
ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council Meeting

Thursday, 19 January 2023 at 21:00 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/0XXwVhHOh27Fks-bfs1pDiKbiAVyJRYgLiz_lrl0CWva8eb5OfmufvahH8DSbYGdjpqI0snET-YU9_yi.SKXfMp20qB4RskzG

Zoom Recording: https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/UwCA3K-B3dejXZv6GWw0J6aPbEGwK8CsSYILwld08I_IHdsmaYd5_TwvTWKuNobd.Ue3OItYW-dWU0SR2?startTime=1674162030000

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** – Anne Aikman Scalese

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Antonia Chu, Greg DiBiase, Theo Geurts

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Kurt Pritz, Sebastien Ducos

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evan

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Marie Pattullo, Mark Datysgeld, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, John McElwaine, Susan Payne

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.

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Stephanie Perrin, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Manju Chen (apology – proxy to Stephanie Perrin), 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 (absent)

Guests:

Roger Carney, Chair of the Transfer Policy Review PDP

Mike Silber, Chair of the GNSO Guidance Process of Applicant Support

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 Policy Management

Steve Chan - Senior Director, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations

Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director

Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support

Emily Barabas - Policy Development Support Senior Manager (GNSO)

Ariel Liang - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)

Nathalie Peregrine - Manager, Policy Development and Operations Support (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Specialist (GNSO)

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting on the 19th of January 2023. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Nacho Amadoz?

NACHO AMADOZ: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kurt Pritz?

KURT PRITZ: I'm here. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Theo Geurts?

THEO GEURTS: Still awake.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Greg Dibiase?

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Desiree Miloshevic?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo?

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. I see Mark in the Zoom Room. John McElwaine?

JOHN MCELWAINE: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes. Thanks.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Osvaldo Novoa? I don't see Osvaldo in the Zoom Room yet.
Thomas Rickert?

THOMAS RICKERT: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady? I don't see Paul in the room either. Wisdom
Donkor?

WISDOM DONKOR: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Stephanie Perrin? I don't see Stephanie in the Zoom Room yet. Manju Chen has sent her apologies and has assigned her proxy to Stephanie Perrin. So we'll make sure she joins the Zoom Room shortly. Farell Folly?

FARELL FOLLY: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Bruna Martins Dos Santos?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Here with cold. Hello, everyone.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sad to hear that, Bruna. Hello. Tomslin Samme-Nlar?

Tomslin Samme-Nlar: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Anne Aikman Scalese? I don't see Anne in the Zoom Room yet either. Jeff Neuman? Jeff is on but can't speak yet. I've just caught up in the chat. Justine Chew? I don't see Justine in yet. Maarten Simon? And the same thing for Maarten, we'll follow up with them.

As guests on today's call, we have Roger Carney, chair of the Transfer Policy of EPDP, and Mike Silber, who may or may not

make it in time, but Paul McGrady will be able to assist with that, chair of the GNSO Guidance Process Applicant Support.

From the GNSO support staff, we have Steve Chan, Marika Konings, Caitlin Tubergen, Emily Barabas, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. As a reminder, in a Zoom Webinar Room, councilors are panelists, can activate their microphones and participate in the chat. Once they have set their chat to everyone and not the default hosts and panelists for all to be able to read the exchanges.

A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are sound observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones nor to the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior. Thanks, Sebastien. It's now over to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Nathalie. Good evening here. Good morning and good afternoon to everybody. Nathalie, I see that Osvaldo just joined. So I assume that you'll update the roll call as it goes, as people are joining.

So the second item, 1.2, is the updates to Statements of Interest. Does anybody have any updates to announce? Looking at my queue, I see no hands up and so I assume that everybody's up to date.

1.3. Review amendment of the current agenda. Does anybody want to add anything to the agenda? Any AOB? I'm putting maybe one of my co-vice chairs or somebody from staff on notice. Tonight is not a great night. I've been sick all week. I can't remember who was supposed to handle item five. And if I was, I would love for somebody to take it over. That would be fantastic. Item five would be the discussion on the Council work related to SubPro. Anyway, we don't change it but just if there is a slide deck, if I was supposed to do it, then can somebody, please? Otherwise, don't worry about it. Can we go back to the top of the agenda? Thank you.

So 1.4, the review of the minutes. The minutes are our last two meetings. Okay. Thank you. I've got answered my question. We published the minutes to our last two meetings. So beginning of December for the November one and beginning of January for the December one. I do check those notes. Thank you, Nathalie, for producing them immediately after the call. I do check and review them and edit, if need be. But I hope that you also take time to look it up and make sure that at least what you've said or what we noted and what you said represents your thoughts and what you meant to have on the record.

With this, we can go to item two, which is a very short one. I had zero minutes on it, as has been the practice for now almost a year. The project list and action items, I just want to make sure. Does anybody have any questions about the status of things or where things are at? If you don't, then we can move along. Everything's going fine and fast.

To the Consent Agenda. Today on the Consent Agenda, we've got two nominations. One is the nomination mentor for the ICANN Fellowship program, and the nominated person is Arinola Akinyemi. Congratulations to her. There was a quick chat I saw on the list this week over it. I think it was Tomslin that raised the question, a great question. And thank you very much for raising these issues. For those who don't know her, Arinola is chairing the SSC, the Selection Committee. Obviously, she did the right thing and stepped out for this discussion. But it's important to say and for [inaudible] disclosure to make sure that these appointments are done according to the work. So, congratulations to her or at least as soon as we go to this.

The second one is Osvaldo Novoa, who has raised his hand last month for the position of liaison to the Transfer Policy, which Roger is going to present in a minute. Nathalie, did you want to take us through the vote for this?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Yes, of course. 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, would all those in favor of the motion, please say aye.

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Would Stephanie Perrin, proxy for Manju Chen, please say aye.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much. No abstention. No objection. The motion passes. Thank you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Thank you, everybody. Which leads us directly to item four on the Council discussion on the acknowledgement of the Council input on the SubPro Operational Design Assessment, the ODA, for the ICANN Board. Now, I was normally part of this multi meeting. I joined the last call, I think. But I kindly asked Susan Payne if she could step in and walk us through this topic as she will be a lot more able to fill those questions than I can. I see your camera is on. So, Susan, the mic is yours.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Sebastien. Yes, absolutely. I think everyone probably recalls that following our discussion at the SPS, it was decided that we'd have a small team to pull together some preliminary feedback, I think, is the best way to put it on the ODA, the Operational Design Assessment that could go to the Board. We were very conscious that the Board is having their workshop actually started today for over a period of about four days, and

that they are anticipating spending a full day on discussing Subsequent Procedures, the ODA report, and all of those issues. So for our feedback to be of most value to the Board, it was strongly felt that we should really aim to be getting something to the Board that they have an opportunity to read before they go into that workshop session on Sunday. Obviously, that inevitably has meant a bit of a quick turnaround for the small team. So I think right from the outset, nothing that we're proposing to send this prevents the Council from deciding that it wants to give additional feedback or say something else at some point in the future. But we are very much focused on trying to get something out that could be of use to the Board when they have that full one day discussion on Sunday.

I guess I should just mention who the small team were, just for completeness, which is myself and Thomas, Jeff, Justine. And as Seb mentioned, he also joined certainly some of the calls.

So I hope you've all had an opportunity to see the draft letter that was circulated. I'll come on to some of the feedback in a minute. But I think the really key points to highlight—we highlight, as we discussed at the SPS, that SubPro is viewed by us as a Council priority. So we really are encouraging adoption of the SubPro recommendations and the initiation of an IRT as soon as can be achieved by the Board.

Also, there's been a lot of talk about the two options that have been proposed in the ODA. Ultimately, we point out that implementation choices, and particularly whether Option 1 or Option 2 or some other option in between the two, it's really a matter for that IRT. So we're expressing a strong desire for that

work to get underway and some of those issues to get explored more fully.

We also, as a subteam, had identified kind of various concerns and questions regarding some of the ODA content. So we did highlight some of that. I wasn't planning to go into all of it, but I think one issue that I think is quite important that we felt really did need highlighting was some reservations about the implementation approach that the majority of the ODA adopts, which is the Option 1 approach of something that's highly automated and requiring building a number of systems sort of from scratch. Our feeling in the a small team was that that really exacerbates or even possibly even causes, in some cases, some of the concerns that the Org is raising in the ODA about the lack of certainty of demand and whether costs will be recoverable, given that uncertainty about demand, and whether a system is being built that is too complex for the volume of applicants, for example. So we're really encouraging a kind of approach to be adopted that builds on the know-how and the learnings from the 2012 rounds and really assesses whether a kind of [split] system is needed or whether some kind of alternative that's less than that, and perhaps involves more of a buying in of services or a subcontracting will do the trick. I think it sort of echoes that kind of let's not make the perfect the enemy of the good, that conversation we were having with Sally Costerton last week.

So, as I said, I don't think I want to go into all of the points that we're making in the draft letter, although if anyone has any questions, obviously, I can come back to that. But having circulated that letter, both Kurt and Paul gave really, really good

feedback. Actually, both of them came up with sort of alternative drafts. That was really appreciated. I think on balance, given the limited time that we've got available and a real sense that we need to get this feedback to the Board in time for their meeting on Sunday, if it's to be of maximum value, our favor in the small team is for Paul's version, which is essentially a restructuring of the original draft, so that it's more of a covering letter from Sebastien on behalf of Council, and then annexing the small team feedback. That's not in any way a kind of a criticism of the much more extensive redraft that Kurt did. I think a number of us in the small team felt that with more time, even probably just a week, we could have, I think, come to a place where we've got the draft sort of snappier and the timing doesn't really allow that.

So really, what we're hoping for now, obviously, is a discussion, but hoping to come out of this meeting with support from Council or, at a minimum, non-objection from councilors for that feedback to get sent to the Board really no later than tomorrow so that there's a chance that the Board will have time to read it.

So I think I will stop there. Obviously, I can expand further if anyone wants me to. But I'll just look for questions, comments, concerns from the fellow councilors. I'm afraid I may have to turn my camera off. Apparently, I'm a bit unstable. If that's okay, I'll sort of handle the queue as well. Yeah. Okay. I see Anne first. Thanks.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Well, actually, I'd like to defer to Kurt before I comment in support of what the small team is recommending here. But let me defer to Kurt first.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. Thanks, Anne. Kurt?

KURT PRITZ: Thanks for deferring to me. I don't know if what I have to say is so meaningful. I'm for submitting the letter as recommended by the small team and with a non-objection from the Council. I think my point was that staff in adjusting Option 2 realized a lot of the same things that we're bringing up in our letter. So, rather than be critical of the perfection model, we could have been a little more collaborative about, yeah, let's get on to implementation. And then let's sort through Option 1 and Option 2, and figure out the most common sensical way to do that. I also understand the time constraint. We need to get this thing out by Friday.

Anyway, my intervention was meant constructively and I understand what we're doing. I support sending the letter with a non-objection from the Council, or at least this councilor. Thanks very much, Susan. And thanks to everyone and for your work on this, who obviously worked through the holiday and everything, digesting that whole report. I'll also say that I scanned the ODA, I did not read it. So my whole intervention was based on the findings of what was in your report and not anything from me. Thanks very much. Go ahead, Anne.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Kurt. I really appreciate it. Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Okay. Thanks, Kurt. I did want to see what you had to say. First, I just did want to express support for the version that the small team is recommending. I think one good thing about it is that, as redrafted, it's been clarified that there are some comments coming directly from the small team. So if there are councilors who would like to take more time and would like to look into more detail with respect to the conclusions drawn by the small team, I think that leaves the door open for a follow-up letter to the Board if something is noticed that we failed to notice. But I must say that I do think that within a small team, there was a lot of conscientious work done and a lot of trade-offs on redrafting. It makes a lot of sense and it will be important, I think, for the Board to have this feedback before its session on—I believe it's Sunday they'll address this. So thanks again to all those who worked so hard. It's good work and we appreciate your support.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay. I'm seeing some comments in the chat from Tomslin and Osvaldo and Thomas as well sort of supporting this approach. So just mentioning that to put that on the record. And indeed, Greg. I'm not seeing any other hands at the moment. Unless anyone feels differently, I hope we can take that then as, at a minimum, kind of non-objection, hopefully support, and we can go forward and send the letter as soon as it can reasonably be sent out. So I'm probably passing back to you, Seb, I think.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I was going to say yes, absolutely, Susan, and thank you very much for doing this. Thank you indeed to the small team. Thank

you to Kurt and Paul for stepping in in the short time, offering solutions and good outcomes. So as Susan said, I am not seeing any objection either here. I've noted via e-mail I'm also okay with this. So I'm happy to take this. So we will seal this and prepare it for the Board and send it in the next 24 hours before the end of the week. So thank you all.

I think I heard Anne indeed say that if there are other comments coming out and other things that the Council wants to transmit to the Board that this is obviously not the end of it, they will continue discussing it. For those who were present during the SPS, you did hear Becky and Matthew say that indeed they will continue this thing and we're very keen on receiving input, even if it comes beyond this date. So let's keep that up. Thank you very much.

Now, this leads us to item five for which—thank you, Steve for pulling my memory here—we have a presentation. I will just maybe shortly introduce the topic. So we wanted to have a quick discussion on all the work that is working in parallel to SubPro, and which SubPro might be dependent in order to make sure that this is streamlined and doesn't delay SubPro.

So, for this, we will review four items. And of course, I don't have the rest of the slides in front of me so I don't have them by memory. But for that, I think I believe the first one was the IDN PDP. We have Farell as a liaison who's going to walk us through the items, where it's at, and the dependencies. So next slide, please. Farell, if you wanted to take the mic.

FARELL FOLLY:

Thanks, Sebastien. So, the current status is a little bit straightforward, because I think less than one or two months ago, we sent a PCR projection request where we discussed everything for a next step and why we did made some changes. So this current status is just following up and telling the Council where we are and what are the next steps that we are going to do before the working group comes to its end.

So basically, we have completed the first pass of deliberation of all Phase 1 charter questions. Then we are starting now to consider ICANN Org input on the draft recommendation that has been finished. We are almost certain that we will be on time for publishing the initial report by April 2023. So now what we are doing is to discuss with ICANN Org regarding the implementation and any issue between the SubPro implementation and the IDN EPDP with, of course, a focus on the Phase 2 deliberation on a second level IDN-related topic.

So all in all, this is where we are. The most important thing is the initial report to be ready by April. Ongoing is the discussion with ICANN Org to have some input that will guide for the following steps. So, questions are welcome. That's all I can say here.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Farell. I do not see any hands up at this stage. But maybe we'll move forward and pass the mic to Paul. I don't believe that Mike Silber joined us. I didn't see him yet. No. So, Paul, I guess it's for you to present.

PAUL MCGRADY: Mike is here. Mike?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm sorry, Mike.

PAUL MCGRADY: Good news.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: There you are. Yeah.

PAUL MCGRADY: Saved by the bell.

MIKE SILBER: Indeed, Paul. I've been excused. I was attending an Audit and Risk Committee meeting for another Board and I was excused to attend this meeting. So we're getting up to speed quite rapidly with the GGP, so four meetings already held. So if we're going on effort, we're certainly putting in the effort at the moment. We're covering topic 17 of the SubPro final report, and the recommendations and implementation guidance. And the purpose is to provide guidance to aid the implementation of SubPro recommendations, not to modify any recommendations or implementation guidance, and not to develop any new policy.

That being said, Council has given us some pretty clear guidelines and some pretty clear timelines in terms of what our scope is and

what our scope is not. So far, we've completed task one, review the final report and the 2012 Implementation Task 2 working with ICANN Org, identify experts with which to liaise in order to proceed with Task 3, 4 and 5. So we've sent requests for input letters. There was a debate: are we the experts as part of the GGP or is there additional expertise? So rather than being so arrogant as to say we're obviously the experts, we've decided to reach out beyond this group and to ask our formative organizations if there's anybody else that they would like us to include or anybody with specific expertise. Now we're starting to work on Task 3, 4, and 5 relating to metrics with a review of a tool to gather input from working group members.

That being said, the one thing that's been reasonably clear from the interaction is people are struggling a little bit with the very restrictive requirements. There's been a tendency already to start trying to expand scope. People have asked good questions. It's not the typical scope creep, but rather how do we design metrics to confirm success if we don't know what success looks like. So these are, I think, some interesting questions that we need to grapple with.

My suggestion to the team, and subject to input from Council, is that we focus on delivering and answering the questions that have been asked of the GGP as quickly and efficiently as possible. Then if we feel that they're actually questions that you haven't asked us that we might be in a position to assist with, let's give ourselves enough time so that we can actually go beyond the scope rather than trying to scope creep before we've even answered the initial set of questions. So I'm trying to keep it on

track over there to make sure that we deliver what we've been asked to do, and then we can come back to you and say, "Given you've got this group which is working efficiently, maybe we can answer a few additional questions." So that's the thinking, at least, in my mind. Next slide.

So this is the timeline. It's an accelerated work plan goal. At the same time, I don't want to hold anything back in terms of SubPro. I also want to make sure that any additional guidance that we provide is an appendix rather than delaying what you've asked for. So let's give you what you wanted as efficiently as possible and then we can actually add to it and fill in some of the gaps that we may have identified during the process.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Mike. That makes a whole lot of sense to me. But I would like to give the floor to anybody else. Putting you on the spot, maybe Paul, if you had anything to add or—

PAUL MCGRADY: Sure. Just a comment about the tone of the group. So far, it is collegial, kind, a little bit academic feeling, which is the best feeling in a group like this as far as I'm concerned. We are fortunate to have Mike chairing this effort, someone who knows ICANN inside and out. So we're on track.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you. I'm seeing no hands. Thank you both. Sorry. Just one second. I see Anne's hand at the last moment. Go ahead, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thank you very much. Just very quickly, I appreciate the report. I'm wondering about where the discussion has gone thus far in relation to retaining experts to design this program. I'm trying to understand how long that process might take. For example, if there's a recommendation for certain experts and that recommendation doesn't come until September of 2023, then we will be looking at a longer design time. So has there been specific discussion on the issue of expert assistance?

MIKE SILBER: So, let me give you my opinion for what it's worth, and then I'd appreciate, Julie and Steve, if you want to add in. My view is that we have significant expertise within this grouping. I'm not sure that we're going to require specific additional expertise. But if we do, I think we need to give specific guidance in terms of the type of expertise. So if we want an economist with specific expertise in definition of least developed countries and who's at the forefront of the academic debates in terms of categorizing countries and territories, then we need to give you that guidance. But I don't think that holds anything back because we're here to define metrics and how to define success rather than how to define the program. That program definition work is ongoing and we're simply providing additional guidance to it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Mike. I see Julie Hedlund's hand up. Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HEDLUND: Hi. Thank you very much, Sebastien. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. I just want to point out that the request for subject matter experts is actually quite narrow. It relates only to the development or the consideration of Tasks 3, 4, and 5. And those all relate to looking at the metrics that were proposed in the SubPro final report, determining if there are other metrics that could be used to gauge success of the program and prioritizing those metrics, and then looking at the impact of those metrics on various aspects of the program. So we're not looking for experts to design the program per se. That would be out of scope of the tasks before the working group. It's a much more narrow focus. And I'll put a little text in the chat from the initiation request that explains what the criteria are that we're seeking in the subject matter experts. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Julie.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks for the addition, Julie, because I think it's a very important point that Julie is making. And it comes into this question of we may identify a few gaps and we may make some additional recommendations. But the first thing we need to do is answer the questions you've asked us.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Mike. Seeing no other question, I wanted to thank you very much for dropping your other call and coming on. And thanking you for the good work. Passing on the mic to John McElwaine, who will talk about the closed generics.

JOHN MCELWAINE: So as everybody will recall back in Kuala Lumpur, in that meeting we approved the final sort of concept and composition of a group of people to participate in what we're referring to as a facilitated dialogue on the closed generics topic. Really, the purpose of that group is to develop a plan for the mutually acceptable potential solution that we could then roll out to the community and work up through a policy development process. It's important to note that that call for members required—I think required is probably the right word for it, but attendance in person, although there may have been a little carve out if you couldn't—but essentially a part of this was to make sure that we had a sit down facilitated discussion, a willingness to be independent. So people are supposed to be there outside of their particular constituency roles, their community roles, and then to not relitigate the fringe absolute issues, not to relitigate whether that there should never be closed generics or that all closed generics should be acceptable. But really, this is a group of community members to come together and propose a solution, even if maybe they didn't personally think that their constituency would agree to it, but at least to have something for the community to work up through a policy development process, because if not, it's simply just going to go to the Board for a vote.

So we've been working for the last several months on laying that groundwork. We've talked about use cases. We've talked about definitions, things like that. I won't go into too much detail. We've talked about what the personal participant commitments need to be. So some of those initial things that I mentioned. All that is culminating now in a week's time, so January 26 and 27, we're going to have the first two-day facilitated dialogue on closed generics, and I hope then to be able to report how that went in a proposed timeline for the completion of that work. That's it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, John. Any questions? I see no hands. Yes, I see Kurt's hand. Go ahead, Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Hi, John. I'm somewhat—I don't know, this is too strong a word—but I'm somewhat bothered about the closed nature of the discussion. I think I understand the reasoning behind it, at least as far as it's been explained in our constituency meetings, but it seems the opposite of the ICANN model. And to kind of put it in a different frame of reference, say the Council wanted a substantive update on where you stand after the face-to-face meeting, which is a really good idea, by the way, so congratulations on that, then how would we get that? Would we have a closed Council meeting in order to get an update? And what would people think about a closed Council meeting? I think I want to know if anybody else shares my concern and if there's a way to crack open that door a little bit, because I think it's part of our duty to the broader

community to have this in a more open way. So I hope you'd take this in a constructive sense.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Yeah. Let me address that to make sure I didn't misspeak. So there's nothing about it, Kurt, that's meant to be closed. It is Chatham House Rules. So that means that I'm not going to be reporting back, "Well, hey, Kurt, here's what so-and-so said. And here's what the other argument back to that was." So nothing about this is meant to be sort of in secret meeting. We did ask folks to ask permission to share materials. But that's not meant to make it any sort of closed nature. So if I misspoke, but that's it, essentially. It's meant to be no different than any type of meeting that has Chatham House Rules. So hopefully, that helps clear it up.

KURT PRITZ:

I'll just blurt in. That's not really how it was related to us in the RySG. And in fact, our rep won't disclose anything because of her commitments and duty to the group. It's our understanding that documents that couldn't be released have to be anonymized first, and so that makes it difficult or impossible to release case studies that have been developed. Anyway, so if people share my concern, that's great. And if they don't, I've already overspoke my time.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

So, with respect to, again, the reason why the anonymization is to respect the Chatham House Rule, that's why that occurs. And

yeah, as Mary puts forth, the reason why there is the Chatham House Rule, the reason why we're not having people there in a representative capacity is to make sure that in there is the freedom to problem solve, to brainstorm. I understand that even if we come up with a solution, that doesn't necessarily commit the registrars and registries to vote on it because they have participants in that. This has to be a creative problem solving exercise that then would be turned over to the community to try to develop policy out of it.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm seeing quite a lot of back and forth in the chat on this point. I think that Kurt raised an issue that indeed is raising questions. I don't want to pause the conversation. We do have a bit of time tonight, if people want to speak about it. I see Anne's hand up. Go ahead, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yes. Thanks. I just wanted to comment. I guess this is a substantive comment. So maybe I'll turn my camera on. When we look at options that are not on either extreme, I mean, I just want to commend to the group the work that Jeff Neuman did in connection with the SubPro final report, because I think that that work does strike a balance between the advice given by the GAC previously and those who on the other end prefer never to see a closed generic ever, ever, ever. So I just really commend to the group a review in your face-to-face meeting of the work that was done by Jeff and the proposal that exists in the SubPro final report.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thank you, Anne. I guess I feel like I need to respond to Stephanie because I have no idea what she's talking about a degree of secretiveness here, there. Maybe she missed Mary's post right above it. But everything is being done in just like any other sort of work stream would be, this is not meant to be any sort of policy development. This is kind of like our small teams that we currently work with at the Council level. Anyhow, if anybody else has anything on the group, I'm happy to answer.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: John, I see no further hands. So thank you very much for this. As I mentioned in the top of the topic, we have a fourth topic, obviously, which is the SubPro ODA small team. But because we spoke about it just before in item four, it wasn't added to the slide. So thank you, everybody, for this update. I forgot to say and I don't know if you're still online, but thanks again, Mike, for joining us here. This is SubPro and possibly on other topics but this is also something that we will want to do more regularly, having updates from the groups working to make sure that the Council is fully aware of the work and the dynamics and be able to ask questions. Before we go to the next slide, I see your hand, Jeff. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Thanks, everyone. One question in my role as the Council liaison to the SubPro ODP, I'm assuming my job is done.

Or is there anything else needed in that capacity? And if so, do we close that out?

Then the second question is that what we don't have on here but will likely be a significant amount of work is the eventual IRT. And since we know that at some point the Board will likely approve some version again because even the ODP recommended that, shouldn't we be talking about potentially a pre-IRT or be in a position so that we have the IRT ready to go on the day that the Board actually does approve it? To me, I think that would be pretty valuable so we don't lose any time. So those are my two questions. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Jeff. I see Paul's hand. I might respond afterwards. Go ahead, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. Not to preempt you, Seb, but there's been some talk about a pre-IRT. But I think we would need to satisfy ourselves that it's not going to just be double work. And so maybe coming out of this workshop, somebody can ask the Board like, "Hey, how long to the IRT?" because if the IRT is going to come down in the next month, then a pre-IRT doesn't make any sense at all. If it's going to be a year from now, maybe it does. I don't know. We'd have to talk about that. But just automatically assuming that a pre-IRT adds efficiencies, I'm not sure. We sure would like to think it through. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Paul. Jeff, to your question, to be honest, I haven't led you to your first question. So when are you relieved to your ODP liaison duties? I'm not quite sure. I think that technically since the ODA was delivered, the job is done. But since you are around, if we can keep you around at least for a few more weeks until we've potentially cleared questions with the Board and so on, I think it would be good. But I'm happy for anybody to tell me I'm wrong here.

On the IRT indeed, as Justine noted, that this is driven by Org, which doesn't mean that we can't input. It's the whole role of the community participating to offer its input. But indeed, the calendar is out of our hands. Whilst we need to keep an eye on it and possibly have those conversations with the Board too, I don't really know when that would start indeed.

Sorry, if I'm not clear on my feet again today. Tonight is a bit of a challenge for me. But in any case, again, if I'm proven wrong in any way, I'm allowing myself to correct myself in the next few days over the mailing list. Jeff, I see your hand up again. Quickly, and then I'll pass it on to Roger. Go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Just really quick, I think the Council is going to have a huge role. The community is going to have a huge role in this IRT. I would strongly recommend having conversations with Karen's team and others so that we can get ideas of how the IRT will be structured, whether it's going to be one IRT or multiple. I'm just afraid of losing months simply because of a formality. We can help

ourselves more by being active and not reactive, I guess, is my point. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, point taken. I fully understood. Again, let's have these discussions with the Board and see what they have in mind. We need to be also conscious of how we start people and start front loading. Again, we're dealing with volunteers that have limited amount of time and that we can't have on standby doing prep work if things are not coming fast. Steve, I see your hand up.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Sebastien. This is Steve from staff. I just wanted to try to provide a little bit of context on Item five and make sure that at least from the staff side that we understood it correctly. So from what we heard during discussions is that the priority was to make sure that the SubPro-related work that the Council is managing and in control of, that none of those things end up being serving as dependency to any next steps for SubPro. So the idea in choosing the items that are listed in these bullets are things that are owned by the Council. So if we didn't understand that correctly and other projects need to be included, that's certainly a possibility. But at least from our understanding, these are the projects that are SubPro-related that the Council owns. So that was the distinction that we saw or, I guess, we heard. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Steve, for the clarification. You're absolutely right. This said, we are moving on to item six. I hope that I saw that Roger

was in the second room. But I guess he was permitted to panelist and I would like to be able to welcome him. I don't see you in the list now, Roger, but I assume you're there.

Maybe just a quick note of introduction. We had a few months ago Donna Austin coming to us to present an update of the IDN and give us some heads up on coming request from them. I think that Roger will come and do exactly the same thing. Again, I don't see you in my list. So, Roger, if you are there, the mic is yours. Go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Seb. Hopefully, everybody can hear me.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, we can. Thank you. Welcome.

ROGER CARNEY: Great. Thank you. Hopefully, this is a little better news than Donna's, but we are looking for a slight change. Through our discussions of Phase 1, you can go ahead forward through our discussions through Phase 1A. Everybody maybe not quite up on speed but we had three, technically, phases, a 1A, a 1B and a 2. The original goal for 1A and 1B was to finalize those and kind of move on and let those go through the approval process, and then into the IRT while Phase 2 was going on, hopefully trying to parallelize some work. We knew that would be a little strain on resources and things, but we were hoping that we could be more efficient that way.

It turns out that we had quite a bit of dependencies in the Phase 2 discussions that we weren't expecting to have. As we went through the 1A discussions and some early 1B discussions, we realized there were some things in Phase 2 which deals with dispute mechanisms, transfer dispute, the TEAC, and things like that. And we realized that there were a lot of dependencies on those to come to a complete agreement on what was being discussed in Phase 1A, 1B. So we're looking to make a change, not as in scope or anything, no scope changes, but maybe a rearrangement of work product. We'll see it a little bit later but it actually ends up being a maybe a shorter process than we had originally intended just because we're cutting out a few reviewing cycles.

We'll be sending a PCR in for next month's review and decision-making on it. But the ask really is to move Phase 2 work to the immediate work so that we can discuss those dependencies that have come up. So we've completed all Phase 1A work. We've got a few things to tie up at the end. But really, we're done with 1A. But we want to circle back and hit the dependency issues in Phase 2 so that we can confirm those 1A commitments. So our ask really is moving Phase 2 to the immediate next process in our discussions, and then completing those discussions in Phase 2, and then going on to finish Phase 1B discussions and hopes that it'll speed that up as well because there won't be that dependency issue of, "Well, we need to decide on that first." So that's the big ask. Again, Phase 2 is those dispute mechanisms that we had some dependencies pop up in Phase 1A.

Showing on the screen here, the target of these was Phase 1A initial report was in June of last year, which we hit. We did spend more time on the public review and actually more time on the public comments and on a public review, but really those public comments. But we're not awfully that far on it. Phase 1A and 1B was supposed to be done I think in August of this year, and then move on to Phase 2. Thank you for pulling those up. The final Phase 1A and B was supposed to be August of this year and then working on Phase 2. We never did work through the exact timeline, but the approximate timeline given was January of 2026.

Again, the ask is to move this forward, but we're also looking at changing. So we did a Phase 1A public review, and we were going to do a 1B, and then a 2. Actually, after Phase 1B, there was supposed to be a report to Council, and Council would go through their approval process and the Board would do that. But with this change, we're going to say we're going to get rid of that. We're actually going to a combined report for everything. So there will be only one final report, knowing that the final report will be more onerous to review. We're looking at extending the public comment review for that for maybe possibly doing a 75-day public comment because of the report will be much larger and impactful.

But as you see here, we're removing that review cycles and approval cycles, actually shorten our timeline. So yes, we're asking for a change, more changing. Just order and it ends up working out to our advantage a little bit to shorten it by almost a year. The benefit of this here obviously is talk about those dependencies that we have come up already and get those resolved. So it'll actually speed up, hopefully, the Phase 1B work.

Then we can confirm all the Phase 1A work as well once those dependencies are discussed and resolved.

Again, I don't know if this is a benefit or not. Obviously, it's just one review for the public but it is going to be a bigger review and a little more work on that part for Council and for Board as well. It'll be just one review and approval process, which again may be simpler. It'll just be more details to come over.

Again, reduced timeline. It almost cuts a year off by doing that that way. So that is a positive. I'm sorry for Donna that had to add on to hers, but hopefully we can shave off on ours by doing this. And really, it will reduce the burden on the volunteers because now we won't have IRT running at the same time as a PDP. I suspect a lot of those same volunteers would be working both sides of that. Again, this is just kind of a high-level review for everybody. We'll be sending in a change request for your consideration for next month as well. Some additional considerations to think about.

Again, I think one big thing is that, yes, we're moving away from three reviews, at least two approval cycles down to one. So it is going to be a bigger undertaking, that one time, but it should be more efficient. But some additional considerations is on attendance. Obviously, it's actually a shorter time period but we're talking about different topics now. So I don't know if maybe it's something to think about. I notice out to the stakeholder groups, "Hey, it's a rework of commitment here. Do you need to make reassignments on your side?" Again, I think that when you look at the participation rates, it's been good across the contracted parties. The other stakeholder groups have been engaging, I would say, not as big of an impact. Here and there, they do. And

maybe that's rightfully so, a topic of transfers hits the contracted parties a lot harder. But still, we don't want to end up going through a process of looking at three years of a PDP and then at the end say, "We didn't bring this up during this, but now in the final report, here it is. We want to say that this is wrong." So we just want to avoid those things. But we give that opportunity as well because we are changing up the topics. So I think that it's not new topics or anything, it's just the order of topics. So maybe some stakeholder groups will have a preference of who participates in on those.

I think that's about all I had to cover here. I think that's it. Any questions, comments for me? Again, we're going to send in the change request within the next couple of weeks so it's ready for next month's meeting.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Roger. You sort of killed my question there because it was going to be when you intended to send it. So indeed, we you will send it, in any case, before our document deadline because we have already penned this as an item for our next meeting.

Any question for Roger? I see none. So thank you very much, Roger. We look forward to receiving that request. We'll definitely look into it.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, everyone.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you very much. Have a great day. I just did a quick time calculation. It looks like we're way ahead of time, which is fantastic. It'll certainly get me back to bed earlier.

So moving on to item seven. Now, again, I'm happy to take this, but for the life of me, I can't remember if we had decided that anybody else was going to present this. And if I can get a quick confirmation that it's on me, then I'm happy to do it. I'm seeing nothing. I guess it is on me.

Farell, you might have your mic open. I hear some voices in every now and then. Thank you very much.

So as was presented last week, we have shared our SPS report. We have the SPS report and wanted to have discussion. I'm really struggling here. I wanted to have some discussions on the results. The priorities identified during our sessions was first working on—and I might have to read, I don't usually like to do it—but we wanted to improve the way our policy recommendations were packaged were presented to make sure that they were Board-ready and in order to make sure that we're not sending over the fence information that these are for interpretation or at least for the Board as another team in this community to take decisions that we weren't able to take.

So this will be a focus ongoing. Part of the elements that we had already been working on to present this was indeed to organize meetings with the Board in order, for example, as we did with the IGO topic to run through these questions with them. For those who were present, or hopefully all of you who weren't but were able to listen to the recording, the Board made actually a very

interesting point, to me, on this with, which was that as they look at our input but also the community input through the public comments that they received before the discussion, they invited us to organize our call with them possibly after the public comments that were received so that we can also together review and look at them together.

I'm closing my Skype because it keeps on popping in. The other point, the other priority that we identified, is to ensure timely input to the Board consideration of the SubPro ODP and related topics and recommendations. This is the exercise that we just undertook reviewing the items that are in relation to the SubPro that SubPro depends on. As Steve noted, what we're looking at first is the ones that are on our table that we are directly responsible for. But for us, also the Council to decide what we want, if not control, at least make sure that we influence in the right way. If the IRT is part of that, then it may need to be—again, this is not something that we have the finger on the trigger on that one. But we can indeed do what we can to actually help ensure the process run smoothly.

We want to continue and engage in further conversation with the ICANN Board as well as the GNSO community on how the ODP type of input and assessment are handled. So I'm leading in diagonal there. We have had gone through the subject many times already but we've had to have those two ODPs now, those two already are delivered. It was decided when the ODP step was sort of proposed that we would have gotten too. They were in the immediate future that we would run to and stop to see if indeed it's worth the effort, worth the time, what are the benefits, the pros

and cons, and decide if it was something that we wanted to continue going with or find other ways to do it. During the SPS, we did have a few considerations already off the cuff on these, including, for example, maybe bringing forward during the policy development processes. Some of those considerations instead of waiting until all the policies are essentially voted on at least by us to then decide to look into that feasibility. Next slide.

So, we discussed the small team. I think that, at least that was my sense, most of us like the nimbleness, the hands-on approach of the small team, the fact that we were able to quickly spin them in, get the discussion going and results out. But as a sort of a new nimble way of dealing with things, then after about a year's or a bit more of experience of the a small team, we wanted to make sure that we can find more transparency or better ways to ensure that these discussions in the small teams are done in a way that is clear and transparent. And we had that discussion in a sense, in a way, on the closed generics a few minutes ago. When do we need to define or how do we define the border between having open and frank discussions and keeping the rest of the community aware and able to interact. Again, just like in closed generics, these are not PDPs, these are small teams tasked with simple things. So, we want to make sure also not to overkill here but keep a balance in the way we interact.

The next topic is to consider how to ensure enhanced uptake and use of the—oh yeah. The Consensus Playbook—this has been a pet project of mine for the last year, but not only I, I hope. But I still think very strongly on the fact that indeed we need to sort of relearn or just not forget, just not walk away, and keep always in

top of mind, this idea of consensus, it's what builds our community. It's at the very root of it. We need to get our skills, if not up, at least constantly shopping on this topic.

We've discussed, from memory, before the SPS—or was it at the SPS? I can't remember. Maybe it was presented yesterday. The [inaudible] have been asking for a bunch of requests on developing tools to better disseminate the information and allow for it to be used by us, and more importantly, by our working groups who are the ones that are going to need these tools. We've floated the idea of videos basically relaying the same information. There was some pushback, including from Kurt, if I can name you, on the idea that it'll be just in videos that people aren't going to watch. So we are still thinking and we'd love your input on how this needs to be better presented, the videos or courses or any sort of educative tool that we can use. The playbook as is is a big document, it works for a lot of people, and there's a lot of people that digest that sort of information just through that and great on them. I just want to make sure that it's something that—I don't want to use the word input—but something that we can ensure that everybody in a workgroup joining in is able to have gone through is able to have digested and will use as a tool in their working deliberations. Kurt, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

KURT PRITZ:

Sorry. I hope I didn't come across critical of that as a tool. I certainly support the additional budget item for exploring how we can do exactly what you're saying. And to me even go as far to say explore ways not to make the Consensus Playbook and the

contents therein available to all the participants but sort of make it a requirement of participating. Anyway, I want to say I'm very supportive of exploring how such a program could be implemented and the additional budget item for doing that. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I appreciate the notion of making it mandatory. I actually suggested earlier today and somebody related to me PTSD-like scars after trying to impose some kind of a GDPR training on EPDP Phase 1 participants. So yes, that would be great, but if we can do it in a way that doesn't scar anybody. Actually, maybe even if a few blisters are in the process. But I really think and feel strongly that needs to be something that people seriously go through and acknowledge and understand and use. I still see your hand up but I assume that it's the previous because we decided not to call the old hand.

Then exploring incentives for compromising and promoting opportunities for mutual gain. So this is in the discussions. I'm not sure if I should name who were the people have brought this topic—and sorry for that, Kurt, as we were in Chatham House Rule during our deliberation—but it's in the same direction, the same efforts, making sure that people don't arrive at the discussion table with set goals, set mind, and so riveted to the goals that they set themselves coming in, that they're not even able to hear the other side, and for those to be explored and suggested. So I'll be definitely looking to you councilors for ideas and examples, particularly for those of you who have the experience in this community and maybe elsewhere, to bring that

knowledge in as how things are done elsewhere. It doesn't always apply. But it's always interesting to look into. Anne, I saw your hand flashing up and down. Did you want to add something?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yeah. It's just a question on this very interesting aspect of Chatham House Rule in connection with efforts that will ultimately require a policy development of some sort. We were discussing earlier the whole closed generics dialogue that's occurring and that that is occurring under Chatham House Rule, and yet I guess there's recording or whatever. But when you see the results of something like that into a policy process because you figure that it is policy, have we given any thought to how Chatham House output propels forward a policy process and the fact that in a policy process there are representative views.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Again, I'm not in my best today but I'm not quite sure how this relates. So my reference to it was simply because during the SPS, when we discussed, somebody mentioned this particular item but I haven't asked the permission to quote him or anything like that. I am not suggesting that Chatham House Rules would be part of the PDP. This comes out as recommendations from Council as Council in general, not from anybody specifically in the Council. And as long as we all agree on these priorities for this year, and again, this is a priority, this is not policy development or is not something that is immediately applicable to policy development. They become ours as a Council.

Sorry, my brain is bit fuzzy tonight. I'm not sure how your question fell. But if anybody is ready to step in and help me, I would love it; otherwise, maybe something to discuss through the mailing list. I see your hand, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Seb. My understanding of an intervention is that we should consider or think about the impact of Chatham House Rule-based inputs to policy development process, considering that those inputs would have come out of a non-transparent process and we have to use that into policy development process, which is transparent and unrepresentative. That's my understanding, if I'm correct. So we should have a think about what such an input could be as Council.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That was my understanding too. I'm not understanding what the point in case we're trying to get to. Again, I'm happy to discuss further or if anybody else has any input. Anne, I see your hand up.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: I hope this isn't just too theoretical but, for example, in relation to closed generics, so the Board gave direction, you can't stick yourself at either end of the spectrum on absolute no go on closed generics or a wide open closed generics are allowed without any sorts of restrictions. So when you figure that there will be a policy development process coming out of this, for example, what happens if it hits the GNSO Council level and parties acting in their representative capacity say, "Well, I really don't agree with

the way the Board scoped this thing.” So you’re back at a standstill in the work that you’ve done under Chatham House Rule may not got you anywhere. So I agree with Tomslin that it is a question worth considering how that work feeds into a policy, particularly scoping and whatnot, into policy development. And certainly, I don’t want to sound as though I’m not in favor of Chatham House Rule. In fact, I’m very much in favor of it. I just mean that, again, it might be worth anticipating how that might feed in to an expedited policy development process.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Okay. Thank you. I guess it makes more sense to me now. I was going to ask John but I see Jeff raised his hand first. So go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: I think we should take this offline because those who have read the Consensus Playbook may recall that there are a number of recommendations in there about confidential discussions, which could include things like Chatham House in order to gain consensus. So I don’t think Chatham House Rules are the opposite of transparency. In fact, Chatham House Rules could be much better for consensus building. So long as the results are fully transparent, the who said what is not necessarily as important as the what is being said. So for all of you that support the Consensus Playbook, go back and read some things, because in there, it does talk about the value of confidential discussions. I don’t think it uses the term Chatham House Rules, but it does definitely mention confidential discussions to make people feel

more at ease with helping the consensus process. So I just want to throw that in there and maybe we should take all of this off. I do think closed generics should be open but I don't think that that has anything to do with consensus building in the Consensus Playbook. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, Jeff. John, I see your hand up, and then Stephanie, and then we might draw a line.

JOHN MCELWAINE: I'll make it very quick. I agree with everything that Jeff said. I would further point out that our current PDP outputs are just like Chatham House Rule, where we don't say, "John McElwaine said this." I mean, it says, "This recommendation reached consensus." Then say, "It doesn't outline all the people that were part of that vote for consensus." So I really think we're overanalyzing this issue.

And then lastly, to the point that there could be a policy development process that fails based upon a concept or suggestion made by a group operating under a Chatham House Rule situation just like our SPS. Nothing ventured, nothing gained. I mean, it's just a way, as Jeff said, to try to build some bridges on some of these stickier issues. So with that, I'll turn it back over.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thanks, John. Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin for the record. And that “for the record” part is really important in my view. I think that we have to understand any kind of small team activity constitute, however useful it is for moving forward, it raises the question of whether we’re adhering to our multistakeholder principles. And one of the key principles behind this multistakeholder effort is transparency. The fact that small team records are hard to find and may only be available to insiders is, I think, one strike against us. So I’d rather they were open.

There is a distinct difference between Chatham House and confidential discussions. Confidential discussions, nothing’s on the record. Chatham House, you just don’t have attribution. I do think that we should, by all means, use these in our playbook as tools to break log jams, but not as a regular way of doing business, not as a regular way of doing—if we’re going to move more to small teams, and I don’t disagree with it, they’ve got to be more transparent. And if we’re going to endorse Chatham House says as a method, I think we’re heading down a dark alley. I’m happy to discuss offline.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Stephanie. It sounds like a discussion offline has already started online in the chat. But let’s indeed take that offline. If we’re going to have the next slide now.

So derived from those priorities, we have a scope, a long list of action items. Some of them are already underway, like for

example, the first one here, to have a SubPro small team's work on the ODA, and we've already discussed that earlier, an hour ago.

For staff to develop an overview of the SubPro-related items and their impact. Again, this was presented a bit earlier during this call. A work in progress. We'll refine that list as need to be done. But work that we've been already working on.

A proposed item. So the next topic was on the Council meeting planning. There was a proposal item on the fact that during ICANN meetings, part of our role as GNSO Council is also to listen to the community. We've had in the last two meetings issues one with a lot of disruption around that my time that wasn't particularly called for, but potentially called for or could have been handled differently. The other one where we didn't even have time for that, my time. So that was a proposal to bring that forward at the beginning of our call in order when to make sure that we get to it and to have a hard stop and say after whatever it is, 15 minutes we need to move on to our discussion and avoid problems like we had last year. Next slide.

I might not go through all the details of the slides but let's go. You have those anyway in the document. In the PDP improvements, there were items, for example, to the liaison guidelines as proposed by Thomas. There was the ODP review and that we need to look at. They mentioned on top of the slide deck with the Board-ready and what does it mean to have a Board-ready report and etc. Next slide.

The incentive to compromise. Again, this is to be discussed in the community, but this is something I'm personally very curious in. I would love to hear a lot from you, again, in your past experience within the community and outside make sure that these sorts of incentives are properly installed. Anyway, I'm not going to read all of them. The Consensus Playbook, we already spoke about it. Maybe next slide. And I don't even know exactly how many more slides we have.

The operational improvement. So the exchange with the Board sessions, which I mentioned earlier. Again, after having done this first one two weeks ago, last week, I can't remember exactly. But in any case, review what went well and what can be approved there.

Just continue work on the project list and making sure that we can make it as readable as possible, as easy to use for ourselves. And as was discussed also in the SPS, more and more we'll want to be able to use that as a tool to put discussions with other parts of the community, the Board or other parts of the community. Next slide.

Still on operational improvement. So the small team and the transparency that we've discussed already. Oh, that discussion that we had, we've had that a few months ago, brought in by Jeff, on how we comment or offer feedback on the GAC communiqué and depending if it's on advice, not on questions that we're asking. I'm sorry. I'm not using the right terms tonight. But you know exactly what discussion we were mentioning. So we will work on this template to see how we can capture this idea as a back end. Matthew also relayed to us the fact that they are indeed interested by our feedback, even if it's not formally our role or wasn't. I just

want to make sure that we keep the difference between the two, that we keep it formal where it needs to be and the response and the helpfulness and the sharing our view maybe in a slightly different category. But we will work on making sure that that is also something that is a bit more institutionalized. Last slide and hopefully the last.

Then in terms of communication. I can't remember what the first one was. Sorry. We had discussions indeed on how the different houses were communicating as a house, and also with their NomCom appointee, and how to work that in a better way. And then there was also a discussion late in the day on the possibility of starting a communication plan of our own as a Council and get a bit more of a voice outside of the direct community onto the market. And in particular, in reaction to some of the bad press that we may have received that shows on the fact that things don't move fast enough in the ICANN community and that the Council has been part of it, one of the cogs in the system, not moving fast enough. There was a feeling that there's a lot of things that are happening and that we probably need to be better at telling the world about it and better communicating on our successes.

So we have an ABR on the way to request for a bit of money. We don't know how to allocate yet. There is a small team that needs to start making propositions there. But we've already sort of asked for this. We are asking for this to be earmarked in case somebody will be needed in the near future to do some of that comms work.

That is the last slide. I see your hand, Stephanie, but I assume that it's from the previous point. Did I miss anything major that anybody wanted to ask any question or adding points? Sorry, that

was a bit disjointed, I'm afraid, but it is as good as it will get from me today. Questions or comments? Nope. Well, then seeing none, I guess that closes the item.

If memory serves me well, we are on to Any Other Business and 8.1 on the ICANN76 planning. Nathalie, was it going to be you presenting this? Again, I'm very sorry, team, but I simply can't remember.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: No problem, Sebastien. It was me.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Fantastic. Go ahead.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Okay. Thank you. As you know, ICANN76 is taking place in Cancún from the 11th to the 16th of March. For those of you who are, unfortunately, not able to make the trip, it will be in UTC minus five. So we do have a little bit of time in the months coming to go over a venue on more participation. So I won't bug you with this. What is important, however, is the GNSO schedule. So as you know, this is a draft schedule. It will be finalized once Meetings Team has received the draft schedules and the meeting requests from other SOs and ACs, put it all together, and hopefully, magically, have all our GNSO requests in rooms in the way it is now with as few conflicts as possible. So that's the dream. I was hoping it works.

Just to go over. Well, first, why is it being published a little later than usual? The main reason being was that there will be two SubPro-related sessions taking place, a little bit of discussion as to when and how these would fit into the schedule. So what's been decided—and I think official notification will go out on the ICANN meeting mailing list—is that there will be one session during Prep Week and then another session. So a new gTLD SubPro Operational Design Phase update is the exact title, and which will take place during the weekend. So obviously, these are not sessions which are listed as unconflicted as some sessions are because they're not of equal interest to all SOs and ACs. But as you can see on Sunday morning, so the light blue slot there, it remains unconflicted for the GNSO for obvious reasons.

There will be one plenary session. This was decided amongst the community leadership teams. There were several proposals but this plenary session will take place on Wednesday morning and will be equally unconflicted.

There's the same ICANN Org sessions as we've been used to it over the last few meetings. So there'll be the Q&A with the ICANN Org Executive Team, the Geopolitical Forum, and then on the last day, the ICANN Public Forum.

As has been the case also recently, the GNSO PDPs are being concentrated mostly on Saturday and Sunday in order to allow for the rest of the time for the SG/Cs to be able to prepare for their meetings with the Board or other joint meetings they may have.

Regarding the Council sessions specifically, there are a few changes here but mostly no surprises. And of course, once the

schedule is published, we'll be sending out e-mails, reminding you which sessions these are so you could organize your attendance accordingly.

Of interest however, there's the GNSO Council dinner on Saturday night. So that will be the eve of the GNSO Council working session which is on Sunday, so it should be a nice moment for councilors to regroup before quite a heavy Council day on Sunday. A few councilors still need to RSVP so please do so as soon as possible to GNSO sec. Osvaldo, who has kindly offered to sponsor dinner, can get to finding us a lovely venue, basically.

As mentioned in the SPS AIs about Council communication during ICANN meetings, as you can see, the Council slots are in green on the schedule, and there are three slots on Sunday rather than the two we've had previously. It's yet unconfirmed. Obviously, agendas need to be finalized for the managerial sessions. But the aim is to allow for one moment in a town hall meeting mode, potentially, to allow for proper interaction, rather than a few minutes of open mic, as is usually the case because we tend to have hefty agendas.

I'm trying to read my notes. Given that that SubPro session is now being scheduled on Sunday morning, there were a few sessions that were initially conflicting that we've managed to move. However, what was impossible to move at this later stage, unfortunately, was the joint ALAC and GNSO session. So we realized it's just a few hours ago. So that's why that's not available on the schedule. We're hoping to move it to a virtual meeting.

Either before or after that will be discussion, which obviously GNSO and ALAC leadership teams will need to have.

The joint sessions that were not conflicting with the SubPro sessions are obviously unaffected. These are the joint GNSO and ccNSO sessions. It will be end of day on Monday and will take place in a formal setting first. Then we'll go into—those of you have been on Council before might remember—the cocktail session to allow for more informal interaction with ccNSO members to the end. The usual Board and the GAC joint sessions with the GNSO Council, of course, are taking place.

Tuesday evening, as you can see, there's a little green slot at the end of the schedule. I put there at the bottom there. So what's great is now with restrictions being lifted in the venue and for the meeting throughout. We are allowed to have a more informal GNSO Council prep session. So that's on the eve of the GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday. As per usual, stakeholder group and constituency chairs will be invited. So it'll be an excellent moment to be able to gather.

Wednesday is the usual GNSO Council meeting, no surprise there. And there'll be the GNSO Council Wrap-Up session on Thursday to review the AIs gathered for the meeting. This time around, we're lucky there are no conflicts on Thursday, which hasn't always been the case. So we're delighted all councilors will be able to, hopefully, make it.

There will be more information coming regarding health and safety at the venue, etc. But I don't think that's something we need to know ahead of time. I can, however, tell you that masks will no

longer be mandatory on site. It is obviously strongly recommended to wear them and face masks will be available on the venue. There will also be the usual tracking done for any COVID testing results. You will be required to test upon registration that you're fully vaccinated and up to date with your boost against COVID.

So that is all I have for now. There will be more information coming so I'd rather distill it as we go along than bombard you with information right now. The schedule has been posted on the GNSO website. You also have the link in the agenda. And if there are any changes, which I doubt at this late stage, I will of course let you know. Thank you, Sebastien. I can take questions or comments if there are any.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Any questions for Nathalie? I see none. So thank you very much, Nathalie. Back to our agenda for one last item which is 8.2. So having seen no further objection on the two ABR requests that were prepared, again, poor memory, the first one was related to the Consensus Playbook. We did have comments but I think they'll be included then. We just discussed them with Kurt 10 minutes ago. So I think that we're agreed. The second one is for the budget I mentioned just a few minutes ago regarding some comms' capacity for the GNSO to sort of better address market concerns and better promote its good work. So having heard no objections on those and because the deadline for having them submitted is, I believe, next week, we will go forward and send those in.

With this, we are almost at time. As always, I'm very sorry that I haven't been able to follow the full chat conversation. But there's been lively exchanges on the topics of the ODP survey and etc. But I will encourage those conversations to happen also on the mailing list if we can settle everything tonight. And with this set and unless there are any other last-minute comments or questions, I would be very happy to give everybody back seven minutes of their lives and get my own self to bed promptly. So I see no hands. So without further ado, I think this session is closed. Thank you very much all.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much all for joining. This concludes this GNSO Council meeting. Have an excellent rest of your days and evenings, and take care, everyone. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]