



Council Prioritization Discussion

10 September 2026

Council Prioritization Discussion



Topics

1. Intro (5min)
2. Review of the Results (7min)
3. Next Steps (3min)
4. Council Discussion (25min)

INTRODUCTION

Council Prioritization Discussion

Purpose

Use the prioritization exercise to support an informed Council discussion on future work.

Understand

key outcomes of the exercise

Identify

areas of alignment and divergence

Consider

factors beyond the scores

**Potentially
agree**

on a path forward for Council work

What this is NOT

Using the numbers alone to prioritize.
The numbers should inform judgment;
they DO NOT replace Council discussion
and decision making.



Council Prioritization Discussion

Why we are doing this exercise

A test run - not a perfect methodology

A common framework to compare potential work

A way to move from priority to sequencing

- The exercise is meant to help Council look at potential work as a portfolio, not as isolated items.
- It gives Council structured input on importance, community demand, complexity, resources, and deliverability.
- The goal is to support a better Council discussion about what should proceed, what needs preparation, and what should remain on the future horizon.

The scores are an input/info base for Council judgment; they do not make the decision for Council.

Council Prioritization Discussion

How to use the following numbers

Starting point

Assumes prior review

Councilors have reviewed the individual submissions and the Master Matrix shared last week.

High-level signals only

The slides surface selected patterns and discussion areas; they do not reproduce all detail in the submissions or matrix.

Use the full record

Discussion should draw on the input received, the exercise conducted, and Councilors' review of the full matrix/submissions.

What the numbers are for

Indicators, not a strict ranking

The real value is the strategic direction and discussion signals the numbers provide, not a simple ranked-list outcome.

Discussion triggers, not conclusions

Councilors may have different interpretations, additional considerations, or other areas they want to discuss.

REVIEW THE RESULTS

Council Prioritization Discussion

How to read the numbers

Scoring direction

5/high scoring means favorable: important topic, high demand, manageable complexity/resources, likely timely delivery.

Weighting view

Weighted results apply a Council-house model and exclude ALAC and the non-voting NCA.

Data quality caveat

Zeros are outside the 1 – 5 scale and materially affect weighted results

Discussion principle

Use averages, weighted results and comments, together before drawing conclusions.

Council Prioritization Discussion

General Overview Compiled (no weighting)

Project	Avg. /25	Over-all assessment	Importance / demand	Readiness	Comments
DNS Abuse	17.37	Strongest overall	Very strong	Mixed	Strong importance/demand; resources, scope and timing still matter
TDRP	15.88	Strong near-term	Positive	Mixed/positive	Relatively even scoring across all factors. Comments note narrow scope.
Expiration Policies	12.69	Divergent	Mixed	Mixed	Views seem split between CPH and NCPH
RPMs Phase 2	12.55	Divergent	Mixed	Mixed	Concerns about scope; WIPO-ICA report could help.
New gTLD-related Work	11.34	Future horizon	Relevant	Weak	Less so than Exp, but views seem split between CPH and NCPH

Council Prioritization Discussion

General Overview Compiled (weighted)

Project	Avg. /25	Over-all assessment	Importance / demand	Readiness	Comments
TDRP	16.25	Strong near-term	Positive	Mixed/ positive	Relatively even scoring across all factors. Comments note narrow scope.
DNS Abuse	15.71	Strongest overall	Very strong	Mixed	Strong importance/demand; resources, scope and timing still matter
New gTLD-related Work	11.74	Future horizon	Relevant	Weak	Less so than Exp, but views seem split between CPH and NCPH
RPMs Phase 2	10.70	Divergent	Mixed	Mixed	Concerns about scope; WIPO-ICA report could help.
Expiration Policies	9.52	Divergent	Mixed	Mixed	Views seem split between CPH and NCPH

Council Prioritization Discussion

Zeroes affect weighted results

Project	Weighted /25	Valid-only weighted	Dif	Signal
TDRP	16.25	18.12	1.87	Still highest/near-highest; conclusion robust
DNS Abuse	15.71	19.22	3.51	High signal remains; stronger when invalid records removed
Expiration Policies	9.52	10.57	1.05	Weighted result remains low; divergence matters
RPMs Phase 2	10.70	12.60	1.90	Divergence remains even after sensitivity check
New gTLD work	11.74	14.06	2.32	Ranking improves in valid-only view; readiness still low

Council Prioritization Discussion

EMERGING ALIGNMENT

DNS Abuse

Strong and consistent importance/ demand signal.

TDRP

Relatively consistent scores; manageable scope and delivery signal.

New gTLD work

Current comments lean away from immediate initiation.

AREAS REQUIRING DISCUSSION

RPMs Phase 2

9- 25 total-score range: the widest spread (setting aside invalid 0 scores).

DNS Abuse

Agreement on importance, less clarity on what should happen next.

Expiration Policies

Divergence between CPH and NCPH. Some promising feasibility signal.

Council Prioritization Discussion

Priority does not automatically mean launching a PDP ?

DNS Abuse

Strong priority signal

Complete/assess work already underway; determine the next issues and the appropriate mechanism before starting more (i.e., non-policy work).

Expiration Policies

Focused / achievable

First test whether implementation or operational improvements could address some issues rather than assuming a full PDP.

RPMs Phase 2

Important / resource intensive

Long-standing commitment, but comments emphasize scale, volunteer/staff capacity, need to reassess scope (e.g., WIPO-ICA report)

NEXT STEPS

Council Prioritization Discussion

Next Steps

Today

Discuss the results

Confirm whether the results are being read/understood in the right way.

After today

Prepare follow-up inputs

Capture Council direction and discussion outcome.

October

Follow up Discussion

LT to take discussion outcome and propose potential next steps.
Follow-up Council discussion.

Council Prioritization Discussion

Proposed Decision Framework

Category	Description
Priority 1 – Proceed	Ready to initiate or advance in the near term. (2027)
Priority 2 – Prepare	Important work requiring further scoping, or resource planning, or other preparatory steps that can be done in this cycle. (2027)
Priority 3 – Monitor	Important work to be revisited during a future planning cycle. (2028)

Council Prioritization Discussion

Preliminary Lessons learned and best practices

- Overall, this was a useful exercise.
- Because this was a test run, the issues around scoring, interpretation, validation, and weighting should be treated as lessons to refine - not as evidence that the exercise failed.
- The numbers are helpful, but the comments and rationale are just as important for understanding what groups are actually telling us.
- Keep the useful framework, clarify the guidance, and improve it through repeated use.

This is the right direction: it helps Council manage its workload and helps the community understand realistic next steps for potential work items.

Council Discussion

Council Prioritization Discussion

Interpret the results

- Why did groups score the way they did? Would you change anything?
- Were there any results that surprised the Council?
- What explains the areas of divergence? Have any circumstances changed since the scoring was completed?

Move to sequencing

- Which work is ready to proceed in the near term?
- Which items need scoping, resource planning, or a mechanism choice first?
- What can realistically proceed in parallel? Are there opportunities to combine related work?

Prepare for decision-making

- What additional information is needed before?
- What can staff/leadership develop as pre-work?
- Any other considerations?