EN

ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council Meeting
Thursday, 09 January 2025 at 05:00 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.
Audio is available at:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/2MFPWZdm73PuUp4fS0RhPFhgJ4bzWlV3EGIj7YaeePxnsnMAWtACHfe OY7sWr2VGRJXSYZYUYOEaeGMm.0YVUrmchwHSzECyz
Zoom recording is available at:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/v8R2spHopqrPTpSczoWVgjSWZLt3AK0- 5lTKfREIanAsP4rmoI5KxKEUZedtfZ6I.1r9q6Zrz8L_9H3t0?startTime=1736398847000

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar/2025

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): **– Non-Voting** – Anne Aikman Scalese
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Greg DiBiase (apology – proxy to Prudence Malinki), Prudence Malinki
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius,Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Peter Akinremi, Manju Chen
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :
Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison
Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC
Antonia Chu: ccNSO Observer

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)

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.

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)
Devan Reed – Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO)

TERRI AGNEW: The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place on Thursday, the 9th of January, 2025. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Nacho Amadoz.

NACHO AMADOZ: I'm here, Terri, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Jennifer Chung.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Hong-Fu Meng.

HONG-FU MENG: Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Samantha Demetriou.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Present, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Greg DiBiase sends his apology and the proxy will go to Prudence Malinki. Prudence Malinki.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Present, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Desiree Milosevic.

DESIREE MILOSEVIC: Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts.

OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Vivek Goyal.

VIVEK GOYAL: Present, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Damon Ashcraft.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: I'm present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE: Present, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Thomas Rickert. I don't see where Thomas has joined. We'll go ahead and follow up with him. Julf Helsingus.

JULF HELSINGUS: Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Farzaneh Badiei. I don't see where Farzaneh has joined, but we'll follow up with her. Just circling back, I do believe Thomas is on now. Thomas Rickert.

THOMAS RICKERT: I've joined. Thank you so much. Good morning.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Peter Akinremi.

PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Tomslin Samme-Nlar.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Manju Chen.

MANJU CHEN: Present, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Bruna Martins Dos Santos.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Present, thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Paul McGrady. I thought I saw Paul on, but I
                         don't see him on at this time. We'll circle back. And I do believe
                         Farzaneh Badiei is on now. Farzaneh, are you able to confirm?

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yes, present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Anne Aikman Scalese.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Sebastien Ducos. I don't see where Sebastian is on. We will
                         follow up with him. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Present, thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: I'm here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. We will have one guest today. It will be Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Chair. The policy team supporting the GNSO is also on. So, you have Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Devin Reed, and myself, Terri Agnew. May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as this call is being recorded. A reminder that we're in a Zoom webinar room. Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat once you have set your chat to everyone. So, please do that now for all to be able to read the exchanges.

A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones nor to the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. With this, I'll turn it over to the GNSO Vice Chair, Nacho Amadoz. Please begin.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much, Terri, and welcome to the Council Call, the first of 2025. As Terri has noted, and you can see by me speaking, Greg is unable to attend today's call due to some personal incidents of the wildfires in LA, and this has also affected some bits of the agenda. We have been able to reassign the introduction of some topics to the Vice Chairs, Tomslin and me, and we have to thank the staff for helping us navigate them and have some guidelines to work them out. So, before going to describe those changes in the agenda and see if anyone has any proposal, I think that the first point of order is to ask Councilors if anyone has any update to their statements of interest.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Nacho, this is Jen Chung for the record. Sorry, I can't find my hand up button, but just a quick mention of an update to my statement of interest. It's just a title change, but wanted to mention it for sake of transparency. Thank you.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much, Jen. Noted. So, that being done, there are some amendments to the agenda that is going to make our agenda a bit lighter today. We were supposed to have Patricia Castillo, I think, from the Org to present on agenda item five, which was the updates on the report that has been delivered. I think it was, what, one month ago, two months ago. On the six months since the amendments to the RA and the RA were conducted to assess how that was affecting the reporting and the actions of compliance on DNS Abuse.

So that has been moved to February, to our call in February. And we also move item seven, which is billing contact discussion to our next meeting. And that is something that we did because Greg had some very specific things he wanted to say, and he wanted to participate and help the discussion. So, that's also been moved to February. That was a time to ask if anyone has any proposed amendments to the agenda or any comments on these changes that we've done so very last minute, but due to the circumstances from these last days.

Seeing none, and to finish the administrative matters, just a quick note to let you know that the minutes from December's council meeting were already posted, and they are there. I've seen the comments now talking about the wiki issue and the problems for access, so that is something that we've been experienced, but that is there already.

Good. I think we can move to the consent agenda, which is also conducted by me, which is the confirmation of the Standing Selection Committee. I don't think we need to read any resolve process, so we can immediately move to vote, right?

TERRI AGNEW: You are correct, unless anyone has any comments before we do. All right, seeing no hands, shall we go ahead and move then to the vote?

NACHO AMADOZ: Yes, please.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect. I do note Paul and Sebastien have made it on the call, so welcome, everyone. All right, here we go. 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.

ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies please say aye, so prudence for Greg?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. With no abstention nor objection, the motion passes. Back over to you, Nacho.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much, Terri. Moving on to the next item, we are starting the discussions now, and this one here is about the Board Readiness Small Team and the update on the work they've been doing. Just to present the framework, and then Kurt will go into detail, this was something that we discussed in the last SPS.

The work started in August, I read, and I think that there have been conducted four interviews so far, and the mission of this effort is to help improve the creation of Policy Development. And when we say Board Readiness, we know what we're talking about, to avoid getting everyone involved and doing the work, and then getting this to the Board, and seeing that the Board may have some linguistic issues or some understanding of the context of the issues that could have been resolved beforehand, so therefore avoiding the trouble that we have to go through some of these clarifications. The presentation will be delivered by Kurt, so Kurt, whenever you are ready, just go ahead.

KURT PRITZ: Hi, Nacho, it's good to see you again, and I hope everybody's new year is off to a good start. Let me share my screen here. All right, so assuming you can see that, I think I can see any raised hands if there are questions, but if not, Nacho, just bring them to my attention.

So in the last update we covered these bullets, and in talking to the Board Readiness team, we decided maybe we should review some of these things again, because we have a new set of councilors, so everybody will be marching to the same team. So, we have a small, yet mighty team that's working on this project. The mission and scope is to perform a study that will inform the improvement of Policy Development Practices that will improve Board Readiness of GNSO Policy Recommendations, where Board Readiness is measured by the likelihood that GNSO policy recommendations will be readily adopted by the Board.

EN

So what Nacho just kind of said there, I'll pause for a second to make sure that's clear for everybody before going on. And the scheme is this, that we're going to work primarily through interviews with those that participated on the PDP teams, the Board liaisons, the Board members that considered their recommendations when delivered to them, and some staff members that substantively supported the discussion. So, how we set to work is we compiled and organized the set of recommendations that were rejected by the Board, and kind of looked at them and developed sets of questions for each one of those groups, and then conducted interviews, and interviews are taking anywhere from 45 minutes to an hour, generally.

And then in looking at the responses, and we, the team trades off, so somebody different conducts an interview each interview, and some unlucky team member is tasked with taking notes of the interview. And then the idea is to look across all the responses and identify causal relationships between gaps maybe in the process or information and the Board rejection of recommendations. And by identifying those relationships, we can identify possible improvements to close those gaps. And then we have a couple, we have several feedback loops in the scheme during it to try to test our thinking and our conclusions. So, that's a general scheme.

Some notes about the program are each interviewee receives an information packet that provides a brief introduction to the program, and then staff has created a brief historical summary of the PDP with links to key documents, a summary of the Board's reasoning for rejecting recommendations, and a list of questions

EN

that are going to be asked during the interview, so they have some time to consider them beforehand. Before the interviews start, the interviewees are advised that with their permission, the interviews are recorded, so our notes can be verified. But then we're going to destroy the recording. And that we provide a list of questions, but depending on the answers, we may go down some rabbit holes and ferret out some interesting things. I said rabbit and ferret in the same sentence.

Interviewees are afforded the opportunity to review and amend the meeting notes before the Board are written, so we make sure we have the intent of the interviewee correct. And like I said, there are several feedback loops along the way to verify findings and conclusions. So, we're off to a little bit of a slower start tonight than I hoped, and the intervening Istanbul meeting and holidays wreaked part of that havoc. But we're essentially done with the interviews on the PDP, that was the registration data phase one, and trying to draw some conclusions there.

We've sent invitations out for the registration data phase two EPDP and have some interviews scheduled, so we expect those to take place in the next couple weeks. We interview like five people, five participants, say, from each PDP so far, and that doesn't include the Board and the staff members. And the subsequent procedures PDP will be next. As you can imagine, the subsequent procedures PDP takes quite a bit of background work before we can launch the interviews because it was so extensive.

So, staff has been a great help in wading through that pile of stuff that resulted from that PDP. And just with the invitation set,

there's a footnote there that just before the holidays started, we received a communication from the Board that they were looking forward to participating individually as selected for this process. So, that was really heartening as I think that's a really important part of the process, and that their participation will be really meaningful, so we get opinions from both sides of the equation. And then as I pointed out earlier, after this work is done, we'll identify those causal relationships and hopefully make some recommendations.

So, we posted an aspirational schedule last time, and it's still aspirating, but just barely. And this has shifted out about a month. But I think it depends on the workload of the team and availability and the workload of the interviewees and their team. But I think it's best to try to get this over with in a hurry, especially for my sake. And then I thought it'd be fun to talk about substance and some of the conclusions that we might draw based on the interviews from EPDP. And they're not recommendations for changes, they're just findings that came out of this set of interviews. But the first is, and our first question is, were you surprised by the Board rejection of any of the recommendations? And everybody says yes, because up until the EPDP phase one, the Board really didn't reject recommendations before.

So, this is a somewhat novel occurrence. And so, it kind of tells us that, well, this is a timely study, then that this is kind of a new development. And so, this isn't a study that should have been done a long time ago, that it's sort of right on time. And my take is that there appears to be a great deal of respect for the Board's opinion. So, over the history of ICANN, there's been good and

bad relationships between the Board and community, but it seems to be in a good state right now, especially look at the work Paul McGrady and his team did on solving the disagreement between the Board and the PDP conclusions. And so, there's a great willingness to find compromises between the Board and community. So, I think that's going to help this effort.

The PDP teams who have had, well, the one anyway that had some of its recommendations rejected, didn't take the rejections negatively, but rather as an opportunity to learn. There's a good deal of discussion in the interviews about availability of appropriate expertise. And one point that's made is the availability of expertise to the teams and the Board should be normalized, meaning the same. And there's some wondering whether the opinions the Board gets from its experts is different from the opinions the PDP teams might be getting.

So, we have to look into that. But as far as the EPDP on registration data, the team itself feels like it became the GDPR experts over time, because a lot of study went into it. And another finding was that after some time of asking, independent legal expertise was made available and was found valuable. So, that's certainly a lesson that we already know. And we should compare that with other kinds of expertise that the panels or the EPDP teams request from time to time.

The Board liaison role is also sort of a novel thing developing over the past few years, especially an active Board liaison. And we found that interaction varied significantly among liaisons. And it's clearly an evolving role and therefore a timely topic. Interestingly, and I remember this implement, implementability was generally

EN

not a concern during the EPDP phase one discussions. I know it was for other EPDPs and PDPs, but we haven't got there yet. But certainly, we've learned from the IRTs subsequent to the PDP that going forward, teams should pay close attention to recommendation wording and have access to cost and other information. And we could talk about that for quite some time, but that gets us into the discussion of ODPs and when they take place and such. And we think we're going to learn a lot about that in the subsequent interviews.

And finally, this PDP, the one that was studied was the first representative model. And the takeaway from the team members was it helped the team arrive at conclusions more quickly and facilitated compromise by costs. As we learned from mediation experts that helped this EPDP, Smaller Teams somehow work better together and there's a willingness to compromise more. And so, that was interesting. I'll pause for a second because this team we had had a discussion on this just last night, my time. And I tried to incorporate the thoughts that came out there, but I just want to pause and see if the team has anything to add at all about this, what's been said here. I can't see chat. So, I guess I can click on this.

NACHO AMADOZ: I will go to the chat exchanges now if no one else from the team has any addition to what Kurt said. There's been a couple of exchanges in the chat room. Kurt, there was one question from Farzaneh that Jen replied to, and we didn't want to interrupt your presentation. The first one was as to how the selection of the interviews was conducted. And Jen, I don't want to put words in

your mouth, but you said that we looked at the participants of the PDPs and discussed within the Small Team who we thought could represent a good balance and Small Team members who were part of the PDP also bind and gave context. So, it is not a random selection.

And talking about what a good balance could mean, Farzaneh and then said that they want equal representation in these groups. Now I have not been that much present in the group, but I don't think this is a problem of balance because you're not getting the views from one side of the argument and another, you're trying to identify how the group conducted its work and how this could be improved to help this Board Readiness stay right. Farzaneh, please go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: Hi, Farzaneh Badiei speaking. So, my point is that because like NCSG, so one of our representatives to EPDP might not be available or they might miss the meeting. So, it is better to consider two or three representatives, like as many as you also like interview the CSG. And it's not a competition, but this has been a consistent problem in other groups, in other Policy Development Groups, that like we are trying to kind of like bring forward that balance that like there has to be equal representation of stakeholder groups.

So if CSG has three members that are being interviewed, NCSG should have three members to be asked to be interviewed as well. So, that if one of them, like not only for equal representation, if they are absent or like somebody else can pick up the ball. And

EN

yes, I know, I understand that this is a very collegial and not like in representing their interests. But I believe that for the sake of like providing NCSG insights, there should be an effort be made that more than like one representative be reached out to. And yeah, sorry, I'm probably adding to your work, but I just wanted to make sure that we are invited to provide that input. Thank you.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Farzaneh.

KURT PRITZ: Yeah, Farzaneh, thanks. And Jennifer, jump in here too. But yeah, so we aspire to take a member from all groups. And so, if somebody from a group can't make it, then we'll invite somebody else from that stakeholder group or constituency. So, we can kind of change as we go, right? So, the test is kind of we interview people and we look at the answers and consistency across answers. And by looking at those answers, we don't have a complete picture because there's a divergence in perception about what happened or something like that, then we can conduct additional interviews.

So, like in the PDP phase one we do have one more interview to go, but we're looking across and we're seeing people came away from that with the same perception and the results are consistent then, or the answers are consistent and the points are consistent. Then we feel we have an accurate picture of what people's feelings are. But if that's not the case, then we can go ahead and

schedule additional interviews to try to get to the bottom of that, or even go back to the original interviewee.

So, there's not a rigidity to this, but rather we can modify the approach as we go to make sure we have a complete picture. But when you ask the question what is a good balance? We just aspire to in the menu of things, pick one from each list.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you for that. There was another exchange if we are done with this one, and I think that Farzaneh, you are satisfied with the answer because you said, thank you in the chat room, about the role of ICANN Legal here, if they should be factoring, that was posted by Lawrence, in the interview mix as their advice impacts the Board decision largely. I would like to see that one. I would like to see an ICANN Legal interview, but I just didn't know that, I think it is very on point, which is that ICANN Legal isn't a member, so they won't be interviewed. Lawrence, please go ahead.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE: Thank you, Nacho, and happy New Year, everyone. Nice hearing your voice again, Kurtis. So, in my personal opinion, I feel that the advice the Board receives from ICANN Legal to a very large extent influences some of what we call surprises that we get in terms of the Board's decision. And it will be, while I understand that from what Justine posed that because ICANN Legal isn't a participatory entity in the PDPs, it's not one of those that we're looking to interview on the staff side, which is a valid excuse. But because of the influence that I feel they have around this subject

matter, and we are going to cut off the surprises we get in terms of Board Readiness.

We might have to explore some kind of mechanism that can also get us understanding what we need to do in order not to have those surprises coming from the Board side. So, I basically feel that we need to hear and also factor the views of ICANN Legal in terms of Board Readiness and find out such recommendation, whatever the findings are, I believe will be very useful to getting us prepared to ensure that we don't have such surprises coming from the Board side.

KURT PRITZ: Thomas, were you going to answer that question? Is that why you have your hand up?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, if I may, I just wanted to add that these are good thoughts. And whilst ICANN Legal is not a member of the group, their input is certainly very welcome. I guess the point that we're making is somewhat more nuanced. It's one thing to have a person from ICANN Legal in the room chiming in with the view of the organization or also help the community understand what legal issues are, the answers to legal questions. But as you know, there's this saying, I'm not sure whether this translates well, but in German, you say you have two lawyers and three opinions. So, you might not always get the same answer if you ask different legal experts.

EN

And what we have been witnessing in different working groups and projects, including the CCWG-ACCT, like almost 10 years or 10 years back, is that the community had attorneys that ICANN paid for. They advised the community/ the working groups. And then ICANN Org had their own law firm providing legal advice to the Org. And whilst the questions asked to the legal advisors of the community were framed more in a sense like, is what we are planning to do compliant with applicable laws? Can we make it work?

Certainly, the interest of ICANN Legal, and ICANN Legal should speak to that if they see this differently, is to protect the interests of the organization to help the Board understand whether their fiduciary duties might be at stake if certain things are done one way or the other. And so, we have a clash of interests where we have competing legal interests, legal opinions, the legal opinion that the community gets and the legal opinion that the Org gets. And that does not only increase the costs involved, but also it is a recipe for disaster if you have a fight of legal experts basically.

And I'm not sure how exactly that can be mitigated and under no circumstances do I want my comment to be understood as criticism. I think it's quite natural for these two positions to be different, but if they could be reconciled one way or the other, I think that would help expedite the processes and reduce the risk of friction at a late stage in the process.

KURT PRITZ: Yeah, I think those are really good points, Thomas. And the thing I would add to that for Lawrence is some of the questions for

Board members that we haven't been able to interview yet but are going to soon would be, what will be what are your sources of information and how did you base your decisions? So, the place to ask the questions that you posed, I think, are to the Board members who are the receptors of information rather than legal.

So, I don't know if we're going to get to the answers that we all want, but it will be interesting and that's where we'll take that step. But I do admire Thomas's opinion about the number of opinions that are out there. I think there was one more about the, how do we make the aspirational schedule happen? And I think, I'm not sure. My experience with everything in life is the first interviews and starting up take most of the time. And then once you get into a rhythm of interviewing and compiling notes and sending them out, that will go faster. So, the way Vivek, was your question, the way to make the aspirational schedule really happen, I think, is to get into our operational rhythm a little better. In addition to what was said in the chat by Justine. Go ahead, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Yeah, good. In my experience, I think resources is most of the time bottlenecks in any process. And while I understand the availability of interviewees might be a challenge, but if you believe that having more people participate in this thing, conducting Interviews in parallel or being available in time zones, where it's more convenient for the person that you're trying to interview will help, then maybe open this up for more volunteers and get more people and work in parallel, would be a solution.

EN

KURT PRITZ: Okay, great. Yeah, we'll talk about that at our next meeting. Thanks for that. I don't know if I'll call it an offer or suggestion, but thank you very much. I thought I was off the hook. Go ahead.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thank you so much for the presentation. Just wanted to understand, because I put it on the chat, the kind of method that the team wants to use to analyze the data. I just wanted to understand the procedure aspect, because that helps you understand the objective of where we want to arrive. Are you analyzing our participant or interviewee? Are you waiting to finish the interview and analyze the transcript or the observation and the note-taking? In that case, what are the methods that we want to use to analyze them? I just wanted to understand the process.

KURT PRITZ: Yeah, so you're correctly describing a process that is well-defined, and I'm not sure we have that. So, we conduct the interviews. During the interviews, any of the team members can jump in with a question that's triggered by the answer. So to a certain extent, the interviews are scripted and to a certain extent, they're ad hoc. So, we can dig into interesting points that have come up. But then we have notes from the interviews.

So when we take notes, we have a transcript, but we take notes from the interviews. And staff has created a document for us that has each question and the interviewee and their answer, his or her answer to that question. And then the process is pretty much stare at those answers. And since the interviewees were in recent

memory, sit down and talk about what we think the points that came out of it are.

So, I think the process will become more formal as we do this for a couple PDPs, but we're letting the results of the interviews tell us what we should dig into and what the issues might be, rather than put them through a pre-designed machine and have the answer pop out. I think necessarily ad hoc from that point of view. I don't know if anybody else on the team has a better answer than mine.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah. Before anyone jumps in, I understand the process. The process is well defined. You've selected a method for data collection, which is to interview, collect the information, but there is a particular problem statement that we're trying to find, we want to arrive at. So, we need to be able to define that process in such a way that we ask the same questions and we don't deviate from that when we're interviewing the samples that you've selected so that we can arrive at, to understand the problems that we're trying to address.

Then I'm sort of asking, after the data collection, how do we analyze this data so that we can arrive at, or understand the problems that we want to solve when we're talking about Board Readiness? Because when I say Board Readiness is vague, so what I would try to look at, because anyone can give us any answer when you're interviewing. I know that there are questions that can guide the team, but we need to be able to do it in such a way that we get answer and responses to be able to address the

KURT PRITZ: So I think that we designed the questions, we started with a blank sheet of paper and designed the questions we thought, given our experience would ferret out the sorts of issues. The questions are intended to allow the interviewees to identify interviews or shortcomings or gaps in the process. We don't want to point the interviewees in any direction, but there has to be some sort of framework. So, one question is, were you surprised by the rejection leading to whether you are or you aren't, that points to a subsequent set of questions as to why. And did you have appropriate resources and did you consider implementation problems?

And did you get the right kind of advice that you needed? And each question is intended to see if there are or are not gaps or shortcomings in our process that we could identify and then cure. And even talking about the process subsequent to the rejection, what sort of communications could we bring forward into the process? So, we had to make some assumptions about the types of issues that would be raised. So, we did that at the outset with the questions and then we're at the other end where we know specifically what recommendations were rejected.

And so, the answers are kind of the string between those two things, but I'm kind of stuck here, but we don't know what those strings are until we do the interviews. So, I don't know, I think we're a little bit short of the structure you kind of agree, but the

EN

kind of structure you might be looking for, but maybe Prudence can do a briefer and better job of answering your question than me.

NACHO AMADOZ: Sorry to jump the queue. Sorry to interrupt you. We need to start wrapping this up. Prudence, you can go ahead, but just to let you know that we need to finish this in a couple of minutes in order to move on.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Not a problem. Challenge accepted. Let's go. Peter, I just wanted to preface this with, I love your question. Same with you Farzi. I love how your minds are thinking about how we analyze it. So, I just wanted to add, just add a little bit to what has been wonderfully explained so far. A lot of this is really flexible and has been mentioned in the chat as well.

We have a set of questions that try to address the concept of Board Readiness and they're asked over and over again, equally to each person, but there's flexibility as to how they choose to respond and scope to allow them to explore specific things that they thought, because here's the thing, everyone individually has their own opinions or they thought the issues were relating to what the Board's kind of projection was and why and what happened and what led to that point and how things can be improved moving forward and access to facilities.

So, there are very explicit questions. I just want to talk to Peter's point about how we collect the responses. So, we record each

EN

interview. Each interview is recorded. We preface that by letting the interviewee know that it's recorded. In conjunction to that, there's contemporaneous note-taking at the same time. So, then we combine both the recording and the contemporaneous notes together to get an objective view as to how the questions were answered. And then we also, because we have the list of questions, when people decide to kind of add a bit of color, go into different directions or different trajectories, which is a natural thing with an interview, we're able to come back on track and make sure that all of the questions are addressed in due course or due concern.

And then what we do is we have a look at the recording, then have a look at the notes that were taken and then come up with like a compiled list as to what the responses are. So, it's a rough thing. It's not an exact science, but it kind of deals with the overarching concepts and questions that we have and the responses to address what we need to improve the process and giving the interviewee the ability to address what they think should have been happened or should have happened to make the Board be able to be able to be ready to actually accept what was put to them and improve the process in the future, if that makes sense. Was that fast enough, Nacho?

NACHO AMADOZ: Are you taking this? It was fast enough for me and we need you to be super quick and it's as you wrote, so please go ahead and finish this.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: So, it's Anne and I will be very quick. Something that concerns me a little bit is that we seem to be equating Board Readiness of a recommendation with the Board actually accepting the exact recommendation that moves forward. I think there should be a bit of a question about that because it is the multi-stakeholder model and that there is in fact the possibility that the community would put forward a recommendation that the Board would reject but that the community would see as improper rejection.

So, yes, we do want to cooperate and collaborate but I think in the interview process it would be good to know those who might have been extensively involved where they think that, wow, that recommendation should not have been rejected and in fact it was Board ready. Thank you.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thomas, 10 seconds.

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, and you're making an excellent point and certainly this is not to do what we can as a community to please the Board, right, but it's better to know than to not know what the obstacles might be. We've been discussing yesterday that there are situations or there have been situations in which there was gag advice, right, but still the community proceeded to do what the community thought to be the right thing and then gag advice is directed at the Board and not at the community.

So, we do have this in mind and we do appreciate that we need to do what we can and if there's conflict between what the Board has

to do or what the GAC has to do then there are processes for that but what we are interested in avoiding things that can be avoided and that should be avoided just because we didn't know certain parameters that we otherwise could have known if only the processes were better thought out and organized.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you for that and we are really sorry to cut this short because we think this is a topic that is creating a good discussion. We will be getting back to this. Thank you to Kurt and all the active members. I'm counting myself as a passive member but thank you to all the active members of the group and as David suggested that Kurt noted if somebody else wants to collaborate so that we can go ahead and have more people for the interviews, that would be great because I think they are putting a lot of time into this and this is a really worthy effort. Okay, moving on, moving along. Next one was the DNS Abuse mitigation so that's off the agenda.

Now, we are getting to the urgent requests and trilateral meeting preparation. So, a brief recap on this that I needed to do to get my mind back to life after the Christmas break. So, we had a discussion in our call in December that was preceded by our meeting prior to Istanbul with the three parts of the trilateral meeting, the GAC, the Board and the DNS. So, two days ago there was a letter that Caitlin and staff are preparing and presented to the list and there were some comments by Anne on the mailing list and some comments in the document by Farzi and I think there were a couple more.

EN

So, I see the document now being presented. Good, thank you. So, one of the discussions was, how to stress to the whole community because this letter is going to be received and addressed to somebody specific but this is going to be what frames the discussion. If we were to stress the questions that we were discussing I think it's a good idea. Caitlin, please go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Nacho. This is Caitlin from ICANN Org for the transcript. I just wanted to note that for those of you who may not have clicked on this letter recently, there have been a couple of updates as Nacho mentioned and provided some suggestions. Also, Jen and Farzi had some comments in the document and I believe Manju as well. So, what support staff went in and did is in editing mode you'll see that some of the objectionable text or text that people thought maybe could have been worded differently has been crossed off, and if you scroll down, you'll see some yellow highlighted text.

There was one sentence that support staff added to this paragraph right here with respect to the council talked about last time that additional policy work clarifying that this could happen at the IRT, but adding some context about how that would be within the bylaws or just clarifying how that would happen for the sake of informing the GAC or clarity and then when you scroll down a little bit more if you could, Saewon. Thank you.

There's some text that's crossed off above that I think Jennifer said we should probably just remove that and Farzi agreed and then an added section at the end which is the text that Anna

suggested which we highlighted in yellow also to note that this is new from the original draft that was circulated. So, just wanted to give a quick overview of the comments and see if anybody had anything else they wanted to discuss before this letter is sent. Thank you.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much, Caitlin. This letter is going to be sent before our next meeting which is supposed to be scheduled in February. And apart from the questions themselves, if I remember correctly, we also had the discussion for sure in the conversation with the Board and the GAC and I think that we probably went through that also in our council meeting, is that whether this was implementation, whether this was additional work policy and whether they the work with authentication and the work to decide what is the road to take on this one, could go in parallel.

So, the questions, other specific questions are substantive questions but we should also maybe go into what is our take here if this is additional policy. I think that with the conclusions that we had in our call and maybe this is old news already sorry for that if that's the case but the conclusion that we had in our call in the trilateral calls was is this presentation is this policy or should we find a new way a different way to tackle this issue and to start working on this. And I guess that is also something that we should consider when we go into the February call. What is the position that we should take here if we think that we have to inform the two other entities of our position.

I see no hands raised I was not anticipating this why would this be anything other than implementation? I don't know but I don't know if this was already completely covered by the Policy Work and therefore, we can consider this as implementation. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thanks. I may be wrong here but I don't think any of us, well, I think currently at least the view is that this is implementation.   I mean, there is a recommendation which addressed this and it was dealt with in the IRT. Or be it that we then reached a kind of stalemate point, but I think it's worth making this point to the GAC, because certainly, when they've been talking to us, they've used the words more policy work and giving this to the IRT sort of interchangeably. So, I think it's good to you know to put something down that makes that very clear, because I think they sometimes use the reference to policy quite interchangeably with a reference to implementation work.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Susan, and thank you, Anna. I see no other views right this seems to be clear sorry it was not clear to me personally, but now I understand it better. So, we just keep the text as it is now. There seems to be no other concerns or additions to be added to the document and we can go into the February meeting having in mind that this is the text that we are going to be providing to the GAC and to all those participating in that call.

Okay, good then. So, we are in agreement to send that communication as it is now good. All right, let me get back to the agenda because we're skipping that one too and I think this one is in Tomslin and I guess I'm going to use the five minutes break for myself to check on the kids because I have seen movement around the house. Sorry, about that. I'll be back in a minute.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Nacho. Good luck. So, we'll jump into the review of the project list and the ADR and this came about from an SPS action prior to I think ICANN79, that council should prepare for a careful review of what captured on the project management tool that will be concluded or initiated prior to the next AGM. And at ICANN79 we actually did review these four letters through the first one and the intention was to review this once every year in detail and so, leadership discuss doing this now. So, the new councilors have an understanding and returning councilors have a refresh on how our portfolio of work looks like going into the SPS and with the understanding that we'll use the valuable face-to-face time at the SPS to discuss prioritization.

So, for new councilors and also a reminder to returning councilors that the portfolio management tool is designed to show councilors in addition to the full GNSO, everything that touches the GNSO, either because the GNSO is required to or decide to initiate work. And just for the record, no councilor is expected to review this document in detail. However, support staff uses the tool to create the action decision rather for GNSO council.

EN

And the project management tool, sorry, the project list itself shows a holistic overview of all projects at the council level. It looks at the different stages of the PDP process. So, when we look at it, you will see that the projects on the list are grouped into issues at the scoping level, at the initiated level, and ones that are active PDPs and those that are waiting for Board voting and those that are in implementation.

So, the project list is provided on a monthly basis and focuses on changes during that month. That's why you'll see absent prior to every council meeting as well. And it covers what is currently being worked on, what is planned and what is completed during that period. And also seeks to identify risks and mitigations. So, it's a really good one to have a look at every month as project PDP managers rather. So, we'll go over the projects in the project list with an eye toward the projects in the council's court or where the council is the next decision point.

So if we can move to slide five. So the first one is grouped under the issues. Items that are under the issues. The first one here is rather was under the scoping. And the first item here is that we currently have just one project on the scoping. And as background for new councilors, the councilor finds a Small Team to scope the issue of data accuracy. And the scoping team submitted a write-up of some of its work, but ran into issues, some issues and questions with respect to bulk access to data, without which it was difficult to answer some of the questions. So, the work was put on hold pending further information from ICANN Org and data processing agreements.

EN

ICANN Org provided information on what would be feasible and based on that response, the council recently worked on framing questions, which have been sent to all participating groups for response by the end of January. We currently awaiting feedback. And once that is received, the council will determine next steps for how to make progress on this accuracy scoping team. So, that's the only one under the scoping phase.

Moving on, we look at the ones that are under initiation. The first year is the ICANN procedure for handling who is conflict with privacy law implementation advisory group. And this group was tasked to provide the GNSO of council with recommendations on how to address the comment and input that has been received in response to the Public Comment forum on the revised ICANN procedure for handling who is conflict with privacy law. Now this was last discussed in 2020, I believe.

So, it might not be in the memory of most council members, but the group was put on hold pending a data processing agreement between Org and registries and registrars. And this dependency is now completed. So, the council should consider returning to the discussion of this at a future meeting, whether there is a problem with the existing procedure in 2025. And if so, focusing on how best to address that. Under the working groups, so these are active PDPs, our most recent one, which the councilors should pay attention to, well, not pay attention to only this one, but pay attention to all the active ones in particular.

The most recent one is the Diacritics and Latin Scripts of IDNs. And there has been just recently initiated, there is an open call for volunteers. And each year, the group has not yet began meeting

and it is in its early stages. The working group will be responsible for developing a project plan. And we as council will review and approve that plan. The goal is to have the Board approve a vote, sorry, not approve, but vote on this by April this year.

The next one is the PDP on Transfer Policy Review. This working group has been meeting for approximately three and a half years and published its second initial report that covered all charter questions in August, 2024. And under its project plan, the working group is scheduled to deliver its final report in early February. So, we should be expecting this to come soon. This is a representative group, so your representatives should have shared the proposed final policy recommendations with you for final input. Our council liaison to this group is Osvaldo and we have a newly appointed Board liaison, Alan Bard, to the group.

Now we'll move to the ones that are under Board vote. The first day is the EPDP on IDN Phase 2. The final report was recently approved by the GNSO Council and the final report is out for Board Public Comment. There is nothing for the council to do on this one at this time. When this goes to implementation, we will appoint a council liaison. The next is the SSAD. And for this, the Phase 2 final report was approved by the council and due to concerns about financial sustainability, the Board requested the first operational design phase, which led to a Pilot called Registration Data Request Service and has been operating since November, 2023.

The council did charter a Standing Committee to review metrics coming from the RDRS and make recommendations on how to proceed with the SSAD recommendations themselves. And the

standing committee is currently working on a report to the council. And when we receive that, likely in the coming months, the council can determine how to approach the conversation with the Board about how to proceed with the SSAD recommendations. These recommendations are still pending Board action and so they haven't been accepted nor rejected yet.

The next is the protection of IGOs in all gTLDs. And this working group was passed to provide the GNSO council with policy recommendations as to whether there is a need for special protections at the top and second level in all gTLDs for the names and acronyms of international governmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations. This group, we've included this under the Board vote and implementation because there are still a subset of recommendations sitting with the Board while others are in implementation phase.

Those sitting with the Board, I believe, the Board hasn't made a decision because of some inconsistencies with GAC advice. These pending recommendations, as well as the implementation of Board adoption, adopted curatorial recommendations being managed under, we group them as IGOs and INGOs. Yes, we're still talking about them Farzi.

ICANN Org provided a current estimate, an estimated timeline for completing the implementation of the GNSO's policy recommendations on IGO curatorial rights. And to the completion of the development work on a permanent notification system for IGOs and the necessary updating of the current IGO contact list for the system and three other work necessary to achieve an

orderly release of the temporarily reserved IGO acronyms. The timeframe for this is estimated at June, 2026.

Moving to those under implementation, IGOs and INGOs, like I mentioned, appear in both groups. So, we've discussed where that is already. The next is the SubPro group of work, which is progressing well according to the schedule. We have two council liaisons, Anne and Susan, to this. In general, the work, like I mentioned, is progressing well. There is a Public Comment period open on the Application Guidebook Language. However, we recently discussed one, I think we also discussed this in the last meeting, a potential roadblock, which was the treatment of a single character hand script gTLDs.

We'll need to agree on an approach for this specific issue as with why implementation effort, sorry, as with any implementation effort, we need to prepare in the event another issue comes up. I see Anne's hand already. So, if there's any other thing you'd like to highlight, please go ahead, Anne or Susan.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yeah, thanks. It's Anne. Thank you, Tomslin. I'm not sure that I would call that hand script question a potential roadblock. I don't think really there's anyone who thinks that this issue should hold up the next round. And so, I'm a little bit reluctant, I don't know what Susan thinks, to identify this as a roadblock. I see it in terms of the timing as something that's more similar with the Latin diacritics, for example. We haven't figured out quite yet how we do want to handle this, but I'd say it's maybe a bit of a separate task and not a roadblock. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks for that clarification, Anne. So, I guess we'll reclassify that then, not as a roadblock, but as a potential additional work that needs to be done on this. Jennifer?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Tom. Jen, for the record. I finally found the hand up button. It's related to this, and I know the last call we had the action to have a small group of councilor's scope what we could do. So, looking forward to having that started. That's all I wanted to add.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks. Yes, I'm aware some background work is being done on that to provide some additional comparison between the two possible ways to go about this from our last conversation. So, we should see some information coming on that. All right. I see Farzi has a question on whether that's the last remaining issue to be addressed. Did you want to quickly answer that, Anne or Susan, before we move on?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Well, I think, again, it's Anne, and I think otherwise SubPro is proceeding apace, and the staff is keeping us on schedule with various sections. There was a very specific section on name collisions yesterday, and we have a session coming up tomorrow on registry volunteer commitments. So I think, I'm not sure if I understand the question, Farzi, other than that, I think that the

EN

timing is still on target for the IRT work. And I don't know if Susan has additional comments.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Susan, any, before we move to Farzi?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yes, sorry. I have a, so I kind of, I'm a new to the council. You should not forget that. So, basically, what I'm asking is that, now I understood that the IRT is happening in parallel while we are sorting out this single character Han script question.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Anne?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Yes, and I think it's pretty well understood, Farzi, that even if the Han character issue isn't resolved in accordance with the planned timing for the next round, that that would not hold up the next round. And the same is true for Latin Diacritics, where that's actually policy work. So, there's nothing about, as far as we know, there's nothing about the Han single character issue that's going to affect the timeline for the IRT work for the next round at this stage.

I mean, if it all gets resolved very quickly one way or the other, either it's just killed because it's not possible to implement, that's one thing. But if there is a method for developing a way to reduce risk of confusion that has been raised by multiple native Chinese,

Han Chinese speakers and readers, then that that would require expert advice. And that would proceed in a manner that would not hold up the rest of the implementation of the Next Round.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks for that clarification, Anne. And all right, seeing no hands on this, I'll move on to the next item under implementation, which is the EPDP on Temp Spec Registration Data phase one. And on this, the registration data policy was published with an effective date of August this year, 2025. Thomas is our council liaison for this group. There are a few outstanding issues that are on council's radar. The first being the urgent request from REC 18, which we've discussed a little bit earlier. And we'll also be discussing the upcoming trilateral meeting.

And the second is the billing contact data, which we'll be discussing at our February meeting. Next is the EPDP on Temp Spec reg data phase 2a. This work deals with legal versus natural persons and the anonymization of unique contacts. The next step for ICANN Org is to produce a project charter and send out a call for volunteers for an IRT. I think council will need to appoint a liaison to this group when this work begins.

The next is RPM's phase one. This implementation is progressing according to schedule. Susan is our liaison for this work. I don't know whether Susan has anything to, that we should be aware of.

SUSAN PAYNE: Hi, it's Susan here. Yes, so there is a potential issue which may come back to council. The slight difficulty we've been having is

getting sort of a meeting scheduled of that RPM's group at a time in which to finalize the discussion on this. We're due to have a discussion shortly, but it hasn't aligned yet with a council meeting. But the issue is around the extent to which a claimant might be able to amend their URS complaint once they have been provided with registration data information regarding the actual registrant. And there's, I would say, there appears to be a difference of opinion on the extent to which amendments can be made.

There is a recommendation allowing for amendments, but some members of the RPM IRT have differing views as to what that permits. So, we're not quite at the point of bringing it back, but I'm flagging. I think probably by the next meeting, I think, I hope we would have managed to have finished that discussion in the RPM's working group and reached a point of either having reached agreement or knowing that we need to bring something back to council.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks for that, Susan. And I think further to your point, that updates where we are sort of in that group. I suppose up to this point, we understood that they're progressing according to the schedule and there could be a potential issue that's raised with us. That's probably where we are at. And if council will have to address it.

All right. Moving on to the next one, which is the PPSAI. This group was paused when EPDP phase one registration data began. And we started its work during, again, during ICANN IRT. Paul is our liaison for this group. ICANN is currently reviewing the

recommendations with the IRT and the IRT's flagging implementation related concerns. The IRT is also discussing if any of these concerns or questions should be sent to the council for further guidance. So, I think that is where we are at. I don't know whether Paul has any most recent update different from this.

PAUL MCGRADY: Hey, Tom. Nothing more other than a little bit of specifics where we have been encouraging the IRT members to when they put together thoughts about what needs to come back to council, those are related to situations where new laws have come into being since the recommendations were originally passed or new technology that might affect the recommendations or internal ICANN policies rather than seeing an opportunity to relitigate past defeats.

And so, we started to talk very generally about, well, this was a bad idea in the first place, and I did my best to nip that in the bud, and I think staff is on Board with that nipping. And I made it pretty clear to the IRT that if they put together a list of relitigation, I will present it as such to the council and help the council glean through what we really need to work at and what are just people who are unhappy with the outcomes from the initial recommendations. But I think people got it, and I think people are working in good faith, and so I don't expect any problems. But one never knows. This is one of these lightning rod issues. So, we will see. But no alarms at this point. Just checkered flags. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Paul, for the reassurance. Vivek, I see your hand is up.

VIVEK GOYAL: Yeah. Thank you, Tomslin. Quick process question. So, the traffic light in front of PATH is yellow. I assume that's on purpose to show that there is some challenge with this. So, it says that the ICANN Org is reviewing. Do we have a timeline on when the ICANN Org will get back to us? So, if we do have timeline, then it should not be a problem. If we don't have a timeline, then it's a big problem. So, I just want to understand the process here.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Paul, do you want to take that? We're getting the timeline.

PAUL MCGRADY: Sure. So, Vivek, the bottom line is at 12:28 a.m. with no notice. I do not have the specific time frame. There is a time frame. There is a work plan. When it says ICANN Org is to review the PPSAI recommendations and present potential updated PATH to council, I think that is probably overstating ICANN Org's role and the IRT members are involved in that process. And so, that PATH description is essentially a lightweight way of saying what I previously said about the focus of the things that are being looked at and the next steps. In terms of the actual dates for deliverables, I just don't have them in front of me. But, yes, they are working on a plan and it's rational and it's on track. Thanks.

EN

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Paul. And we don't have it yet provided to us, Vivek, and that's why it's NA on the time frame. All right. Moving to the next one on the implementation. That's the Translation and Transliteration. On this, now that it was on hold and now that the registration data policy is published, ICANN Org is reviewing how RDAP implementation affects the recommendations of this Policy. Council will appoint a liaison when the implementation work starts. We do not have a time frame yet from ICANN as to when this will start. But once that is provided, the project list will be updated.

All right. Moving on to, so, that's it for the walk-in groups. Let's look at what the standing committees are doing on the projects that are coming up. For the standing selection committee, the SSC starts with reviewing, evaluating and ultimately selecting candidates. So, you will see in the action decision radar a couple of tasks grouped under different time periods in the year that the SSC will be working on. I am currently following the work of the SSC from the council. So, if there are any updates I'll be reporting back to you on those.

The next group is the newly created Standing Committee for Council Improvement. Which is charged with overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement Focusing on GNSO Structural Procedural and Process Improvement to the PDP. There is currently a call out for volunteers to this group. It will be a representative group. We plan to discuss this in much greater detail during the SPS as well. Including the overall topic of Continuous Improvement.

Now, we move on to the action decision radar that concluded the project list. And here like I mentioned earlier, this group's actions

EN

into time periods of the year. And the ADR itself is designed to show the council what is potentially on the horizon in the next 12 months. And it is important to note that if something appears on the ADR it does not necessarily mean that it will equate to a project. It means a decision needs to be made by the council. Which could mean initiating a project or deferring the work or declining the work all together. But it does provide the councilors as a window into potential upcoming work where they can flag to their SGs and Cs that more volunteers may be needed.

So, we won't go through each item individually on the list. Rather we'll focus on those that are really critical in each time frame for us to keep an eye on. So, for the one-month time frame, one that we should I like to mention is the Policy and Implementation Policy Status Report which we are expecting as council. And it's a topic scheduled to be discussed during our February council meeting. Once we have that discussion we'll need to determine how to proceed or address the recommendations in the PSR.

In the one-to-three-month timeline, two items I like to highlight. One being the council needing to consider the transfer Policy Review Working Group's Final Report as we saw in the project list earlier. That is coming. And then the council will need to deliberate on how to make progress on data accuracy after receiving responses from SGs and Cs. In the three-to-six-month timeline the standing committee on continuous improvement will need to start its work and we'll probably be discussing that much more in that period as well.

The council will also need to use the standing selection committee to select candidates for ATRT4 if the work begins in April 2024.

And in the six-to-12-month timeline we'll potentially receive the Policy Status Report on Expiration Policies and council will need to make a decision whether to initiate work on that topic or those topics. And also, the GNSO Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team, SPIRT will need to consider activating that, which is in relation to the SubPro as well.

So, that's it for the ADR. I'll pause to see if there are any comments or questions before we move on to the next item on the agenda. Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Thanks, Tomslin. It's Anne. And the question really relates to our SPS meeting next week because it strikes me that the Policy and Implementation Policy Status Report and the final version of that is very--

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Did we lose Anne?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes, we did. It looks like she dropped. We'll wait for her to rejoin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah, I think in the absence of any other comment or question or I see Jennifer's hand up.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sorry, Tomslin this is Jen for the record. A question about the cadence of these updates. I know last SPS we had a discussion of having this before every ICANN meeting. I don't know if that's too aspirational because we didn't manage to have that this year. So, I don't know what's feasible for us going forward but this is very useful and important for us to go through including places where if we need any discussion to move some of these items forward as well. So, just asking to see when we might have the next one or if we have some time carved out in the SPS to discuss things.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Jennifer. My understanding currently is that the cadence is once a year, but we certainly can take an action item to see if we can do that before every meeting if the council believes that's necessary and very helpful for us. So, we'll take an Action Item to discuss that cadence. Also, have that conversation in the SPS as well. I see Susan also supporting the fact that we should do it more frequently. We'll take it and shadow for it to be done more frequently than this so far. Thanks.

All right. I think Anne wasn't able to rejoin. So, I'll probably move to the next agenda item. I think that's any other business and we have a couple there. The first being an update from-- Terri, you've put on the chart update on planning and draft GNSO schedule but I believe we also had the genesis liaison to the ccNSO to update.

TERRI AGNEW: Correct. Desiree should go first.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, sure. Making sure. Desiree, if you're available, please go ahead.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Are we already at the AOB?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, we are.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you. So, this is an update on the ccNSO and the council work. The ccNSO council had a meeting, last meeting was in December last year and I just want to give you some insights of what's been discussed and what their plans are. We'll also forward the copy of the report that is being made. The chair Alejandra Reynoso will prepare the chair but the deadline for the report is today, so we have to wait a little bit for that.

TERRI AGNEW: So, it's Terri. It looks like Desiree has now dropped.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Wow. It has to do something to do with me.

TERRI AGNEW: I will ping her but should I go ahead and just move on to the ICANN82 Update on Planning and if she rejoins, we can circle back to her.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, please.

TERRI AGNEW: All right. Hi everyone. It's Terri. We're going to talk about the ICANN82 on Update on Planning and the draft GNSO schedule. Thank you, Saewon, for bringing the Draft Schedule up on screen. Meetings are being submitted right now into our system, so thank you everyone that we worked with.   We worked with council leadership, the GNSO team leads and the SGC support staff to get them all lined up. We want to set expectations early. So, with that in mind there will be one main GNSO room which is the large room for our meetings and then all of the other meetings requested as you can see there's several at one time slot. They're going to be in the smaller rooms.

We've also alerted your SGC support staff so they're aware as well but just know when you go into a room it's probably going to be small. So, there you go. Thank you very much. Susan is taking on the GNSO Team dinner and more details will follow closer to the meeting. No, a date has not been set yet. It's a work in progress all the way around. On Sunday we will have three GNSO working sessions.   You can see those in the green. Following the three GNSO working sessions on Sunday will be the joint GAC and GNSO session.

The GNSO informal meeting has been moved to Monday as requested from our last meeting so you'll see that on there as well. Also, the joint ICANN Board and GNSO council meeting is taking place on Monday. On Wednesday, we have our GNSO council meeting and on Thursday, we'll have the council wrap up. Nacho will be speaking with the NomCom during ICANN82 representing the GNSO council. So, thank you Nacho for doing that.

In addition, there are still a handful of GNSO funded travelers. You need to complete your funded travel booking. We've been in contact with you directly and please get this done ASAP as we're now a month past the deadline. As Greg had shared on the December meeting, this all starts affecting the budget so I just want to bring that back to the forefront. That's all I have for ICANN82. Does anyone have any questions before we move on to the SPS reminders?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Terri. I think looking at the schedule, we hope to make it as effective as possible so that we try to have those planning sessions before we have the bilaterals. I see Bruna's hand is up, so I'll probably move to her before you continue.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Bruna?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Tomslin and Terri. I was basically going to say the same thing Tomslin just said. Just a reminder to use the

planning sessions in order to prepare for the bilaterals and sort of like remedy the Istanbul meeting what happened in Istanbul. I just wanted to double check actually Terri when what's the slot for the informal session because the screen moved rather fast here for me. So, if you can just confirm it, I would appreciate it.

TERRI AGNEW: Sure, it is on Monday the 10th at the 1630 to 1730 slot. So, there, you'll see the green little spot. Also, their link was put into the Zoom chat if you click in the link for the ICANN82, you'll be able to enlarge what Saewon is showing on screen as well.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, I was just checking if we avoided the morning or not. Thanks a lot Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. We sure did, as requested. So, Tomslin, up to you. We do have Desiree back. Should we swing back to Desiree for her ccNSO update and then go on to SPS reminders?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, please. Let's do that.

TERRI AGNEW: All right. Desiree, you're back up.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you. So, where I started was that there were a lot of updates at the ccNSO council in terms of the vice chair and the councilors participating and they also had elections with regards to the liaisons within the ccNSO but all these details will be in report. So, for the interest of time, I'll keep this brief. There's also another election process being currently looked at and that's for the Board C12. The nomination process has been completed but now we have the ccNSO has two candidates Byron Holland and Nick Webner-Smith from CIRA and nominated UK.

They were nominated and they have both accepted their nomination. So, there will also be a questions and answers sessions with these candidates during the ICANN that already took place at the ICANN81, but there will be a virtual follow-up on the 4th of February at 140:0 UTC. So, the council has approved the resolution regarding these appointments and as well I think one of the activities that ccNSO has been doing for some time that we haven't followed as much is their DNS Abuse process.

There was a report on the standing committee on DNS Abuse and the recommendation is that the DASC should develop a more flexible description of DNS Abuse to improve greater clarity, improve stakeholder understanding. So, note it's not a definition, it's just a description. So, they are next steps include finalizing this Review Report and it should also be finalized by the 9th of January which is today and I'll be happy to share that as well.

Some other substantive matters and decisions that they took is that they will be looking at the next meeting at the IANA framework report and also looking at the root servers group work on the root server organization. The last thing I think that is

EN

maybe also interesting where we need to coordinate is the progress on the Pilot Holistic Review. I think there were some concerns mentioned and that is that the Continuous Improvement Framework has not yet been finalized yet the Continuous Improvement Process is still under Public Comment.

So, I think the suggestion was to the wait for the Continuous Improvement Framework to be finalized before launching into the Pilot Holistic Review. So, there is this disjoint between the current timelines that the latter one cannot start before the first one is completed. I think I'll keep it here very brief and if there are any questions, I'm happy to answer. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks Desiree. I don't see any questions. So, probably cycle back to you Terri, to take us through the SPS.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. I think there might be one question in chat before we do from Farzaneh. Desiree, when are they going to elect their Board member?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: So, that will happen I think before March and so the ccNSO members will cast a vote. I do not recall the exact date for the vote, but yes, it's happening next month. Also, the ccNSO has been growing and they have just welcomed the member from .bd, Bangladesh but also in the last year they welcome more members. So, I think that's another, I think worth mentioning as

well as they now have some IDN, more IDN ccNSO members only. If anyone's interested for the whole list also I can prepare that.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks Desiree. Now over to you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. Some SPS reminders. Hotel emails went out a while ago. Please reach out to me if you don't see yours. Lunch will be served both Tuesday and Wednesday. The temperature will be cold. Please see the email I sent to the SPS mailing list with additional information, including the weather link, the address, what to expect during the meeting. It has the agenda link in there. It was sent on the 13th of December but I think I'm going to send it out again after this meeting just so it's fresh in your emails.

We will have a welcome reception on Monday evening at the ICANN office for those who have already arrived. Again, that information is in that email I'm talking about. The council team building event will take place Tuesday just before lunch. I'll be sending an additional email to the SPS mailing list to share in advance what to expect for the council team building. There are a couple of video links in the email that our instructor had advised I share with you all. So, be looking for that email here shortly. Tuesday evening is our council dinner and an invite has gone out.

Please let me know ASAP if you're not able to attend as I need to adjust the numbers with the restaurant. We will walk to the

restaurant and it's about a five-minute walk so not too far. We did that on purpose and since it's January in Washington D.C., we took weather into account. Kurtis, ICANN's president and chief executive officer, will be joining us remotely on Wednesday afternoon. All of this is again listed on the agenda.

Unfortunately, we'll have three councilors who will not be able to attend in person, but we have sent them an email asking them to alert us what sessions they are able to join remotely. We look forward to spending a few days with you all in person and we're wishing you uneventful travels. With that, Tomslin, I'll turn it back over to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you so much, Terri, and I'm one of those who can't join in person but I'll join you for some sessions remotely. Moving on to the next item which are the Public Comments. I don't know if they're all listed there but there are a number of Public Comments that are currently opened where leadership thinks that council should consider whether us as a community body would like to submit a comment or not.

Now usually, we don't have to but on the lens that the council uses to look at these Public Comment proceedings is whether or not the council specifically has a comment to make and some things that the council usually considers for the benefit of new councilors, is whether the proceeding or parts of the proceeding are aligned with the remit of the council and whether the council specifically needs to respond outside and not in addition to the SGs and Cs.

The question to the council is, should the council submit comments on some of this, especially things like the ICANN FY26-20 Operating and Financial Plan, ICANN IANA FY26 Operational Plans and Budget. Both of these close on February 14th and then we also have the draft Pty FY26 Operating Plan and Budget and The IANA 2030 Strategy which closes on 29th January.

Another one that the council might want to consider is the Continuous Improvement Program Framework. Well, I think that one closes to 9th of January. Just being aware that not everyone is on 9th of might not be in 9th of January already, and the proposal updates to operating standards for specific reviews. So, those are some which we wanted to make sure that the council considers whether we should submit a comment as council separate from the SGs and Cs.

To the question from Vivek on chat, yes, the council has in the past submitted comments to some of these proceedings but not always. I'll leave that so that if councilors believe we need to or shouldn't, we can have those responses on the mailing list as well. We don't have to conclude that today. So, I'll move to the next item on the agenda with two minutes left. That's the IGF WSIS+20 Small Team.

During our last meeting father suggested the addition of a Small Team on IGF WSIS+20 and leadership took a note of this and believes we should discuss this more during our upcoming next week's SPS. Having said that, this same WSIS+20 was discussed at the previous SPS where it was generally agreed that the council's most important contribution to this issue is to demonstrate the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model

EN

which for the council meant effective management of the PDP. As such, the previous council determined it unnecessary to initiate a council specific effort or group on this topic. So, I see Farzi's hand up. I'll come to you for any comments.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you, Tomslin. I would like to do my best to change council's mind on this and we don't really care what sort of if it's formal, if it's informal, if it's a Small Team, if it's micro team, but it is not enough to just do our job. WSIS process needs to hear from us. We need to follow it and it has like time and time again people don't really know diplomats and people who actually come up with policies don't know what we are doing.

So, the least we can do is to informally contribute or observe what is going on and engage with these processes in order to make sure that they know that we are actually doing our job. So, I want to put that on the agenda again and we will be prepared to provide some rationale to the council. It's not going to be, and we will come up with a few action items, that is not going to be too heavy or anything that the council has to have a like a cohesive position on it. But it's going to be like very lightweight, but we believe that it's important to follow these processes as a general council. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Farzi, and hopefully this council can agree on or consider those next week. Quick one, Bruna, before we close.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Tomslin, and thanks for giving me the floor, even though we're over time. No, just to add a little bit to Farzi's point and perhaps to other councilors, I do think the scenario changed a little bit. And as opposed to last year when we thought that just giving the example would suffice, I think the GDC shows everyone that just keep things as they are. It really backfired and to some extent, a lot of the technical community trying to engage in the GDC process was sidetracked for a lot of different reasons, including the tech envoy. So, perhaps we can do a little bit more than that and we already have some ongoing efforts at ICANN, such as the working group for that and the mailing list for WSIS+20. And maybe the goal here is just to align all of those efforts with what's already in place. That's it. Thanks.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks so much, Bruna, for keeping it short. We certainly will look into it. With that, everyone, apologies for going two minutes over the time, but thanks so much for your contributions today and hope those still sleeping at night can have some more sleep or get up. So, thank you, everyone, and have a nice day, night.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Thank you very much, Nacho and Tomslin. We did it without Greg. Everyone, take care. I'll end the recordings and we'll see most of you next week. And again, those that are attending in person, we'll hopefully see you online. Take care. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]