
**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council**

Thursday, 16 December 2021 at 14:00 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/T77ojQi-6wbQEFKiqie06BINSu2317zL0elwQOhzAR6vU9XW_69Z2eDx5PVomDPMOxMEjVSXEQ-1cN4e.izpmjWRkG6BFOxHY

Zoom Recording:

<https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/uvNkpKz0lg5SJXC4yaFVcYbEdVaSrglwUB8izpkzf1HG45kGOunFxi95bHG7JRu2UrUFrz89SRIViH2s.nw-x5VTfNSN1dH-z>

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

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

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Jeff Neuman: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Maarten Simon: ccNSO observer (apology)

Guests:

Janis Karklins, SSAD ODP Liaison

ICANN Staff

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.

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

Marika Konings - Vice President, Policy Development Support

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

Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director

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 16th of December
2021. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it?
Thank you ever so much. Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: I'm here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maxim Alzoba.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kurt Pritz.

KURT PRITZ: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Here, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Greg DiBiase.

GREG DIBIASE: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Kristian Ørmen.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Desiree Miloshevic. Desiree, you may be muted. I see Desiree in the Zoom room. Marie Pattullo.

MARIE PATTULLO: Here. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Marie. Mark Datysgeld. I 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: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Wisdom Donkor. I don't see Wisdom in the Zoom room yet. We'll go back to him. Stephanie Perrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Farell Folly.

FARELL FOLLY: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Maju Chen.

MANJU CHEN: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Juan Manuel Rojas has sent his apologies and assigned proxy to Tomslin Samme-Nlar. Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Here.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Olga Cavalli.

OLGA CAVALLI: Here, Nathalie. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you. Jeffrey Neuman.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Present.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Present. Thanks, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Justine. Maarten Simon has also sent his apologies for the call. We'll be welcoming as guest speaker Janis Karklins, SSAD ODP liaison. From staff on the call, we have Steve Chan, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Caitlin Tubergen,

Emily Barabas, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind everyone here to please remember to state your names before speaking as this call is being recorded. We are in a Zoom webinar room. Councilors are panelists, can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once they have set their chats to "everyone" rather than the default "hosts and panelists." That way, all will be able to read the exchanges and they'll be captured by the recordings.

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, it's now over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I hope you're all well. I think we can move on with our agenda. And our usual 1.2, any updates to our statements of interest? Anyone?

Okay, moving on, 1.3, any change you'd like to make to the agenda? Kristian?

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Hello. The RrSG would like to have the project change request special curative rights protection for intergovernmental organizations EPDP moved away from the consent agenda, please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. Thank you, Kristian. We'll take that out of consent. And then I think procedurally, we will go through that right after the vote on the consent agenda. If I get this wrong, staff will correct me. Any other change on the agenda?

Okay. Seeing none, 1.4, we'll just note the minutes of our previous meetings, October and November, and then which leads us to item 2 of our agenda. Just a couple of initial remarks. You will note that the structure of this meeting is pretty much the same, and in particular, this item 2, very similar to those that we had before the SPS, and we discussed the structure of these Council calls during the strategic planning session. The idea is that we indeed implement those changes when we have formally—the word is a bit strong, but approved the conclusions.

I've circulated those on December 7th I think. If you have any comments on this, please provide them by the end of the week, but the idea is that we implement these changes after this meeting.

Second note is somehow related to the SPS as well. Most of this meeting is focused on the ODPs, and this was very much discussed during the strategic planning session, and this is essentially a follow-up to this.

So this being said, for the review of projects and action list, looking at Berry and noting the e-mail you sent on December 7th, is there anything you'd like to bring our attention to?

BERRY COBB:

Hi Philippe. Thank you. Just real quickly, I think Steve will bring up the e-mail. I'm not going to talk substance today, but what I did want to highlight for the group here, the portfolio management suite of tools are updated each month in preparation for the Council meeting, and we received feedback that there's a lot to digest and some of the tools are a little challenging to understand.

I think what's important here for the Council, when you see this e-mail that's typically sent out after the agenda has been posted, there's really two key components that the Council should be paying the most attention to, and that is bullets three and four, the Action Decision Radar and the project list.

Below both of those, I try to provide key project changes for the period and maybe some things to look out for in the following month. These are pretty much redundant, but they are just a quick, helpful summary of what we're looking at.

The key project changes for this period most of the time will match the agenda because these things have floated to the top on the Action Decision Radar, but you will see them.

So if you can flip over to the ADR, really, what is important for the council to be looking at each month is the top two areas of the Action Decision Radar.

With the Action Decision Radar, as we've noted in the past, basically, there are range markers, and there's the zero to one month which is right in front of us, and then the secondary one, the one to three months. It's really just this top first half of the page that you need to pay attention to the most.

Zero to one month is everything that we're working on right now or that requires Council attention or action or some resolution that's coming your way or delivery of a milestone like an initial report or final report. And then the one to three months is a little bit further out but if it's not going to be talked about by the next month's meeting, it'll be likely from this second meeting. So this is just kind of a quick indicator of what's in front of you.

Lastly, the project list, I think this is probably the most important tool that the Council needs to pay attention to month to month, starting with page one. This is just a summary overview of all the projects that are in flight that the GNSO has initiated at some point in time or another. And the reason why we have this summary page is a couple of reasons, but primarily so that you get a quick view about the status and health of each project.

I'll take for example the EPDP on specific curative rights. The quick takeaway here is when you start to see yellow or red, there's something that is going on with that particular project that needs attention. So looking at that and seeing that the status with the yellow triangle is based on the legend is that this project is behind schedule and this is probably an indicator that you should jump down into that specific project to review what is going on, because it'll provide a quick summary of why the condition or the status or health of that project has changed.

And Steve, if you can just click into the IGO one to go down to that page, and this'll be my final statement. The entire project list should be reviewed from top to bottom, but the key component that you should be reviewing on each page of this is the lower right quadrant. This is where you'll get the qualitative details of what is going on. The whole idea here from month to month is that staff as well as the leadership team are documenting what that group is working on right now, what they plan to work on in the next period, basically the next one to two months, it identifies any issues or risk that the project is facing and in most cases will try to identify some sort of mitigation plan. And then finally, what was completed in the prior period or the past month.

So it's this section of each of the projects that should be reviewed in detail so that you come prepared, especially for those particular topics that are on the current agenda for any one Council meeting.

And then the final final thing I'll say here is there is the other tool that's the portfolio management tool that used to be called the scary spreadsheet, but it's the monster Gantt chart of everything going on in the GNSO. We have no expectation that the Council will review that in detail in any particular period. It's provided there as an aid to help the GNSO community as well as the GNSO Council understand everything that's going on or most everything. But it is very difficult to read and that is the absolute reason why we created the Action Decision Radar in complement to the project list.

So think of the Action Decision Radar almost as kind of an executive summary of the PMT and then the project list is a more tactical breakout to better explain what each project is doing. And

then on top of that, of course, on a monthly basis, each of our PDPs are also sending to the Council list their respective project package that'll go into even more detail about what the particular group is doing, what they plan to do, what they've accomplished, tracking attendance, so on and so forth. I'll stop there. Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Berry. And the respective project packages were shared on the list on that same day, I think, on December 7th. Any questions for Berry on these documents? Okay, seeing none, as I said, we may be revisiting the way we review those with the help of the SCBO moving forward, including prioritization, maybe. Thank you, Berry.

So with this in mind, we can move on to the next item, that's our consent agenda where we had four items, now three. Kristian will correct me if I'm wrong, but you requested that 3.2 will be removed off consent. So we now have three items. I'm just checking, any other comments on this? Anyone would like to take anything else out of this?

Okay, seeing no hands, we'll take our vote on then item 1, 3 and 4 that we have. So that's the motion on the PCR on transfer, the approval of the new SSC leadership, and the recommendations report on phase 2A. Nathalie, would you like to take us through this vote, please?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Philippe. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye. Hearing none, 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: Tomslin Samme-Nlar for Juan Manuel Rojas.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Aye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much. With no abstention, no objection, the motion passes, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Thanks, everyone, and congratulations to the new SSC leadership then. And with this, I think we can go to—I suppose that formally, we will take the vote and discussion on the item 3.2, and that's the PCR on the IGO PDP.

For a start, maybe I should turn to Kristian to start the discussion, obviously, and to elaborate on the reason why you wanted to have that out of the consent agenda.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. The RrSG had a look through this project change request and we of course acknowledge that if the EPDP needs more time to review all these public comments, we understand and accept that, but we would like to have noted in this accept that we have some concerns around the EPDP moving out of the scope of the charter. So if we approve this—which I expect that we do—I would really like to have noted that the EPDP should use this time to also make sure that the recommendations are still within the charter of the EPDP. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Kristian. In terms of language, I'm sure—that would be helpful, probably, for the minutes, for you to provide that. We got the point, obviously, but for you to provide that text and that text be captured in the minutes. Thanks, Kristian.

Anything else from anyone before we take the vote? And the caveat will be duly noted. Okay. Thank you. Thanks, Kristian. So I think we can go through our vote for 3.2, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Philippe, given the notion has been removed from the consent agenda, I wonder if you shouldn't read the resolved clauses too.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Maybe, just to be on the safe side. I don't know if that's necessary. Procedurally, I'm sure that someone can help me with this. I see, John, you have or had your hand up. John, would you like to take the floor?

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Philippe. I was just going to volunteer to read it since I made the motion and I'm the liaison.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Absolutely. Please do.

JOHN MCELWAINE: The motion that I've made as the liaison to this working group, seconded by Juan Manuel Rojas, whereas on 19th August 2021, the GNSO Council initiated an Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on Specific Curative Rights Protections for Intergovernmental Organizations along with its charter; two, the EPDP Team published its Initial Report for public comment on 14 September 2021; three, the EPDP Team received 33 comments from 14 individuals, 13 Organizations, and 6 community groups; four, The EPDP Team has determined that the substantive nature of the comments will require additional time to thoroughly review in addition to the remaining tasks to prepare a Final Report; five, The EPDP leadership team has submitted a Project Change Request outlining the full rationale for extending the project timeline.

Resolved, the GNSO Council approves this Project Change Request, and the GNSO Council instructs policy support staff to update the EPDP Team's project plan and other materials accordingly and post them on the EPDP wiki project space.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, John. I think we can go through our vote now, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you very much, Philippe. 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. And Tomslin Samme-Nlar for Juan Manuel Rojas, please.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Aye.

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

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nathalie. Thanks, everyone. So that leads us to our item four in the agenda—I'm sorry, Kristian, I guess we're still on three then.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Thank you. Just a quick comment. You asked me to write it down. I put some text in the chat. Just wanted to know if that's good or if you want anything else from me.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: For the record, I think that's good enough. And again, if it's not, procedurally, we'll get back to you. But it should be. Thank you, Kristian.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Perfect. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. So we'll now move on to item four, and that's our discussion on the SSAD ODP and the next steps. Just a couple of reminders and a bit of context on this, especially for the session that we will have next week. As you would have seen, and as those who attended the recent webinar, the ODP is nearing completion and we'll be hearing about the latest report shortly from Janis.

More broadly, as you would remember, we had expressed our willingness to get involved and have a follow-up on the financial sustainability of the SSAD and the cost model of that assessment. So we will have that follow-up soon following the findings of the RFI which was launched, and in light of the financial elements that were collected, hence the session that is scheduled for next week,

and that's the first step of this where we will have an update from ICANN Org on those aspects of the financial sustainability of the SSAD.

We will have Board members present at that session, the members of the GDPR caucus group will probably take part. So I would expect the first part of this to be essentially informative where we'll be provided with the elements and the findings of the RFI and the figures, numbers that were collected and the cost model that could be inferred from that.

The second part of that session on Monday will be devoted to our informal discussion just to debrief on what we would have heard by then. So more on this on Monday. You will have some of these elements in the e-mail that I sent on the 3rd of December on the list, and overall and moving forward, there are essentially three options for this and for us. Either the Board determines that the adoption of the recommendations is the best interest of the community and no further action is necessary from us, or the Board determines that it isn't and does not adopt these recommendations and in that case, the GNSO would have a second look at that and will be requested to affirm or modify those recommendations.

Option three, and that's where the window is probably since we're somewhere in-between, before the Board considers those recommendations for approval and in light of the elements provided by the ODP, Council may decide—and I stress the May, that will be up for discussion if necessary, that'll be up to you to decide—to modify or amend the recommendations.

So that's where we are. I wanted to provide some background for the meeting we will have next week on this. So with this, I think it's time for us to have a look at the latest report on the SSAD ODP by Janis. I'll hand over the floor for this to help us go through the assumptions versus recommendations and discussion that you had with the ODP team.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you, Philippe. In all honestly, I was not informed that I would need to speak now. I think that all interactions that I had with the ODP team, I have documented and submitted for information to the Council.

The latest interaction we had about a week ago where we reviewed the results of the webinar that ODP team had in relation to Recommendation 2, accreditation of government entities. I know that there are some questions raised by the GAC in relation to proposed model. But since my task is to review the proposed model or questions of the ODP team in relation to recommendations as such, I think that what is now proposed by the ODP team is in full compliance with Recommendation 2.

At the same time, the proposed model is much larger than just Recommendation 2. Rather, Recommendation 2 is a subset of activities that are proposed to organize for the government entities. That means accreditation, sending query, and also billing.

Another answer is to queries that have been submitted by the Council. No concerns were raised, and I took it and ODP team

took it as silent approval. And I think that that's about what I can say today. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Janis. Any questions on that last report? Okay, seeing no hands, any questions or comments on maybe what I said earlier, the next steps for this, the review or the discussions on the financial sustainability of the SSAD, the discussion that we will have with Org and the next steps? John.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Philippe. Is the GAC's recent letter going to be part of this discussion? Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, John. It was not meant to be. From what I understand from the letter and the comment, clarification given by Janis here, it is slightly orthogonal to that discussion, my reading at this point. What's for sure though is that there will be probably a need for us—us being Council given that the letter was addressed to us to respond—it seems to me that maybe that's just—not a matter of interpretation but maybe—I'm not sure there's strong disagreement on the reading of the assumption versus recommendation. That's what I seem to be hearing from Janis. But certainly, we will need to respond formally to the letter. That's my reading of this at this point. But to your earlier question, John, I don't think that'll be an input directly to the discussion that we'll have on Monday.

Any other questions or comments? Thank you, John. Okay, seeing no hand, then we will move on. And more on this on Monday. For Monday, please have a look at the e-mail that I sent on this. Again, it was sent on Friday the 3rd of December to be prepared for this. The idea is for us to ask any questions you may have. It's likely that we're provided with the financial elements of the request for information that was sent around. And it'd be good that we come with our questions.

Yes, thank you, Maxim. Maybe I keep saying 20th. It depends on where you are. Okay, thank you, so let's move on to the next item, and that's item five, our discussion and update on the SubPro ODP. As you would know, it's on the way, although it's not formally launched. I believe—and you know—Jeff, our liaison has already met with the ODP team. There's been a couple of e-mails on this on the list, and a set of questions that was asked by Jeff and there was a way forward suggested there and a way for us to review the assumptions and recommendations of the liaison in that context.

Certainly, beyond this, the case of the SubPro ODP, a question for us on how moving forward we'd like to proceed with our reviews of the reports of the liaison. So with this, I'll turn to Jeff, our liaison, to help us go through these initial stages of SubPro ODP.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Philippe. I think some of this will relate to the next topic as well. So if I start crossing over, just let me know. But a couple things. So I am having a call later on today, as today will be the second liaison call that we're having. So that's in about seven

hours. I'll likely have another update to send to the Council tomorrow on today's call.

So my goal is really to basically report on everything in the discussion, and I think the ODP team from ICANN's side is on the same page as well. So if there's ever any reaction to what's sent on the Council list, just let me know and I could provide that feedback back to the group.

One of the things I think we need to work on, as Philippe said, we did get the first set of questions pretty close to the last Council meeting. I'm thinking it was actually a little bit before the last Council meeting if I recall correctly, and then I drafted some proposed responses.

I don't think I saw any changes to those proposed responses. And perhaps someone could post the link to that Google page as well in the chat, because I think it was supposed to be on suggestion mode. So if anyone had any changes, we would have seen it. I didn't see any redlines, but I didn't read it that closely to see if there are any changes.

So it's been pretty close to a month since we got those questions, and so one of the things for the Council to consider is, is that timely? Does the Council want to try to come up with something to respond more quickly than taking a month?

And my impression—and I could be wrong—is that because of the large amount of topics in SubPro, my guess is that there's going to be a fairly significant amount of questions. And again, I could be wrong, but if there are, then perhaps taking a month to respond to

those questions, I'm not sure if that'll impact the timeline. It's scheduled for a ten-month ODP, and I think as we said in the last update, it's scheduled to start in January at this point, which would mean that it would end around November.

And I'm not sure, like I said, and I don't think they know either because they're asking questions as they go through each topic. So if we take a month to respond, I don't know if that's going to have an impact on the overall time period.

So that's one issue. The second issue is, again, in theory, they're starting the ODP in January, which I guess is about a month behind what the schedule was in theory, because I think the Board had approved going forward with the ODP in September and then taking three months would be this month to start the ODP. But they're starting it next month. So just think about that as well and if there's any comments.

And then I would love any kind of feedback on, is this the right amount of information that you're given, especially with the last update? Is there more that you want? And just any ideas on responding to the questions and if there's a way we can do that in a more timely fashion. Thanks. I think that's most of it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. Any questions or comments on this? Both on the time that might be needed to review those inputs, the feedback provided by the liaison, and the level of detail of those inputs. Any comments, questions?

My only [naïve] comment at this point on the risk of this, if we should take for example a month or a long time to review those elements, is it also depends on how much dependency we have between these answers and the next steps for the ODP. I suppose that the inputs that we'd be providing would somehow impact the next stages of the ODP. So those inputs cannot stay in limbo if the ODP team cannot proceed with their work.

So Jeff, to this point.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks, Philippe. That's a great point. The honest answer, I think, is there probably will be questions. I don't know if this last set of questions creates dependencies. It may. But I can certainly envision questions in the future that are needed to get clarification on, and then that would determine a certain direction. So I could certainly see that being the case.

And I know there's nobody really raising their hands and commenting, so I guess one of my questions is, do I take silence as you're good with the responses that we've provided? And if silence is good, how long should we wait after we post the responses? Really need to have that feedback because otherwise, we'll be in limbo if we don't have some sort of confirmation or something.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Jeff. Absolutely. I think even for Council to be prepared in terms of when before the Council meeting should we expect those inputs, and I seem to remember that for the SSAD,

that was roughly ten days, a couple of weeks maybe before, and that would seem to be sufficient just as a rule of thumb. I'm not suggesting any particular timeline there, but just saying that that was considered as enough for the SSAD ODP. Maybe that's something that would be feasible for SubPro as well. There's certainly a balance to strike there.

But to your question, Jeff, on the initial input, we've discussed it twice I think because we also alluded to it during the SPS. There were no comments received. So I think they're good as is.

Now, on the timeline, would probably need to get back to you on this. For what it's worth, my initial thinking would be two weeks prior to the Council call. If we post this earlier than that, the odds are this will not be noticed. And if it's too close to the Council call, then people won't have time to review that. But that's just a thought.

Any views on this? I saw that people discussed it in the chat. Anyone care to speak to this, whether we need to go to the SGs and Cs for this and on what particular point? Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO:

Hi Philippe. Thank you. I apologize, I've obviously got lost somewhere in the e-mail threads here as usual. Jeff, from my understanding, are you saying that I can take this document and I can already send it to the BC for comment, or not? Because I really don't want to have a misstep here. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: I'll answer from my point of view. Philippe, let me know if you agree or not. But yeah, as soon as document is up and posted—these are just my suggested responses. They could be right, they could be wrong. But yeah, that's meant for you all on that day to get whatever input you need to get from whoever it is you need to get it from. So that was the intent.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. And just to this—and yes, Marie, I think that's the purpose of this, going back and forth with our liaison. Those are suggestions on the assumptions made by the ODP team as sort of the draft responses, and then it's for us to review. So by the time those are provided by the liaison, I think they can be shared with our respective SGs and Cs. Does that answer your question?

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. It does. And noting what Maxim has just put in chat—with which I completely agree—on behalf of the BC, Mark and I will get it to our BC experts today. My concern is of course relatively soon, people are not going to be reading e-mails, or if they are, they're going to be not reading them quite as often as they due at the moment, shall we say. So Mark and I will get that into the BC today and then we'll give us a deadline and then we'll ask people to get back to you. And thanks so much, that's been really helpful. Thanks, gents.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Marie. Any other questions or comments? To yours, Jeff, and in light of the comments made by Marie and Maxim—and

maybe we should have stressed this more strongly, so we'll take those inputs and those of us who would need to go back to their SGs and Cs will do so and we'll provide some feedback by, let's say, the second week of January. So that's for the initial responses.

Now, there's also your question about on an ongoing basis, how long should we take? That question remains. I think they should certainly be shorter than those—what would it be, six weeks now? And maybe more. So again, thinking in terms of this being as efficient as possible, maybe two weeks would be good enough.

And indeed, as some of you would have noted, we're between item five and six now in terms of the agenda, but that's fine. We'll move on to six in a moment. But we're getting into the framework that we will be using for our review of the ODP team feedback.

Tomslin, you're first, and then Jeff.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Philippe. Actually, you did answer the question that was on my mind, because I noted that Jeff asked how long, and I also noted that folks were saying they're going to go to their stakeholder groups. So I wanted to ask what you just asked, what then is the time that is suggested to be taken before we expect feedback from the time that is provided. But I suppose that is taking us to agenda item six. I wasn't sure whether we had moved there because the discussion was leading towards that direction. So I just wanted to ask that as well so that we don't miss it. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. That's fine. There's always going to be an overlap between those two anyway. But yes indeed, there's that remaining question. Again, my initial thinking would be pretty much the same as what we did for the SSAD, which was roughly two weeks, ten days. But maybe the initial question is also for you, Jeff. Do you have a timeline that would seem reasonable in light of the frequency of your meetings with the ODP team, and how long would be reasonable?

JEFF NEUMAN: Good question. The intent is for us to meet once every four weeks or once every month. It would be great to be able to, if there are questions asked, to have that response within two weeks.

The other thing I can try to do—again, this would be from my own opinion—is try to indicate where there may be a question that would require discussion. And if I know that within two weeks of a Council meeting or the document deadline, then I can certainly indicate that on the list and say, hey, this would be great to talk about it as an agenda item.

The other thing you could do—and this is completely up to you all—is perhaps create a small team of councilors that have the responsibility, once the document is posted, to just make sure they look at it and provide their input. That might help the other councilors who maybe are working much more on other items or are on other small teams. So that's a possibility as well if you wanted to do that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. That's also an option. That's not what we did for the SSAD. And given the broad interest on SubPro, I thought that that would be relevant for the full Council. But you're right, it also depends on how much detail and how deep we go into those responses and inputs. Maybe that'd be easier for that small team questions for the group if there are views to this. That would be useful.

So clearly, we're now into item six on our agenda, so we'll move to item six. Thanks, Jeff. But obviously feel free to chime in on this one too. And that's our review of the ODP liaison feedback that we'll put in place. So we just had a discussion on SubPro and we need to think in terms of how heavy or lightweight we want this to be. There was a paper, general guidance, that was posted by Steve I think on the list. And maybe we could have that on the screen.

It's a short paper, but it outlines the approach and documents pretty much what we did for the SSAD and suggesting that we might apply that to SubPro as well. So maybe things that are obvious but the work would primarily proceed by e-mail. We need to think about the duration, which is the questions that we just asked, and that two-week period, maybe. And the option of having, if necessary—I don't know if extraordinary is the right word, but if necessary, a small team. But then by default, this would be visible to the full Council.

So that's essentially the framework. And maybe we could use this paper as a way for us to document the process. we would add what we just said about the duration and the frequency of those reports, but I see there's a queue forming, so let's go to the discussion. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we need to add excluding big public holiday periods, and maybe ICANN meetings, because during those times, we will not be able to reach a lot of members. And during ICANN meetings, we will be too busy to properly be able to read and write things. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maxim. Good point. Probably want to further extend that window during the ICANN meetings. Steve, anything you'd like to add, anything I got wrong?

STEVE CHAN: Thank you, Philippe. Certainly not correct you, you haven't gotten it wrong, but just to add a little bit of additional context. So as a reminder—and I think Philippe had already said this—is the process that has been used for the SSAD ODP was nonobjection on e-mail list. And the period of time was generally about two weeks or so. And if time allowed, Philippe would highlight on a Council call and it would be brought up in AOB.

So the intention here for the SubPro ODP is to take into account that practice but then also add a little bit of formality around the

process so that there's more clarity and predictability about how it's going to occur. And a big part of that is about the timing or cadence of that. So that is part of what is intended to be captured here.

And I would add that Karen Lentz is on the list and she can correct me if I'm wrong. But one of the things the ODP team will try to do is work around the Council meetings. So to the extent there's assumptions and questions that the ODP team wants to circulate to the Council via the liaison, we'll try to do that so that they occur before a Council meeting and then Jeff will more than likely try to get those responses prepared in advance of the Council meeting so that you get them shared with you before the Council meeting, and then have the responses hopefully validated throughout the course of the meeting and then shared afterwards.

So that cadence will more or less actually take place over a couple weeks naturally, which was, as I mentioned, the timing and cadence for the SSAD ODP, but now there's a bit more structure so that the timing will try to be targeted to take place surrounding the Council meeting so that if there is more substantive discussion needed, it has the opportunity to take place during the Council meeting.

So hopefully, that helps a little bit with understanding why it was structured this way and to also, I guess, provide some clarity about the timing as well. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Steve. And to the last point coming back to the discussion that we just had with Jeff on the potential dependency between questions from one report to the other, I'm sure that the bandwidth that will be devoted during our Council meetings to one particular item will also depend on this, and we can rely on Jeff and moving forward on the ODP liaison to help us determine that, as you said, Jeff. There's nothing precluding—quite the contrary—from having one item for discussion during a Council meeting. Jeff, you have your hand up.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. It's sort of on another ODP issue, so if there's anyone else that has comments on this particular issue, go to them first and then come back.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. Maxim, is that to this point? Please do.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Yes. Also, we need to underline that this process shouldn't be used for time extension slowly, because formally, you can ask a tiny question, then wait two weeks for answer, then say, okay, we're trying to understand what you wrote for another two weeks, then you ask another question, and basically you have another month. Something like this happened to some applicants during the last round of new gTLDs where the formal extensions of time were reached via just basically trigger of a question. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maxim. I'm not sure I understand—I think I understand what you're saying in the context of a gTLD application and the duration being exceeded by a series of timeouts, but—yeah, all right. Jeff, I see that you can address that. That would be helpful, for me and everyone else, I think. Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. I'm actually very sensitive to what Maxim is saying, not just on this but actually some other items going on. But Maxim's point is that ICANN has a ten-month timeline for the ODP. So what Maxim is afraid of—which happened in the new gTLD process—is that ICANN would get close to the timeline, the ten months, and then ask a series of questions. And then if it takes a month to respond to the questions, ICANN would say, well, okay, now we've extended that ten-month deadline because we have to now consider your response.

So really, making the analogy here, we don't want ICANN to say, "Well, look, yes, we planned on the ten-month ODP, but it took you a month to get back to responding to this one question which raised another question, and therefore this ten-month ODP is now two years.

That does tend to be a habit with some of the things that—and I apologize to ICANN staff, but sometimes that does happen, not just with this but with a lot of other things.

So if ICANN is going to ask a question, I think another way to put it is that they should indicate to us if there's a dependency. So if they're waiting on an answer before they can produce their next

step, then I think what we should say to them is you need to tell us that this is a dependency and that you can't do work on certain items until you have this answer, otherwise we don't want to get to the point of ten months from now and saying, "Guys, look, if you add up all the time in-between questions, you all took—we asked eight series of questions, you guys took 30 weeks to respond to those questions in cumulative, so therefore our ODP is now extended by 30 weeks." That's what we want to avoid, and I think that's Maxim's point.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Jeff and Maxim. Now I understand what you're saying. And I guess the takeaway is that the earlier the more structural questions can be taken, the better so that if there's a dependency, then it's first identified and then sufficient time is given to address those rather than taking those later in the process and be accountable for the deferral or delay, although that's probably a difficult task for the team to figure out those more structural questions. But I get the point. Thank you. Thanks, Maxim.

Anything else? Jeff, yes.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, so the other topic I wanted to raise—and I think I only saw a response from Paul on the e-mail list—so ICANN staff is still sticking to what the SSAD ODP has done, which is that the liaison is only privy to any information in the event that there's any questions or clarification. But in the SPS, we talked about—there were some Council members that said they wanted more insight

into the ODP than only if and when there's questions or clarifications. So we still have not yet resolved that. And if we don't provide any other advice on that, then ICANN's going to proceed under the assumption that all the liaisons can have insight into is clarifications and questions but not anything else.

I will say also staff is planning to, as you saw on the first update that was on December 1st, is to post regular blog type updates on each of the—I think they indicated there were 12 topic areas if I'm not mistaken, in that first blog post. So they did say that in each area, they're intending to post some sort of update or more in-depth update, but if the Council wants otherwise, then the Council needs to state that. Otherwise, it's just going to proceed the same way if the SSAD ODP proceeded.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Jeff. And indeed, it was a question that we asked during the SPS. Any more views on this in terms of expectations from Council, whether those inputs should be limited or focused on the clarifications or whether there's some expectation that they should be broader in terms of the coverage of the ODP in light of the communication that could be done otherwise? Any views on this? Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Paul has asked a question in the chat, and I don't know if he's in a position to speak or not, but he asked—I think it might have only gone to the hosts and panelists, but it says, "Jeff, what

is the secrecy motivation for keeping liaison in the dark on their progress, perhaps if they can explain.”

Yeah, so I would not say it's a secrecy thing. I don't think ICANN staff is trying to deliberately keep us out of things. I think they're just doing their work and they are just proceeding under their job to do this under ICANN Org. There's no intent, I don't think, to keep anything secret. It's just this is what the ODP is set up to do and this is how they did the SSAD ODP, and that's why they're doing it. But I would not read any ill will or anything like that into ICANN Org at all.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Jeff. And just to add to that, I think it's also a question of channeling the inputs. If the intent is also to communicate broadly through webinars as they did for the SSAD, then maybe that could be seen as [a duplicate.] I don't know, but it seems reasonable to be proportionate and maybe focus the involvement of the liaison on the assumptions and clarifications expected on those. That would seem to make some sense to me.

Steve, you have your hand up.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Philippe. I just wanted to respond to some of the discussion right now. And as Jeff noted, the motivation certainly is not secrecy. It's better framed as equality of information and ensuring that the information being shared is done with the entire community and not privileging the role of the liaison, which is more about seeking clarification of information. So I just wanted to make

sure that that is not the takeaway here, that there's any motivation for secrecy. It's more about ensuring that something that is of high interest to the entire community is shared widely and broadly. It's more about that being the motivation rather than anything else.

But as noted, Karen's on the call, and if she wants to add anything, she certainly is welcome to. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Steve. Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. I just raised my hand because Jeff read into my question that I somehow believe there's some ill will. That's actually not in my question anywhere, nor do I believe there's ill will. In fact, my question was the opposite, which is if the staff can explain the reason behind not feeding information to liaisons that might make more sense to us, which Steve just has. Their motivation for not feeding the liaison and therefore not feeding the Council information is because they don't want anybody in the community to be privileged over anybody else.

I'll leave that to Council leadership about whether or not that makes sense, because we have work to do in relationship to responding to the questions that are given to Jeff. But we also have work to do in terms of planning our work process for implementation and other things that we need to be thinking about. But again, I'll leave the response to Steve's indication about motivation to Council leadership and you guys can decide if you want to think about that some more or address it.

But there's certainly no ill will. There's usually a good reason for these things and I was glad that somebody—even though the answer isn't intuitive to me, I'm glad that somebody showed up and explained why. So, thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Paul. Clarification taken. So I'll go to Jeff now to have the last word.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. And Steve's right, and I'm sorry, I should have made that—I think I said that in the update e-mail, that that was—and yeah, apologize for not saying that.

But I do want to also say that I do think the Council should think about that response, because remember, this is a GNSO policy development process that ICANN is working to implement. So therefore—and I'll just give my personal view, which people can absolutely disagree with, but my personal view is that the GNSO should be in a privileged position because it's the GNSO's policy. And as Paul said, the GNSO then needs to work on other items that may be related to that.

It's not different than if the GAC provides advice to the Board, then the Board responds to the GAC only in its scorecard. That information could be very useful to many other people in the community but it's only provided to the GAC, because it was in response to GAC advice.

So I'd really like the Council to think about the rationale that's provided by ICANN Org, and as Paul was sort of alluding to, is, is that intuitive? Does that make sense? We know a lot of people are going to want to participate in the new gTLD program, sure, but this is not announcements about the program itself. This is information about what will be the implementation of GNSO policy.

So please, Council, think about that, run that by your communities. Like I said, personally, whether that matters or not, I think the GNSO should be in a privileged position here because it is GNSO policy that ICANN's responding to. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Jeff. So we'll keep those as question marks, those being the duration and the need for broader involvement of the liaison. Please share those two questions with your respective structures and go back to Council on this. Certainly, leadership will give some thought on those two questions, but provide your inputs on those two points.

Anything else that people would like to raise on this? So we will update the paper that we still have on the screen now with the inputs that we received, and we'll come back on the two questions on the list and certainly at the next Council meeting on the duration and the involvement of the liaison beyond the clarifications and the assumptions.

Okay. Thank you. So I think we can move on with our agenda. So now to item seven on the planning and the involvement of Council in the planning of ICANN meetings. You would have noted that

planning has just started for 73. It's going to be virtual again and we need to plan early. And looking beyond that, maybe we want to give some thought about how we can get involved into that planning. And there's been some ideas circulated to the list, and you have that point in the agenda.

For this, Tomslin, would you like to help us go through?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, Philippe, thanks. So like Philippe mentioned, the goal with this is to obtain early input on ICANN 73 planning as the production planning calls are beginning later today. And more so for the long-term on how the broader Council can be involved in ICANN meeting planning, which is not limited to only the virtual environment.

In doing so, it would be good to both identify the necessary sessions and then perhaps subsequently plan and execute them. And as Philippe mentioned, Nathalie shared on the list a Google document for councilors to provide input on GNSO sessions. So if you look at this document, there are some sessions which were face-to-face and have successfully been held as virtual, and others which were never moved to virtual like the GNSO Council informal private session. And others too have been proposed, like meeting between the Contracted Parties House and the Noncontracted Parties House to have some exchanges, meeting between the Council and SSAC, RSSAC, and the meeting between Council and At-Large.

So it'll be good to know—and I note that John McElwaine has put some comments already in the document, but it'd be good to know what councilors think about these suggestions and if there are any other suggestions that are not yet captured in this document that councilors might have.

So with this, I'll open the discussion and queue up for any comments and input. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: The GNSO Council working session is marked as X in face-to-face and no marks in virtual. Does that mean we will not have any updates from ICANN Org?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I see Nathalie's hand up to respond to that, I suppose. Nathalie, please.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Tomslin. Just to point out, this is GNSO working Council session, which in face-to-face, if you remember, was the full day session held at the week-end. So whilst we have had updates from ICANN Org and PDPs quite separately from ICANN meetings, mainly during the prep week, during the GNSO policy session and during other prep week webinars, we haven't managed to, in a virtual setting, replicate this GNSO Council working session. So it's not the Council meeting, it's the working session. And as raised at the SPS, it was a moment of interaction that was helpful to Council, but given it's a full-day session, with

the time restrictions we have having gone virtual, it's been harder to copy. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Nathalie. And I believe there are some sessions also suggested at the bottom which are supposed to complement those updates, Maxim, I think, like the ICANN Org Q&A session. I don't know if this will be an additional session that is useful. I think a comment on that will be good. Thanks, Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Before having questions and answers, it would be nice to have a report, because before that time, you might not know some recent developments and you will not be able to properly ask if you don't know things.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Maxim. I'm not sure I understood the comment, but it seems like Nathalie did. Nathalie, you'd like to respond to that?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you so much, Tomslin. Maxim, correct me if I'm wrong, but I do agree that obviously, Maxim is right, scheduling is starting right now. It's very hard to know where Council will be lacking clarity on updates provided if we don't even know what the updates to be provided are. We don't have the schedule for prep week.

but what we've done in those situations is, along with Council leadership, we've identified—and you may have noticed them on

previous draft schedules—placeholder slots. So nothing stops, if Council thinks that could be helpful, scheduling a placeholder slot to allow further information from specific ICANN Org teams. And then once the prep week schedule is published and we have a clear idea of what's going to be done, then Council can decide to go ahead with that session because it's of Council interest and more interaction would be needed, or to cancel it. So that's always a solution when maybe information is lacking so early ahead in the planning process. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Nathalie. Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Short question. Could it be replaced with just short briefs from different ICANN teams to the Council before the meeting? So we could, I'd say, usefully spend time in Q&A session. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: So if I understand, the question and answer session could be short briefs like you suggested rather than a full working session like was had in face-to-face. I hope I understood that correctly. And I'm sure Nathalie has taken note of that suggestion.

Justin, you're next.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Tomslin. I see on the top of page two a suggestion of a joint meeting between GNSO Council and At-Large. I would

suggest that it's actually ALAC and not the At-Large. And I'm certainly happy to take this proposition back to ALAC for their consideration. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Justine. We'll correct that. And I note [John's] comment there suggesting that meeting formats are discussed with ALAC leadership as well. But thanks. I welcome that you take that to ALAC and provide some feedback if that's something that would be helpful.

That is what leadership is hoping to get out of this item. If councilors have any other comments or suggestions, it could be that like John mentioned, there might not be any need for a Council to meet with SSAC unless on a very specific topic that is of interest at that time, not for every meeting. That could be something we could also look at.

So yeah, Philippe, we don't have anyone else, so I think that is all we had for that item.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin, and thanks, everyone. We'll take that onboard for the planning on 73 and the subsequent meetings for that matter, and possibly update the document that we have here.

So this leads us to item eight of the agenda, and that's our discussion on the update on our consideration of the Board's letter regarding the deferral of the IDN implementation guidance version 4. As you would recall, we had a discussion with the Board on

this. There was a letter that the registries agreed to take onboard and provide clarification on notably the security and stability elements that might be associated with some of the elements.

The reason for the deferral was essentially the beginning of the IDN EPDP and the potential overlap between the guidelines and the remit of the EPDP. So with this, I think Kurt, you're in a position to provide some feedback on this, having discussed this with the registries.

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks, Philippe. Here's some slides. If we can just leave it on the first slide for now. I'll provide a little bit of background and get everyone caught up.

So, as you mentioned, as Registries Stakeholder Group councilors, we were invited into discussions with the lead writer of the IDN EPDP charter some months ago now and noted that some of the guidelines in version 4.0 and the topics being considered by the IDN EPDP overlap. So it'd be good to pen the implementation of the guidelines to avoid a scenario—there are several scenarios here, but avoid the scenario that the guidelines were adopted, then potentially contradicted by the IDN EPDP which would be bad for users and others.

So that made perfect sense and the question that leapt to mind right away, were there any security and stability or resiliency issues addressed in the version 4.0 guidelines? And the answer was no. So at that point in my life, I was thinking this was a fairly quick test, that we could present this to the Council as this is in

line with our role as policy managers and it was an opportunity to actually gain some efficiencies in our policy management. So at that point, it seemed fairly straightforward, but here we are about four Council meetings later. It's been an agenda topic a couple times, a briefing with the Board. It turned out to be quite a bit of work.

When we briefed the Council, again, the same issue came up, and I think it was John McElwaine that reiterated, are you sure there are no security and stability issues associated with this, because we don't want to hand any guidelines out. And the answer was, "We were sure," and then actually, when we briefed the Board and asked them, not just in trading documents with them but in an oral briefing, the Board asked us how are we sure there are no security and stability issues here, and we had our subject matter expert come and list each of the recommendations and indicate that there were no issues.

At that point, the Board SSAC liaison said she would check with the SSAC to see if that was the case. So that gets us caught up to date. Next slide, please. About 45 days ago, we received this letter to the Council. This slide is just a cut and paste, because we wanted to be precise. But the Board is getting concerned that the delay in implementing the latest update may continue to expose the end user to potential security issues for IDN registrations at the second-level, which version 4.0 is to address. Therefore, the ICANN Board proposes that the GNSO proceed to review and organize the 19 guidelines in version 4.0 into two subsets, those that are already part of the applicable guidelines 3.0 and additional guidelines which do not overlap with the IDN EPDP

process, and the few guidelines which overlap so that the Board can accomplish something and approve a subset of that, which would launch a community process then to implement them.

I think another thing we're trying to avoid here are two community processes to implement sets of IDN guidelines and policy recommendations. So that's the letter to the Board. So I think our response would be—the next slide is sort of an outline of our response to the Board, or at least the talking points.

So again, there were no stability and security issues addressed in 4.0 that are not addressed in 3.0, so that's to say that there are security and stability issues addressed in the 4.0 guidelines but the 4.0 guidelines are an amalgamation of 3.0 plus some more. So the security and stability issues really were already being enforced and are currently enforced in 3.0.

And as sort of a demonstration for that, the new version 4.0 guidelines apply to new registrations only and also only four of the new guidelines are mandatory. So if something addresses a security and stability issue, then you wouldn't apply them to new registrations and you would make them mandatory. But how much of that we want to make a point of in our response is maybe more up to leadership.

So of the four mandatory guidelines, three of them potentially collide with the IDN EPDP. They're being considered by the IDN EPDP. And then the very last bullet, guideline 12 also overlaps with the IDN EPDP. So this slide is a little bit more obtuse than it needs to be, but the bottom line answer to the Board question is the guidelines that overlap with the EPDP are 11, 13, 18 and 12,

and the remainder do not. So that's the answer to the Board question. To me, the result is that the Board's potentially going to approve the IDN guidelines except for 11, 13, 18 and 12 and we'll have a community process to implement this one mandatory guideline, 6(a), and then some other guidelines that are optional.

I think my editorial comment is this turned into something more complicated than it needed to be. But nonetheless, I'd be happy to provide to the leadership a better outline of a letter or some initial wording or collaborate with you or anyone else on the Council in clarifying how this slide should be used to compose the letter. So I hope that's helpful in some way.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Kurt. It is, yes. My initial question would have been, how would that map onto the two questions from the Board's letter? But you just answered it. So, any questions or comments on these elements? Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Philippe. I just wanted to check that—if I heard correctly, Kurt said he'll send a letter, properly formatted, in addition to this for review. Is that correct?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. I think Kurt offered some help with this. What we can do is that within leadership, we can draft a response. I think the essential point was really how the elements on the slide would actually translate into an answer to the two questions. And

people will correct me if I'm wrong, but Kurt just answered that in terms of the recommendations 11, 13, 18 and 12 being the part that would be overlapping, and a letter can be drafted on that basis and circulated to the group. Unless I'm mistaken, I'm not sure we need a small team to do that. But that's open for discussion.

Any suggestion on this? I had a question mark on the coordination with the CCs maybe on this, and Maarten is not here, so we'll take that offline. Any questions or comments on this?

So what we will do, with your help, Kurt, is draft a response letter to the Board and circulate it to the list using the elements that you provided us with. Seeing no hands, thanks again, Kurt, and we'll move on with our agenda.

That leads us to the AOB. Just to note that the deadline for the additional budget request is January 24th. You would remember that there was a number of things that we used the ABR for in the past: the SPS, the consensus playbook, and all sorts of things which have now been turned into our normal budget, but there's an opportunity there for suggestions. So if you have items in mind, please suggest on the list by early January for us to review. That'll probably be only subject to nonobjection by e-mail, don't need a motion for this.

Any question or initial ideas on this? Okay, seeing no hand, we'll move on to 9.2, and it was the review of the job description of the liaison to the GAC and the review of the GAC communique. You have with you and on the agenda a pointer to the input that was sent to the list. I think Jeff contributed to this.

There has been—unless I'm mistaken—no input on this so far. So we'd encourage people to have a look at it and provide theirs. I'll be looking at the floor, any thoughts on this? So this is a reminder for us to further consider that task. So I think we can move on. Paul's question in the chat for Jeff.

And that leads us to item 9.3, and that's an update on the Board's letter on Recommendation 12 of the EPDP phase one. A small team was established to consider that letter and prepare some clarification questions and discuss them with Becky through an informal call. I think Caitlin would provide us an update on this.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Philippe. As many of you probably remember, EPDP phase one Recommendation 12 deals with the publication of the registrant organization field. The Board adopted part of that recommendation but expressed concerns with some of the text around the deletion of the registrant organization field. So the Council provided a supplemental recommendation which the Board also had additional concerns with. The supplemental recommendation essentially paralleled the recommendation about the administrative contact field, noting that the value of the field would need to be confirmed and that there would be another contact method prior to the deletion of the field.

From that point, there were several letters that went back and forth between the Council and the Board. The Board's most recent letter was from October and a small team of councilors met to go over that letter which included seven Board assumptions, and the Board noted that provided the seven assumptions from the Board

were correct and agreed to by the Council, they would be comfortable adopting the supplemental recommendation.

So the small team went through all seven assumptions and was in large agreement with the Board's assumptions. However, they noted some textual imprecisions or specific words they were uncomfortable with. Those textual imprecisions and concerns were circulated to the Council, I believe it was November 30th, for comment.

There were no comments provided. So the next step that the small team had suggested was to meet with the Board shepherd for Recommendation 12, which is Becky Burr. The small team met with Becky on Tuesday and went through the clarifications and textual imprecisions with Becky, and Becky understood Council's position on those Board assumptions and was comfortable with those. I think there'll be one or two edits.

The next step will be for staff to work with the small team to draft a response to the Board assumptions to be shared with the Council. Most likely, this'll be an agenda item in January if there are concerns and further discussion necessary. Otherwise, it might be something that could be resolved over the list. But certainly, that'll probably carry us into next year so that councilors will have sufficient time to review those assumptions, noting the soon to be office closure and holiday season.

But happy to answer any questions. I also open it up to any of the small team members that may want to provide additional context or something that I may have missed. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Caitlin. Anything that the small team members would like to add, any questions on this update? So we should be prepared to have that draft response for a final answer to the Board's questions along the lines with minor edits of what was circulated late November to the list. Any questions? Okay. Thank you, Caitlin.

With this, this completes our agenda for today. Any Other Business that people would like to raise, bring? Okay, seeing no hands, I think we can adjourn eight minutes ahead of time, which is good, for once. And indeed, we'll meet again at the very least next Monday. For those of you who might not be able to attend, happy holidays to you. And to the others, speak to you early next week. And to the observers, have a pleasant festive season. All the best. It's bye for now.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you all for joining. This concludes today's GNSO Council meeting. Have an excellent rest of your afternoons, evenings, mornings, and take care, everybody. Stay safe. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
