

## **Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 06 March 2024**

### **Agenda and Documents**

GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday, 06 March 2024 at 17:15 UTC: <http://tinyurl.com/yc8h56uu>

09:15 Los Angeles; 12:15 Washington DC; 17:15 London; 18:15 Paris; 20:15 Moscow; 04:15 Melbourne (Thursday)

#### **List of attendees:**

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – **Non-Voting** – Anne Aikman Scalese

#### **Contracted Parties House**

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Antonia Chu, Greg DiBiase, Prudence Malinki

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Kurt Pritz, Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans

#### **Non-Contracted Parties House**

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Mark Datysgeld (arrived late and absent for vote), Osvaldo Novoa (apology, proxy to Thomas Rickert), Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Stephanie Perrin, Bruna Martins dos Santos (apology and temp alt to Farzaneh Badiiei), Farzaneh Badiiei, Wisdom Donkor, Tomslin Samme-Nlar , Peter Akinremi, Manju Chen

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady

#### **GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :**

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Jeff Neuman: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Everton Rodrigues: ccNSO observer

#### **Guest:**

Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of DNS Abuse Subgroup

#### **ICANN Staff:**

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

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management

Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations

Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)

Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support

Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)

Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)  
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)  
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Specialist (GNSO)  
Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Sr. Coordinator (GNSO)  
Devan Reed - Secretariat Operations Coordinator

[Zoom recording](#)

[Transcript](#)

### **Item 1: Administrative Matters**

- 1.1 - Roll Call
- 1.2 - Updates to Statements of Interest
- 1.3 - Review / Amend Agenda
- 1.4 - Note the status of minutes for the previous Council meetings per the GNSO Operating Procedures:  
[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 18 January 2024 were posted on 02 February 2024  
[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 15 February 2024 were posted on 02 March 2024

### **Item 2: Opening Remarks / Review of Projects & Action List**

- 2.1 - Review focus areas and provide updates on specific key themes / topics, to include review of [Projects List](#) and [Action Item List](#).

### **Item 3: Consent Agenda**

- Motion to Adopt the Communications Small Team Final Report

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

[Vote results.](#)

**Action Items:** On behalf of the GNSO Council, the GNSO Secretariat notifies the Communications Small Team that the GNSO Council accepts the recommendations as outlined in the Final Report, requests that the leadership of the small team works with Council leadership on developing the respective communications as foreseen under recommendations 6.2.1 and 6.2.2, and thanks the small team for its efforts as well as the ICANN org communications function for their contributions.

### **Item 4: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Reaction to Program Management Tools Discussion**

- 4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)
- 4.2 - Council Discussion
- 4.3 - Next Steps

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair,** reminded Council that in the Strategic Planning Session (SPS), Councilors agreed to review the Project Management Tools regularly. Council did an in depth review during the GNSO Council Working Sessions on Sunday, 03 March 2024 during ICANN79. He asked for Councilor opinions on whether this was worthwhile, and how this should proceed in the future.

**Damon Ashcraft, IPC**, recommended that once a year makes sense for these reviews.

**Jennifer Chung, RySG**, thanked Paul McGrady and staff for presenting the slides and asked if Council has next steps on what to do after the review, as there is a shortlist on outstanding items from the Board, working groups, etc.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, expressed that next steps were part of this discussion, as he is curious to hear Councilor's thoughts.

**Manju Chen, NCSG**, shared that once a year might not be enough and recommended a review at the first ICANN meeting of the year and the AGM. She also noted that in the Council project list for this month, the vice-chair of the IDN EPDP group has not been updated.

**Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Council Vice-Chair**, recommended finding a mechanism to identify topics that are too old and have been overtaken by other events or require updating.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, agreed with Tomslin's recommendation to review notes from that meeting for a refresher.

**Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA**, supported Tomslin's recommendation and believes that Council discovered some items are with the Board and suggested that Council to follow up with a letter.

**Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA**, suggested identifying liaisons now, informally, so that Council does not feel like they need to pull information from staff constantly.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, recalled that there were volunteers in that session to track certain projects.

**Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Council Vice-Chair**, recalled suggestions that where items were with the Board, the vice-chairs or chair should follow those items.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, remembered that they decided vice-chairs should follow items with the Board, and recommended that staff review the notes and categorize them into next steps. He noted that Council did not get to the Action/Decision Radar (ADR) and he is planning to present those at the Wrap Up.

#### Action Items:

Outcome: GNSO Council agreed to review the Program Management Tools at least twice a year. Staff to ensure that the second review of the year takes place at the AGM.

Leadership and staff to provide a summary by 08 April of the outcomes and action items from the discussion at the ICANN79 GNSO Council working session.

### **Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Council Engagement with PDP Working Group Chairs**

5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Nacho Amadoz, Council Vice-Chair)

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

**Nacho Amadoz, Council Vice-Chair**, shared that Council discussed what should be done with the ICANN Meeting prep webinar during the SPS, as it was to keep Councilors apprised of what is going on with PDP Working Group Chairs. Council agreed that this webinar could be moved out of Prep Week, and this seemed to improve attendance and engagement at the webinar prior to ICANN79. Leadership also worked on elaborating the questions to help Chairs focus on what information is needed during the webinar. He asked for Councilor opinions on whether this was successful, and how this can be further improved.

**Kurt Pritz, RySG**, shared that in the RySG this week, and in other places, they talked about the Council objective of making policy recommendations Board-ready. In order to do that, the Council has to become more involved in the substance development of the policy recommendations. Typically Council takes policy recommendations, passes them through, and then the Board does a review. How does Council discover issues where the staff might disagree with the rest of the community and might relitigate with the board, or where they see inconsistencies, vagueness, or un-implement-ability. Engagement with the PDP chairs is one of the tools in their toolbox.

**Nacho Amadoz, Council Vice-chair**, understood the suggestion that Council rethink how to approach the working group chairs and to encourage working group chairs to make their information more palatable for any interaction, not just the webinar. It is a good focus to consider expanding the initial approach.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, noted that he liked the question to explain the issue simply, as it was helpful, even though it was difficult with EPDP on IDNs.

**Nacho Amadoz, Council Vice-Chair**, concluded to take suggestions to help working group chairs to make information easier to share.

**Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Council Vice-Chair**, asked if Council considered if the structure is fit for purpose. When the communications small team reviewed this webinar, they noted that it needed to be improved, but did not have any specific recommendations. He noted the update of the questions and the timing of the webinar were changed, and asked for thoughts on the structure of the webinar.

**Nacho Amadoz, Council Vice-Chair**, noted that the structure is fit for purpose but perhaps Council should consider going beyond this. He noted that when he needed to prepare for the issues, having everything condensed into one session is very helpful.

**Manju Chen, NCSG**, agreed that the session is very helpful but asked if it is necessary to do it before the face-to-face meeting or if it can be incorporated into the first session during a face-to-face meeting. She reminded council of the discussion during the working session about the policy making process being a bottom up multistakeholder – it is important to try not to micromanage the process and there is a representative in the working group that should be alerting council if there are issues. She reminded the Council that it is important for the multistakeholder process to remain a bottom-up process rather than constantly trying to guess what the Board would like to see.

**Nacho Amadoz, Council Vice-Chair**, thanked Manju Chen for her intervention and confirmed that it can be really difficult when English is not your first language, it can be difficult to understand. He flagged Justine Chew's chat and confirmed that he heard Manju Chen relating the importance of Liaisons as well.

**Message in the chat: Justine Chew 01:01:38:** +1 Kurt, through the liaisons as well?

**Susan Payne, IPC**, shared that she thought the session was useful and is worthwhile but does not feel strongly whether it is in Prep Week or in person at the meeting. She noted that it used to be in person and it was taking so much time that it was shifted to prep week. At the moment, two PDPs does not take up a huge amount of time.

**Steve Chan, ICANN org**, provided context about why the sessions were moved to Prep Week. GNSO working sessions used to be on Saturday and Sunday. When they reduced to only Sunday, the intention was to focus more on dialogue – the Prep Week sessions have trended towards updates and if there needs to be dialogue about it time is allotted at the face-to-face meeting.

**Jennifer Chung, RySG**, noted that it is useful to have this dialogue even though the PDP and EPDP are going smoothly – there may be future processes that need deep dives for issues that may come up.

**Message in the chat: Manju Chen 01:11:57:** Now that we're trying to make this update more into a dialogue too I'd argue it makes sense to move it back to working sessions too

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, confirmed hearing that the webinars are useful with the updates and overall with the improvements the sessions still make sense, and it can be decided going forward, depending on the updates, whether it is during Prep Week or during a Working Session.

Action Items: GNSO Support Staff to organize a pre-ICANN80 dedicated GNSO Council webinar, similar to pre-ICANN79 webinar, where Councilors are invited to engage directly with PDP WG Chairs. Note: as discussed during the Council meeting, Councilors have other avenues to engage with PDP WG Chairs if the need arises, including through the appointed Council liaisons to the WGs.

#### **Item 6: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Update on Contracted Party House Abuse Subgroup Meetings with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group**

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of DNS Abuse Subgroup)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, shared that the CPH DNS Abuse Subgroup has organized separate outreach meetings with the NCSG, BC, and the IPC so far. The CPH DNS Abuse Subgroup asked the groups to speak about their expectations for the future and how they would measure the success of the amendments. It has become clear that proper and regular communication is the key to moving forward. They are considering asking each group to appoint a point person with respect to DNS Abuse. All agree that there needs to be a closer communication with ICANN Compliance, as the amendments go live on 05 April 2024. There was an outreach session earlier at ICANN79 with panelists, discussing what is going to happen going forwards, and there was a general understanding that the amendments were a step, and there are more steps to come.

**Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Council Vice-Chair**, asked what plans does the DNS Abuse Subgroup have to look into the input that was given by the panelists in the conversation.

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, shared that they are in wait-and-see mode. He confirmed that Mason Cole suggested gathering metrics, and the subgroup has asked Mason to work

with them on that. The next steps are dependent on what happens in the next six months, after the effects of the amendments are seen. If there are open lines of communication, feedback can be taken from all of the constituencies.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, asked if there was information Chris could share about different groups raising different concerns as the Council DNS Abuse Small Team is interested in issues that can be addressed with policy.

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, shared that discussions have been more based on what to do to measure the effect of amendments.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, clarified that his question was about more specific issues the parties were seeing, or general concerns, such as an update in 'x' type of abuse.

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, said no, there have not been any discussions like that. There have been anecdotal observations, made often in the GAC, that there is an uptick in abuse, but there is no real evidence of this. They have discussed how to measure success of the amendments and the fact that you could actually see more DNS Abuse and that might mean that it is a success.

**Taiwo Peter Akinremi, NCSG**, asked what is the cost to the registrant when domains are taken down. He asked this question during the panel and there was no substantial output.

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, shared that the answer to that question is yes, there is a cost to the registrant. The complicated area is where there are compromised domains rather than malicious domains. They are still working on the best way to deal with that, to avoid taking an entire domain down because a smaller portion of it is being used for abuse. A better word for cost may be consequences, which are absolutely factored into the amendments and ongoing discussions.

**Thomas Rickert, ISPCP**, shared that the question "How much abuse do we see?" is the wrong question in this context and warns to not create a recipe for disaster. Whether or not there is abuse is not within Council or ICANN's control and does not have anything to do with whether the amendments are successful. Council has made the point with the Board to obtain intelligence on whether Contracted Parties that were previously unresponsive have become responsive and whether Compliance is taking action against those who remain to be unresponsive.

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, agreed that there is a general understanding that while it is great to say that there is this number of abuse complaints, it is more about dealing with the bigger picture and those that do not respond. His understanding that the Compliance team has been or will be expanded and that the bigger question comes back to communication. The Subgroup is hoping to work with Compliance to ensure transparency and regular communication.

**Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC**, noted that the amendments were built to help org enforce rights against abuse. He asked what they are waiting to see in the months ahead, and if nothing happens if this should be a cause for concern?

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, confirmed that if nothing happens this is a cause for concern.

**Mark Datysgeld, BC**, noted that the DNS Abuse small team stopped meeting to give contracted parties time to bring statistics to the discussion to see where they stand and what is being accomplished. From the Council standpoint, the next step seems to be to collect data from the CPH to continue to evaluate the progress of that work. He asked when it would be reasonable to start working on this?

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, shared that he does not know the process ICANN Compliance uses to deal with complaints, but notes that it takes some time. The Subgroup is expecting to get clear about the answer to that question in the next few weeks to manage expectations.

**Farzaneh Badiei, NCSG Temporary Alternate**, noted that she heard during the GAC meeting that they were talking about a PDP on dns abuse and shared that these amendments go into effect on 05 April 2023 and if there is a need for PDP Council will go through the processes and discuss this. She wants the CPH to make sure that the outreach sessions should not get the impression that they are preparation for a PDP.

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, shared that GAC makes their own impressions and has likely decided that Policy needs to be made and therefore there needs to be a PDP. There may need to be a PDP at some point, but he has never given anyone the impression that there will automatically be a PDP.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, noted that he did not get a clear sense that they were calling for a PDP so much as asking about the next steps.

**Stephanie Perrin, NCSG**, noted that she gets over her depth in abuse matters and suspects that there are others in the community that also get over their depth, as there is not a clear set of definitions or codifications of abuse. She shared a concern about getting junk statistics.

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, shared that there is a clear definition of the term DNS Abuse in the new amended contract that flows from one of the SSAC Publications.

**Stephanie Perrin, NCSG**, confirmed that she read the SSAC Publications and was encouraged to see the language in the RAA, but when statistics are shared to various parties they are not necessarily counted based on those definitions.

**Chris Disspain, Co-Chair of the DNS Abuse Subgroup**, thanked Stephanie Perrin and assured that he thinks the statistics coming out of Compliance are going to make it clear what sort of abuse is defined and that the statistics from the DNS Abuse Institute should also be according to those definitions as well. He accepts there is more work to do in this regard.

**Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, emphasized the point Greg Dibiase made that there is no call from the GAC of having a PDP on any of this – the discussions have all been on the next steps. There has been no GAC Advice or Issues of Importance calling for a PDP.

**Farzaneh Badiei, NCSG Temporary Alternate**, did not say that GAC in a consensus document or advice said that we need another PDP on dns abuse– she reiterated that what she said during the GAC meeting, that repeatedly GAC members have been discussing the future DNS Abuse PDP.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, confirmed that Farzaneh Badiei shared that individual members may be calling for a PDP and reiterated there has been no formal or direct request from the GAC.

#### **Item 7: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Response to Update from ICANN org Implementation Update and interaction with ICANN Board**

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Nacho Amadoz, Council Vice-Chair)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, shared that they added this to the agenda to see if there were any responses to the Implementation Update or Interaction with the ICANN Board. He noted that a number of Councilors seem to have questions about the PPSAI and the proposed approach that the ICANN Board put forth, and that a lot of Councilors did not understand the next steps for IGO and the release of IGO acronyms. Taking on the PPSAI item first, it seems that the next step proposed by staff is to let the IRT commence and identify issues. He opened the floor for questions from Councilors regarding this update.

**Paul McGrady, NCSG NCA**, noted that the session started out quite chaotic with questions like “what do we all want out of this” that are not helpful – as the question should be “what should staff do.” Staff recognizes some recommendations from Council to the Board are heavyweight implementation and the industry has changed. For example, standing up a new accredited entity that’s a Privacy/Proxy service has been destroyed by GDPR. He noted that any big implementation issues should be addressed by the Board and that presumably the Board would open a dialogue with the GNSO if that is necessary.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, confirmed that was his understanding as well, that the IRT will convene and there likely will be issues and the process seems to be to raise issues to the Board and the Board will consult the GNSO on those issues.

**Thomas Rickert, ISPCP**, noted that on the PPSAI, it’s missing the point today. Council needs a discussion on how to navigate that as Council may not have the appropriate tools that match reality. To try to shoehorn this into an IRT seems crazy. He notes the conclusion earlier this week that independent proxy service providers are hard to identify and need to be approached as one would approach a registered name holder. There does not seem to be any independent WHOIS privacy services anymore. He does not think the tools established in the PPSAI are not the right tools for after the Temp Spec and subsequent Registration Data Policy.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, noted that when someone says that the IRT is restarting, they do not necessarily mean that they are going to try and implement these recommendations as written, but that it currently sits with the IRT. To go out of the IRT they need to write a letter to the Board, or involve Council to take that next step if needed.

**Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA**, confirmed that nobody is saying that the recommendations written in the final report nine years ago are state-of-the-art. The question is what is the process to deal with that. It cannot be that staff decides that the recommendations timed out. The Board made a resolution that accepted the Policy Recommendations from the community. In the usual practice, it would come back to the GNSO Council and a group would kick off to replace it. The question is, do some or all of the recommendations need to go? The IRT is going to do that hard work. There has to be a community process as the community does not want the Board vacating old resolutions, because then the question



is, what else can be vacated. Becky Burr has been telling them that there is not a mechanism to deal with things that time out.

**Stephanie Perrin, NCSG**, shared that Council had an opportunity to fix some of these things after the Temp Spec tried to figure out how to apply the GDPR. They said at the time they needed to do a review of the procedures that were ongoing because they had a whole new set of principles. The policy work they had been working on was no longer applicable. She noted that the GNSO knows that this requires new Policy work and asked why the GNSO Council cannot write a letter to the Board recalling the PPSAI.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, noted that Stephanie Perrin's view is represented in the IRT but if it continues to lumber on, they can consider an intervention.

**Thomas Rickert, ISPCP**, thanked Stephanie Perrin, and shared that he did not intend to say that no work needs to be done. The IRT can only look at the recommendations that they got. This topic needs an entirely fresh look and examination of the current scenario. He observes two different discussions happening, one regarding how to deal with the subject matter at hand, and two, regarding how Council can deal with situations such as this.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, noted that it is clear that there is a policy gap where recommendations adopted by the Board may no longer fit for purpose. He then asked for further comments on IGOs and INGOs.

**Jennifer Chung, RySG**, noted that this has been languishing for a long time and she does not know where it is on the priority list for the Board and feels that there needs to be more information in addition to the slide presented by staff. It is difficult to complete the puzzle when the puzzles do not seem to be from the same box.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, confirmed that Council could keep pushing for information and asked if Council could take an action to talk to the GAC about this.

**Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, does not think this is an issue to talk to the GAC about as the GAC has requested a moratorium on the release of acronyms until the curative rights are implemented.

**Susan Payne, IPC**, echoed that it was nice to see all of the different things that need to be done, but it highlights how much hasn't been done and there was not clarity on the timeline for completing those things.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, asked if there were any questions or comments on the topic of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures.

**Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Council Vice-Chair**, asked what Council should do on the conversation regarding PPSAI. There did not seem to be a way forward.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, explained that the IRT is talking about reconvening and will send a letter. If Council aligns with the IRT's position that there are issues that are unworkable, Council can work with the Board. If the IRT takes a direction Council does not agree with, they can intervene. He suggests a wait-and-see approach.

**Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA**, confirmed that the IRT may come back and say that out of the x number of recommendations, four no longer work. That is a different conversation as opposed to starting a multiyear PDP on the entire issue all over again.

**Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Council Vice-Chair**, agreed that this makes sense.

**Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison**, shared that she thinks it makes sense, from a third-party perspective, to let the IRT do the first review, because what comes through the IRT may be the charter for the next PDP if that is needed.

Action Items: IGOs/INGOs: GNSO Council leadership to continue to ask ICANN org for a timeline until it is delivered.

### **Item 8: Selection and Timeline of Next GNSO Liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee**

8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC)

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Steps

**Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, noted that there is a position description that was approved to define the role of the GNSO Liaison to the GAC. Over the last several years there has been a lot of collaboration with the GAC and GAC Members have been brought into PDPs. He meets monthly with the GAC Point of Contact and their main topic of discussion is to create agendas for bilateral meetings. There have been times that the GAC has communicated their perspective to be shared with the Council this way as well. He recommends putting the next Liaison in place before ICANN80 in Kigali for training purposes.

**Manju Chen, NCSG**, thanked Jeff Neuman for having been the Liaison and noted him providing a lot of valuable opinions to the Council discussions. She feels that Liaison performance is more about enforcement than having a definition of participation.

**Farzaneh Badiei, NCSG Temporary Alternate**, noted that Council has the description for the GNSO/GAC Liaison and that description prescribes the role to liaise with GAC and be a bridge of communication between the GAC and GNSO Council. It is nothing about broader policy issues. This limited mandate is needed for that position and in the past the other GAC Liaisons intentionally were neutral.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, recommends reading the guidelines and ensuring that they are implemented correctly.

**Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, shared that he has read the guidelines, and that the Liaison is to bring GAC discussions and points into the GNSO Council discussions where they are relevant. He also recommended that Council speak with the GAC as this is a joint role and the Liaison needs to be approved by both groups. The GNSO Liaison to the GAC now has the ability to speak and post in chat at GAC meetings, and he has met with new GAC members to explain the GNSO processes to them.

**Susan Payne, IPC**, shared that she does not think Council came ready to discuss the role of the Liaison, and recommends reviewing the document and having that discussion. She thinks there has been good value from the Liaison that they have and it seems to be a good idea to have a handover.

**Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA**, noted that she will be replacing Anne Aikman-Scalese on the SSC going forward.

Action Items: GNSO Councilors to review the GAC Liaison role at: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1jYOMd0RIYPqo7EHjLEXgw78AxjRx693sO30sXI1VCsU/edit?usp=s\\_haring](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1jYOMd0RIYPqo7EHjLEXgw78AxjRx693sO30sXI1VCsU/edit?usp=s_haring) and be prepared to finalize it at the Council meeting on 18 April 2024.

## **Item 9: ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### 9.1 - GNSO Chair Election Timeline Announcement

Terri Agnew, ICANN org, reviewed the [GNSO Chair Election Timeline](#).

### 9.2 - Updated Small Team Guidelines

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, reviewed amendments to the [GNSO Council Small Team Guidelines](#). He recommends Councilors read the updated document and raise additional comments. This will be put on the consent agenda for the 18 April 2024 GNSO Council Meeting.

Action Items: GNSO Councilors to review the updated Small Team Guidelines document at: <https://gns0.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2024/draft/updated-small-team-guidelines-06mar24-en.pdf> and consider for adoption on the Consent Agenda at the meeting on 18 April 2024. GNSO Support Staff to send a reminder to review and make edits by Monday, 25 March.

### 9.3 - Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team (“SPIRT”) Charter Drafting Team Update

**Anne Aikman-Scalese, NCA**, shared that this drafting team is about following what is in the Annex of the SubPro final report to describe how the Standing Predictability IRT will be the resource in the predictability framework that was recently published by the Subsequent Procedures IRT. She emphasized that the SPIRT team will not come into play until the next round opens. Anne Aikman-Scalese confirmed that she is the GNSO Council Liaison and that Nitin Walia is chair, and Alan Greenburg is Vice-Chair. Alan was not appointed by the ALAC, he is an individual participant. The drafting team expects the work to take 3 months.

### 9.4 Aspirational Statement

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, reviewed the [draft Aspirational Statement](#) and shared that Counselors are able to edit the document directly and can work on it offline.

**Damon Ashcraft, IPC**, noted that the Aspirational Statement needs to be aspirational, and that the initial draft was too directional.

**Kurt Pritz, RySG**, noted that a mission is what you want to do and an aspiration is what you want to be.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, encouraged Councilors to share their opinions in the document.

Action Items: GNSO Councilors to review the draft Aspirational Statement at: <https://gns0.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2024/draft/draft-aspirational-statement-06mar24-en.pdf>

f and provide any suggestions for edits in the document by Monday, 25 March for discussion on the list. GNSO Support Staff to send a reminder to the list.

Ad Hoc AOB

**Paul McGrady, Small Team Plus Chair**, shared that they did not receive any negative feedback or suggested edits to the Draft Supplemental Recommendations during the GNSO SubPro Supplemental Recommendations Community Consultation.

9.5 - Open Mic

**David Olive, ICANN org**, thanked the Council for their efforts and cooperation with the Policy Team. He reassured all that he has always been behind the scenes and is leaving behind a strong team in his retirement.

Councilors followed to thank David Olive for his work at ICANN and wish him a happy retirement. No further topics were raised.

**Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair**, adjourned the meeting at 19:10 UTC

The next GNSO Council meeting will take place on Thursday, 18 April 2024 at 21:00 UTC.