

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 18 July 2024

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 18 July 2024 at 13:00 UTC: <https://tinyurl.com/mud7kn9k>
06:00 Los Angeles; 09:00 Washington DC; 14:00 London; 15:00 Paris; 16:00 Moscow; 23:00 Melbourne

List of attendees:

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

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng (first meeting, replaces 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 (joined after vote), Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Stephanie Perrin, Bruna Martins dos Santos, 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 - absent

Guests: none

ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management (apologies)

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)

John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Sr. Coordinator (GNSO)

Devan Reed – Policy 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 16 May 2024 were posted on 01 June 2024.

[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 12 June 2024 were posted on 01 July 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

- GNSO PR Officer - Roles & Responsibilities
- Confirmation of GNSO nominees to the Pilot Holistic Review

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

[Vote Results](#)

Item 4: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - EPDP on Temporary Specification Phase 1 Urgent Requests

4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)

4.2 - Council Discussion

4.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that the discussion began during ICANN80 and that the Council received a letter from the Board regarding recommendation 18 of the EPDP Phase 1. This had language about urgent requests and quoted: “a separate timeline of less than X business days will be considered for the response to urgent, reasonable request disclosures.” The IRT considered this but did not reach consensus on number of days. The Board letter noted two concerns:

- 1) Timeframe in business days may not be fit for purpose for a truly urgent request.
- 2) There are no verification procedures for law enforcement for registrars, which would take time.

Board queried what the next steps should be regarding the recommendation.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, raised two steps to the Council to address this: Do we agree with the Board and are their concerns valid? If so, what do we do procedurally?

Leadership has the following suggestions that are not exclusive and open to the Council for other ideas:

- 1) Council could agree with the Board but allow impacted stakeholders like the GAC or PSWG to offer potential solutions such as an authentication measure.
- 2) Look at the language of the recommendation that says the IRT will consider a timeline, it did and was unable to reach a consensus on timeline. So, we could consider this recommendation implemented and move on.
- 3) Support new policy effort on this specific area such as a PDP or EPDP.
- 4) Somehow reconsider this recommendation noting that there is not an established mechanism for un-adopting a recommendation that has been adopted by the Board.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, voiced his support for revisiting the policy recommendation as the Board's concern is sound. He noted that a contractual requirement is not tenable as it must take into account verification and decision making takes days even if the goal is to respond immediately to truly urgent requests. Queried if there was a way to remove the contractual requirement and instead have the contracted party house, the PSWG, and law enforcement to continually hone the procedural aspects to develop best practices in a continual improvement program. Perhaps the best way to go forward is not trying to determine what number goes into the contract, but to create practices to get better at responding to urgent requests.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, clarified that Kurt Pritz was suggesting to continue work on this issue, but not to advocate for specific language for a contract, and instead focus on more informal or different venues between registrars and GAC PSWG.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, agreed if informal meant it does not become a contractual requirement, but formal in the sense of developing teams to respond to urgent requests and measure that.

Susan Payne, IPC, agreed that we should look at this recommendation again, but disagreed with removing this entirely from the contract itself. She highlighted two issues: The timing that one should aspire to (hours rather than days) and a separate maximum amount of time by which one must respond under contractual obligation. This was the intent to give ICANN compliance something to have some enforcement against the worst operators that simply ignore things like DNS abuse. So, there needs to be some kind of day limit in the contract, or we are removing ICANN compliance's ability to deal with it.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, sought clarification that Susan Payne agreed with having a backstop of a time period. However, the Board concern was that it shouldn't be in business days.

Susan Payne, IPC, responded that she was not specifically opining about the Board, but she did not agree it should be taken out of the contract altogether. She does not believe that the IRT discussion was sufficient to meet what the recommendation said. Perhaps it could be redrafted, but it is not sufficient at present.

Manju Chen, NCSG, stated that the first option sounds nice, but is not doable. Option 2 is not ideal as well. She agreed with Kurt Pritz that more policy effort is needed with perhaps a narrow scope EPDP. However, if someone is envisioning this as only between contracted parties and the GAC or PSWG it is going to not be a great idea. Advocated for a more multistakeholder PDP reframing from simply having a simply bilateral conversation where two parties are trying to solve the problem. So, the third option of a specific EPDP is a good idea, but she would appreciate a Board request to start an EPDP.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, agreed that there should be more policy development on this. Noted the recommendation should be in hours and not business days. The most relevant urgent request involves safety and crimes, if ICANN can't come up with a policy it becomes a hindrance to public safety and ICANN would look bad.

Thomas Rickert, ISPCP, noted contracted parties do not have appropriate staff over the weekend because requests such as this require legal review and that should not be underestimated. Due to contractual requirements, there must be an emergency point of contact on file for this kind of request. Furthermore, issues can arise when requests come from non-competent law enforcement, especially the international dimension where one cannot lawfully request data. This cannot be resolved with policy because that is law. He had previously suggested during the IRT that contracted parties need to respond within 24 hours even if the response is that they need more time. So, maybe having a small team along with what Kurt Pritz suggested along with GAC at the table would be a good starting point.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, spoke from the registrar perspective. First there is a concern that registrars need to authenticate law enforcement from around the world and that takes time and ICANN policy cannot bridge that gap. Also noted that there is a separate law enforcement contact for all registrars with a 24-hour timeline for urgent requests about abuse to ask for data and that often requires legal staff review from the registrar. So, that is some background as to why the IRT was grappling with the business-day decision. Reiterated that he is hearing more work is needed, but what might that be? If it is an EPDP that should come from the Board given that they raised this concern.

Stephanie Perrin, NCSG, agreed overall with Manju Chen and Thomas Rickert. Pinpointed that nobody has been willing to take accountability for authenticating a law enforcement request. She understands that there are registrars who ignore requests and are bad actors, and there are also regrettably law enforcement agencies that are not giving clear authenticated responses or lawful requests. Absent a third party willing to take on that accountability it does not seem feasible that we can do this. Any PDP would require some outside authentication or figure out how small operators would do the legal work on an urgent basis. We should make this accountability explicit when we take up this request.

Peter Akinremi, NCSG, stated that this is not new, dealing with this will define the scope of an EPDP. What does an urgent request actually mean to different stakeholders and how to handle that. In order to define a timeline we must know the scope of things, so we need to be careful and scope it well.

Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans, NCA, stated that there is more work that needs to be done. We are seeing the difficulty in authentication and setting up a verification system. Those closest to the operations should be more outspoken as to whether any other procedure would help, but there are these limits with staffing with registrars and legal advisors. What level is realistic, she thinks we need to manage expectations.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, summarized that work is not done here and whether that is a PDP or something else remains an open question. He noted that he heard that this request should probably come from the Board given that it was their letter and leadership may take this back and think about a path forward. Initial response is a letter to the Board acknowledging their concerns and noting the work is not done here.

Action Items:

- 1) GNSO Council leadership will consider next steps, including a response to the Board that more work is needed.
- 2) The Small Team to update the guidance on the issue of urgent requests in the response to the Board on the GAC Communiqué based on the discussion at the 18 July Council meeting.

Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Accuracy Check-in

5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, opened with background that the data accuracy scoping team had been paused due to a lack of data to assess and frame this issue. ICANN staff has noted that there is no legal basis for using registrant data for the sole purpose of assessing accuracy. Leadership sent out an email for Councilors to consider the following:

1. **Evaluation of Proposed Alternatives:** In its [write-up](#), ICANN noted limitations in processing data for the purpose of assessing accuracy and proposed two alternatives (analyzing historical audit data and engagement with Contracted Parties on ccTLD practices – see detail below). Is pursuing these alternatives worthwhile? If not, are there other alternatives for obtaining data Council should consider?
2. **Consideration of Scoping Team Restart:** Given the limitations with respect to access to data, would there be value in restarting the Scoping Team at this time?
3. **Advancing the Topic:** If restarting the Scoping Team at this time is not deemed advisable, what other ideas do you have to advance this topic given its importance to the ICANN community?

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, stated that the registrar group came together to address the three questions. For evaluation of proposed alternatives, specifically about validation or using the registrar compliance audit information the idea is that it sounds good, but analysis of that data may not show the overall

accuracy rate of gTLD domains as it is not a complete representative sample. It may be helpful to review that data, but it has limitations as it is not comprehensive. In part two of the first question relating to ccTLD practices, the process of using identity documentation raises a number of issues for ccTLDs especially in Europe. Registrars should not be placed in a position to evaluate the legitimacy of ID documents, as it raises lots of questions about standardized approaches and who will be checking the documents, etc. Raised the question as to whether there is any clear evidence that the current state of registration data accuracy is a genuinely significant problem that has contributed to DNS abuse and whether accuracy will solve the problems. So, these high-level questions help us to understand whether we do need to take action, and if so, what action we need to take.

Prudence Malinki, RrSG, addressed the second questions of scoping team restart. If there is a concrete definition of data accuracy that has to be a prerequisite to restart the scoping team. One of the salient points from the registrar group was that the scoping team should only restart if there is a plan to take a new approach or pursue new ideas for addressing the topic. The common consensus view was that their current common practices are appropriate at the moment.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, noted that the issue has gotten confused and intertwined with the data processing specification (DPS). One thing that needs to happen as the GNSO is to clarify this issue with the GAC. From the GAC communiqué it was their belief that GNSO put this conversation on pause primarily because the DPS was not complete. Important for GNSO to send message to the GAC to clarify that this is not the reason for the pause, but there are these other outstanding issues as Prudence Malinki relayed. Ultimately, it is important to get the GAC and GNSO on the same page.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, stated that IPC has formed a group to look at proposed alternatives as data accuracy is a huge issue. It is curious the amount of time we spend on access to data when so much data related to DNS abuse is inaccurate.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, queried if Damon Ashcraft was advocating for a scoping team restart.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, responded that initial approach is to look at proposed alternatives and not restart the scoping team at this time.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, stated registry group concurred that the scoping team should not be restarted at this time. There was a call to solicit ideas from stakeholder groups for what alternative proposals might there be. Registries and registrars have taken this up to develop some alternatives for this but it is a sticky problem to deal with. Suggested to give stakeholder groups more time to discuss this internally to address this problem to start bottom up.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, agreed with Jeff Neuman about the GAC level setting and within GNSO for current challenges and a perhaps scoping team is premature at this point. At this time like Kurt Pritz and Damon Ashcraft said looking to alternatives. One thing that comes to mind, though he was not

proposing this, the DNS abuse small team purpose was to solicit input from the various groups and some type of exercise might be helpful here as one possible avenue.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, summarized that everyone is in agreement that more work is needed. We cannot have anything too amorphous as we need some deadlines and structure so we can take this back to our groups and think of ideas and put it on our agenda for next month.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, proposed an action item to respond to the GAC still discussing the issue and to make it clear it is not about the DPS and we are working on it.

Susan Payne, IPC, stated no objection and believes the GAC response is necessary. Emphasized that GAC must know DPS is not the only issue here.

Action Items:

- 1) GNSO Council[ors] to reach out to their respective constituencies to propose further ideas on level-setting and how to progress on the issue of data accuracy.
- 2) Council to send a call for volunteers to develop a letter to the GAC, which can then be referenced in the response to the Board on GAC Issues of Importance.

Item 6: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - GNSO Review of GAC Communiqué

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Jeff Neuman, GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, shared the good news that ICANN org and the Board have moved beyond the communiqué. There was a response by small team to the GAC and the Board thanking us for the small team response. On items of advice and follow up advice. Communiqué response was just reiterating the [GNSO Council Review of Kigali GAC Communiqué](#). He noted that the GAC advice seemed to be contrary to what they had initially agreed to during the GGP. Cited [item 2](#) about Auctions with no response as it is really just setting forth what they had previously. They simply reminded GAC of the adopted recommendations and what the Board has done on this. For [item 3](#) he proposed discussing this further within the small team based on the current Council discussion. No response yet from the small team to be viewed by the Council at this time, but those topics are being worked on.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, noted that as a small team they are still working through issue of importance DPS and that will be a part of their response. Asked Jeff if someone will be volunteering to write a letter regarding this specific topic and would this be attached to the response there or go directly to the GAC. She noted that the issue of importance response will go directly to the Board.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, responded that the letter should be a separate letter to the GAC and then refer to the letter in response to the Board.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, Agrees.

Action Items:

See item 4 above. The Small Team to update the guidance on the issue of urgent requests in the response to the Board on the GAC Communiqué based on the discussion at the 18 July Council meeting.

Item 7: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Update from Small Team Plus on Singulars/Plurals (10 minutes) | Item start time 14:00 UTC

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Paul McGrady, Chair of Small Team Plus)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, gave background that the Council was about to vote on supplemental recommendation in April, but received a last-minute proposal from staff related to how singulars and plurals would be reported. The main idea of the staff straw person was that the identification of singulars and plurals of the same word in the same language would be crowdsourced. The majority of small team plus had buy-in on the staff straw person. However, some on the small team plus set aside some hesitancy about that approach as there is not unanimous belief about crowdsourcing without an exceptions process. Noted that SubPro did to create an exceptions process that had to do with the intent to use of the TLD, but the Board has made it very clear that they are not for intent to use because that brings up content concerns. There was an additional straw people from Jeff and Susan instead of setting up exceptions process with its own panel it can be run through the extended evaluation process for the average gTLD process. There are some informal rumblings from the Board that whatever is decided needs to be simple and implementable and that IRT is getting concerned about the timeline. We do need to conclude about whether to incorporate staff straw person to get it back into the work.

Anne Aikman-Scalese, NCA, thanked Paul and stated that the team is currently headed in the right direction with a more general recommendation. Gave the timeline of weeks given the Susan and Jeff straw person was immensely helpful.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded to Paul's questions as leadership. Emphasized his concern if this were to push back new gTLDs timeline. He was also concerned about a more complicated process. Stated that from a leadership perspective, he encouraged erring on the side of simplicity and resolve this in the order of weeks rather than months.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, stated that the SubPro not adopted were more prescriptive, so emphasized that the team hears that message and will document deadline for next Council call.

Action Items:

GNSO Council leadership urges the Small Team to complete its work within a few weeks.

Item 8: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - SubPro Small Team Supplemental Recommendations - Non-Adopted Recommendations (20 minutes) | Item start time 14:10 UTC

8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Paul McGrady, Chair of Small Team Plus)

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Steps

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, noted the positive that several supplemental recommendations did go through, while unfortunately some were not adopted. Took the Council through those not adopted. Topic 9: registry commitments exception for .brands for DNS abuse as the Board signaled that this was not likely to be adopted. This was not surprising, it seems like a narrow thing so a Section 16 seems unlikely.

Topic 18: 18.3 conditional recommendation about covenant not to sue only included if there was no challenge and appeals mechanism. The Board adopted the challenge and appeals mechanism (topic 32). But 18.3 was not adopted and expected to be non-adopted because we got what we wanted. While it is a non-adoption it is a victory masquerading as non-adoption.

18.1 non-adopted tried to establish reasonable boundaries where ICANN org could reject an application. It came out of the last round as it was unclear why they were rejected in the previous round. This basically giving the Board a lot of room if it violated the bylaws or the law, but it was rejected by the Board and were not willing to accept that it could restrict their ability to reject an application. The Board noted the bylaws provision for fairness, transparency, and a rationale for all decisions. Queried as to what the Council wanted to do about this.

Jeffrey Neuman, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, written in chat: "The other part of that recommendation is that ICANN cite with specificity the reasons for a denial. And they did not want to agree to that either That is the part that worries/scares me."

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, responded that is part of the rationale for decisions. Personally, he wishes they had accepted this, but they did not. So the question is it worth spinning up a section 16 process over something the Board has made clear they are not interested in, just let it go, or something else?

Susan Payne, IPC, stated that personally we are at the end of the line on this, at most we could write a letter on the disappointment. She cannot see the point for section 16 on this.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, agreed to keep moving things along to either write a letter or perhaps raise at next ICANN meeting with the Board. Highlighted all the adopted recommendations to celebrate the work as it was unique and it was an overall success.

Action Items:

GNSO Council leadership to consider a response to the Board on recommendation 18.1 and outreach to promote the recommendations that were adopted.

Item 9: COUNCIL UPDATE - Intellectual Property Constituency Request for Reconsideration (10 minutes) | Item start time 14:30 UTC

9.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)

9.2 - Council Discussion

9.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that there was nothing to share with Council at this time as the team is working on this for the next meeting.

Action Items:

Greg DiBiase to develop a draft letter for the Small Team to review and subsequently share with Council for discussion at the August meeting.

Item 10: Any Other Business

10.1 - Aspirational Statement

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, stated that that this was a nice idea that unfortunately did not pan out. While this was a laudable effort we should not let this distract from other objectives.

10.2 - SPS Actions Follow-up

- Recommendations Report

Steve Chan, ICANN ORG, noted that councilors seen emails to get in writing on the recommendations report item where the Council stands right now is easily apparent and in writing and then solicit opinions on the status in writing on the list to allow Councilors to determine whether there needs to be further work done.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, followed up on the letter leadership on recommendations report it is required in the bylaws and unless there are specific amendments we can consider this closed and something similar on PDPs for public comment.

- Public Comment Review

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, we consider this closed unless someone sees specific gaps after staff summary.

Action Items: In response to the requests from GNSO Council leadership in emails on the list, GNSO Councilors did not provide specific proposals, so these outcomes are considered completed.

Board Readiness

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN ORG, introduced the topic during the SPS and Council talked about how to ensure that recommendations are Board ready to avoid a situation where the Council approves and Board is unable to adopt them. Staff has prepared a one-page document on what does Board-readiness

mean that will be shared with the Council when it is ready. Highlighted that during ICANN78 some of the current gaps in the PDP continuum that contribute to Board readiness. Given the recent issues for non-adopted recommendations what are some things the Council has done to prevent this in the future. Pragmatic solutions have been implemented for more informal discussion with the Board to avoid letter writing to deal with the issues in real time. She welcomed input on this from small team on this.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, presented in detail the following [slides](#). Focused on questionnaires to develop a new set of practices for PDPs. Conduct one-on-one interviews and to synthesize those into findings and recommendations to inform Council work on board readiness.

Manju Chen, NCSG, queried who was a part of the working group small team that was listed on the final [slide](#).

Kurt Pritz, RySG, responded yes.

Manju Chen, NCSG, noted the ambitious timeline of one month and questioned how many people are going to be interviewed, and how can one ensure quality control to get usable interviews.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, answered that quality control has to be carefully managed do a sampling of each group and how to control quality to perform study with rigor needs to be careful.

Peter Akinremi, NCSG, raised concern of sampling and the timeline for completion of the project. The questions the group came up with would be good to streamline those to get response that is measurable as some questions have two questions within it that could confuse the participant. Suggested looking to meeting minutes or other documents rather than sole interviews for how to respond to some of the recommendations of the report.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, agreed the questions need to be more concise and straightforward and thanked Peter Akinremi for the excellent idea to examine the record of Board minutes and meeting minutes.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, questioned if the names listed in the slides were volunteered to work on the document for board readiness?

Kurt Pritz, RySG, responded that Caitlin Tubergen sent out a request for volunteers for this small team and the names listed responded affirmatively.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked if the original small team was only drafting the document on Board readiness.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, responded that he did not think so and asked Caitlin Tubergen for clarification.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN ORG, stated that part of the reason why Kurt presented his idea to the whole Council, was because support staff had a different understanding. Volunteers from the Council were

interested in the topic of board readiness, and support staff's interpretation of this was the action item coming out of the SPS, which was to work on a document about what Board readiness means and identify gaps if there were any, but Kurt had a different idea of that which he just presented.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted Kurt's great questions. He raised the concern that this is more work to start a small team down that path that may need a vote to see if it is worth our resources. Also, noted a starting point first would be to see the staff paper to first look at what staff has put together to see potential gaps before moving on to this larger effort.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, questioned where the proposed efforts and results will land. If the goal of a potential small team on this is informing council work on Board readiness, where will the eventual efforts of this land? Along the lines of Greg's final question.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, asked Kurt Pritz if it is reasonable to first look at staff draft document to address potential gaps before undertaking this larger effort.

Kurt Pritz, RySG, stated that Council should certainly look to staff document to improve Board readiness. Noted that we talk about Board readiness frequently and cited the history of our PDPs where we were surprised when the Board rejected recommended. Cited the urgent need to look into what the Council should be doing during PDP process to reduce the number of recommendations that are rejected by the Board.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, summarizes support in the chat for looking at the staff paper and to start gathering information and for Council to consider Kurt's proposal.

Manju Chen, NCSG, requested staff paper

Steve Chan, ICANN ORG, sought to connect some dots that document that staff prepared on Board readiness is a good starting point to identify problems that resulted with changes that had been deployed by the Council. Carefully reviewing that document could impact the proposed survey design, to not simply validate work that has been done. General point the work we have done so far could serve to design the potential survey in a meaningful way.

Action Items: Small Team to review the [staff document](#) on board readiness and the survey proposal from Kurt Pritz.

10.3 - How We Meet

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, reminded Councilors to submit feedback on "how we meet" discussion paper from ICANN deadline of 24 July.

Stephanie Perrin, NCSG, sought clarification on the financial picture as costs are up. Noted that especially for noncommercial stakeholders in person meetings are especially helpful.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, shared in the chat:

<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/budget-fy23-2022-en.pdf>

Action Items: GNSO Councilors are reminded for their groups to provide input by 24 July.

Meeting closed: 14:53 UTC