
**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council**

Thursday, 11 December 2025 at 21:00 UTC

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

The audio is also available at:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/damSL6sbS_dsoCee4J65BOyK6eW-Uk0SHxdfDPJrqV1I3KdsdxMZzYh1qIBELcU8RruqcNPFU2a-JVZ0.VEg8Ck13hhBnPneg

Zoom Recording:

https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/7SiOpSbnKAYk4ne9atZS-Z-3csevl2Kf8nYox_TfcMmGbWa0VAu_KNDp6jS0PI-.RzK5lbpXIfORYHk?startTime=1765486877000

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:

<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – Non-Voting – Anne Aikman Scalese
Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, Prudence Malinki

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz (apologies, proxy to Samantha Demetriou),
Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Gaurav Vedi

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne, Susan Mohr (joined 30 minutes into call, proxy to Osvaldo Novoa)

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos (joined late - absent first vote), Julf Helsingius, Peter Akinremi, Tapani Tarvainen, Benjamin Akinmoyeje

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Christian Dawson

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests: none

ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management

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

Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO) (apology)

Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support

Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)

Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (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.

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 Analyst (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 the 11th of December, 2025. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it. Nacho Amadou sends in his apology and the proxy goes to Samantha Demetriou. 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: Most welcome. Samantha Demetriou.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Ashley Heineman.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Prudence Malinki.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Oh, wait.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, go ahead.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Can I just quickly interrupt?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes.

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Terri, Staff, fellow councilors, maybe all just very quickly wish Ashley Heineman a very happy birthday because it's Ashley's birthday today, and I'm not gonna sing, but happy, happy birthday, Ashley.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, happy, happy birthday, Ashley. And thanks for spending two hours with us. Göran Marby, I'm pretty sure I called your name, but I got all excited about the birthday.

GÖRAN MARBY: Yes, that's correct. Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Yes, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Lawrence Olawale-Roberts.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present. I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Vivek Goyal.

VIVEK GOYAL: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Damon Ashcraft.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Here, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Susan Mohr. I just wanted to cross check. Susan did alert us she'll be joining 30 minutes after the scheduled start time and the proxy does go to Osvaldo Novoa. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Farzaneh Badiei.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: I'm pretty sure you said present, but you may have cut off.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yes, I did.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay. Peter Akinremi.

PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Tapani Tarvainen.

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeje.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You are welcome. Bruna Martins dos Santos. I don't see where Bruna is on, but we will send her an email and see if we can snag her before the votes.

TERRI AGNEW: Christian Dawson.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Anne Aikman-Scalese.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Sebastien Ducos.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: I'm present Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm here, Terri. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. And Antonia Chu.

ANTONIA CHU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW:

Most welcome. You do have your policy team supporting the GNSO: Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Berry Cobb, Julie Bisland, Devan 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 they have set their chat to everyone 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 the chat.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply the expected standard to behavior, ICANN community anti-harassment policy, and the community participant code of conduct concerning statement of interest. With this, I'll turn it back over to our GNSO Chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Lovely. Thank you very much, Terri. So, hi everyone. It's the 11th of December, so welcome to our last council meeting for 2025. First up as usual is just to check whether anyone has any updates to their statements of interest. Ooh, this is unusual. Farzi.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

Don't worry. It's very exciting. So, I just wanted to disclose that PIR has sponsored Digital Medusa for research for first phase of research on disclosure of engagement with law enforcement agencies at infrastructure level. And just that.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks for sharing that and thanks for the update. That sounds very interesting. We'll have to ask you about that over a drink. Anyone else before we move on? Okay. Not seeing anyone else. Next then, are there any proposed amendments to our agenda for today? Okay, I'm not hearing any.

So, our next order of business is relating to the minutes from the last council meeting. In fact, the last two council meetings. So we have the minutes from the 29th of October 2025 meeting, which were posted on the 15th of November. And the minutes from the meeting on the 13th of November were posted on the 27th of November. So, all is in order with them. So, just noting that for the record. All right.

And then I think we can move on to our agenda item two, which relates to the review of the projects and action list. Now, we do have an agenda item to talk about the projects list in more detail later on in the meeting. So, really this is just the regular opportunity to pause and see if any of our council liaisons to working groups or IRTs have any updates that they would like to share with council that aren't on the project list already.

Okay, I'm not seeing any. And so, then as I say, we will be coming back to the projects list in much more detail when we get towards the end of the meeting. Okay. So, then we can move on to the consent agenda, which is our third item of business. And I am going to hand over to Peter to lead on this. Thank you.

PETER AKINREMI:

Thank you, Susan. On the consent agenda, we have four items, and the first item on the consent agenda is to confirm the representative to the GNSO Empower Community. And here we have Jennifer Chung, the volunteer to check. And the second one is to confirm the leadership of the Standing Selection Committee. And here we have Julf as the chair and Vivek as the vice chair.

Then the third one on the council agenda is confirming the leadership of the SPIRT Standing Committee. And here we have Jeff Neuman as the Chair, and the Vice Chair to be Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Segunfunmi Olajide. And the fourth one is to confirm the GNSO Review of the GAC Communique. And we like to thank the people that volunteers to drive this. I'm sure that we've had time to review this, and if there are no consents and no comment, and then we can move to a vote. And if there's none, I'll pass it to Terri to move over to a vote.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. Oh, looks like we have a hand.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Sorry, I'm not sure of the procedure here, but can I vote because I am listed as a vice chair. If I vote for myself, is that a challenge?

PETER AKINREMI: Well, Susan, your mic is mute if you're talking. Okay.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, sorry, found it hard to get off mute. I don't know what happened there. I think it's okay particularly given that that this is something where you vote as directed, so you are not really voting in your personal capacity, Vivek. I don't believe there's a problem with this, and I hesitate to say that you could give a proxy to someone else because I think that would need to have been done in advance. So, I would say from my perspective, I think that's okay.

VIVEK GOYAL: Okay. Thank you.

PETER AKINREMI: Okay. And Steve responded and say it's fine as well. Okay. So, I'm sure that clarified the whole thing. Terri, over to you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. Before we vote, I do want to note that we are still missing Bruna for the vote and a proxy will be in play for Susan Mohr. So, here we go. It will be a voice vote. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say aye.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would you like to share your reasons?

JULF HELSINGIUS: I don't like voting for myself.

TERRI AGNEW: So, on the entire consent agenda, you would like to abstain, is that correct?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes, that's correct.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay, great. We'll note that. Hearing no one further, would anyone like to vote against this motion, please say aye. Hearing none, would All those in favor of the motion please say aye.

SPEAKER: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would Samantha Demetriou for Nacho and Osvaldo for Susan Mohr holding proxies, please say aye.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Aye.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. We have one abstention, no objections, and the motion passes. Back to you.

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Terri. So, that it's quite good. And on to move us forward in the item four, I will pass the floor to Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Hello, councilors. I'm Jen. And we are here now on this agenda item, the council vote on the final issue report on the Policy Development

Process for DNS Abuse. Yes, I see in the chat that some of our councilors think it's a right agenda item. We'll see. Let's have some good constructive discussion here. So, bringing us back to where we started or actually where we are right now, on the 1st of December, we submitted this motion concerning the next steps on the DNS Abuse Policy Development.

The motion originally proposes initiating two separate PDPs following each other. We then received some considerations and concerns sent to the councilors from NCSG. So, leadership took a look at all these concerns and feedback, and we looked at amending the motion to immediately convening a charter drafting team to address some of the concerns that were noted.

I think we also received some concerns from different parts of the council regarding the membership model recalling that we did have a discussion in the last council call where we surfaced these opinions as well. So, the amended motion was circulated to the council, I believe yesterday. I need to stop sending friendly amendments to my own motions. And it was also considered a friendly amendment by Damon who was our seconder.

So, this updated amended motion provides the council and the broader community with additional time to carefully review, consider, and if needed, to further develop the second draft charter. Still in the motion text right now, it's known as PDP 1 and PDP 2. So, the draft charter is PDP 1 on associated domain check. The additional time to review when we go to PDP 2, that is not going to be contemplated at this very moment in the motion text in the charter drafting team.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: So to reiterate, if I wasn't clear enough, the council is pursuing two separate PDPs. The GNSO council will revisit the draft charter on DNS

abuse mitigation PDP 1 -- sorry, PDP 2 when it is deemed appropriate based on the progress and the resources needed for PDP 1. So, in other words, it is ultimately up to council, which is us in consultation with PDP 1 working group and Staff to determine what this is most practical. And stating the obvious again, PDP 2 cannot begin without council taking this next step.

So, this proposal reflects substantive input that we received. During the public comment, the very good discussion we had during the ICANN Dublin meeting of the DNS Abuse section and also our subsequent discussion on [00:14:31 - inaudible] and the council meeting last month. And across these inputs, we heard both a very strong desire for progress on DNS Abuse Mitigation, and a clear expectation that the policy development should be scoped in a way that is realistic, focused, it's targeted and capable of producing implementable outcomes.

There were many comments during the public comment period and also in Dublin that indicated that associated domain check topic appears to be adding more advanced page of problem framing.

TERRI AGNEW: It's Terri. I'm so sorry to interrupt, but there is a bit of chat that it's getting harder to hear you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Oh, I'm very sorry.

TERRI AGNEW: That's okay. I don't know if you're able to speak a bit louder. I know there's a lot of background noise where you're at.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, sorry. In fact, let me see if I'm able to make sure that I do the noise cancellation or maybe I will remove myself into a hallway. I think that's what I'm gonna do. So, if you can just bear with me for several seconds. Is this better, and can I be heard yet?

TERRI AGNEW: It is quieter. Let's go ahead and continue, and I will interrupt again if we get more information on it.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay. I'm very sorry. Hopefully you can hear me better now and I'll speak a little louder now that I'm in the hallway. So, back to where I was. Yes. So, the associated domain check topic was framed around a well-defined problem statements with a relatively stable terminology and known stakeholder roles, making it easier to scope the work plans and begin deliberations without significant preliminary work.

The public comments noted that Associated Domain Checks as a potentially high impact first step PDP, and there was relatively broad alignments that requiring checks for associated domains. Using these existing registrar tools could produce tangible results relatively quickly. And also some registrars then also conduct associated domain checks voluntarily already. There were a lot of comments also that emphasize potential human rights impacts, human rights implications.

And so it's really important to note that the human rights impact assessment considerations on the broader global public interest frameworks are part of the standard PDP process. And this importance in the context of the policy development process comes from the need to evaluate the proposed recommendations against these frameworks to ensure all of the expected benefits of the outcomes are weighed against potential negative impacts.

So accordingly, this working rule will be expected to take appropriate due diligence in this area, including identifying potential impacts as part of its deliberations. And this is going to be the central focus of the work outlined in the scope of Associated Domains Check. If you need the page number on the final issue report, it is page 48. So, the PDP seeks to create an obligation for registrars to investigate other domains associated with a customer account or registrant, or at least one domain of that registrant is found to be engaged in DNS abuse.

So, any Associated Domain Check requirements would only apply to confirmed malicious domain registrants. In addition, this would specifically exclude domains that have been compromised. So, understanding that registrars value their customers, value their name space, this PDP working group should ensure to keep in mind the registrant's rights and responsibilities throughout the process.

And this design also, of course, responds directly to the inputs that we receive to prioritize Associated Domain Check PDP, but also providing clear commitment from the council to pursue the second PDP on API access at inappropriate time. So, again, emphasizing that council will not move forward with the second PDP without considering the appropriateness, the resourcing, and of course finalizing its charter.

So, the balance of the diverging opinions on this phase approach, simultaneous, separate, all of this has been contemplated. So, this majority, again, favors the two separate PDPs, of course, with assurances. If there are any efficiencies that can be made, they will be made. But again, the final say, rests on council to deliberate and decide on when it is appropriate to start this meeting.

This design does not deprioritize any topic raised in the issues report. I know a lot of us in our consultations with the SGs and Cs that we come from have listed many priority topics. Rather this time it provides a very structured path to advance all of the work while sequencing efforts in a

way that reflects community feedback and resource considerations. So, the decision to revisit the PDP 2 charter and to commence work will again be a council decision in discussion with PDP 1 working group staff, and all the concerns parties to ensure that a timely start takes into account the resource, constraints, and also benefits.

So, finally given the concerns that are raised by NCSG and also concerns that we've heard about the membership model, the vote on the charter of DNS abuse mitigation, PDP 1 on Associated Domains Check has been deferred to the general council meeting to allow for a charter drafting team.

So, a very limited time bound charter drafting team to address these primary issues, so, the working group model and also addressing the further human rights concerns perhaps beyond the requirements to provide the human rights impact assessment. And then, of course, from the leadership perspective, we believe that these are the two main issues that should be considered in the amendments of the chart drafting proceedings.

I'm going to pause here. I would like to see if it is time, and I'm gonna look to Staff, to see if we are able to open the queue or if I need to go into the motion text itself or is it a council discussion time. So, I'm looking to Steve or Feodora to let me know if this is the right time to open up the floor.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Jen. This Steve from Staff. And generally, we lead off the items by reading the motion, at least the resolve clauses. But I think there's a little bit of discretion if you want to have discussion first. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Let me just go and read the resolve clauses and then I'll open up the floor. So, resolved: the GNSO Council adopts the recommendation for two PDPs on DNS Abuse Mitigation, and initiates DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1 and DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 2.

GNSO Council request the formation of a Charter Drafting Team on PDP 1 to further update the charter were relevant and present it for a vote by the council at its next meeting. Resolve clause three: the GNSO Council requests that the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1 Working Group be convened as soon as possible after the adoption of the charter in order to fulfill the requirements of this PDP.

Part 4: the GNSO Council will revisit the draft charter and timing for the commencement of DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 2 when deemed appropriate, based on the progress and resources needed for PDP 1. The council asked Staff to find efficiencies were sensible and appropriate in managing the two separate PDPs. Five, the GNSO Council requests that DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 2 be convened after the charter is adopted.

Six, the GNSO Council thanks the DNS Abuse Small Team, the ICANN community, and everybody who contributed to it for their efforts in moving this important topic forward with the aim to improve the security and stability of the internet. So, with the reading of these resolved clauses, I guess now is the time that we can open up the floor for some discussions from the councilors on the motion and any concerns you need to raise about this. Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Sure. I just wanted to thank you and Susan for revising this in light of NCSG's comments. I think this is a good compromise. My big concern is just making sure that we're prompt on the two PDPs. Little concerned about the second one not starting as fast as I'd like. That being said, I

think this is a good compromise position, and thank you very much, and I'm happy to support it.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Damon, and thank you for considering the amendment friendly as well.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Of course.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Sam, please go ahead.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Jen. This is Sam for the record. I just wanted to note that the registries understand that in order to get a charter finalized by the January meeting, that will likely require some really expedient work because we are dealing with the holiday, but that the registries are ready to contribute to that charter drafting team to make sure that this happens. So, you can put my name down if we're calling for names, and we definitely support this initiative.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Sam. Indeed, we have, I think eight, I think if we were counting how many working days we still have left for this year, and it's going to be a tight squeeze, but I'm glad that we are all willing to go forward and also put the work in as needed. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. I am sorry my camera isn't on at the moment, and I'm trying to work on that. So, it's been my understanding that in terms of, or rather the work around the final report included the charter drafting and that we have summarily been able to do some work in this regards which regards not just the three PDPs, but going forward as we continue to complete work around the PDPs, the Staff and possibly the Council small team, not the Council small team, but basically Staff and Council basically would work to kind of ensure that we have charters in place for the upcoming PDPs.

What I'm trying to seek clarification is if we are deviating from the understanding that we have had before, and if we have evaluated how this is going to impact on the future work as regards DNS abuse. So, it'll mean, will this mean rather that while we begin to look at work for the second PDP, the third, fourth, fifth, we will also have to grow through this type of cycle, or are we still gonna be depending on work that has been done previously from the staff effort? Some clarification is needed to aid my confusion here.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Lawrence. And also, forgive me if I'm misunderstanding your question. I think what I heard from you is whether or not we've departed from our initial plan to look at charters of the topics that we have indicated as priority in Council. I guess with respect to the information that is in the final issue report.

Now, taking a half step back, there are two draft charters currently in the final issue report. One, for Associated Domain Check, and the second one is for API access. So, those are the two that we've indicated as the most priority items through the full list of topics that we discussed in the small group. So, again, that doesn't mean the others don't get looked at, it's just that this is a first step of staff preparing these charters.

And clearly this time around we are calling for a charter drafting team to refine the charter of the very first PDP that we're starting. I suspect that we will be doing similar exercises for the second one to make sure the charter is fit-for-purpose when we start this PDP. I think everybody in council right now is, is of the same intent that we need to have well scoped, tightly scoped focused PDPs that will allow us to bring implementable recommendations in a relatively short amount of time, I guess time being relative in ICANN.

So I hope this actually helps you understand how this work might go forward. I do not have a specific timeline on this. Of course, we'll know once we see the work plan of PDP 1, and then how we can also look at refining charters, putting together the charters for any subsequent topics. So, Lawrence, before I go to the rest of the queue, I just wanted to get a sense from you if I've answered your question correctly. If not, please let me know.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, you answered my question correctly, and you basically confirmed my fear suspicion. Hopefully, as we progress with the work ahead, which we will definitely, possibly this would cause for consideration on how we'll manage timelines around all these efforts.

We have previously talked about advancing PDP 1 to a point where possibly we submit our recommendations or we have the recommendations set, and then we start work on PDP 2 because at that point the work load will be lighter, but where we now have to create for the stages or steps to ensure some more robust discussions and contributions into the process, I'm hoping that that will also mean that we also review our timelines and possibly start work for the next phases early enough to ensure that we don't have lags. And we also keep the momentum going as fast as we can. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Lawrence. And I think you will find on the screen, I guess result clause four definitely allows for that as well. I'll go to our next person on the queue. Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you, Jen. I wanted to tell you a little bit about my analysis of the final issue report and a little bit on why for us, NCSG associated domain check has a lot of risk and it should be done carefully, and we should take all the time we need in order to come up with recommendations that do not impact the user, the general internet user and the domain name registrant. And it's not just about human rights, it's also about people's access to domain names.

So, we have been asking for due diligence and transparency to be considered, and not just in the associated domain check, but also in other policy development processes. API safeguard included that anytime that we come up with a recommendation that could have an impact on the domain name registrant access to a domain name, we need to have a remedy for them.

It is not the best course of action to come up with mitigation mechanisms and not come up with remedies if things go wrong. And at the moment, all we have been focusing on in this community is how to mitigate DNS abuse. We don't have a mechanism on what do we do when that mitigation goes wrong and there's a false positive or somebody gets their domain name suspended while they haven't done anything.

And the Associated Domain Check is very possible that it would have those implications, considering the recommendation. Justine, I think I have the right to mention our concerns because we have been saying this for the past six months, and I want to put it on the record. And we

are going to be nice, we are going to be collegial, we are going to approve the motion, but I still want to put our concerns on record. And the other thing with the final issue report is that, so, this is why we were very concerned that Associated Domain Check was prioritized.

Also, my concern is also procedural. I don't know how we prioritize it to be the first one to be the PDP, but that, we set aside. So, another issue that I have with the final issue report is that there are some texts that I see that still says that they suggest that the PDPs to be concurrent. I think, well, I don't want to revert to this final issue report and say that, no, we said it should be concurrent.

I think that we want to refocus on the resolved motion that you have. Another problem with the final issue report is that the points that we raised which was one was that there should be transparency due diligence and accountability. It was just like dismissed. They said that like, there's not enough data.

So, I think that like in the future of issue draft, I really believe that we need to be considerate of all the community discussions. And also there was another point of final issue that I'm now going to dwell upon. But all in all, these are the concerns that we had, and we thank you for letting us convening a drafting team for the charters, and yeah, we look forward to contributing. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Farzi. I believe we spend a lot of time looking at the feedback and comments, and we definitely hear you. Thank you for putting that on record. I guess when we start the Charter Drafting Team, we can see where this language is best put in there, and if it is a template kind of language that would be appropriate for all the charters, I guess I welcome Council to determine that and look at that once we

have that. I know the time is running out and we have a queue, so I'll go to Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Jen. This is Justine for the record. Just quickly to Farzi's point about that we're not debating it, but I just want to make the point that I think Council has very clearly heard in NCSG's comments and remarks, and therefore we have come to this compromise position. But I would also like to remind that DNS abuse affects a lot of other people apart from these registrants, end users as well as brands.

So, we're not just looking at it from one point of view. The other thing I wanted to mention is administrative. I think the preamble eight link to the final report, I'm not sure whether it's the correct version because it still says 1st of December. So, I would ask Staff to make sure that it links to the correct version of the report. And I don't believe that we are going to go back and change anything in the report, because what Susan said in chat is correct, that it's the motion before Council that counts to determine the way forward. And I would also like to volunteer for the charter drafting team. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Justine. Thank you, Farzi. I see a lot of offers to be part of the Charter Drafting Team as well. Prudence.

PRUDENCE MALINKI:

Hi. Thanks. Prudence, for the record. Firstly, I just want to say thank you Jen, and also all of the members of the small team and all of the other parties that have been involved in the work so far. I've got a quick statement from the Registrar Stakeholder Group that I just want to put on record. So, we, as in the Registrar Stakeholder Group, we support the continued discussions relating to the wording and substance of the

charter questions that are gonna happen subsequently after this meeting.

And also, we support the vote relating to the further progression of the PDPs, both of them, the two PDPs. However, we just want to make sure that the Registrar Stakeholder Group have made sure that it's recorded officially on the record that we as registrars would prefer to have an alternative ordering of the PDPs whereby the prioritization of the API PDP going first as opposed to the Associated Domain Checks PDP going first.

However, that being said we really still want to engage and participate in today's vote. We really do want to see both of these PDPs proceeding, and we do support and believe in the progress of the PDPs as a whole, but we just take slight issue with the ordering of those PDPs, and we just wanted to go on record saying that. But otherwise, we support the working endeavors so far. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Thank you, Prudence. Before I go to go back, I just wanted to get a clarification from you, Prudence, and I guess for the registrar councilors. Does this mean that you'll still be prepared to vote on this motion with this vote on the statement.

PRUDENCE MALINKI:

Yes. So, we'll happily vote. We'll happily engage in the vote. Sorry if that wasn't clear for my statement. Yes, we're going to engage in the vote today. We'll also engage in all of the subsequent discussions to do the charter questions and the substance of those charter questions. We just want to go on record that we would prefer for the ordering to be changed of the PDPs. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Prudence. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Thank you. I'll be quick. My only request to all the members who are volunteering to sign up to do the charter is that let's keep in mind that the discussion is for the charter and the discussion is not to run the PDP and what the PDP will come out with and not preempt the outcomes, and then start to discuss those. The charter is just charter.

Let's wait to resolve all our concerns when actually we have the PDP and where we can resolve those with a larger amount of information, especially from the Registrar Stakeholder Group and other members of the CPH who might have 20 different ideas on what associate domain might be. They will bring in real life examples of what happens and what is possible and what are the impacts of this.

So, please keep in mind the charter is just the charter. Let's not run the PDP during the charter, and we want to get the charter out done very quickly so we can do the real work in the PDP. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Vivek, for that good reminder. Indeed, the Charter Drafting Team has very limited time, and we will be working very hard on focusing on getting the charter correct and focused for the PDP to start. With that, I think we have exhausted the queue. I think now it's time for me to hand this to Terri for the vote. Is that correct?

TERRI AGNEW: That is correct. And this will be a roll call vote. So, individual names. Here we go. Christian, Dawson.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: What is the word that you use? Approve, agree, what?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Okay. Approve, yeah.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay. Yeah, I'm sorry, the word is Yes. Approve works, but yes, sorry.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Yes, thank you. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. You're welcome. Vivek Goyal.

VIVEK GOYAL: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Göran Marby.

GÖRAN MARBY: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Farzaneh Badiei.

FARZANEH BADIEI: I will go with yes, but I would like to read something if I'm allowed either now or later.

TERRI AGNEW: Go ahead and go now.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay. So, we maintain our serious concerns regarding Associated Domain Checks. We are grateful that we are deferring the charter to look at all the questions and topics that we need to look at in order to make sure that registrants and users of the internet don't get impacted as a result of these mitigation mechanisms.

Also, throughout this process, we have said this in our comments, also, so, the fact that we relied on external reports without doing our independent studies ourselves to do like a more holistic DNS abuse research and made decisions based on these external reports and not based on an independent study that continuously considered all the feedback.

And we didn't have a role in research methodology either. That was a matter of concern to us, and I personally want to discuss how we can do things in the future so that we don't focus on these research reports that we have no way of looking at their research design and not make a policy based on external research.

And also, the last thing is about how we actually look at what the community wants. And I reiterate that we would like to see more acknowledgement of NCSG positions when it comes to measuring consensus. And we would like to be acknowledged when, if you decide

to prioritize ADC, you prioritize ADC, but you also mentioned that NCSG was against it in these manners. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And Farzaneh, if that's an NCSG statement, please send that to the gnsso-ssc@icann.org and we will get that linked. I do you need that email address said more slowly?

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah. Sorry, these are just some of them are NCSG concern, but I have to confirm with NCSG and then send it.

TERRI AGNEW: Okay. Okay. Samantha Demetriou.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Approve.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And Samantha Demetriou for Nacho Amadoz.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Approve again.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Susan Payne. Susan Payne.

SUSAN PAYNE: I said approve.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, thank you. Now I hear you. Thank you so much. Peter Akinremi.

PETER AKINREMI: Yes, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Prudence Malinki?

PRUDENCE MALINKI: Yes, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Damon Ashcraft.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Approved.

TERRI AGNEW: Osvaldo Novoa.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Ashley Heineman.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Lawrence Olawale-Roberts.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Susan Mohr.

SUSAN MOHR: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Benjamin?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yes. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS: Hi, Terri. I will abstain from voting, and apologies for the silence on the list this past days, I have not been feeling super well, but I just wanted to thank Farzaneh for addressing some of our concerns or most of our concerns. Thanks a lot.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Hong-Fu.

HONG-FU MENG: Approve. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Julf Helsingius.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: Tapani.

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Yes.

TERRI AGNEW: And Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Yes. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. For the Contracted Party House, we have seven votes in favor, no votes against, and no abstentions or anyone absent. For the Non-Contracted Party House, we have 12 votes in favor, zero against, one abstention, no one absent. The motion passes with 100% in the

Contracted Party House, and 90, oh gosh, it's so small, 92.31% in the Non-Contracted Party House. Congratulations, and back to you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Terri. I see a hand and is this for this agenda item or for the next one?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: No, it's really, I guess point of order, Jennifer. Just that my understanding from a recent discussion about a different motion is that whenever there's an abstention, that there should be a statement in connection with the abstention under the GNSO operating procedures. I think I understood Bruna to say that she was abstaining for the reasons that Farzi stated.

I'm just not clear on, although I think the operating procedures and staff will straighten me out, that when one abstains on a substantive motion, that one should state why now. Earlier you'll have said, I don't want to vote for myself. So, maybe Bruna is saying, well, I abstain for the reasons Farzi mentioned or saying because I'm not feeling well, and I thought we should be clear.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Anne. I'm gonna look to staff to see if we follow procedure correctly and if we need to do anything further on these votes.

STEVE CHAN: Hi, Jen, this is Steve from staff. And I will admit I had to go take a quick glance at the operating procedures, and it's a good thing Anne has a memorized, apparently. She's correct, when you abstain, you are

supposed to include an explanation. It actually says explanation is required. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. So, Bruna, please go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks, Jen. And thanks, Jen, for the reminder. I was just wondering if I can send the statements to the list instead. I'm just recently back from a doctor appointment and not feeling well. But in principle, it's a lot of the reasons that Farzaneh explained mostly in terms of like how much I would wish that there was a proper or maybe a stronger acknowledgement of NCGS positions and concerns with regards to the PDPs.

And also, that I personally wish that we had more time to discuss the charter part of things, and some of the points that I already explained on my mail to the council list. But I can totally write things on the list and explain them further. Thanks a lot.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Bruna. I'm sure we'll be able to receive this by list, and please feel better. I think now it's time for me to pass it back to Susan for the next agenda item. So, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Jen. Okay, thanks very much everyone. So, we can move on then. We have another vote. So, this is councilor agenda item five, which is the vote on the Registration Data Request Service or RDRS standing committee findings report. So, this is another item that we did discuss during our November meeting. And as we discussed, the

motion regarding this standing committee's report is a little bit different to a typical motion accepting policy recommendations because the standing committee, whilst it does make recommendations, these aren't policy recommendations.

And so, we are not treating them as such. So, the motion therefore, notes that council accepts the RDRS standing committee findings report as being helpful input to inform our future deliberations within the GNSO regarding the next steps on how to treat the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations, so the SSAD recommendations. And as I said, important that everyone's aware that the standing committee's findings report makes recommendations, but they are not GNSO policy recommendations. Nevertheless, the findings report is the reflection of a significant amount of effort and community engagement.

And so, it's appropriate that we formally acknowledge it as an important step in order to recognize that work. The primary purpose of the assignment to the RDRS standing committee was to help the council determine next steps as I said, regarding the SSAD recommendations particularly as they were informed by the results from the RDRS pilot. So it's important, I think, for us all to note that in that findings report, the standing committee is recommending pursuing the path of supplemental recommendations. And I think many of us are very familiar with that process now, which is set out, if I have my reference right in section nine of Annex Eight to the bylaws.

It the process that deals with where the board is minded to not adopt recommendations. It's a process of engagement with council and then council discussion and potential development of supplemental recommendations. And so, accordingly, if this were the case, then council would be requesting the Board to non-adopt or reject the recommendations as they relate to their, so the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations in order to kick off that supplemental recommendation

process. Obviously, it will be council's role to consider whether we agree with that path before we enter into any substantive dialogue with the Board.

The Standing Committee's findings report also contains several other recommendations regarding enhancements to the RDRS. And they build on the foundational decision that we have about how we pursue a potential supplemental recommendation pathway. So for this reason, it seems that it's more appropriate that the group that is tasked with considering the modification to the SSAD recommendations should look at this. But that council at least should adopt the findings report and take that as input when we are considering this.

And so, it may well be I think one path forward, and it seems to me appropriate it would be for us to establish a small team or an informal group that will examine that findings report and report back to council on this suggestion of following the supplemental recommendation approach. But in the meantime, our task here is essentially to vote on accepting and approving the receipt of the standing committee findings report and taking its input.

It should also be said that I think it should probably be considered that since that standing committee was a fairly representative group that worked very collaboratively and reached consensus, in some cases full consensus, on those recommendations and took public comment to input and so on, that if we as a council do decide to go with a different approach, then we ought to give a rationale as to why we don't think we should be following the standing committee's recommendations.

But that's a task for us to do. We are not bound by them, but we should reflect on them, and if we indeed don't want to follow them, we should explain why. So, with that, I think as with the previous vote, I think I should read the resolve clauses and then open this up for discussion.

Gosh, that's tiny, but luckily there's only a couple of them. Okay. So, resolve number one, the GNSO Council accepts the RDRS Standing Committee findings report as helpful empirical input to inform future deliberations within the GNSO regarding the next steps on EPDP Phase 2 SSAD recommendations.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Standing Committee's findings report, and the recommendations therein do not constitute GNSO policy recommendations. And then two, the GNSO Council would like to thank the RDRS Standing Committee for its work on this report, and in particular, thank Sebastien Ducos and John McElwaine, who diligently served as the chair and vice chair of the Standing Committee.

Okay, with that then, I would like to open this up for any discussions. So, looking to councilors to raise your hands if you would like to make any comments or raise any issues. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL:

Thank you, Susan. Just a very short one. The current RDRS is a very poor measure of the demand for such a service without the need for mandatory participation and the low level of results that the requesters got. I think the demand for such a service is huge, but because of the way RDRS is set up, it is not reflective of the demand, and really hope that going forward as RDRS improves more and more requesters can benefit from the service and put more faith in the service, and that it can truly reflect the demand that is out there for such a service. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks. Thank you, Vivek. Peter.

PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thank you so much, Susan. I just want to echo what you said that we need to like -- if it's possible, we can convey a small team to look at the findings, because this has been excellent work done, and there's a lot of findings and might need to dig further from the council side, so some of them can look at them further and then take the conversation forward. I just wanted to re-echo that. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you, Peter. And I'm seeing some comment in the chat as well liking that idea. Farzi.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yes. Thank you, Susan. So, I think the Standing Committees is still there, right? And I'm a member of it. Did we disband it? Am I not a member of the Standing Committee anymore, or is it there?

SUSAN PAYNE: I believe it's still there at the moment.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Okay, great.

SUSAN PAYNE: I don't think it's been disbanded.

FARZANEH BADIEI: So, I think that we should keep the Standing Committee. I found that very useful. And so, I'm a member of the Standing Committee, and also some of the -- and I think that the idea to look at the findings as a group, I think is a very good idea. One thing that, I don't know if I can say is like

this is know that as a council member, just letting you know that some of the -- so, this kind of like the RDRS Standing Committee and RDRS as an experimentation of policy, like to see how policy can be implemented and what are the shortcomings.

And so, I think it has been extremely helpful. And I think that I suggest to the council to consider these kind of experimentation. And I think not many people, I agree with me because it's so expensive as well. But this kind of like looking at empirical analysis, see what's happening when we actually provide service based on a policy to people and refine some of the recommendation as a result. I think it has been very, very important.

And so, I'm going to discuss these things in the INFERMAL group, but some of the things that we considered in the standing committee the thing that I really care about was about the accreditation of the request. And there, we agreed to narrow authentication for law enforcement, and this kind of like experiment is being continued for the authentication of law enforcement.

And I think it has been very helpful for also working with GAC to ensure that we are considering all the concerns and we are trying to come up with solutions. And of course, these are not policy solutions. All in all, great. I think the Standing Committee and the RDRS was a really good initiative. And of course, we are thanking the chair and the vice chair, yeah, and all the members, sorry. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yes, thanks, Susan. As you all know, I'm non-voting and I certainly don't oppose a vote on this matter. But I wanted to ask a question about language that says future discussions about the next steps, I guess. I'm

kind of wondering, number one, sorry to ramble on, GNSO regarding the next steps on the EPDP Phase 2 SSAD recommendations.

And so, what we know is that the Board didn't adopt the SSAD recommendations and they said that they were too expensive, et cetera, et cetera. And the Board strongly favors, I guess, improvements to RDRS and even potentially making it mandatory, et cetera, et cetera. So, I'm trying to understand whether this group that's gonna be formed, that group, will their scope include what should be the council's next steps on this operational mechanism or further policy? What next steps are we talking about?

SUSAN PAYNE:

So, next steps really are that at the moment we have the EPDP Phase 2 SSAD Recommendations, which are still sitting, let's call them in limbo. They're with the Board, but they have not been adopted by the Board, but as yet, they have not been non-adopted or rejected either. So, we have a set of policy recommendations that are still in limbo.

And we, separately have an RDRS system which has been operational, and we have this review by the standing committee and some recommendations from them about things that could be done to improve the RDRS system. And we sort of have something of a gap to get from what we have as policy recommendations and what we currently have as a system whether enhanced or not.

So, the next step really is to get ourselves in a position where we're able to have a dialogue with the Board about what happens next. And I know you are aware that separate to this report that we are voting to accept, there is also a comment period under way just wrapping up, which is something that the Board did where they asked Staff to look at policy alignment or if you like, policy gaps between what we have and where we might want to be and are looking for the community's input on that.

So, I'm quite sure that that also will -- there will be interesting views expressed in that about what next steps might be as well. But really, yeah, our job is to get from where we are now to where we have some policy that backs up that RDRS system or the successor to the RDRS system, shall we say.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Right. Understood. Yeah, just a quick follow up that if we're going to form on council a small team of some sort to consider both the report and the public comment and what next steps should be, I think that hopefully, we would get an assignment for the small team at some point that would include that in the scope of things.

And I guess, my concern here being that policy lies within the remit of GNSO Council, and here we're all kind of trying to make a system work, but hopefully I see a lot of support in the chat for an INFERMAL Group, and hopefully, this report and the appropriate next steps and the public comment on RDRS could all be considered in that small team assignment. Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah, thank you. Taking that input on board. Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands and I am also conscious we are a little over our scheduled time, so I think if there's no one else, we can move to the vote on this.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. We will go ahead and conduct the vote now, then. This will be a voice vote. So here we go folks. 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 this motion, please say aye.

SPEAKER: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies, so Sam for Nacho, please say, aye.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. No abstention, no objection, the motion passes. Back to you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Terri, and thanks everyone. Okay, we can counter on to item six, which is a discussion item. It's preparation for our 2026 Strategic Planning Session or SPS. We as a council have held an annual SPS since 2018, and it's a dedicated meeting for us to spend some time together to understand and review the GNSO portfolio of work for the coming year, to try to align on our GNSO priorities for the year, and to consider whether we've got the resources and tools we need, and to discuss how best to kind of prepare for any kind of emerging or upcoming challenges that we might be anticipating that we might face in the year.

So, in preparation for the SPS, our GNSO support staff are going to give us an overview of the role of the GNSO Council and the tools and resources available to GNSO councilors in fulfilling the role. And this is kind of foundational for a substantive discussion that we'll then have at the SPS.

And indeed, sometimes this is something that we do at the SPS but we in particular since this time we, it's a two-day meeting rather than sometimes it has been a little longer, and it seemed that certainly this foundational piece was something that we can readily do on a virtual call, and then we can get to the more exciting stuff when we're together in person. Okay. With that, I'm going to hand this over to Steve.

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks very much, Susan. She covered quite a bit of the intro. This is Steve. I guess just a tiny bit of more background, some of the regional reasons for having the SPS, it necessitated the need to really concentrate on the foundational elements. And so, like maybe one and a half days of the SPS in the early days was actually dedicated to the role of councilors and things like that.

And then it ended up being pulled out and made into a standalone webinar. And here we are in maybe iteration number three of the approach which is maybe a bit of a middle ground where it's just a part of this council meeting. And like Susan said, we'll hopefully set up the council to be able to concentrate on all of the important things that needs to discuss and not spend so much time on the foundations.

So, she covered what we'll approach or what we'll discuss today. So, the first part is the role of the GNSO Council as a manager of the PDP will have a brief segment on I think the origins of the SPS because I think that's a little bit of a -- it gets lost in the nels of history, so I thought it might be important to talk about that too.

And then there's be a last segment that Susan mentioned on tools that the council has at its disposal in order for it to serve as the manager of the PDP. So, with that, next slide, please. I hope you enjoy this, Jeff here. So, I guess I do want to preface this just by saying that a lot of this will not be new to many of the councilors, especially for the incumbents.

So, please bear with us. But this is a reference to the bylaws and it talks about the council serving as the manager of the Policy Development Process as it relates to gTLDs, and that there will be a set of GNSO operating procedures that governs that core competency. Next slide, please.

And so, what these talks about is, and I'll proceed into the next slide too, it just talks about the core decision making opportunities for the council and also responsibilities. And so, it's broken up into the different phases of the PDP. Here, we look at scoping, and there's a really great example recently of all these actions. It's just concluding at least this first couple of steps, mostly with DNS Abuse.

In that case, there was a scoping team that proceeded the issue report. That's not always a requirement. But the council may do such things and do additional scoping before requesting an issue report. And then you just saw what the council can do with an issue report once it's delivered, it can initiate a PDP, and then separately also adopt a charter possibly in the next month.

And then when it comes to managing the PDP once it's actually kicked off, the big role of the council there is to make sure that they're keeping current with the work, making sure that they understand where the work is going, making sure that there's paths of communication in both directions to the PDP, and from the PDP to the council. And so, it's really about the PDP and the council holding each other mutually accountable and making sure that there's awareness. And then of course, the goal of the council is to make sure that as issues arise and such, that the council's able to help mitigate, that they actually do so.

Next slide, please. And then at the end of I guess closing parts of the PDP process, it's really about considering the recommendations developed in the PDP, and if the recommendations and the report are

adopted, then sending a recommendations report to the ICANN Board, which really kicks off the Board's consideration of the recommendations.

And so, in the past another council responsibility, and it's still available now, it just is not always used. But the council has the opportunity to brief the Board on recommendations that it has adopted. This makes sense, I think, when the recommendations are complex or maybe the Board doesn't have as much of awareness about the recommendations as it needs.

And I guess maybe get ahead of things, part of the reason why this need is not as acute as it has been needed in the past is with the advent of Board liaisons, where now the Board has a much earlier connection to the PDP and better awareness about recommendations are going. And then lastly, assuming adoption by the Board of the recommendations, then the council has the obligation to send a liaison to the implementation effort and serve as a liaison with the Implementation Review Team. Where there are, and I guess there's also an example here recently from the SubPro PDP. And so, there's an escalation path when there's disagreement between the staff implementing and the IRT in its interpretation of the intent of the recommendations.

And I will pause just for a moment. I think this should not be new information for folks. All right, next slide, please. Here's everyone's favorite graphic. It's a depiction of the really the continuum from start to finish. It's not true to length of time, and I think in particular, things like the development of the initial report and also implementation are definitely not true to size. Those are the lengthier steps of the process, but it does depict really the full life cycle.

Next slide, please. And so, now that we have just a real general overview of the role of the council, and therefore that of the counselors as well, it's also important to talk about the picket fence. And what this represents is essentially that registries and registrars, when they sign the

RA and the RRA, they agree to follow the agreements of course, but they also commit to agreeing to and adhering to consensus policies that are developed through the policy development process.

And so, this is a bit of a unique dynamic in the context of agreements between different parties. And so, this concept of the picket fence is important because it essentially places a constraint on what can be imposed upon the contracted parties since it is such a unique mechanism to be able to impose additional requirements through a mechanism like the multi-stakeholder model.

And I will not go into detail here, but next slide, please. I'm glad. I will confess that the graphics are all from, Caitlin, which is probably not surprising to folks. So, I'm glad there's appreciation for them. And so, just quickly touching on this, and like I said, I won't go into any of this in real detail. It emphasizes certain things like stability and security, and it also is really about when there's a need for uniform or coordinated resolution being reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security, and or stability of the DNS.

And obviously, I'm reading that, but that's essentially the guidelines for the policymaking process. There's a reference to two annexes that spell out exactly what the picket fence represents. So, that's Annex G1 and Annex G2 from the bylaws. Those are respectively about the limitations for policymaking in respects of registries and registrars. And I think that's all I wanted to cover here. If we can just quickly scroll through the next couple slides.

That's Annex G1. Next slide, please. Provide some examples, and then the next one will be G2. Next slide, please. And the next one is some examples. And I think if you're really interested in examples, you can actually look at a set of existing consensus policies to determine or I guess, get a better sense of the sort of policies that make sense in the context of consensus policies.

And that is all I had on the picket fence. I'll pause for a moment. Like I said, this is probably not new information to many, if not all of you. I'll see if they hands. If not, then I think what we'll do next is go to just really some of the origins for the strategic plan session. So, next slide, please.

Oh, I forgot about this question slide. It's a brief intermission about just checking in with folks to make sure that everyone is clear on the primary remit of the council and their roles as councilors. And then also maybe not the specifics exactly of the picket fence, but that there is a picket fence that helps govern and constrain policy development.

So, if there are any immediate concerns or questions, definitely please raise your hands. And I will preface this that I don't know that I can answer every single question. So, I'm glad there's a lot of other experts on the call. So, Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, thanks so much, Steve. And I was just gonna suggest that at the actual SPS, it would probably be helpful to everyone to have a couple of examples of things that are inside and outside of the picket fence in terms of the policies and capital C consensus policy and what's the realm of the RA and RAA versus other things. And I just wonder, are we gonna be reviewing these things at SPS and can we get some examples?

STEVE CHAN: Sneak preview, thanks for that, Anne, we are still in the planning phases, and I definitely welcome Susan and the rest of the leadership jumping in, but I think we may or may not be planning a set of quiz questions around this to help keep you all engaged in that part of it. So, thank you for the ideas, and so, that might be an approach we go with.

All right. Hey, I see support for pop quizzes. That's great. Next slide, please. All right. So, I thought it might be helpful to go over a little bit of

the history of the SPS just because it helps illustrate where the council was and where they are now. And I think that's an important evolution. So, next slide, please.

Okay. I will try to say this in a measured manner, but a big reason why the Strategic Planning Session existed is because I think it was an acknowledgement by the council at that time that there was more that they could be doing in order to serve in that primary role of managing the PDP. And so, what they experienced at the time, some of the dynamics that they saw were problematic issues within the membership itself.

So, you can see some examples here. Inadequate representation. Some of the engagement was disrespectful, not treating each other in a respectful manner. And then also having the work distributed unevenly. So, a lot of the different parts of the group not equally contributing to the work. There were also issues in PDP leadership dynamics.

And so, there's one PDP. Actually, I'll just make it a little more generalized. There's generally more than one chair, which makes decision making harder. And so, what you'll see generally these days is that PDPs have a single chair, and then at times they will also have a vice chair or vice chairs, plural. And so, some of this is about making sure that the decision-making structure is more streamlined.

But it's also to make sure that this notion that the leadership has to be representative in some nature, that it does not persist. And so, really the leadership role is about facilitating discussions in an unbiased and neutral manner. And so the notion of having that leadership team being representative is really contrary to that notion. And then the last one that was I think one of the main triggers is just the length of PDPs.

And so, a lot of this really comes from overly expansive charters which is, I think the biggest problem. And then what this led to was essentially the PDPs missing deadlines repeatedly. And so this is really not to call

into question any of the folks that took place in this. It's really about spotting issues and then trying to make things better. And so, that's what the council at the time did.

And then more matter of factly, this was around the time of them empowered community being established. And so, while there is some guidance about how the GNSO is supposed to navigate its role, there's not guidance specific to, or at the time, there was not guidance specific to the GNSO, which talks about timelines and roles and responsibilities, especially in the context where the GNSO council is made up of its constituent parts too. Next slide, please.

So, SPS in the beginning, what it concentrated on, like I said, and I think Susan mentioned it, a lot of it was really about foundational roles and responsibilities. And one of the things there was decided to set up a team to develop all of the guidelines and templates for the GNSO as a decisional participant. And then also, really digging into the council's role as PDP managers.

And what was discovered at the time is that the SPS really serves as a useful tool to make sure that the councilors have a chance to interact more than just in the context of it's monthly remote and occasionally in-person meetings, but also have a time to be able to meet in person and collaborate and really get to know each other better, which really helps in advancing the work more effectively.

And in the early days, it was also recognized that the council had an acute lack of tools in order to actually manage the PDPs and really lacking a view into the overall portfolio work, which is about the work that the council has already initiated, but then also upcoming work. And so, those were some of the things that the early SPSs were looking at.

So, next slide, please. And where are we now? There's a full suite of guidelines and templates. You can see those on the GNSO Operating

Procedures page. In the early days, the council launched PDP 3.0. You can see all the outputs also on the GNSO Operating Procedures page. And so some of the key outputs from that PDP 3.0 effort was the establishment of a number of different membership models.

At the time, what the small team on PDP 3.0 talked about was generally having a preference for representative model as sort of the default. And it doesn't mean that other models like the Open one, which was used for Latin diacritics can be used in certain cases, but generally presenting the representative model as the default because some studies at the time showed that the smaller the group is, the easier it is to make sure that everyone is carrying their weight and is dedicated and accountable to the work.

Another key output there was helping to provide written documentation of expectations for working group members and the chair. This is a big output. It was a professionally developed consensus building playbook. It was a recognition, and I think it's just the reality that reaching consensus is hard. It's hard work for everyone.

And so, the consensus playbook is intended to provide some tips and tricks on how it can be done more effectively. And then I think one of the biggest outputs, and I will provide a shout out to Berry, I think he's on this call, there he is, is the development of the program and project management toolkit, which at least for me who has been with the GNSO for quite some time.

It's had a profound impact on the council's ability to effectively manage the work. So, some things that came out of that are PDP work plans that are agreed to and developed very early in the process. And that creates a sense of accountability for the PDP members, the leadership, and the council, and just better site lines to the work.

And so, what that means in summary, really is that the council has become very, very good at delivering work on time, which I think is really a testament to the tools in place, but also the council and the working groups that perform the work. Next slide, please. And I'm almost done, I swear. This is more about where we are now. So, I mentioned that these tools, they provide the council with a better sense of visibility, but it also provides a better visibility to the broader community too, because a lot of the community is in fact paying attention to the work of the GNSO.

And so, really to take us back to the SPS, what this means is we get to have this foundational discussion outside of the context of the SPS itself. And the council can really dedicate its time to having strategic discussions instead. And so, I think that's really all I had to cover. I think we can go to Caitlin in a moment. I'll pause like I did before just to make sure there's no questions, but yeah, I'll pause for a second. All right. Thanks for putting up with me for that long rambling. And over to Caitlin.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Steve. We'll now talk a little bit in more detail about what tools the council has to manage its work. So, if we could go to the next slide, please. So, when we're looking at these tools, there are a couple things to keep in mind in terms of the goals of the tools to ensure that you're able to properly serve as a GNSO councilor and prepare for council meetings and discussions, and importantly, to manage PDPs in an effective manner. So, as we're going through these, one thing to keep in mind, especially for returning counselors, is what tools you use and what you may or may not use, what you think could be improved, et cetera.

And we can have a more robust discussion at the SPS. But this also obviously serves as an introduction to new councilors about the origin of some of these tools and what we use them for. So, if we could go to the next slide, please.

So, some of the existing mechanisms that we have for getting councilors on board, obviously, all of you have gone through councilor onboarding. Secondly, we have our dedicated face-to-face time at the upcoming Strategic Planning Session where you'll learn a lot, have good discussions.

And then lastly, and probably most importantly is we rely on a lot of people to make this work. So, you can seek guidance from returning councilors, from people who used to serve as councilors, from your appointing stakeholder group or constituency, and obviously from support staff members as well. Next slide, please.

This is a bulleted list of some of the existing tools that we'll go into a little bit more detail on. But the two key tools that we'll talk about that came out of PDP 3.0 are the action decision radar and the project list. These are sent on a monthly basis to the council, and all councilors are expected to familiarize yourselves with them and read them.

Secondly, you all may remember that at the wrap up session at the last ICANN meeting, we went back over the appointed GNSO Council liaisons to all of the active PDP working groups and the implementation review teams. And these individuals serve as the folks that closely follow the work of those groups and report back to the council if there's any issues the council needs to be aware of or any upcoming milestones the council needs to be aware of, et cetera.

Additionally, councilors can participate in PDPs and IRTs if they'd like to follow the work in a more direct way. Nothing prevents you from doing that. And then prior to council meetings, you receive a lot of emails from Staff. As I mentioned before, the Action Decision Radar and Project List are distributed to council prior to every council meeting in order to prepare for that meeting.

And then prior to ICANN meetings, there's two ways that you can prepare. First is a written document, a detailed GNSO policy briefing, where there will be updates in terms of what's happened between the last ICANN meeting and the current meeting as well as some issues of importance or topics that are likely to come up in discussions and meetings at that ICANN meeting.

And then also, there is a dedicated GNSO webinar, which many of you have participated in. But in short, that is a mandatory webinar that we ask councilors to attend, and that's a dedicated time where working group chairs present to the council and talk about the progress that the group has made and flag any issues to the council.

Additionally, it provides kind of an informal setting where councilors can ask honest questions whether substantive questions or procedure questions about what's going on in that PDP so that there are no surprises along the way. So, those are important ways to keep updated on the projects under the council. Next slide.

As Steve had mentioned, one of the topics that comes up during a lot of the Strategic Planning Sessions for obvious reasons, is how to ensure positive PDP outcomes. And by positive PDP outcomes, we mean narrowly scope PDPs that have consensus recommendations that can be approved by the council and ultimately adopted by the Board.

So, some of the ways over time that we have discussed ensuring positive PDP outcomes is for councilors to stay current on what's going on so that you're prepared to vote and prepared to enter into fruitful discussions about the topics under the council's remit or voting items. We've also talked about the importance of narrowly or focusing the scoping efforts of PDPs. So, some of you who have been around for a long time may remember that there have been some PDPs in the past that had very large scopes and accordingly resulted in PDPs taking upwards of five years to complete, or just having a large scope.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

So, for example, one of the recent PDPs was a review of the transfer policy, the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy, and that charter was very large and had a contemplated a review of the entire policy. So, that had a large scoped effort. Another thing that's been added in recent years is that there are now additional liaisons to the PDP working groups.

There's a liaison from ICANN Org that is there to follow the work and flag any potential implementation challenges or concerns that Org would have in implementing those from an Org perspective, as well as an ICANN Board liaison to PDPs. And the Board liaison follows the PDP to keep other Board members up to date, as well as potentially flag challenges that the Board sees with recommendations as they're crystallizing.

That input is throughout the PDP process, but also more recently, Org has started submitting a formal public comment to PDP Working Group outputs, particularly the initial report. And that ensures that if there is an identified implementation concern, the working group has the opportunity to discuss that before proceeding with its final recommendations.

Also, all along the way, the Project List and the Action Decision Radar allow you to alert your specific group about upcoming public comment opportunities or upcoming things that you would like to flag so that we have a diverse group of comments to consider, and again, to avoid surprises in the end.

And then a relatively new feature that we have incorporated into our most recent PDP, the Latin diacritics, is the integration of some new parts of the charter that refers specifically to global public interest human rights, as well as a consideration of how the policy recommendations may impact current consensus policies.

Next slide, please. So, this again, highlights what we have been talking about, the importance of engaging along the way and providing input along the way so that when it comes time for a final report and the council to discuss that, the council should be pretty familiar with those recommendations.

And similarly, there are many opportunities to receive briefings from working group leaders to the council all along the way through those mandatory webinars as well as presentations during council meetings so that everyone's engaged along the way and we avoid confusion or, again, surprises at the end of the process where maybe some councilors feel like they can't accept the recommendations because they didn't follow along and didn't raise the concerns in a timely manner. We want to avoid that. Next slide, please.

Steve touched a little bit on this about PDP 3.0 and a lot of the good work products that came out of that. Namely you see where the arrow is pointing, how the council can keep up with the projects under its remit, and that's primarily through the Project List and through the Action Decision radar.

So, if we can go to the next slide, I'll explain the purpose of those two tools. So, you'll see a little snapshot of both tools and what they look like on this slide, but essentially, the projects list is a holistic overview of all of the projects at the council level. So, you'll notice that begins at the planning stages and scoping stages all the way through to the implementation phase.

So, the Projects List is updated on a monthly basis, and it focuses on changes to that project over that period. It also highlights what that group is working on, what work is planned in the immediate future and what work was completed in that last phase. The goal is to also identify key risks and mitigations. Occasionally there's some emojis or icons sprinkled into the Projects List to make sure folks are reading.

And as Steve mentioned, there will be a game showesque pop quiz that we will administer during the SPS. So, you might want to familiarize yourself with these documents. So, the Projects List helps the council stay current on what's currently under the products at the council level. The Action Decision Radar helps the council look ahead at what is coming down the pipeline. You'll see that there are a couple of colored lines, and the Action Decision Radar focuses on the 12-month period ahead of the council.

So, you'll see that with the red, it's focusing on what's coming up in the zero to one month period, and then one-to-three-month period, three-to-six-month period, and six-to-12-month period. That allows you to know when a vote would be potentially coming up, when a final report may come, when a group may spin up, when the decision on whether to charter something may come up.

So, it's important to familiarize yourself with that. It's also what leadership and the support team work with to build out the monthly agenda so that we make sure we don't miss anything that the council is about to make a decision on or needs to make a decision on. So, this also helps you keep your relevant group current on what's going on.

And so, there's no surprises, and you can help with your resource planning in terms of maybe there's three public comment periods coming up. So, accordingly, this is also important to look at. This document is shorter than the projects list but both I think are equally important for different reasons. Next slide, please.

So, that's the end of the presentation. These are some questions that we might discuss in a little bit more detail at the actual SPS. So, one thing that would be helpful, for example, is for returning counselors to maybe share with the new counselors how they use the tools, what they find helpful, and also, we can have a discussion on is there anything missing that would help the council manage PDPs effectively? Are there

improvements needed to the tools? Is there something that we can do to help you?

And if there's something that no one is using, that's also helpful for us to know because it does take time for us to update these tools on a regular basis. So, with that, I wish everyone luck on studying for your pop quiz that will happen at the SPS. And I will just pause to see if there's questions or if any of my colleagues wanted to add anything that I may have missed. I see Anne. Please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, thanks so much, Caitlin. It's Anne. I have a question with respect to projects about work being done in the community that is not directly under the auspices of GNSO. So, for example, for Standing Selection Committee appointed to representatives to the CCG on Review of Reviews, so we have Sophie and we have Osvaldo participating, excuse me, and they provided written report as to what's going on, keeping us updated and everything.

And then I also learned as an observer that, for example, the ccNSO and the ALAC, they have CCG Review of Reviews as an agenda item apparently at every meeting. And so, the question is about efforts like that and how we address those in our project list. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thanks, Anne. That's a good question. I will attempt to answer that, and if anyone wants to correct me, please do so. But I think the Projects List tracks direct projects under the council. For other ancillary efforts, what we recommend is we have an agenda planning tool that every councilor can contribute to.

So, if for example, there's something in the CCG or any topic, in fact one of the topics coming up later in this AOB about the IG Tracking Team, if

there's anyone that has something that they think the council should be aware of as part of our monthly meeting that's not on the Projects List I would suggest either making a request to the list like some have done, or you can update the agenda planning tool directly, and we will make sure that it's incorporated into the agenda as appropriate. But I see Osvaldo's hand is raised. Please go ahead.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Osvaldo for the record. Now, just to let everybody know that, well, we send Sophie and myself, we send an email with a quick update of what we are doing in the CCG, and also the CCG is open for everybody, and in the wiki, all the documents are available for everybody. So, right now, just to let all you know that we are asking for feedback on what the different participants members contributions to stakeholder groups, what they think about the reviews and which one they think we should keep and which ones we should delete or postpone. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, Osvaldo. Any other questions? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands raised, so, I think we're going to AOB, and if I'm not mistaken, I think Terri will be taking the first item.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you very much. Just to continue on with SPS logistics, not a whole lot to share, but just to keep everybody informed, invites will be coming out shortly. Thank you for your patience, we appreciate it. Some things are still getting sorted, almost there, folks. on the evening of the 19th of January, we will be having our welcome reception for those that have arrived and not too jet lagged. It is not mandatory.

Just come enjoy a little bit of festivities before we kick off two full days of work. Tuesday and Wednesday, the 20th and 21st of January are the

two full days of SPS. And as others had mentioned, the agenda will be sent in advance so you all know what to expect. On the evening of Tuesday the 20th of January, we will have a council activity and dinner. Again, invitations will be sent in advance.

And then, your Wednesday evening, the 21st, you are free. Go plan whatever you want. Maybe you could all get together at different restaurants and enjoy each other's company. There you go. As a reminder, hotel confirmations will be sent one to two weeks prior to travel.

So, just enjoy your holiday, your time away with your family, and just know, before you actually travel, you'll get that email. I'll also send an email out to the SPS planning list when I know the hotel travel confirmations were sent so that if you all did miss it amongst your festivities, you know what to go back and look for it. Again, we want to thank Nacho and .cat for sponsoring this space. Any other questions at this time for me? Okay, if not, we will turn it back over to Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thank you, Terri. That's really helpful. Thanks for that update on the logistics as well. Okay. We've got one other AOB item listed, and I think it's down as Anne and Jennifer, but I think Anne is gonna take this one. So, over to you, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Great. Thank you, Susan. It's Anne, I'll try to be quick. I did send an email in case we ran out of time on these other items. And it's really about an update from your council INFERMAL Internet Governance Tracking Team. This team consists of Farzi, Jennifer Chung, myself, Desiree was on it, but now she's of course turned out on council, and so Seb has also been participating somewhat in our signal group because

initially we were working with trying to map ICANN's actions to the World Summit on the Information Society Action Lines.

And as I think you all know, we are going to be in New York next week, some of us, to participate in the WSIS+20 meetings. Jen has been super active. She is on the INFERMAL Multi-Stakeholder Sounding Board that's been conducting consultations as recently as Monday, which Monday's consultation was on revision two to the document. That will be coming out after the meetings by the governments that will occur on Tuesday and Wednesday of this next week.

And generally speaking, it's been a very collaborative process. People have been happy about the input that the UN has been willing to take from the multi-stakeholder community. And as we know, there are governments who have issues over their sovereignty, and certainly they do not want to be instructed by others as to what actions they have to take. But there's been a really good exchange, and ICANN has participated actively.

Alexey Trepikhin, who's in government relations for ICANN has issued statements in support of the continuation of the Internet Governance Forum and trying to figure out how to keep that funded on an ongoing basis. Theresa Swinehart has been active. She's also in the IMSB, and I think she made a presentation in November. And they will be at the meetings at the UN next week.

There are still negotiations going on among the governments to arrive at a final document, which I believe will be a revision three, and Jen will correct me if I'm wrong. And so, the UN has said, well, we hope that we get the final document before Tuesday or Wednesday because we'd like to just celebrate the statements that are being made in the WSIS+20 outcomes.

And when there is a final document, your internet governance group will circulate it to the list. And I'll also mention that if there are others who are interested in joining this little INFERMAL group, do let us know. In addition, I have noticed that on the list for the SO/AC discussion group, which I know that Farzi and Bruna and Desiree have all participated in the past on the ICANN SO/AC discussion group for WSIS+20.

I note that it appears that that group is likely to be shut down considering that this work is going to be concluding with the governments. But I know that in our last meeting in Dublin with the Board, the council suggested that perhaps that group should continue. I don't know if anyone has strong feelings about that, but just by way of update, and we will be sending out to you revision three, the final version that is hopefully voted by the governments in the UN in the general assembly. Any questions? Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Hi, Anne. No questions, but just a small clarification. I've been trying to put that in chat because I'm still sitting in the room. Rev 3 will come out tonight at 7 o'clock New York time, and that is when the [01:55:39 - inaudible] will be putting this document [01:55:41 - inaudible], and the expectation is that will be broken pretty much right away. So, that's just my smallest update that happened.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Okay. I'm gonna repeat that, Jen, because of the noise issue. What I understand from you is that revision three will be coming out tonight in advance of the meeting, so that'll be great, and we'll find a way to circulate that. Thank you. Mostly thank you for all your hard work. Oh my goodness. You've been absolutely amazing. I just have to echo everything in the chat. Thanks so much.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Anne for that. That was very interesting. Yes, and we will all wait with breath for when we're allowed to see the proposed final draft of the outcomes document. Okay, I noted in the chat that Farzi had an AOB as well. Farzi, we are close to the [01:56:47 - inaudible], but we do have a couple of minutes, so if that's enough time, do you want to speak now?

FARZANEH BADIEI: I just wanted to know, is the council planning to comment on the strategic budget thing that ICANN is doing? Can we discuss suggesting budget proposals? Because at NCSG, we are asked to comment on the strategy for 20, I think it's 2026 or 7, and I was wondering if the council is doing something about that or did I just miss the deadline?

SUSAN PAYNE: No, we certainly can. If people feel that there is something that we can coalesce around collectively that we should say, then yeah, we certainly can. Do happen to know off the top of your head what the deadline is? Obviously, I can look at it up after, but...

FARZANEH BADIEI: I'm not so sure, but I think like if we can.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, well, why don't we draft budget and related plans. Mary is saying are due to be published for public comment later this month, is that what you are referring to? And in which case, yes, we could have a look at seeing whether we think it's something that is worth trying to get a pan

GNSO comment on. And if so, if there are volunteers, we can certainly do that.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Yeah, that's it, but I don't know if the public comment can make any difference. But yes, I think if we can, we can clarify that.

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. Thank you for raising that. Okay. All right then, we are just at time. And I'm just noting what Sebastien is saying in the chat that in the past the GNSO has had a group to review these. So, yeah, that certainly sounds like something we should think about. Oh, I was just about to wrap up and Steve's put his hand up. Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Oh, I'll keep it to like 13 seconds, hopefully. There's a new group, it's called the Budget and Operations Town Hall. I can either send an email about what it does and how it operates or maybe I can cover in the -- actually I'll do that because I think the SPS is maybe too late. So, I'll send around an email about the group that talks about the Budget And Operating Procedures. Sorry.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much. Yeah, that sounds, that sounds good. Okay. Then, it's still on the top of the hour, so I'm not late yet. But thank you very much everyone. Thanks for good discussion. I'm very pleased that we've had a productive meeting. So, thank you very much. I'll let you all get back to the rest of your evening, morning, day, whatever. And happy holidays.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you everyone. Once again, the DNS Abuse Small Team doodle will be sent out shortly to you. Please watch that. It's a very quick turnaround. I will stop the recordings, and the meeting has been adjourned. Bye.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks.

SUSAN PAYNE: Bye, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]