's a general view that it's important or helpful to look at that, but where more work and resources are required so that it can be planned into in Council's overall planning process.

So currently, we have suggested that there are probably three categories, at least from our perspective, that can be applied to

those proposed improvements. Number one, those improvements that are easy to implement and not require any changes to existing processes or procedures, category two, improvements that may require some effort to implement but again are not requiring any changes to existing processes and procedures. And then category three, improvements that require a higher level of effort to implement and are likely to require changes to existing processes or procedures.

So that categorization would then be applied to a tracker that we're suggesting to create that would be a living document. So this is as well, this is not a kind of a one off or standalone frozen kind of document but something that would get updated over time, because again, these conversations are expected to continue over a certain timeframe. And in that way, it allows for tracking and monitoring as well both of improvements that are suggested but also those that are agreed to be implemented to be able to see where implementation stands.

So we would basically take it on us to kind of include the suggested improvements that are made through these different conversations that are ongoing, and assign a proposed category as well as suggested next steps for these, which then would be reviewed by the Council and confirmed. Or of course, if you don't agree with the categorization, or the next step should be considered, that would be part of that conversation.

And once the Council has reviewed how it would like to proceed, we would coordinate those next steps, which in certain cases might mean that it's for staff support to kind of go in and do something, or it may involve the creation of a group or forming a

working group to undertake that work. And of course, that would be in combination with regular review sessions to look at what is in there and whether it's kind of delivering as well, of course, the results that are anticipated with the different improvements.

So just a brief example, and I think this is also what you hopefully will have seen in the document where we've kind of tried to show what that might look like, taking some very specific suggestions that have been made in some of these conversations already.

So the first one here, for example, looking at one of the outcomes of the Council strategic planning session where there was a suggestion that the Council should share with the ICANN Board, basically, its planning of when it is expected to deliver certain items to the Board. So the board would also be able to kind of plan that into their calendar, knowing when certain recommended recommendations would be delivered to them.

So here, a very specific proposed next step would be that in combination with the report that comes out of the strategic planning session, which is Council's forward-looking documenting in what is the Council going to do in that upcoming year, that it would also combine that with here are some of the recommendations or projects that we think we will be able to deliver to you this year.

And again, that will then allow the board to plan or factor that into its planning accordingly. And again, that is something we figured is a fairly easy to implement, it's kind of looking at the project list and including that as part of the report from the strategic planning session and provide that to the Board.

Another example that we provided here is in the category two that there's some effort to implement but not requiring any changes to processes or procedures is, for example, a specific suggestion that there would be an additional provision to the charter template to basically indicate that a working group would also need to look at impact on existing consensus policies.

And again, from our perspective, this only seems to take an update of the charter template, which is a document that I think is available on the GNSO website, that would basically flag that that is an area where a charter drafting group would need to consider if or how to include that. So again, a little bit of effort entailed in that and updating of the charter template, but not an extremely heavy lift nor requiring changes to the existing processes or procedures.

So I think that's in nutshell what we're suggesting. And so first of all, I think what we really would like to hear from you all is, is this approach helpful? If the answer is no, we would like to hear what you would like to suggest, how to track all these different conversations and make sure that there is a kind of path for dealing with the different improvements that are being suggested as well as those items that are still on the Council's project list.

If you do think that this is a helpful approach, I think some of the questions that the Council may want to discuss it would be helpful to get input on is how to ensure broader community input on your proposed improvements, as not all improvements may be Council specific.

I think the two ones I just shared, they are very specific as they're part of kind of the council's role and remit as manager of the PDP.

But there may be others such as, for example, one item that's on the list is the review of the policy and implementation recommendations. That is obviously a broader undertaking, or broader involvement expected in that conversation. So what will be a way to ensure you're getting input from others as well, would those regular review sessions include participation from others? And is it a regular request for input that could be shared with stakeholder groups and constituencies and even beyond the GNSO?

And again, I think that's really open to ideas and suggestions. How regularly should such a review take place, from our expectation, of course, the initial, once we've kind of mapped the current conversations, might be kind of a longer conversation. But once that initial review has done and an assessment has been made of those improvements, it may not need to be on a kind of monthly basis. Maybe more whenever further items are added or there are updates that are worth discussing.

So again, should that also be part of the Council meeting, or is there a standalone meeting that would be helpful in that regards? And then as well, thinking about how to best plan for items that would fall in that category, [three parts.] So improvements that require a higher level of effort to implement and are likely requiring changes to existing processes and procedures. But what is the best way to kind of plan that into the Council's plan of activities, because of course, there are many other projects on that list as well. But obviously, these are important, too. So I'll pause there and be happy to hear your feedback.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you Marika. I don't know if you saw that there was a question for Paul McGrady in the chat. So is the idea to get this finalized and up and running before we kick off the next PDP? Which according to him should be RPMs phase two. Do you want to take that before I pass on the mic to Kurt?

MARIKA KONINGS: Sure. I think the question is, what is this? If it's the tracker, yes, I think if the Council gives green light for setting this up, I think that should be possible, because I think there's still some steps to go before the next PDP is moving ahead. And then of course, it depends on which of those items on the kind of proposed improvements Council gives green lights to. And again, there's also of course a conversation you can have around what is most important, especially looking at what is coming next, because obviously, there might be a next PDP in the pipeline. There's also likely implementation work that will kick off soon.

So again, I think there's also a conversation that the Council would need to have, which of those improvements do you deem most important? And again, it also depends on kind of the resources needed and who needs to be involved in implementing those to be able to kind of say, "Is that possible before that next PDP kicks off?"

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, I see that Paul has also thanked you for the answer in the chat. Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Seb, and thanks, Marika. I do think this approach is helpful. The suggestion might be implicit in it, but in addition to ranking the projects, easy to implement to hard to implement, I wonder if it has been done or should be done also to rank order them as to their impactfulness. So instead of a continuum along one axis, one axis would be cost, low, high, and the other axis is impact, low, high. So even if something is really cheap and easy to implement, if it doesn't have much of an impact, we might not do it. And if something is very impactful, even though it's expensive and uncomplicated to implement, maybe we jump all over that right away and invest considerable resources and time. So maybe the analysis could include that additional axis. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for that input. And I think I saw Marika's hand shaking yes, and a thumbs up. So we'll work on it. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: From the operational perspective, the most beneficial things are those which are easy or cheap to implement, which have the best impact on the things. So if we are able to identify those small items which with minimal efforts do the most, those should be put into a different category and implemented first, because you spend less time, less effort, have the best impact.

Speaking about the questions, why do we need the broader community input on the Council related issues? If issues are not

related to Council, most probably, then do not need to appear somewhere in the Council or in the processes around it.

And speaking about regularity, I think we need to ensure we avoid the situation with the death of 1000 reviews, which we might see soon, when we will have to pass through many reviews at the same time, same people, and not necessarily the more often you make reviews—at some moment of time, you have the negative feedback when you do a review so often that you cannot do the actual work. We definitely need to avoid that. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Maxim. Marika, did you want to answer to those questions?

MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, thanks, Sebastien. On the question of why do others need to be involved? I think there are some aspects here that are not Council only. Council is obviously involved, but it's not the only one that may be affected or impacted or have an opinion on. One example is, for example, the ODP. And I think a review is expected to happen, I think after the second ODP is completed. So that might be a conversation where obviously Council will or may have an opinion, but it's also something where stakeholder groups and constituencies may have an opinion. So that might be a specific aspect where collaboration may happen or where opinions of others need to feed in.

And similar, the policy and implementation recommendations. They were actually developed as well by a community group, I

think that consisted of representatives from GNSO but also outside of the GNSO. We may have ALAC participants, maybe GAC as well. So again, those are conversations where I think the Council does play kind of a leading role in chartering and forming and leading those types of reviews. But it's a broader community conversation that's involved.

So again, it's kind of a planning that would need to be factored in. And I think that's where a tracker could help. Of course, if the items that really don't belong there where the council doesn't play any kind of role whatsoever, obviously, they shouldn't appear on the tracker or maybe just for information purposes, but obviously, anything that's related to PDP at the end of the day, I think there is a role for the Council as a manager of the process. So there's always some kind of linkage, at least from my perspective. So I hope that answers the question.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Marika. I see also Tomslin's comment in chat on finding a way to keep the community continuously informed and maybe publish this tracker to the community or find other ways to socialize it. Seeing no further hands, thank you, Marika, very much for this. I think we'll go back to Steve's screen sharing and go back to the agenda. And a few points of AOB that we have.

MARIKA KONINGS: If I can just ask one last question. So just kind of knowing from the staff side, there seems to be some support for this approach. Is there an expectation that based on this, we can kind of maybe

develop the tracker and show more clearly what it would look like? Is this further conversation needed? Is any kind of formal decision expected? Just so I think we're clear on what our marching orders are.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Marching orders is a huge word. I would love to hear Philippe on this rather. But no, I think that yes, I think that at least a first example of what it could look like will help the conversation and will bring comments. So yes. For me, I think that is something that we should proceed with. And plus one, Sebastien. Thank you, Thomas.

So if there are no further question, we'll go to any other business. So we have three items here. The second the, SO/AC chair roundtable update was a topic that was going to be handled by Philippe who did not leave me notes for it. So we will have to skip it and present it next time. And I will let him do it because I don't have the material for it.

But item one, we had a request from our NomCom NCPH Councilor to say a few words. Paul was very patient because he asked us for this slot already two months ago, but was skipped last Council meeting. And so we ensured that he would have his hour of fame right now. So Paul, if you are available, I'll give you the mic.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Seb. Yeah, this is going to be short. Basically, it's just a commercial for me to ask folks within the house to be in touch. I've

been trying to reach out through the NCPH councilors list. I get feedback, I think in the ordinary course from the IPC and the BC just because of longstanding membership within the IPC and friends over at the BC. And I do get input from other folks within the house from time to time, but I really would love it if folks would reach out and let me help you with documents you're drafting or just for me to have your point of view on things before we go into these Council calls. All that would be helpful to help me do this job, which is not for any one constituency, but it's for everybody in the house. So anyways, that's my short commercial. Everybody's got my email address and phone number. I'm happy to talk to anybody at any time. Thanks so much.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. I don't want to speak for her but I know that Desiree who's the NomCom appointee for the CPH reached out to me early days when she joined the Council with exactly the same proposal and question and so yes, absolutely, we should. But I'll let everybody handle that the way they see fit. Thank you very much, Paul, for this.

This leaves us with our very last item of discussion today, which is ICANN 74 planning, and I believe that Nathalie is going to update us on this. Yeah, go ahead.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Just a few pointers. Right now we're expecting the schedule, which obviously will be extremely helpful for discussions, to be published in the next few days. The

minute it is ready, I will send out the e-mail reminding you what the steps are to sign up to sessions and how to download them. For now, if you have signed up to the website, you will see the prep week session schedule has been published.

So as a reminder, prep week takes place two weeks before the actual meeting. It's a virtual setting for obvious reasons, but does help replace the traditional updates which used to happen in the face to face session and maybe weren't necessarily leading to as much interaction as could be wished for. So a lot of the web sessions are meaningful and relevant to discussions which will take place during the face to face setting. So please as much as possible, at a minimum, attend the policy update webinar and the GNSO policy update webinar. You'll learn a lot.

For those councilors who are traveling to The Hague, you ought to have received your travel e-mails. You should be booked or in the process of finishing your booking. If you run into any issue, please email travel support, you ought to have received emails for them. And if you have other questions, please reach out to us. So GNSO [inaudible] icann.org and Terri Agnew, my colleague is your point of contact there, she'll be more than happy to help you.

Those of you who are also members of PDPs, EPDPs or scoping teams will have received a survey. And those of you who are not [and are only Council,] no need to panic. I'm just going to explain what that that's about. Given the health and safety restrictions in The Hague, there is social distancing in the meeting rooms and so there are mathematically fewer seats in attendance.

In order to ensure that for example, all councilors are able to access the council sessions, we've submitted lists of priority seating per group and per activities. For example, all GNSO councilors, be it for the GNSO Council session, the Council wrap up, the joint meeting with the ccNSO and joint meeting with the GAC, you will have priority seating in the room for those sessions.

The same thing applies to the PDP, EPDP and scoping team members who have responded positively to the surveys and said yes, we will be in The Hague. Yes, I will be attending, for example, the transfer policy session, I am an active member. That means that your name is on the list to have a seat in that session.

Spaces are restricted unfortunately. So it means that it will be hard maybe to have everyone who would wish to observe the sessions in the room. But as a minimum, we can guarantee the active members have a seat.

So this initial survey sent by policy staff was to know how many members will travel. Once the schedule is published on the 23rd— and again, if you're half listening, don't worry, I will send an email which will make a lot more sense. But once the schedule is published, as you access and download the sessions you wish to attend like you've done virtually for the last few ICANN meetings to add those sessions to your calendars, you will be asked whether you will be attending on site or not.

If for example, as you are a member of Council for example, of course, please say you're attending the Council session, but it's kind of overkill because your name is already on the list. So this

signing up to a session will only mean that you have the access details on your calendar.

Regarding other sessions, however, it will be on a first come first served basis for observers. If you're not a member of the transfer PDP for example, but you really want to observe the session face to face, I will suggest and encourage you to sign up extremely fast in order to make sure you do get a seat in the attendance.

If you are not in the main meeting room, there will be what we call overflow and secondary rooms where there will be screens and microphones as they are in the main room. And you will be able to interact and go up to a standing mic to ask your questions. So these are slight differences. That is why it's key that you do the sign up on the registration as soon as possible once the schedule is out. I will remind you that in the next few days.

Regarding the different Council sessions, they are four. A joint session with the GAC and ccNSO, there's a traditional Council meeting, the two-hour meeting, and then the wrap up on the Thursday. If you cannot make any of those sessions, please let us know ahead of time.

And last but not least, the fun parts—and again, apologies for those not traveling to The Hague. Sebastien Ducos has very kindly helped and found a venue for the Council dinner which will take place on the Monday evening. Everyone has RSVP'd so please don't worry if you did a while ago and you can't remember. We have the final list of guests. I will be sending more information regarding the venue tomorrow. So please take a look at your emails tomorrow morning. And there'll be something to look

forward to. If you have any questions or clarifications, please go ahead. I'll be happy to answer them.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Nathalie. There was a question from Maxim. So the prep week is two weeks before ICANN. Can you remind everybody what week that is?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Prep week starts on Tuesday, May the 31st and goes through to Thursday, 2nd of June.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much. Was there any question from anyone? Obviously, you can always reach out to Nathalie directly or any of us. And we'll try to answer. I see a hand for Manju. Go ahead.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you. Nathalie. I think you said we have four meetings, one GNSO Council meeting, one wrap up, one with the GAC and one with the ccNSO. Is that correct?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Correct.

MANJU CHEN: Are we not meeting with the Board?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: No. So during the policy forum, the four-day meeting, there's generally no meeting with the Board. There have been a couple of exceptions to this. But the main reason for not meeting with the Board is that this would usually take place during the GNSO working session, which would be either on the Saturday or the Sunday, during either the first meeting of the year or the last meeting of the year.

The policy forum being in the middle of the year and only four days focusing on PDP and SG/C work, it was decided that meetings with the Board could be requested but wouldn't be automatic as it can be for the other meetings.

No, Manju, it is an excellent question because there have been exceptions. And GNSO Council leadership discussed this. Because there was the SO/AC chairs roundtable recently with the Board and potentially maybe a brainstorming session between the GNSO Council and GNSO appointed Board members coming up, it was decided to give priority to PDP and SG/C work for the return to face to face which hasn't taken place in years. But excellent point. Thank you for listening.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for that and all those clarifications. I wanted to give a personal shout out to Manju and other councilors in East Asia who woke up at 4:00 in the morning today for this session. So thank you very much for doing that and for actively participating.

EN

This said, and seeing no hand, no questions, I'd like to adjourn this session and thank you very much for everybody's contribution. Thank you. We can stop the recording.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, everyone, for joining. This was a GNSO Council meeting. Have an excellent rest of your days and evenings. Take care, everyone. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]