EN

ICANN Transcription

GNSO Council Meeting

Thursday, 17 February 2022 at 06:00 UTC

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

The audio is also available at:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/8yqvVVukIGxe6Uc7xmVmiWLFOpvBRQuYdK91bjLciBiuR-mpHH7rxzcNG_WGo5jRdH7qmnHBPvac_LKm.g4bhMlhmvL27YlcS

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/3pbMgcDonUomB_XfL8UGQVmmimVApFmBaQgyeD0eXGZdA3dPJJPek TyJRaoxWZr8BCC5zqjwuFBJwvob.JcEU47mRadvd37Kx

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, Kristian Ørmen

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, Thomas Rickert, John McElwaine, Flip Petillion

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): Juan Manuel Rojas, Stephanie Perrin, Manju Chen, Wisdom Donkor, Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Farell Folly (joined after vote)

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 (apology)

Guest: Alp Elkeren, ICANN org

ICANN Staff

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

Marika Konings - Vice President, Policy Development Support

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

Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director (apology)

Steve Chan - Senior Director

Berry Cobb - Policy Consultant

Emily Barabas - Policy Senior Manager

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 17th of February 2022. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kurt Pritz.

KURT PRITZ: That is I.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm here, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kristian Ørmen.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Desiree Miloshevic.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Mark Datysgeld. I don't see Mark in the Zoom room. John McElwaine.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Flip Petillion.

FLIP PETILLION: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Wisdom Donkor. We'll circle back to Wisdom. Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Farell Folly. We'll also circle back to Farrell. Manju Chen.

MANJU CHEN: 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: Thank you, Tomslin. Olga Cavalli.

OLGA CAVALLI: Here, Nathalie. Thanks.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Jeffrey Neuman.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: I'm here in spirit.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Wonderful. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Present. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. We received apologies from our ccNSO liaison, Maarten Simon. As guest speakers today, we'll also have Alperen Eken joining us from ICANN Org.

Staff on the call, we have Steve Chan, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Mary Wong, Caitlin Tubergen, Emily Barabas, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to remember to state your names before speaking as this call is being recorded. We are in a Zoom webinar room. Councilors as panelists can therefore activate their

microphones and participate in the chat once they have set their chats to "everyone" for all to be able to read the exchanges.

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

Thank you, Philippe, and it's over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to our February Council call. Welcome to our observers. All the best to those who [inaudible] late evening. As an early morning here, it's going to be difficult a little bit. So let's get started with our agenda. Any updates to statements of interest? Anyone?

Okay, seeing no hands, any change to the agenda that you'd like to see?

Okay, thank you. Moving on to the minutes. We'll just note as usual the minutes of the December and January meeting and move on to our project review.

Just a preliminary note, you would have seen that in a number of discussion items that we have for today, we'll be talking about the way we're engaged with the Board on not only the SSAD ODA review, but also more broadly on how we can have a more interactive dialogue with them on how they approach not only this,

but more generally, recommendations that Council have adopted. So I think that's typically a topic that we'll come back on to within the next few months and possibly within this year, during this year. So I just wanted to highlight that as a salient point of our agenda.

So this having been said, let's go to our projects list review very briefly. For reference, Berry circulated [inaudible] on February 9th. And Steve may help us with this with a few words. Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks very much, Philippe. As noted, Berry circulated update on these documents and highlighted some of the changes that occurred in his email. And so I'm not going to go into any particular detail on the products list or action items or action decision radar either. But what I do want to do was just focus a little bit on the project list and the project packages which are produced for all active PDPs and the scoping team on accuracy as well, and really start focusing on the purpose of them and just provide a reminder for you all why, at least from our perspective, they're critical pieces of information for all of you as Councilors that allow you to more effectively manage PDPs, which, of course, is the central function of the GNSO Council.

So you probably all know this already, but the project list is high level updates on all the GNSO projects. And so that includes those that are already past the Council. And so examples of that, of course, the EPDP, phase two, SubPro and RPMs. But the project packages, those are much more detailed, and they're limited to just the active PDPs and EPDPs, and in this case, a scoping team. So that would be the transfers PDP, EPDP on IDNs

and IGOs, and then the scoping team on accuracy. And those provide a much more detailed look at the status and health of the active projects, as well as some activity metrics, participation levels of the members, and then the detailed project plan and the Gantt chart.

And so I think what's important to note is that these tools, which are all about allowing the Council to try and match the PDP as best as possible, they all stem from PDP 3.0, which itself was about effective and efficient management of PDPs. And, at least from our perspective, and from the staff perspective, and in discussions with the Council leadership team, that makes all that really important to review these documents, which, they of course allow you to do your jobs as Councilors more effectively.

The last part I think I want to touch on is what can you do with this information. And this may be obvious, but if you're looking at these project package documents, and you spot an issue, you can and should raise it to the Council list. In your management of a PDP, you see an issue, you should raise it of course. Or if you see the issues identified in a mitigation strategy that's also shared in the projects list and the project packages. The same thing, you could raise it to the Council list, or potentially could also raise it as an agenda item for an upcoming Council meeting.

And that incidentally actually ties into one of the elements identified during the strategic planning session where some Councilors mentioned that they want to try to take a more active role in shaping the agenda on an ongoing and regular basis. And that is actually one of those ways. So reviewing these project documents, if you see something that you want to discuss and you

think it is worthy of discussion and attention of the Council, by all means, highlight on the email, the Council email list, utilize the Google planning document that we share on a regular basis. These are all ways that you can enhance the way that you manage the PDPs, but also actively engage in planning the agenda on a regular basis.

So in summary, obviously, we think they're important documents, and from our perspective, we just want to provide a reminder why they're so critical. And that's really it. So, with that, I think I'll stop there. Actually, just sorry, one real quick thing is that these documents are for you, the Councilors and so, to the extent you think there are things that should change, we're all ears, because we're obviously looking to improve them along the way. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Steve. I would just add to this that as a consequence, we do not have regular updates to these Council calls unless there's a specific ask whether that's a PCR, whether there's a question from a liaison, etc. Or for that matter, as you said, Steve, there's a particular question or request from some of the Councilors, in which case we would have an update here. But that's the reason why that list of documents and material is so important. And we encourage everyone to share those with the [SGs and Cs]. Any questions to Steve, Berry, on this?

BERRY COBB: None for me. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Moving on then to our consent agenda. We'll go through the voice votes, I think, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hi Philippe. Given there is emotion attached to this consent agenda, would you like to read the resolved clauses, please?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Certainly. As tradition goes, I think the initial submitter, I think that's Tomslin unless I'm wrong. Tomslin, would you like to read the resolved clause?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, sure, definitely. Thanks. So I'll just read the resolved clauses. The GNSO nominates Chris Disspain to serve as a ICANN Fellowship Program mentor for three consecutive ICANN meetings, beginning with ICANN75. The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO Secretariat to communicate resolved #1 to staff supporting the ICANN Fellowship Program. The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO Secretariat to inform the nominated candidate that he or she has been selected. The GNSO Council requests the GNSO Secretariat to send a response to the applicant who was not nominated, thanking them for their interest and encouraging them to apply for future opportunities as they arise. That's all, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Tomslin. So we'll start the voice vote. I'd note for the record that we have Farrell Folly as absent from the call. 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. Would all those in favor the motion please say aye?

PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: No abstention, no objection, the motion passes, Philippe. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Thanks, everyone. And thanks to Chris for stepping up on this. Moving on with our agenda, item four, discussion on the updates on the CCOICI, the Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvements. So you would recall that early last year, we discussed the issue of workload in general with the SGs and Cs, but mostly what's expected on the non-policy issues and the Council.

So we resolved to initiate the pilot in June last year on two topics, review of the working group self-assessment and the review of the SOI requirements. So the CCOICI has delivered on those two items. Well, it's moving forward on the second one. And Olga who chairs the committee will provide us with an update on both points

and Council are expected to provide our inputs on the next steps on the process. Olga, I think [inaudible].

OLGA CAVALLI:
Okay, thank you, Philippe, for the update about this issue. And first of all, I want to thank all the participants in this committee, which has a very long name, Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement, CCOICI. I must confess I keep on repeating it and still don't have it totally in my memory.

Well, I also want to thank the staff who have made a fantastic job as usual, Marika, Terri, Julie, Emily and Nathalie, thank you very much for your support and your help.

Thanks to them, we have prepared some slides to summarize what we have been doing. So this update is especially about the review of a working group self-assessment requirements, the statement of interest, is already in the taskforce stage. I am having the role there as a Council liaison to that task force so we will be updating you about what is happening there. But that's just starting.

So this is the review of the working group self-assessment requirements that we have been doing. So what was the assignment of this committee, we had to consider if how the working group self-assessment can be improved and possibly enhanced with different things like periodic assessment, as well as exit interview with interested parties to help identify at early stage if possible potential issues, as well as future improvements to be

considered. That this very important because working groups play a very, very relevant role for our work.

This could potentially be combined with the working group chair assessment as outlined in PDP 3.0 improvement number 13. Council committee to also consider the findings of the most recent working group self-assessment to determine if there are other improvements the GNSO Council should consider. This is what we have to do.

So, we took the working group self-assessment test survey, we reviewed the PDP 3.0 improvements number 13 as stated in the assignment, and we considered also our own experiences as members of different working groups and Council members. So we also used that as a very useful part of our work. Can we move to the next one, please? Thank you very much.

So we had working guidelines section 7.0, working group self-assessment, section 6.2 of the GNSO working group charter template, the GNSO working group charter template and working group self-assessment survey. To these documents and this text, we proposed some changes and updates, which are the following.

Stating objective of the working group self-assessment. So we propose to inform the chartering organizations of potential issues that might need to be immediately addressed in the periodic survey or in future efforts in closure surveys.

Marika says to review the proposed updates as well as new documents in detail, please review the document. Yes, of course, we will send to the Council the whole document. We [inaudible] if

and when a periodic survey and/or closure is expected to take place, to provide some flexibility, we propose to have clarity around what will be publicly available and with whom information is shared. That was discussed, as we consider that it was important to have clear information of who will receive the information.

And permitting anonymous response is also important so people can be totally sincere what they think about the role of chair or other members or the functioning in general of the working group. But with the ability to send unique link to working group members to ensure that only the working group members respond, so it's not openly available.

And new and updated questions focused on the performance of the working group leadership, which is very important for the performance of the working group or the Council liaison and staff support which is mainly the force that drives the work of any WORKING GROUP. Can we go to the next one, please? Thank you very much.

So this is new. What I told you a minute ago was updates to the text that we used as basis for our work. And this is new, propose a periodic survey and to use a survey tool, technical requirements. So the new periodic survey template that would normally be conducted after the publication of the initial report of working group, unless the charter indicates other things differently or the Council decides that it's needed at any other moment.

A new thing is includes a PDP 3.0 proposed survey questions regarding leadership that we consider that was important, and

Council leadership in consultation with liaisons to the working group may decide to modify the survey if necessary. And then there's a set of technical requirements that the survey tool will ideally possess. So this is new, what I told you a minute ago was changes to the text already in place. And then we'll go to the next slide. Thank you.

This is the next step. So the document, you will receive the document that I have summarized for review. So the document goes to the Council to review proposed updates and new materials and provide feedback to our committee, then there is a period of public comment on proposed changes—because there are changes to the GNSO operating procedures. And then we combine this public comment period with any changes to the GNSO operating procedures that may be proposed. And then it goes back to the to our committee after the Council review and after the public comment. And we will consider input received from both. And then it should be approved by the Council. There's some estimated timeline here that you can see, so it should be finished [or processed] by the end of this year.

And that's all. I don't know if there are questions or comments or if Marika or staff would like to add something to what I said. Jeff is saying something in chat. Jeff, "the language that allows anonymity is worded in such a way that if you choose not to be anonymous, then it is only ICANN staff that sees your name, which I thought it was weird and is probably just a wording thing."

Jeff, I suggest that you review the document, because we [inaudible] discussion about this issue which we consider very important. Please take a moment to review the text. And this is

only a summary to update you about the work of the committee. But yes, I see your point. Oh, you did look at the text. Okay. Well, you have an opportunity to make your comments so we can improve it, of course. I don't know, Marika, if you want to add something to that. You have your hand up, please go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thank you, Olga. Yeah, so just to note, indeed, we've added some wording to kind of clarify what's expected to happen with the report. And indeed, if someone does decide to provide their name and email address, it's something that staff has available to allow for any kind of follow up. For example, in the past, we've had situations whereby comments that were made made it possible for others to kind of identify who that response may have provided. And we did reach out on those occasions to kind of confirm that people were really okay with that being published. So that's why it's written basically in that way. But as Olga said, if anyone has concerns about that or things that should be done in a different way, the committee is looking for input on that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Jeff, your hand is up.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. Yeah, it's just a wording thing, I think, because if you read the text, the way it is, it makes it sound like if you choose not to be anonymous, then the only people that see your name are ICANN staff. I don't think that's what you meant. But I don't have an issue with obviously ICANN staff seeing it. But I do think

that if someone chooses not to be anonymous, then it's not just ICANN staff that sees it. Again, it's just a wording thing. I don't think that's what you intended and probably easily fixed.

OLGA CAVALLI: Totally is not what we intended, but it was a concern also about not being anonymous and that that information would be spread around and not totally understood in a good way. So Marika says, "I don't think the group intended for the names of responders to be published." Well, that was discussed. The idea was not that the names of the respondents were not anonymous, that could be known by everyone. Marika says, "But it's a question that could be asked as part of the survey, if you provide your name, do you also consent your name being included in the summary report as it is published?" "Example," says Jeff, "On SubPro, I wanted my name attached to my response."

I see your point, Jeff. And it is possible that we have to review the text, and of course, your comments and your experience in working groups will be much appreciated. And we discussed this quite a lot. And there were some concerns about being anonymous or not and who decided not to be anonymous, how far should that information go beyond the working group boundaries. Justine, you have your hand up, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olga. Firstly, I'd like to thank you and your team for doing all this work. This is probably administrative more than anything. And I just wanted to offer a suggestion. I looked at the

text of the report and where you have the survey templates, I think an example of that will be on page seven of the Word document, section one to do with participant identification and [inaudible] primary organizational affiliation. I wonder if you consider adding—where the bullet says At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC,) adding perhaps /At-Large community.

And the reason for that putting aside the Nominating Committee appointees, the rest of the bullets listed are all groupings to say, these are groups of like SGs or Cs. But the ALAC is actually a 15-person committee. So it's akin to the 21-member GNSO Council. So you don't have GNSO Council listed as a bullet, but you have given parts of GNSO listed under the bullets. And it also doesn't make sense to limit to ALAC, especially with PDP 3.0 having open models as opposed to purely representative models where the participants would be appointed by the ALAC. Then it would make sense, but where your PDP is an open model, you can have, At-Largers who are not nominated by ALAC, join as a participant or a member, observer, whatever. And they technically speaking, shouldn't be aligned with ALAC per se.

So I'm offering the suggestion of ALAC/At-Large community, because that's more proper. And we wouldn't want GNSO Council to perpetuate any misunderstanding about what ALAC is and what the At-Large community is. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Justine. Your point is well taken. I think it's a good suggestion. By the way, when we reviewed the tool, the role of NomCom appointees doesn't show up. It's the same I found when

I tried to register to the meetings, so we just don't exist in the GNSO. So I had to pick any other constituency to finalize my registration to the meeting. But yes, I think it's a good point. I don't recall if we had members from ALAC in the group, but I think it's a very good point. Thank you for that. And I suggest that you make that comment when you review the document. Any other comments or questions? Any other comments from Marika or staff, something that I have forgotten to mention? Marika, go ahead.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Olga. Nothing forgotten. Just to note as I've put in the chat, I have already taken note of the suggestion that Jeff made and Justine made. Of course, if there's any further input that Council members may have, Olga circulated the document earlier this month on the list and then you find the link as well in the chat. So please share that and we'll take note of that so that the CCOICI can basically review that together with any input that may come out of the public comment period as they finalize a report for Council consideration.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Marika. Any other comments, questions? Check the chat. Stephanie says, "I think Manju is making a good point about sample size and the prospects of anonymity." Thank you, Stephanie. Any other comments? I see none, so over to you, Philippe. Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Olga, and thanks, everyone who took part in this CCOICI. On those two comments, I would suggest that just for transparency's sake, both on the potential edits and the reference to ALAC, check with the committee and with a follow up message back to the Council list to update Councilors on this and what changes, if any, have been made on this. That'd be good. Any final comment on this? Okay, thank you. Thanks again, Olga.

So let's move on with our agenda to Item five, that's our discussion and update on the implementation of Work Stream 2. So with this update, we have three goals. First, to have everyone up to date with the implementation of Work Stream 2, a reminder of the overall framework on this as well as the limited number of recommendations that are applicable to Council per se, also understand the remit and the role of the CCG, Community Coordination Group. And to this point, Olga noted that she stepped up as a rep from Council to that group. We have that for the record in the AoB to recall and acknowledge this.

And the third goal is to consider how Council can approach those recommendations, possibly through the CCOICI, bearing in mind that it was a pilot and that the work is still not complete. But that's certainly a good—that would be a good candidate to take on those recommendations. So with this, I'll turn to staff to have a brief update on those, bearing in mind there's also Ariel and Alp, I think, who will help us with this update.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Philippe. Yes, we'll help provide some update on the Work Stream 2 recommendation implementation from the

Council's perspective. And you may wonder why I'm providing this update. So backing 2020 and 2021, I was assisting this small Council team to help prioritize the Work Stream 2 recommendations relevant to the Council. And later I have been involved in the internal policy team to coordinate with my colleagues supporting other communities to assess the implementation status of Work Stream 2 recommendations from each group. So Alp is joining me today in this presentation and he is my colleague from policy team and he specializes in Work Stream 2 recommendation-related implementation effort. So he will be able to provide us some overview how this work is done and additional details related to the implementation work as well. Next slide please.

So, in this update, we will cover four items. The first is an overview of Work Stream 2 recommendation implementation and that Alp will take us through and then second, I will provide a preliminary staff assessment of Council's implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendations that are relevant to the Council. And third, Alp will again provide information about what this Community Coordination Group does, and its remits and roles and composition.

And then at the end, I will bring it all together and propose a path for the Council to do consider in order to complete the Work Stream 2 implementation from Council's perspective. So that's the four items we will cover. So now I will turn over the floor to Alp for a Work Stream 2 recommendation overview.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thank you so much, Ariel. Hello, everyone. Thanks. So Work Stream 2 recommendations are divided into eight high level recommendations, which categorize over 100 consensus recommendations. All of these recommendations were approved by the Board. And these eight categories are as seen on the screen, diversity, guidelines for good faith conduct, human rights framework, jurisdiction, office of the ombudsman, SO/AC accountability, transparency, and ICANN Organization-related recommendations.

Around late 2020 and early 2021, as Ariel mentioned, GNSO Council small group made the high-level prioritization exercise and deemed the ones with a star badge medium to high importance for the GNSO Council. Next slide, please.

On the left-hand side, you can see aforementioned eight categories. Among these eight categories, four of them are community-directed recommendations. And among those community-directed recommendations, we have two categories that are recommendations that can be implemented by community groups independently, and recommendations that require some form of community coordination.

Among those recommendations, there are some recommendations that should be implemented. And this is stated in the final report of Work Stream 2. And some recommendations that are non-mandatory and good practices for individuals, individual community group recommendations, recommendations six, SO/AC accountability recommendations are non-mandatory ones. And for guidelines for good faith, recommendation 2.3 is a non-mandatory one. It is over to Ariel. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Ariel. I just want to quickly add that you see some of these recommendations are grayed out is because they're directed at the ICANN Org, or the ombudsman and it's not directed to the community. So these are not something the Council needs to worry about at the moment. So that's why they're grayed out. Just wanted to add that one point. And next slide, please.

So this is staff's a preliminary assessment of the recommendations that can be advanced by the community groups individually or independently. And as to what Alp mentioned, these are recommendation 2.1, 2.2 that's related to the guidelines for Board director removal recommendations. And then also recommendation six, that's regarding the SO/AC accountability.

And so staff did a preliminary assessment how Council is doing with these recommendation 2.2 and 2.1. We found that the implementation is actually completed, because Council has developed a template and guidelines regarding the Board director removal and that's one of the powers related to the decisional participant in the empowered community. And that work was done in 2019, right before the pandemic hit. So the guidelines and templates are ready on the GNSO website's procedural page and can be used if such situation occurs.

So for the Council, this work is basically done. And then there's one small detail is recommendation 2.1.2, it's a sub recommendation of 2.1. So basically, that recommendation talks

about some desired language or form in terms of the petition for removal of directors.

So although in the GNSO guidelines, it wasn't that detailed as prescribed in the Work Stream 2 recommendation, but this additional detail can be added in the future updates for the guidelines. And the future updates is already part of the future work for the GNSO Council, it's already planned out. So that's why staff assessed this as the implementation plans for that sub-recommendation.

So regarding recommendation six, SO/AC accountability, that's a non-mandatory recommendation from Work Stream 2 that's mostly regarding best practices and those type of items. So when staff assessed the GNSO Council's implementation situation, most of the sub recommendations under that umbrella is either completed or not applicable. So that's related to how GNSO Council publishes operating procedure and whether meetings are open to the public and whether mailing list is publicly accessible and whether the Council has its kind of procedures and cadence of reviewing its own policies and those type of things.

So those things are already ongoing practice in the Council. So that's why they're mostly completed. And then for the non-applicable ones, it's usually regarding the outreach related sub-recommendations, because the Council is a representative body, it doesn't really have an outreach role. So that's why staff assessed it as not applicable. So within that umbrella, there's only one recommendation that may require action or decision for the Council, which is 6.1.5. So that recommendation asked the

community group to publish a brief report on what they have done to improve the accountability, transparency, and participation.

So that item, currently, the Council doesn't have a report just dedicated to this subject. But if the Council wish to implement it, there will be some additional staff assistance and resources to help with the implementation of this recommendation. But again, what I want to stress is the recommendations under recommendation six, they are not mandatory, they're mostly best practices. So it's up to the Council to decide whether you want to implement it and if so, how. And there's only one sub-recommendation that may require action or decision.

So regarding the details of all these sub-recommendations under these two umbrellas, they're in the following slides in this deck, and it will be made available for the Council to review after the call. We are not going to talk about all the details. But we list all the sub-recommendations under these umbrellas and their respective implementation status based on assessment by staff. So welcome your review after the meeting.

Next up, Alp will take you through the Community Coordination Group and provide you an overview of what it does, its role, its remit and its composition. So back to Alp.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thanks, Ariel, as always. Next slide please. As mentioned before, several recommendations were identified as they require a form of coordination. You can see the list again on the right side of the screen, which are recommendation one, diversity

recommendations. Not all of them, but two of them. The first one is recommendation 1.1 which is about—which will be coming soon, actually, but first let me talk about the roles and composition of the CCG.

SO/AC chairs agreed to form this CCG group, lightweight coordination group in December 2021. This group has served as a central point of exchange, best practices, lessons learned and sharing information and progress, which are not limited to these three recommendations, the group can decide that they want to discuss further if they want to discuss other recommendations.

Address topics that can benefit from a uniform communitywide approach. This is not a decision-making authority. The decisions, the good practices decided upon in the group will go back to the respective groups and the groups will make decisions, but we hope that best practices, really best one can go out of that group.

Each SO, AC, GNSO SG, and RALOs to appoint one representative. They may appoint one alternate. Olga Cavalli volunteered to represent GNSO Council. All groups have completed or nearly completed their process of appointing representatives.

This group will operate in a transparent fashion, will have documentation online, meetings recorded, notes, and this group aims to hold its initial call in March 2022 following ICANN 73. The group will decide on its frequency to meet and other recommendations to discuss and the general cadence. Next slide please.

EN

As mentioned before, these three recommendations are the suggested recommendations that were identified that need committee coordination. So, diversity recommendation 1.1 is about seven proposed elements of diversity that is suggested by the Work Stream 2 shepherds. And second one is process for handling complaints about diversity. Once 1.1 is decided upon or discussed, then recommendation 1.7 will be worked on with a diversity consultant, which has an RFP [inaudible].

Recommendation two, guidelines for good faith. Recommendation 2.3 is the specific recommendation that will be coordinated within this group, standalone framework for exercising empowered committee powers. This is again a non-mandatory recommendation. However, GNSO already completed or implemented other recommendations regarding recommendation two. So this will be on top of them and additional one.

And lastly, recommendation three is about human rights framework. This recommendation doesn't need coordination. However, it will benefit from a discussion among community. So it will be an information sharing exercise and each SO/AC will implement this in its own way. Thank you so much. Next slide please. And over to Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much. Alp. And I see Jeff's question in the chat. So hopefully this slide will provide some information for considering what you do in order to complete the Work Stream 2 recommendation from Councilors' perspective. So, as what Alp mentioned, the Community Coordination Group is a central

communication point or central point for exchanging information and best practices and each group's work regarding the Work Stream 2 implementation.

So what the Council perhaps can do is through our representative, Olga who volunteer to be a representative, to coordinate with the other community groups by focusing on Recommendation one, 2.3, and three, and in the CCG setting, the representative from each group can talk about how these recommendations can be prioritized based on the overall context of Work Stream 2 implementation, and the overall workloads in the community. And then also talk about the scope and possible timing for additional community consultation related to these recommendations.

And regarding the recommendation that will benefit from a broader community coordination or agreement to develop a uniform approach, this CCG group will be an excellent platform to have those conversations. And then lastly, this group can also help brainstorm and then provide information to assist each individual group in considering what needs to be to carried out in order to implement those agreed kind of implementations for recommendations.

So basically, the CCG will be the place where the Council look outside externally to coordinate with other group and focus on just a limited se of Work Stream 2 recommendations. And then in terms of looking inward, what to do to carry out the implementation work within the Council, in fact, the heavy lifting is still within the Council to finish the remaining community-directed Work Stream 2 recommendations. That's in fact just very few. And when the Council did the prioritization exercise back in 2020 and

2021, it did prioritize recommendation three, which is the human rights framework related recommendation. And also, there's recommendation two, which is related to the Board director removal related to guidelines.

So as you see that the CCG will work on these two recommendations. And that's consistent with what the Council has prioritized on before. And then back to what the Council needs to do internally to get the Work Stream 2 recommendations implemented, there are just a few things for your consideration. So if the CCOICI is the right platform to take on this work, the first thing you can do is to review the staff assessment of the implementation status, which is the part that I just presented. And as you remember that most of that is already either done or not applicable. And there's only one item which is 6.1.5 that may require action, but that's not mandatory.

And then secondly is to take a look at recommendation one, which is related to the diversity-related recommendations. So when the Council has done the prioritization back in 2020-2021, it's deemed that one is not applicable for the Council. And it's actually applicable to the GNSO community and the wider ICANN community. So perhaps the CCOICI can revisit that initial prioritization by the Council and consider whether it's still not applicable. And if the CCOICI thinks a different assessment should be made, then should consider what implementation should be carried out for the applicable ones to the Council.

So the reason why we're talking about recommendation one again is because that's a mandatory recommendation for each group.

So that's worth the reconsideration or revisiting the Council's initial assessment. So that's something for CCOICI to consider.

And then the third item is, of course, related to the human rights framework-related recommendation, that's recommendation three. In the CCIOCI, that's a place for the groups to exchange information on how they implement it, and then the actual implementation work still needs to be done by the individual groups. So that's where the Council can take a closer look at their recommendation and consider how the implementation can be carried out from the Council's perspective. And that one, as a reminder, is regarded as a priority for the Council. And that was assessed by the Council small team.

And lastly, there's some additional ranking the Council could do in terms of the recommendation to be tackled by CCG, which is Recommendation one, 2.3 and three. The Council's CCOICI can take a look at these recommendations and rank its prioritization from Council's perspective, and perhaps Olga can report back to CCG regarding that prioritization by the Council.

So there's one more proposal that staff would like to make for your consideration, is that, as we know that the Work Stream 2-related work is very specific and very important and there may be experts in the stakeholder groups and constituencies that can help the CCOICI for the implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendations, so maybe there could be a call for additional volunteers or experts that can help the Council implement that and people from SGs and Cs can perhaps assist the CCOICI for this effort.

So these are some of the proposed paths for completing the Work Stream 2 recommendation for the Council. And we will stop here and see whether there's questions, comments and input for the staff's presentation.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Ariel and Alp. Any questions? Both on maybe the exercise of prioritization as well as the layout that we have on the screen between the CCG and potentially the CCOICI for them to take on those recommendations that would be relevant for Council. Any questions? Okay. I see, Jeff, you're active in the chat. Feel free to raise your hand if you have questions on the next steps. I think that'd be easier. Jeff?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. I apologize. Sorry, this is more—I'll save the question because it's not really related to Council activities. But it's more about Work Stream 2 and why these were prioritized over other items that deal with staff accountability and Board accountability that don't seem to be included. So just ignore my chats. And I'll bring it up in the appropriate venue. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. Yes, these [inaudible] good questions in in absolute terms, I would say, both on what are those recommendations applicable to Council and those that are more relevant for the SGs and Cs and the SOs and ACs in general. Somewhat out of scope for this exercise, as you said, Jeff, but I think it's important for us to understand that split of responsibilities

and why we have a limited remit here in this case. Perfect, good questions and substance. Anything else? Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: What are expected steps on this? Do we say yes and can we ensure that other policy efforts do not suffer from staff being overloaded? Do we know how to ensure that?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: So in terms of next steps, the proposal that I think formally, we will need to come back to Council on what we have on the right hand of the slide, given that the pilot was expected to work on the two goals that we discussed earlier. So a formal proposal will be made to Council. I think that's the next step, whether we need to do this during a call or on the list. I think given that we've just discussed this here, it'd be fair to come back at least to the list for this.

As to the workload, I think that that's probably a broader point. So I'll turn to Ariel. I see that you have your hand up on this.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Philippine. And thanks, Maxim. So just to confirm and clarify, if the CCOICI can take a look at the proposed path, which is on the right-hand side of the current slide, it will be great as an initial step to consider whether that's the viable way for the Council to complete the implementation of Work Stream 2 recommendations that are relevant to the Council.

Although it does look like a long list of bullet points, but if you take a closer look at this, it's actually not too many recommendations that are really concerning the Council at the moment. So the big one is recommendation three, which is related to the human rights framework implementation, and that one probably will involve further effort and discussions. And if the CCOICI has the interest and willingness to take this on, that will be a major recommendation to tackle.

But beyond that one, recommendation one was regarded as not applicable to the Council, so the CCOICI can assess that again and confirm whether it is applicable or not. And then recommendation 6.1.5 is not mandatory. But if the Council or CCOICI think it will be beneficial to implement that, staff can provide some suggested next steps and resources to help implement this one. So it's really not so much left to do for the Council. And we're hoping that CCOICI can at least take the first step and look at this proposed path and consider whether that's something it wishes to carry out the work.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Ariel. On just the timing of this, when's the next call of the CCOICI scheduled at this point? I was thinking, coming back to my point, given that for those of us who haven't been familiar with that, or at least who wouldn't have been aware of this proposal, I think we'd probably need a week for Councilors to get back to and inform the SGs and Cs, this has been somewhat—I wouldn't say controversial, but there were questions raised on the pilot. So if we take a week, I'm wondering whether we have a call next week or not. Olga, could you help us with this?

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Philippe. No, we don't have a call. But we can arrange that because we just passed the document to the GNSO for revision, and unless I'm mistaken, Marika, but I think we don't have a call next week. Please correct me if I'm wrong. We can arrange that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yeah, so let's do this. I think we can offer this as a proposal to Council, we'll give people a week to react and go back to the SGs and Cs, react on the list whether that's something that they wouldn't like being done by the CCOICI. Absent of concerns, then we'll move on with it. And indeed, the committee can have a look at this when they meet. There's no need, I think, to schedule an urgent call at this point, even for the reason that Maxim gave in the chat, I think.

So let's give people a week, and absent of concerns, we'll move on with it. Thank you, Olga. Any other questions? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on. And obviously, if there are concerns on this, please elaborate on how [—if CCOICI] is not the right remit for this, then please provide alternatives. That'd be welcome. So with this, I think we can move on. Thank you, Ariel and Alp, and thanks everyone for this.

Okay, moving on with our agenda, and go to point six, and that's planning of our next ICANN meeting. Virtual meeting again. That's planned on week ten in March. That's the second week of March. We'll have, as usual, a public meeting and Wednesday, wrap up

the following day and three bilateral meetings with GAC, ALAC and the Board and will need to prepare for the prep calls, need to prepare for those calls in the meantime.

And there's a number of common topics, as you would expect, for this. In the general scheduling of these meetings, maybe Nathalie can help us with where we are today and what we should expect from a practical standpoint, people to register, etc. Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thanks, Philippe. So, just to give you the highlights, so next week, so beginning on Tuesday, 22nd February through Thursday the 24th is prep week. So as a reminder, prep week was decided to hold the sessions, which would be pertaining to updates. Generally, during face-to-face settings, there were a lot of the more sessions than we have in the virtual setting. And therefore there was more space for updates. This time, in the virtual setting, it's difficult to fit them all in. So prep week happens two weeks ahead of the ICANN public meeting and is intended to provide the community members with all the information they need in order to prepare for the upcoming ICANN meeting.

There are 12 sessions in total during prep week. There are two sessions which will be of specific interest to the GNSO Council. That's the GNSO policy update, which is this Tuesday on the 22nd of February. You may recognize a few of the speakers. And then this coming Thursday, in a week, there's the policy updates, which we'll be presenting in a new format. That's pretty exciting.

In addition to this, next week also, will be the traditional leadership prep sessions. So these are more aimed for the joint sessions. So for example, on Tuesday, the GNSO and GAC leadership teams will be meeting to better discuss and refine the topics planned for the bilateral session during ICANN 73. There's also doodle outs for the leadership prep session for the joint GNSO and ALAC meeting.

So moving on to ICANN 73, which will take place of the week of the 6th of March through the 10th of March, we have the traditional Council sessions. So no surprise there. The joint GAC-GNSO session, the meeting with the ICANN Board, more of which we'll discuss during this agenda item as topics are due tomorrow, and then for the first time in a few years, the GNSO Council meeting ALAC. We'll be closing off the ICANN public meeting as usual with a GNSO Council wrap up.

So please note that staff will not be sending out calendar nor email invitations for any of these sessions, the reason being—and you can check with the email Julie Bisland sent out which is called "How to Get organized," so the reason being is that once you've accessed the schedule, the ICANN 73 schedule, you can choose to download which sessions are of interest, so not only the Council sessions or your specific SG/C sessions, but any other sessions you're interested in.

Julie's email explains how to do this. Any schedule download should adapt to any of your calendars, so Outlook, Gmail, etc. and will automatically adjust to the time zones your calendars are set at. So this should be pretty easy. If you run into difficulties—there are sometimes glitches—please make sure to check this ahead of

time so you can reach out to the GNSO SO/AC support team and we'll be happy to take you through it. Thank you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. On this schedule ahead, any questions before we get to the tentative agendas of those bilaterals, the topics that we'll be dealing with? Okay, seeing no hands. So just in terms of preparation, as you would expect, there are three, four topics that can be expected to come up during these bilaterals. And I think Jeff, you suggested that in the chat, it'd be good to have topic leads for those items. So we're thinking about probably the ODA small team, the ODP on SubPro, DNS abuse as well. It's something that GAC, for example, would be keen on discussing.

So we don't know whether we need to decide now, but obviously, those who would lead those groups or be the liaison—and I'm thinking about Sebastien for instance for the ODA small team, Jeff is liaison for SubPro. And I think Mark or Paul, you stepped forward for the DNS abuse small team, you'd be good candidates to lead those discussions during the bilaterals.

So we'll probably circulate that on the list, but just for you to be aware that you may be put on the spot for those discussions. So any views on this—thanks, Sebastien—on how and whether that's agreeable? People nodding in the chat. Okay, obviously, that doesn't preclude anyone else to jump in during the discussions or come forward either, but it'd be good to have these leads.

Also note that probably, our GAC colleagues may want to discuss other topics, such as the status of some of the PDPs, the IGO, for

example. So, again, those are also expected to take part in that discussion.

Regarding our meeting with the Board, on our side of things, the main goal here is both to discuss the initial questions from the Board and also think about the topics that we want to put forward, which may include the SSAD ODP, for instance, unsurprisingly—SubPro—ODA, I should say, for the SSAD, SubPro ODP and more generally how we engage with the Board on the next steps.

So you would have noticed that in the agenda, we reproduced the questions that the Board submitted for that bilateral meeting. Essentially, two questions, the key priorities for 2022 on our side as well as suggestions that we may have to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation process of the PDPs.

As a side note, to this point, it probably would be good for that bilateral meeting to be efficient to take question two where we left the issue in our discussion with the Board last time, on the SSAD ODA and take it a bit further. We had a discussion around that point, too, with Becky and Matthew, as a side note on our call on the SPS follow up. And I'll say a word about that later.

But it'd be good if we could pursue that discussion and see how we can engage with the Board without going into uncharted territory, though, making sure that we stay in our remit, but still engage and make sure that we facilitate the implementation process, small I, implementation, but make sure that we move forward and remain, as they call it, effective and efficient.

So in terms of priorities, the first question, which maybe we could—just as a suggestion—go back to our mandate, in our response, go back to our mandate on the PDP stewardship [unsurprisingly, in supervising,] making sure that the PDPs deliver in time. And maybe as a second point, specifically for 2022, refer to the PDPs in flight, IDN, transfer and the IGO one.

And as a third priority, as I said, go back to the point we discussed regarding the SSAD ODA, and the soon to be discussed SubPro ODP, we'll come on to that in the AOB. But those are initial thoughts as inputs to our discussion with the Board.

So, this being said, I think it'd be good to have this discussion and ideas and inputs to those bilateral meetings that we will prepare between now and ICANN 73. Any views on this? I know it's getting late for some of you. Certainly happy within leadership to come back to the list on both questions on our side, possibly based on what I've just said, but also inputs on the two questions from the Board. Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Philippe. I just wanted to put a finer point on one thing, which is that the topics for the Board, they're due tomorrow. So preferably, you're all able to agree on this call what those topics are. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Steve. Thanks for the reminder. Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. I'll just put the placeholder here. Since it is due tomorrow, I'm going to suggest something during the update on the SubPro ODP which we may want to discuss with the Board. So Steve, if we could just put that as a placeholder since it's due tomorrow. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Jeff. And yes, to this, we've got an update later on in the AOB. We scheduled that to make sure that we have sufficient time to discuss not only the SubPro ODP, but the other small team updates. So we can take those various points that could be inputs to discussion with the Board at that time. Thanks. Anything else? Okay, seeing no hand, I think we can move on to the next point in the agenda and we'll come back on the questions from the Board on the list.

Item seven, discussion on the updates of the SPS and the related action items. We'll go through them one by one. Just to note that we have scheduled a follow-up call later this year on the SPS. So we'll go through the AIs. And the first one on the list was the development of a draft of Council commitments for our consideration. So I'll turn to Sebastien for anything that you'd like to update us with on this. I think you were the [assignee] of these AIs. Putting you on the spot maybe.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm sorry, you're catching me unawares. Can we come back to this?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Sure. It's no problem. So moving on, and action item six, the leadership was intended to discuss with Göran the idea of having regular Q&A sessions as well as having a follow-up to discuss the question [inaudible] follow up, but discuss with Göran the idea of having these informal get togethers. And so we discussed this with the CEO. I think I mentioned that Göran's certainly happy to join in those informal discussions, including the follow-up that we will have in I believe June. In terms of scheduling, can I turn to Nathalie, would you please confirm the date of that follow up? I think we've received invites for this. Is it in June?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: I'll check and post it in the chat quickly.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Nathalie. We've received those invites, but just for people to have that in mind. Regarding action item 11, and leadership to set up an informal get together with Becky and Matthew who joined the SPS and have their feedback and suggestions on how we can engage with the ICANN Board. So we did that. And just to give you some updates on this. So Sebastien, Tomslin and I met with Becky and Matthew, virtually, because we were interested in having their feedback from the SPS and suggestions on how we can further improve not only our work, but also how we engage with the Board.

And on substance, I think it's fair to say that they are quite high-level, that they appreciate the focus of our exchanges. And our intent to streamline the process is for them, I think it's a key as

well as for us, it's a key topic on how Council would support and follow up after our approval of the GNSO policy recommendations with the Board, the SSAD ODA being one example of that.

I think they would also—and the Board in general would welcome more exchange of views and discussions on how we can help while still remaining in our respective mandates, which sometimes maybe need to be spelled out or reaffirmed. So they'd welcome a dialogue, I think is the word that we used, between meetings, an informal way of engaging in those discussions, rather than the formal [inaudible] that we generally sometimes prefer.

And it will also probably help those Board members who—contrary to Becky and Matthew—may or may not be so familiar with the—I wouldn't call limited remit of Council, but the precise role of PDP stewardship that we have.

So the key thing is that there's no joint problem-solving mode at the moment. And we probably want to discuss that with the Board, define one and find one. And to that goal, we discussed the idea of organizing a parallel meeting with interested Board members around the main timeframe, around the SPS follow up to allow for more interactions between those two groups. So may take the form of an informal brainstorming session during that SPS together with those interested Board members to lay out modus operandi on how we can engage those things, not only on the SSAD ODA, which by that time would have progressed, but also on the SubPro ODP bearing in mind that the framework that we have for the ODP is somewhat new and most probably the addition to our virtual working methods these days, it's probably something to figure out as we move along.

I've been [inaudible] a bit, but I hope I've been faithful to our discussion with Becky and Matthew. I'll turn to Sebastien and Tomslin whether you would like to elaborate or clarify things that I missed or mischaracterized, anything you would like to add on these. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: On item 11, you're absolutely right. I've known Becky a long time and Matthew maybe a bit less, but I know that she definitely wants to be part of the conversation and join in, etc. And indeed, seen her on a few small teams and participating, etc. So the conversation is—yeah, they're eager to participate and to be involved. I don't know if it's a fact of also the pandemic and the fact that we haven't seen each other live for a very long time, but all these things are important.

Unless Tomslin wanted to add something, I wanted to—okay, thank you, Tomslin. I wanted to go back to action item one. So as many Europeans, morning is happening around me and I wasn't exactly following you. Apologies, Philippe. So I did promise an initial draft of the proposed commitments for this meeting. And sadly enough, I don't have them. As I will be leaning on Paul McGrady's work with his pledge, I have already told him that I would send him a first draft and maybe suggest as a Council that we help him help me and keeping me honest. So Paul, if you are ready to make sure that I deliver those drafts to you in due time, I'll be super thankful. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Sebastien. Any other comments on this? Okay, seeing no hands, before we get to AOB—and it's good that we have some time for this because it's pretty crowded—I'll just add that we took some notes from our call with Becky and Matthew and even if it's somewhat related, we'll make sure that we share those notes with the list later this week or early next week to, as I said, take the topic further and we will update during our initial exchange with the Board on the SSAD ODP.

So with this, I think we can move on to the next topic, which is the—call it an AOB, but it's essentially readouts from the small teams and updates. And we will start with the small team on the EPDP phase 2A small team, so that's the SSAD ODA small team led by Sebastien. Would you like to give us an update on where we are?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: With pleasure. So we've had two one-hour calls so far, one last week and one this week. Very limited progress to report in the sense that we've been not so much discussing the subject but the target. There was not disagreement, but let's say confusion as to what the remit of the small team was. Hopefully, after two hours spent on it, we were able to better define it.

But arguably, or truthfully, there's a vast world between answering to a Board letter, which is the sort of short remit of the small team, and the full commenting appreciation of the ODA and analysis of the ODA, which is sort of the wider remit of it. And I won't even mention the reopening of the EPDP itself, which obviously nobody wants to get into.

And so there was a bit of discussion there as to where we wanted to get. Next deadline is next week for the small team to gather questions to Org regarding clarifying questions on the ODA. So we'll be gathering that during the weekend and Thursday, Friday, Marika and I will be able to collate that and bundle that for Org. And that's it. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Sebastien. Any questions on the update and then the next steps? Okay. Thanks again. And moving on to the next item. That's 8.2, DNS abuse small team. And looking at Steve, maybe, to have that update or—[Mark or Paul,] I know that you stepped forward in that group to lead it in the next stages. But maybe, Steve, you could start and people will chime in.

STEVE CHAN: Philippe, sure, I can. And I'll wait a moment to see if Mark or Paul wants to jump in. But if not, I can go ahead and provide an update. I do not see any eager hands. Okay. This group met just once last week. And I think it was actually a pretty productive call. What they agreed on was that outreach was probably the best first step. And what that means is reaching out to some of the groups that are very keenly interested in the topic of DNS abuse. So like the GAC, ALAC, SSAC, and the purpose of this is to really ask them to help define what they think are the problems that need to be solved. And in particular, ones that would be solved via policy development in particular.

And so that's the primary purpose, or I guess the primary focus of this group, is really to determine whether or not there's a policy development problem to be solved. It doesn't mean that the Council might not want to engage in some other efforts to help mitigate DNS abuse. But this is specifically about the possibility and prospects of developing policy on DNS abuse.

So the idea is to prepare some draft communications, and then eventually share them with the Council for the Council to actually send them rather than having a small team send them out. It just makes sense from a formality perspective to have them come from the Council. So as noted, there's only been one meeting but at least from my perspective, I thought it was a productive meeting with some good outcomes and some good progress. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Steve. Thanks for the update. Anything you'd like to add maybe? So as I mentioned, Mark and Paul stepped forward to lead that group and would probably be expected to be the topic leads for our discussion with both ALAC and the GAC. I know that the topic, the progress of that group is of interest to both of them, so I expect them to raise that in our bilateral. Thank you.

So with this, I think we can move on to 8.3, and that's our update on SubPro ODP. Jeff shared an update, I think it was last week on the list—I forwarded to the list formally—with a couple of questions for Council to consider, both of principle and even beyond the remit of policy development, so it'd be interesting to discuss them here as well as in the context of the bilaterals that we'll be having. Appreciate the [inaudible] Jeff, would you mind

going through the questions that you raised in your e-mail and the update in general?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, sure. Just before we get to the questions, let me just also—in the note, I also included the timeline that was provided by the ICANN ODP team. And I'm not going to go over what's on there but just to ask the question and you don't have to respond today. But is this in line with what you all were expecting to get when we discussed the concept of high-level project plan on the last call? So this is what they've provided. I think it is in line with what we were discussing, but if not, just let me know. And I can provide that feedback back to the team that's working on this. That's one.

Number two is, real quick, you'll notice that there is a session during ICANN 73 on—I believe it's on the Wednesday, first thing in the morning, or at least first thing in the morning Puerto Rican time. So that's going to be going over—if you all recall the last time we all met face to face in Montreal in 2019, there was an assumptions document that that was provided by ICANN Org before the policies were actually completed, and there were a bunch of discussions on that. Well, they envision having an updated, more in-depth assumptions document based on the work that they've already done. And so they'll go over that at ICANN 73. So that's the other stuff.

Now, the main thing in the note was that we got question set number two from ICANN, which really is not necessarily a question in terms of the substance of what's in the

recommendations, but more a procedural question about—well, let me go back a step. Sorry, it is late.

I do want to go back one step and just say that at the time the working group, SubPro working group made these recommendations and of course the Council approved it, there was really nothing called an ODP. It was just the assumption that we were going to go—yes, there'd be a few months between submitting the report to the Board, it would go out for public comment and ultimately, it was expected that the Board would approve it within a couple months. And then the next step was to set up an IRT to do the implementation work based on the recommendations and implementation guidance that was in the report.

However, as we all know, now there's the ODP and that ODP is going to delay the Board from approving the recommendations for until at least January 2023. So the fact that the Board hasn't approved or will not be in a position to approve the recommendations until January at the earliest means that technically, if we followed the consensus policy implementation framework, we wouldn't be able to set up an IRT to start implementing some of the recommendations. Okay, take that as kind of the context.

And then with respect to this specific question, there were some recommendations within the SubPro report that were was approved by the Council that not only call for a general IRT to implement what was the recommendations and guidance, but it also called for a dedicated implementation review team only on applicant support, because the working group viewed that as

being very different than working on the other issues and because the working group envisioned the specific implementation team for applicant support to have familiarity with like money grants and setting up these types of programs. It was a different skill set than the skill set required for the regular IRT to implement everything else.

ICANN has just come back and said, okay, well, they didn't have an issue with the fact that it'd be a separate team, but there were some components of that overall recommendation 17 which don't quite fit into the consensus policy framework for what an IRT actually does. Some of it may in fact be policy, some of it may be outside the norm of what IRTs do. And therefore, these questions from ICANN relate to whether we as the Council have any thoughts about moving forward and whether we were concerned that empowering an IRT to do some of this work may actually be delegating some policy functions to the IRT, which is not what the IRT is supposed to be doing. That's supposed to be—an IRT's managed by ICANN staff but policies are supposed to come from the community and approved by the Board.

All that's a long way to say that I think that technically, ICANN is right. Some of the things that are being asked for are beyond the normal work that we would consider IRTs for. But I think in kind of taking that issue, we sort of have an opportunity here. Because if it is policy, or something other than implementation, then it's something that the Council or the community can work on without waiting for the Board to actually approve the recommendations. And if by chance the community is done working on these issues prior to when the Board votes on the other recommendations,

well, the PDP manual would allow the Council to update the recommendations, send it to the Board, and include those new set of recommendations in with the already existing final report or final recommendation.

So it sort of presents us with an opportunity to do something that we have discussed in the past about moving on with some work that we know the community has to do. Now, of course, that's going to be moving on with work prior to the Board formally approving the recommendations. But the Council may want to do that anyway sort of hedging its bets that the Board will approve the recommendations. And this work needs to be done and why would we necessarily have to wait 13 months or another year to start that work that we know has to happen and which can delay things even more?

So it's a long explanation for a relatively short question. And so I put a really short paragraph into the document, the Google Doc and the link to the Google Doc is in the email update that Philippe sent around. But most of it is blank because I wanted to wait until this conversation to see, A, if the Council agrees that some of this may be beyond what implementation review teams normally do, and then B, if it agrees with the notion of potentially starting a group up. And I don't know what we'd call it, because it's not really a PDP, but starting a group up that is made up of the community. And I would also strongly encourage us to include the GAC and ALAC, of course, in this because these are—especially applicant support is a big issue with those two advisory committees as we know.

Yeah, so I thought we could discuss that and see if you all could provide some direction on whether that makes sense or whether you all believe there's a different approach we can take. Thanks, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. And thanks for the reminder on the timeline. That was a question that we asked. I would encourage everyone to go back to their respective SGs and Cs and provide those updates and come back to Council if necessary.

So on that specific question, any views on this? Just to note that in addition to what Jeff just said, obviously, given that that would be somehow anticipating the Board's vote—maybe not the right English word there, but there's something in procedurally we can call that unusual, but quite specific [inaudible] given the topic here, it's something that we will also discuss with the Board, that issue of convening a whatever we call it, even if it's not an IRT, a group that would indeed review applicant support issues and address any policy-related questions that may have been left untouched. So just on a procedural side of things, that's something that we want to also discuss with the Board, probably. I see Jeff, you have your hand up.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks, Philippe. And it's late so I forgot to mention this. So we could discuss this issue with the Board if there are concerns, and just ask the Board, because it's my impression that the Board would appreciate us doing some more work on these areas

anyway, even if it's before they vote on the recommendations. Now, I could be misreading the Board. And it may just be some members of the Board. But I think at the end of the day, if we bring it up during our discussion, I don't think that there would be members of the Board that would object to the community taking on this work prior to the Board approving the recommendations. Again, I could be wrong, but I think it's worth bringing that up.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. Further to what you just said, that would at least in principle seem in the spirit of what we did for the SSAD ODP and sort of engaging in the dialogue, making sure that we're transparent if we initiate anything that might have an impact on the consideration of the Council-approved recommendations. I think that's all in line with what we've discussed earlier, but certainly something that we need to discuss there. Any views on this? Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Philippe. No, I don't have a view, of course. Sure that wasn't directed me. But I think what I just want to share is that part of the PDP manual that I think Jeff was alluding to was section 16, which allows for GNSO recommendations to be modified prior to Board adoption. And I guess what I just wanted to point out is that if the scope was limited to, say, something like applicant support and the purpose was to actually modify that, the modifications, there doesn't need to be the creation of some ambiguous group that you guys are having trouble describing. Rather, would be potentially guidance provided from the Council, which is then

reviewed by a reconvened PDP in that case. So there is a prescribed process and parties in the case as referenced in Section 16 of the PDP manual, at least if you're going to limit the scope to something that's pretty well understood and defined like modifying policy recommendations. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Steve. Thanks again for the reference to the PDP manual. It's something that [rarely crops up] in our discussions recently, and that opportunity for us, for Council to amend [policy] recommendations before they are considered by the Board. That's something that we discussed in the remit of the SSAD ODA. And for good or bad, that's quite a flexible process. And indeed, we may want to be equally flexible in the way we convene that group. Thanks, Steve. Any thoughts on this, input? Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Philippe. I had a question regarding—I suppose it's a theoretical question at this point in time—if Council decides to reconvene the SubPro PDP Working Group, would there be any limits as to how the membership structure could be changed or altered in any way to make it more efficient?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Justine. Good question on the how rather than the what. [Is it the full PDP team list of] members that we're talking about? Probably not, given the topic. But even to answer the question or take it forward, you probably need to flesh out the how

that group would work in practice and how we make sure that we don't reopen issues here in that process? Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks, Philippe. And yes, it will be very tightly bound. I would encourage us not to get caught up on formalities of whether it needs to be a "PDP" or any other type of group. If you think about these subjects, these discrete subjects, they're not capital C capital P consensus policies that would apply to contracts. And therefore, the Council can be very flexible in whatever it wants to set up to do the work.

So whether it is an official working group or whether it's something else, I just don't want us to—it would be a shame for us to get bogged down in bureaucratic policy discussions as opposed to focusing on the work that needs to get done. So I would hope that this would be something we could start up in sort of an informal way. At the end of the day, the Council does need to "vote" on the recommendations. And so in that way, they can still be adopted by a consensus of the Council. But I don't think that this needs to be an official formal working group that operates by unanimous consensus or anything that formal, because again, the output at the end of the day is not a capital C capital P consensus policy that would update contracts or update contracted parties' existing agreements.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. There's certainly a need for flexibility here. Also seeing where Justine's coming from, there's a legitimate question

on the layout of that group and whether that's a sort of representative model within a small team that we're looking at or something of [the kind] and indeed, whether other SO/AC would have a voice in that process. So we may want to think about that as well, even as you said, Jeff, without getting bogged down in the details of the administrative process.

So with this, and mindful of time, what we will do is maybe take that back within leadership and you, Jeff, trying to spell out possibly the layout of such [inaudible] next steps to discuss with the Board and come back to Council with a proposal. Doesn't seem to be any concerns at this point, but certainly encourage people to go back to their group if they hadn't read the email that we shared last week and come back here.

With this, I think we can go back to our agenda with the remaining items. 8.4, an update on the election timeline and possibly the consequences for the SGs and Cs in their nominations. Nathalie, could you help us with this?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Philippe. Just to note that the GNSO chair election timeline was circulated on the Council mailing lists and to the SG and C chairs. As you can see, the 17th of February, so today, is the first step of the timeline where this needs to be announced formally during the Council meeting.

The only important next deadline is the 20th of May 2022. This does have an impact on SG and C chair elections as the 20th of May is the deadline for SGs and Cs to submit their funded traveler

names. So funded travelers are normally SG and C officials and Councilors. So this will impact the SGs and Cs' election timelines which generally take place, for most of them, in June.

The reason for this date being earlier is that the AGM is taking place in September and not in October as normally. So hopefully, this advance warning will enable SGs and Cs to adjust their election timeline, should that be needed. And as names come in, I will of course forward them to the Council mailing list.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. And I hope that traveling by that time will mean something. So SGs and Cs will make sure that they adjust their election timelines accordingly. Thanks, Nathalie.

So moving on with our agenda, 8.5, as we mentioned earlier, with regard to Work Stream 2 Community Coordination Group, the CCG, Olga stepped up to be our rep to that group. We just wanted to acknowledge this on record and thank Olga for stepping up.

So we're getting to the end of the call now. We're one minute over. Just a final note and closing remark. We're saying goodbye to one of our Councilors today, albeit virtually. That's goodbye to Kristian who'll be moving to the next door flat, our CC colleagues just around the corner. So all the best for this, and I think Sebastien will be saying a few words for Kristian. Again, thanks for your contribution to this group. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah. Kristian is generally a man of few words, so let's not make it a long speech, particularly as the clock is ticking. No, I just wanted to say on behalf of the CPH and beyond the Council, because Kristian has been volunteering and helping in this community for a number of years on the registrar side in a quiet but efficient Kristian way, so I just wanted to say thank you on behalf of the Council, on behalf of the CPH and the community, and good luck with the ccNSO. We're definitely hoping to see you on the other side and see you soon, whenever we're able to meet together. So thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Sebastien. Thanks, Kristian. We'll meet again, at least virtually for the moment and hopefully face to face at least with our CC colleagues. They're very lucky to have you now. Thanks again.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you, Sebastien, Philippe, and thank you to the Council and staff. And we'll definitely see you around. I will keep going to ICANN meetings. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Kristian. We'll keep in touch then. So with this, thanks again for taking part and wish you a good rest of your day, or rest for that matter. Good night to the others. And speak to you soon then. Thanks. Bye for now.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, everyone. This concludes today's GNSO Council meeting. Have an excellent rest of your days and nights and take care. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]