ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council
Thursday, 09 July 2026 at 13:00 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/cpizHYl0a6k-mB3Mc7we074vOQnv0yoMqQgQfMeOCr9NB1yImehemGFpQXheMOg9WlI_-5c_meGj6rnd.qkSNFWXAZ1sAqrLJ

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/9lmXep7Jvvv4PunOs86Tg2y_AgoLCKHZO7xYRQOgu8tg4tUy7bSEYVHup-WfGmbY.kt_yyjkGoBn0lUZo?startTime=1783602161000

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

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – Non-Voting – Anne Aikman Scalese (absent)
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, Volker Greimann
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, 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 (apology, proxy to Susan Mohr), Damon Ashcraft (apology, proxy to Susan Payne), Susan Payne, Susan Mohr
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos (apology, proxy to Julf Helsingius), Julf Helsingius, Peter Akinremi, 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: Paul McGrady DNSAM PDP 1 Chair

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.

ICANN Staff:
Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations
Caitlin Tubergen - Senior Director, GNSO Policy Development Support
Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Andrew Chen - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO) (apology)
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (GNSO) (apology)
Devan Reed - Policy Operations Senior Coordinator (GNSO/Programs and Operations) (apology)

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 9th of July, 2026. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Thank you. Nacho Amadoz?

NACHO AMADOZ: Yes. Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. Volker... Oh, I'm sorry. Jennifer Chung?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're 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: Here. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Volker Greimann? I don't see where Volker has joined yet, but we will try to track him down here shortly. Gaurav Vedi?

GAURAV VEDI: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Vivek Goyal?

VIVEK GOYAL: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Just for transparency, we did receive a proxy for Damon, but he was able to join. Just in case connectivity issues, which there will not be, it was going to Susan Payne. So there we go. Susan Payne?

SUSAN PAYNE: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Osvaldo Novoa sends in his apologies, and the proxy goes to Susan Mohr. Susan Mohr?

SUSAN MOHR: I'm present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Julf Helsingius?

JULF HELSINGIUS: Here, Terri. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Farzaneh Badii?

FARZANEH BADII: Yes. Yes, I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Peter Akinremi?

PETER AKINREMI: Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeje?

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thanks. Present.

TERRI AGNEW: Bruna Martins dos Santos sends in her apologies, and the proxy goes to Julf Helsingius. Christian Dawson?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Present, Terri. Thanks.

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome. Anne Aikman Scalese? I don't see where Anne is on. We will try to get her on. Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Present, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: You're welcome. And Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. We have the policy team supporting the GNSO, which is Steve Chan, Caitlin Tubergen, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, 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. Please set your Zoom chat now and change it to everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning you do not have access to the microphones nor the chat. As a reminder, those who take part in the ICANN multistakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest. With this, I'll turn the call back over to our GNSO chair, Susan Payne. Please begin.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Terri. Hi, everyone. Welcome to our July Council call. I don't know where the year is going, so this is the 9th of July meeting. First up, does anyone have any updates to statements of interest? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yes, Susan. I've updated my statement of interest a month ago, actually, just after Seville. The registrars elected me as their next vice-chair for policy. I don't believe that this creates a particular conflict with my role with the Council, but I just wanted to make sure everybody knows. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you very much, Sebastien, and congratulations. And I think just for clarity for everyone, this is a role you'll take up at the AGM, is that correct?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: That is correct.

SUSAN PAYNE: Perfect.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So after Bali.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you so much. Okay, not seeing any others. We can move on. Does anyone have any proposed amendments to the agenda? And I'm not seeing any hands, so that's good. Thank you very much. Then I will just note for everyone that the minutes from the Extraordinary Council meeting, which is the one that we had on the 7th of June, 2026, have been posted now. They were posted on the 23rd of June. And the minutes from our regular June meeting on the 10th of June were also posted on the same day, the 23rd of June.

So with that, we can move on to the review of the projects and action list, which, as you all know, is our opportunity for ourselves to ensure that we are keeping an eye on that. And then we have been taking this as the opportunity to also just check in with any councilors or liaisons to working groups, or to IRTs, if there's anything in particular, any milestone, or particularly noteworthy thing they want to flag to Council. So I'm just going to pause briefly in case there's anything. And I'm seeing Lawrence's hand. Lawrence?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes. Just want to quickly report that Council's directive to SPIRT was communicated to them, and SPIRT had made their determination and sent an inquiry, rather communicated this to ICANN org. ICANN org has now come back to let SPIRT know that there is indeed some further work to be done on the RSP issue, and SPIRT has a number of meetings already scheduled for the rest of this month. SPIRT will actually be meeting every week through this month, waiting for ICANN org to get back to SPIRT with regards to the mechanism that can be used to mitigate this particular issue. So hopefully by our next meeting, I shall have a more concrete report to provide to Council. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Lawrence. Great to get that update and to hear that hopefully the process is working as it should. So, that's super, and keep us posted. And obviously if there turns out to be any kind of problem, let us know. But we'll look forward to hearing a further update. That's brilliant.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: All right. I pause and see I'm not seeing any other hands, and so if not, then I think we can move on to our next agenda item, which is the consent agenda. And I'm going to pass over to Peter for that.

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Susan. On our consent agenda today is the review of the GAC Communiqué that was posted by the GAC for the ICANN meeting. Following every ICANN meeting, GNSO Council pulls small teams together to review the GAC Communiqué to identify any potential issues that the GAC might be raising, and that gives the opportunity for the GNSO to respond and update on the progress based on the issue that was identified in the GAC Communiqué. So the small team identified a number of the longstanding issues that the GAC has been raising, basically on DNS abuse, urgent requests, and authentication. So the small team provided updates on those issues and shared that with the Council for further feedback and review. So we got a small, like a minor additional language to the document, which was that the ICANN Board instruct ICANN org to develop a proof of concept with regards to authenticating law enforcement. So that was happily incorporated into the document. And aside from that, there was no other feedback from the Council, and I don't know if there is any. I don't see anything on chat. I don't see any hands. That simply means that we're happy with the review, with the document. So, with all that, then I will turn to Terri to move us to a vote.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much. And before we vote, I'm taking one final look. Looks like we're missing one voting councilor, Volker Greimann, so he will be marked as absent.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, hi Volker. Thank you. Welcome. All right. So Volker is here for the vote, everybody. Volker, are you sitting with somebody? Why am I not seeing your line?

SUSAN PAYNE: He's under G for Greimann.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Oh, no, no, my last name.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, got it. Got it. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Sorry, everybody. All right. Everybody's here for the vote. Good news. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion, please say, "Aye." Hearing no one, would anyone like to vote against this motion, please say, "Aye." Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion, please say, "Aye."

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Aye.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Aye.

SUSAN PAYNE: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Would councilors holding proxies please say, "Aye?" So that's Susan Mohr for Osvaldo and Julf for Bruna.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Aye.

SUSAN MOHR: Aye.

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

PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Terri, for that. It's quick. I would like to thank the small team for coming together to review the GAC Communiqué. So thank you so much. I would like to move us forward by turning the mic to Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks very much, Peter. Hi, everyone, this is Jen Chung. And we have the update on the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1. We also have with us the chair of this PDP, Paul McGrady. And of course, we always welcome Paul. So I'll pass this over to Paul, and he will go in-depth and give us all the good news on PDP 1. Paul, please go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. Thank you, Jen. All good news only. So, just do a quick catch up on where we are, and I know we have some time available at the end for questions and answers, so please get those. Welcome. Just a little background on how this all came to being. As we know, Council chartered this PDP, and we got underway in the spring, but it actually goes back a bit further than that. In August of 2025, Council requested the issues report on DNS Abuse Mitigation. Got that report, quickly looked at it in December of '25, and initiated two PDPs aiming to address DNS abuse mitigation gaps. Again, quickly, one month later, Council approved the PDP 1 charter, and then quickly thereafter, the PDP itself kicks off in March. So this thing has been on a fast track from the beginning, and I think you'll find we've kept the pace going.

So, so far, we'll just talk a bit about what's happened, and where we are landing. So in the early days, we established the work plan, established the leadership team. The work plan went back to Council, which was approved promptly, so that kept the momentum going. One other thing that our brilliant ICANN staff did for us, which was extremely useful, was to get early inputs from the SGs and Cs, which formed a basis for our collaboration document and work plan going forward. It essentially set the table and established a baseline for the work. So if you're looking for learnings from this PDP of good things to do, I personally found that to be very helpful, and I think most or many of the other working group members did too. So far, we've had 21 working group meetings. I wanted to make a joke here. I wanted to say, so far, we've had 19 wonderful working group meetings, one mediocre and one not so great. But 21 total, and we are moving forward. We have been working consistently through a collaboration document, which has proved to be extremely helpful. For example, we put in the early input gathered, and then we developed the ideas. We went to straw proposals, and then eventually worked our way out. We've considered the early input on questions one through nine, which is sort of a funny thing to say because there are only nine questions. So we've looked at them all. And we did some preliminary work on a recommendation document that we've walked through together several times. And we have got that squared away. We did an initial, and by we, I mean ICANN staff put together an initial scope impact assessment that was kind of a new-ish thing. I don't want to say it's new. But basically, it was an early look into the human rights and data privacy impacts of what we were doing. Our theory all along has been, it won't do us any good to work hard as a team, only to find out, oops, we're trampling something very important in the impact assessment realm. And so that was a good quick look. And we have a draft initial report that we are currently working through that was shared with the team June 29th. They've been going through it, and we will start working through comments on that. At this point, we're not looking to relitigate anything. We are looking to tighten up the text and the language and get that initial report out to public comment as soon as we can.

So let's go into what's next. We have an initial report. This is a very boiled-down thing. This slide does not govern, but it's meant to be very boiled down for Council digestion because I know you guys get a lot of information in. On the trigger, the trigger is triggered by actionable evidence on confirmed DNS abuse. We are not looking at compromised domain names. That is out of scope for us. What we are asking the registrars to do is a reasonable investigation. They must perform a reasonable investigation in order to determine whether or not associated domain names are used for DNS abuse. That's the point of the associated domain names check, and everybody is on board with that. In terms of the investigation itself, the registrars must review information reasonably accessible, and that reasonable investigation must be practical and proportionate based on the circumstances. Let me dig into this one just a little bit, because there's a lot here. Thing one, information reasonably accessible. What we mean by that is we don't expect the registrars to have to go out and create lots of new data, conduct studies, collect giant pieces of personal information, all those kinds of things. The associated domain name checks are about what they have in front of them. And then the practical and proportionate is a concern that we all share, that we don't want the associated domain name check to turn into a registrar portfolio-wide witch hunt, for lack of a better word. I'm sorry. I wish there was a better word. But we want the ADCs to be narrowly focused and proportionate to what is going on in the DNS abuse. And so, we have built in some safeguards around that. And the NCSG has been especially helpful in helping us frame all that. In terms of determining association, the registrars must take into consideration potential indicators such as the registered name holder or account-related information or technical information or what looks to be coordinated behavior. And we didn't put in here an exhaustive list of indicators because, as we all know, the most creative people in the world are criminals. And so it doesn't make sense, one, for us to put in an exhaustive list that is going to be outdated shortly after the policy's done. And we also don't particularly want to write on the wall how to evade us in future ADC checks. So, those things will evolve, and ICANN Compliance and the registrars will work together to evolve that.

Safeguards, I mentioned. The ADC must be conducted in compliance with applicable laws, including data privacy laws and ICANN contractual requirements. Again, a non-exhaustive list of considerations such as data minimization. The reason why we are not putting in an exhaustive list here is because one of the other creative people out there are legislators, and they make up laws that evolve and change. And again, we don't want a big policy that expires shortly after we do it because of a major law change. In terms of the ADC timeline, they'll be initiated and conducted promptly following the receipt or identification of actionable evidence of DNS abuse. Believe it or not, we spent a good time talking about this, and "promptly" is the language that's already in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And so after some back and forth, we did congeal around this, but this was an interesting topic. I was surprised how much time we spent on it, but we gave it a good look. And then we have policy effectiveness. We think ICANN org should review the policy's effectiveness after two years. We just need some time for data to accrue in terms of how it's working. And we're focusing on how the ADC obligations, whether or not they've been consistently implemented. We didn't tie it to a hard number. First of all, it's an unmeasurable number, but it's also not a fair number. We didn't say, "Well, check and see how much DNS abuse has gone up or down because of the ADC check." That's just a data point that's out of our hands, and I've not heard anybody say that in the age of AI and the coming age of quantum, that DNS abuse is going to magically go away. In fact, other people think it's probably going to go a little bit the other way, especially when quantum hits us. And so it didn't seem fair to say to ICANN Compliance or to look at a policy and declare it a failure because there's more DNS abuse instead of less. But it's more about whether or not the registrars are doing it and reporting to ICANN, and we will do our best to have the policy and its implementation looked at rather than some other big giant number.

And then lastly, in terms of demonstrating compliance, registrars must be able to demonstrate compliance with the ADC requirements when obligations are triggered by actionable evidence of DNS abuse. And that includes demonstrating the time, the information reviewed, and any potential action. So that's how ICANN Compliance will take a look at whether or not registrars are implementing the policy correctly. Ashley, I see your hand's up. Would you like to have an intervening question now, or is that to get your place in line for Q&A at the end?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Right now would be best while your mind is fresh on the topic. So thank you for raising policy effectiveness and demonstrating compliance. Sometimes it's not always clear what the difference is between the two. And just one other thing. One of our registrars raised a really good point overnight, which was in terms of assessing the policy's effectiveness, this could get a bit funny, a bit tricky, as we have multiple abuse PDPs going on. So just wanted to flag this as something for us to keep in mind if this is going to be a standard component of our PDPs going forward on DNS abuse. How do we do this in a way, if we're going to have them almost back to back to back, how do we distinguish between what is effective? Because was it this policy or was it this policy? So just flagging. Thank you so much, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah. Thanks, Ashley, and that's actually one of the points about policy effectiveness that your comment actually sort of demonstrates even better, the distinction between is the policy effective? In other words, are the registrars implementing it? Do the reports make sense? All those kinds of things versus effectiveness on the global scale. Hard to measure. And even if we could magically measure that, you're right. As the Council puts out more and more efforts in this area, then what? How would we possibly parse out, oh, DNS abuse went down 3% because of ADC checks, but 17% because of the other thing. Yeah, it's a great point. Farzi. Hi.

FARZANEH BADII: Hello, Paul. So I'm a Council member, so I don't want to speak as a member of the DNS Abuse Working Group. But I just think that for all of the PDPs' policy effectiveness, a policy is not effective if qualitative indicators are not considered. You could totally say, yeah, we managed to reduce the number of the DNS abuse, and it could correlate to these various policies. But if, as a result of that, you also had many false positives or you also had suspensions that were unfair and there were no appeals, that is not effective policy. So we need to have more qualitative indicators. I don't know how. It's either for the group to decide, but I don't think that each group should decide on their own. But this is something to discuss with the Council as well. How do we consider policy effectiveness?

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Farzi. And by the way, as you know, I'm terrible about reading chat when speaking, but I did see your chat, and I'm standing behind witch hunt. All right. Let's move on to the next slide. So, other topics. We came across a few... Oh, by the way, I want to go back. So there are nine questions and eight recommendations, and you're thinking, "Oh, McGrady, you missed something." No, one of the questions is not leading to a recommendation. What it is, is leading to things that were out of scope for us that we think are worth Council attention, and those will be coming back to you through our Council liaison in a less formal manner. So we didn't skip one.

So we came across a few issues that we deemed important for mitigating abuse that should be further considered by Council. We will be sharing that with Council as soon as finalized, and it'll finalize. It'll come through Jen. And so there were some other things, just a few teaser examples here. So a recourse mechanism and transparency on mitigation action taken, as well as the potential cross-contracted party information and intelligence sharing. Probably really good ideas, but out of scope for us. And so, that's one of the things that I personally am hoping that these sort of, I need a new word for them. But maybe we'll call them fast-track PDPs, where we're taking little chunks and we're moving quickly through the little chunks. I hope they cause a creativity loop where things that were maybe not in scope for this one can come back to Council, and then maybe not this one, but maybe this one, one further down might be able to tackle some of these issues. So, you will see that come back, not as a recommendation, but rather through Jen. Now I did it, Farzi second hand. Farzi, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: I'm sorry. So I just, again, we are going to bring this to the group. But the Council here also needs to look at when a group, when a PDP declares something out of scope, then we need to look at it carefully, and we need to see if it's really out of scope. And this is not just about DNS Abuse Group. So personally, I don't think that transparency and remedy and other issues are out of scope when there's an action, and there's a policy that could impact the registrant. But one thing that I have seen over and over in PDPs is that every time we don't want to discuss something, we say that it's out of scope. So I think that it needs further discussion on is it out of scope, or are we saying that we can attend to this issue in a more holistic way if we go to the Council and tell the Council that we need to have a PDP on transparency or a separate PDP on remedy. So I think that would be a better framing than saying that it's out of scope because it can be risky for other PDPs to just say, "Yeah, this is out of scope," and the majority wins. So I think that it's better to reframe it. And also the Council too, especially the liaison, to watch for this. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Farzi. And specifically, this thing that we said was out of scope was a recourse mechanism and transparency on mitigation action taken. And so that has to do with mitigating DNS abuse. What we were focused on was ADC checks, and so it's that part. We weren't tasked with figuring out what happens after somebody takes a mitigation action and recourse mechanism. So I don't want to spend our time debating this too much, Farzi, but how about one more time? Just in a second, but I want to explain why this ended up out of scope, and whether or not we think it's a good idea. We think it's an interesting idea. It's not up to the working group to dictate to Council what they think should be a good idea, but it is certainly important enough to flag it for Council and say, "Hey, guys, take a look at this. It came up." All right. Farzi, your hand went down. Susan, hi.

SUSAN PAYNE: Hello. Thank you. I think I was just going to flag, I think I'm correct in this, that some of your, I don't know what to call them, your parking lot items, let's say, are ones that were in the issues report as well. I think this recourse idea is in the issues report, and indeed, I've heard some people talking about actually recourse more generally. The idea of recourse has come up in other PDPs as well. And so, it may be that it's something that's more broad than just DNS abuse. I'm just spitballing here. But yeah. It's not necessarily that all of these items are completely new. Some of them were in the issues report. So it's just added data that we can take on board.

PAUL MCGRADY: Perfect. Thank you, Susan. Yeah. I like parking lot. I almost call them Christmas list items, but not only is that not a universal holiday, but the older I get, the more I look like Santa. So let's not say Christmas. All right. Okay, let's move on. And the road to ICANN87, this is the fun part. So as we know, June was last month. We developed a draft initial report, and we are working to resolve pending items. We have one left. But it's a fairly narrow item about where a definition should go, rather than implementation guidance or in a recommendation itself. So that, we hope is going to work out soon. In July, the working group's reviewing the draft initial report, and we'll be adjusting language, and we will also be completing all the other impact assessments. These are the fulsome ones. We did two, the lightweight ones, on human rights and data. Now we're doing fulsome ones on all of them. Those are out for the working group to look through, but so far comments have been positive. In August, we'll hopefully finalize a draft initial report, have a working group consensus call on it, and we will start public comment. In September, there'll be public comment going on, and we'll be doing some webinars to present it to the community to answer questions and get people prepared to public comment on it. So September should be a nice light month for everybody, except for Nick, Jen, and me. So that's good. September's a nice month to have it not be so heavy. And then right back to work at ICANN87. We'll have four working group sessions to discuss the public comment, and make adjustments to the report to turn it hopefully into a draft final report while in Bali together. We are not going to be able to have enough time to bake in a consensus call, to have that consensus call in Bali. Too bad, I was hoping for a photo opportunity. But that will come a few weeks after Bali, if everything goes well. And then we should be handing this back to Council before the end of the year. So from March to December, March to November, that turned out to be the timeframe that we needed, and so we just kept moving. Again, it's early, so this timeline could slip. But I'm hoping it doesn't, because slippage would mean re-litigation, and we all agreed up front we wouldn't be doing a lot of that. So, that's where we are. I think that may be the official last slide. I know we've already done some Q&A, but we can have some more. All right. I don't know that we see hands. Okay. Susan, back to you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you, Paul. And thank you very much for all of your work and the work obviously of the working group, but everyone is working really promptly and really hard, and we really appreciate it. And it's fantastic to see this effort looking like it's coming in ahead of schedule. So we all love that. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Susan. And I will say, the ICANN staff is killing it. And I've said this before publicly, but this is a representative model, right? And the various parts of ICANN sent their very best people, and I think that's why we are getting the good outcomes at the pace we are. So thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. All right. Then I think we can, since we're talking about DNS abuse, we can move on to a quick conversation about the DNS Abuse PDP2 charter. Draft charter. Very draft charter. So agenda item five, and hopefully Jen is still able to take this one from her corridor.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you so much, Susan. Yes, I can take it from my corridor. Hopefully my audio is still okay. Okay, I see some nods. Perfect. So, continuing on with our favorite topic of the meeting, DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP2. There is a draft charter update. Councilors, you would have seen that we've circulated right before this meeting the draft updated charter for PDP2. Everybody knows that this was originally included in our final issue report, but obviously we have learned several things since then, especially going through the process for PDP1. And so Council thought it would be really good for leadership and also staff to take a first cut at updating this draft charter, and now we're presenting it in front of you. Today we're going to take a look at some initial reactions and feedback, but of course, we have a lot of time for us Councilors to take this back to your SGs and Cs to take a look at it. Here is a little bit of a background there. I think I've kind of gone through this. I think similarly to what Paul has mentioned, I'm not going to go through that again. We know where we are.

So the purpose, if we can go to the next slide. Here it is. So we have enough time for Council to take it back to your SGs and Cs for further review, and then we can come together during our August meeting. I don't have the precise date, but somebody will certainly put that in the chat so we know when that is. So when we come back in the August meeting, we can decide, thank you Hong-Fu, whether or not Council would like a draft charter team established for this charter. I know that there was already some back and forth in the mailing list about that. So definitely we have ample time for some in-depth feedback with SGs and Cs, and we also have ample time for us to decide what the next steps will be. Okay, I think we can go to the next slide. So let's go through some main changes. So here's the rationale behind some of the changes of the charter questions. If you remember seeing different ones in the final issue report, we looked at making the charter questions more open and more balanced. There is definitely a sorting into clusters. You'll see four topical clusters. I'm not going to go into that. You'll see that in the subsequent slides. There's more logical flow because some of the questions actually doubled up on meaning when we took a look at it and we were like, "Well, this is certainly not focused." And then we updated the human rights impact assessments, the global public interest, and other considerations that we discussed during our very intensive work on the PDP charter one. So those are also reflected into this update. We've also updated the membership model. We based it on the ADC PDP. So I think councilors will be happy to see that all of the good discussions we had then are also reflected in there. It is a representative model, and we have currently by default the same seat numbers as PDP one, as we have discussed before. There is also some clarity on the process of the chair selection, and then we can take a look at the next slide.

And here we are diving into it here for the first time. I think there have been just minimal updates to the issue. I think we've all known that the three issues that Council has prioritized in the final issue report, this is the second one. So it's safeguards for the API access to new customers. I'm not going to read through that. I expect we all know this in our sleep, and we can say this. The purpose also, we've adjusted the language a little bit. Leadership had some feedback there. I think originally the framing was a little stark, and I think we've made it a little more neutral here. And of course, it's looking to have a framework of responsibility and accountability, and you can see all of that. Clearly we need to establish due diligence and all of these other considerations as well. I think we can go to the next slide there. Okay. Here we have the charter questions in front of you. You will have seen it in the PDP, but here you have it in slide format. It's the same content there. You will also notice that we've removed API, the term API, in the charter questions. I think we've described it in a way that makes more sense and allows this PDP, the working group members, participants, everybody who will be involved with this work to be able to dive deeper and to be able to have a better and neutrally framed question so we can have a better discussion as well. I don't really want to go too much into the content here. I do realize that councilors may need some time to dig a little bit deeper on these particular changes in the language, in how we separate it into four categories. You see the covered capabilities of what this PDP is about. Then we go to the access requirements, we go to ongoing administration, and then we go to roles and responsibilities. I think if you map it to what it looked like in the final issue report, you'll see that we've tried to organize it in a better logical way.

What was the word API substituted for? Thanks, Lawrence, for the question. Oh, thank you. So, let me just try to explain it a little bit better. API is the conduit where we were trying to address a problem. So the problem really we're trying to solve here is not how, but more of the scale and the volume and the speed. So right now, this is how, I guess, bad actors or people who are doing DNS abuse, that's how they do it. But in the future, if there's a different way to also do the volume and speed or both by another way, then if we kind of narrow it too much to precisely what it is, I think we will be limiting ourselves in our discussions. It could be when we come to, and I'm not going to preempt any discussion of the actual recommendation language, but it could be in that part we would name API as the current, I guess, conduit or method. But in a charter question, I think this is probably framed in a better way. And I think that Justine also kind of put that there, access to domain name registrations at scale. I think that's access to registration is what we kind of changed it to. I don't want to also preempt all that discussion that you will all probably need some time to digest and talk to your stakeholder groups and constituencies about, but I think we were trying to make sure we had the right problem that we're trying to solve instead of framing it in something that actually doesn't help us down the road.

Okay. I think we can probably go to this one. Yeah. So you'll see this, and this is going to be very familiar to councilors that are participating in PDP 1. We have updated this to what you see before you. I think actually Ashley's question to Paul earlier was interesting because we've also included this here, and I think we will be including this in all of the PDPs going forward, especially for the DNS abuse mitigation issues and gaps, so that there's metrics about policy's effectiveness. We need to give it really good thought there, and then that's different to the last bullet. There is a demonstration of compliance. Let's go to the next slide. You now see the numbers that you will also be familiar with, those who have looked at the charter for PDP 1 and those who are on the charter drafting team for PDP 1. This is a default for now, and of course, you can take this back to your SGs and Cs and take a look. But I think we've learned really good lessons going through PDP 1, that this representative model is actually quite conducive to very good and focused discussions. It also allows enough time for each of the representatives to go back to their SGs and Cs for any further input and discussion on the policy questions and the recommendations as well. We will still have participants and subject matter experts. Observers can still join the meeting in real time. There are pre-ICANN meetings that are organized for community updates, so the ones that you've seen from Paul and Nick, I guess the webinars, the information webinars, the updates to Council, that's all going to be the same. And when we are in face-to-face ICANN meetings, the same thing will happen as well. Community is allowed to speak and ask questions and provide input, and I'm sure you've seen Paul and Nick also manage that really well for PDP 1. So I think that's a good kind of continuity for us to follow in PDP 2. The aim is really to balance the participation and inclusivity with consensus building, and that's why we have this. Let's go to the next slide.

And here we have some clarifications and clearer language on expressions of interest for the working group chair. I know we also had some confusion and discussion during PDP 1, so we're applying the lessons we learned from that to make sure the language here is much clearer. I'm not going to read it out. You can see that here on the slide, and you can also read it in the PDF version that was circulated. And let's go. Are there any more slides? Yes. Next steps. Let's go to next steps. So here it is. I think I started off with this. Please take a look at the PDF. Please bring it back to your SGs and Cs. Discuss further. We'd love feedback. Send the feedback to Council. You could give the feedback at least, I think, probably before our August meeting so we can actually have some discussion also on the mailing list if we need to. During the August meeting, we will talk about whether or not we will call for a charter drafting team. And then, of course, the timing for that, as Paul has given us the update on PDP 1, I think will be really good for us to use that quieter period when PDP 1 is in public comment. I know a lot of councilors and community members and subject matter experts are very busy on PDP 1. So when we use that kind of quieter period, we'll have more bandwidth and mind space to be able to work on this charter. I see in the chat that Farzaneh says we need this in the Google document. So perhaps, staff, if we're able to have that version so it's easier for councilors to be able to take a look at it and I guess when they take it back to their SGs and Cs, they can probably look at it a little better as well. So I'm sure staff will be able to do that. I think this is the end of the slides, and I'll stop here for any questions. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah. Thank you, Jen, for the work put into this and for the review so far. First off, I want to go back to reiterate what I brought up on the mailing list. This is the second of a number of PDPs coming down the line, and as much as possible, there are a lot of learnings, yes. But based on the diversity within the Council, it's nice to ensure that in the different processes leading to the eventual PDP, at least there should be a balance in most of our activities going forward. All that you have listed and noted so far definitely could still have gone into that kind of a process that we engaged for PDP 1. To the substance, yes, we definitely will take this back to the BC. I'm sure that we'll be reviewing this vis-à-vis the initial draft that was done during the issues report. Recall that at that point we had the two charters already drafted. But I would want to say that there are a number of comments that were also put forward while we had the public comment period. And whilst a number of them could impact the changes that we will be seeing in terms of what the final draft is, I think yourself and staff have done a good job on this so far. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks so much, Lawrence. Absolutely taking into your points. Just to reiterate and clarify, of course, leadership does not find any problems with calling for our charter drafting team at all. I know when we did it for PDP 1, it was in a very condensed time. So we do have more time here. Hopefully, you'll take a look at it with the BC, others also, and provide the feedback to Council before we make that decision in August. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yep. Thanks, Jen. I wanted to thank you and also leadership for doing the work to come up with this draft charter. I had a very cursory look at it, and I think it looks good. But I'm pretty sure that ALAC would appreciate the opportunity to dive into a little bit more and just to make sure that we're entirely happy with it. So in that respect, I would like to thank Council for giving us the time to do that. I know you said something about possibly using the September lull, if I heard you correctly, to dive into the possibility of getting through this in a little bit more detail. But my question is, based on Paul's report earlier, do we have an indication of when PDP 2 might start? Of course, I'm not going to hold anyone to that, but just to give us an idea.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Justine. Paul did mention the timeline for PDP 1 is going faster than expected, but of course, he gave the caveat at the end there, there could be time slippage. So I think that's as much information as we can have right now in Council about that. And the lull specifically is during the public comment period. It is a quieter time for the working group members. So that's when we will do this charter drafting effort or charter drafting team as needed, as necessary, and all of that. I hope this was helpful, Justine. I know I can't give you any specific or specificity, I'm very bad with this word, on the actual date. But certainly, it's faster than we might expect, is what I can say.

JUSTINE CHEW: All right. Sorry, Sam. Would it be safe to say not earlier than quarter one of 2027?

JENNIFER CHUNG: I really can't say that because if PDP 1... Yeah. Well, not earlier than is probably a good way to put it. Yeah.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Justine. Sam?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Hey, Jen, this is Sam. I'll just echo everyone else's thanks and praise for the good work that you guys have done on this, but maybe just add one more note of encouragement or voice to the idea that if we all agree that we want to set up a charter drafting team, not necessarily needing to wait the extra month to go ahead and do that. I think we could use this time now to get some of the administrative steps out of the way, the call for volunteers, the initial Doodling for early meetings and such. We don't necessarily have to start meeting right away because, as you... Sorry, I'm getting an incoming. As you mentioned, we do obviously need to have some time to take this back to our stakeholder groups and constituencies. But we could always get the ball rolling, and if we end up getting the work done a little bit earlier, then at least the charter's just ready to go for whenever we want to hit the ground running on PDP 2. So just a thought for everyone to consider. Strike while the iron's hot. There's a lot of interest in getting this done. Thank you guys again.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Sam. I'm going to virtually look at staff to see what actual steps we need to do that. Do we need to wait for the next Council meeting? Are there steps we can take on the Council mailing list to set that up? Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE: Yeah. Not entirely to answer that, but I suppose just to say, I guess, that from leadership's side, I don't think any of us are opposed to moving this forward. It really was more we were trying to be respectful of folks' time and appreciating that a number of people on Council are also in the PDP DNS Abuse 1. And so it's nothing more than that. If anything, we were concerned that people would be saying we were overloading everyone, that they didn't have the capacity. But we're clearly seeing a lot of enthusiasm for having a charter drafting team and for kind of getting things moving. So I think we can take that on board, and I'm going to turn over to Steve. But there was nothing more than that. We were trying to be respectful and not overload folks.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Steve?

STEVE CHAN: Yeah. Thanks, Jen. This is Steve from staff. And Jen mentioned this point, and I think it's a really important one, taking us back to PDP 1 charter drafting time. We convened an effort that completed in about a week right before the holiday break, and this is a very different situation. There's considerably more time available to try to dial this charter in. And so, from the staff perspective, we have no concerns if there's a charter drafting team established, and there's time within the schedule to allow for that to happen and to take its due course. So if there is a desire to try to set that up in advance, that's okay, I suppose. But just from our perspective, it seemed to make sense to allow the groups to have their time to review the charter. And it's not to presume that we got it perfect, but maybe we did actually do an okay job. But who knows? And that was the intention, to try to allow the groups to have that time to review it in detail and come back and determine if there's a charter team actually needed, taking into account the much more flexibility within the schedule to accomplish that work. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Steve. Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Yeah. Thank you. Quick question. What will be the process of deciding if a charter drafting team is needed or not? Is it feeling that everybody wants it, not wants it, or it's like a vote, or how will that work?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Vivek. This is a Steve or staff question, but my feeling is people are asking for it, and there was suggestion for us to get that administrative part done. But that's the charter drafting team for PDP 2 will not start meeting until we come to that nice lull and quiet period for PDP 1. That was what I gleaned from it. If I am wrong, please somebody correct me. Vivek, is that a follow-up question before I go to Steve, or Steve, you wanted to respond back first?

VIVEK GOYAL: I'll wait for Steve.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay, Steve.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks. Thanks, Jen. Thanks, Vivek. The threshold is essentially if the Council determines it's needed. That's about it. I think the only reason we were trying to suggest that this should be a tiered process to determine if there's a need for the drafting team is simply being mindful, I guess, and thoughtful about resource allocation. So if the draft charter ended up being more or less fit for purpose, then there is not necessarily a need to establish a drafting team. But if the Council wants to kick off that effort earlier and ensure it is going to happen for sure, then that is the Council's prerogative. Thanks.

VIVEK GOYAL: Got it. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Steve. And oh, did that answer your question, Vivek? You don't need to come back for the second part?

VIVEK GOYAL: Yeah, I think a conversation with BC will help us put our thoughts forward in the August meeting. But I would request other members also to do that, so that by the August meeting, we can take a call either way and then get started with the admin process either way. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Vivek. Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi. Thank you, Jennifer. So I just wanted to make sure I'm getting everything right, and I apologize, I'm sure it was all on the slides. So we're talking, the August deadline for feedback, what date precisely in August?

JENNIFER CHUNG: I think August 13th is our next Council meeting. But I would caveat that. I wouldn't say that it's a deadline for feedback. I think what I'm hearing is we can get that call to volunteers out for the charter drafting team already. So I think rolling feedback is perfectly fine because I don't expect, well, I don't want to jinx anything. I don't want to be clairvoyant because I'm not. If we are going to go ahead with that in the quiet period, which whenever that is, that is what it is, during the public comment period for PDP 1, then of course, further feedback and tweaking and adjusting can be done then. So it's not a hard cutoff for feedback, so I would encourage us to have a lot of feedback by then, but it's not that you can't give feedback afterwards, especially if we are going to have a charter drafting team. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you. That's very helpful. I was just trying to map up with our existing meeting schedule, as well as recognizing a lot of people, Europeans in particular, take aggressive vacations in this timeframe, so this helps. This helps a lot. Thank you very much.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Ashley. I don't see any more hands unless that's a new hand, Ashley. Maybe that's an... Okay, that's not a new hand. Oh, it is a new hand. Oh, nope.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: All right. I got an itchy trigger finger. Sorry.

JENNIFER CHUNG: All good. Back to you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much. Thanks, Jen. Okay. I think we're onto our next agenda item, which is six, which is a Council discussion on the initiation of the prioritization exercise. And this is one that we all know and love. We obviously have had a number of discussions across previous meetings, including most recently a pretty lengthy discussion at our last meeting in Seville. And so now we are launching the sort of test run of the prioritization exercise, basically. And the idea of this, it's intended to be, really the kind of scoring exercise, which is what I'm talking about particularly, intended to give a more structured and transparent approach to then allow us to go into a discussion and that potential sequencing of future Council work. So we're calling it a test run. The objective is not to have a perfect methodology right from the outset, but it's really to start with a methodology and to see how it goes. And we'll test out having this idea of a common framework, and then gather the experience of folks as they use it. And as needed, we can then refine the process over time. Although we are doing this in order to test the methodology, we are also endeavoring to utilize this in the live, to actually try prioritizing. We have a set of items that have been sitting on our action list for quite some time now, and we do need to be able to work out how to effectively prioritize them. And that's something we've committed to the community that we'll do. And so, this test run is being conducted on live examples and, as I say, we're hopeful that this will help us when we go into the more discussion element of the task.

So really the idea is just encouraging everyone to approach it from that perspective. There is a value in the outcome, but the value isn't just in the outcome, it's also in what we learn about the approach to how it works. Does it help us make informed decisions? What works well, what doesn't work, and so on. And let's just try it and see if it helps us to better understand where we have shared views on what should be prioritized, maybe where we have differing views. What factors are driving the differences? And so we better understand each other's perspectives. And we can hopefully come to a kind of outcome that we've got a robust decision on how we're prioritizing the tasks that are sitting on our plate. So I think just to be clear again, I think we've said it before, the scoring exercise, the results of that are not determinative. They're the starting point. They'll give us a basis for the discussion, they'll allow us to see where we're aligned. They'll allow us to see where we're not aligned and hopefully to understand better what the thinking is from the different groups, on how they make the decisions they've made. And it might also be that it identifies for us that some of the items or one or more of the items in the current list, that we're all actually aligned that that's not a priority to be taken forward at the moment. And that in itself is really useful. Rather than having things sort of sitting forever pending as being tasks that we're going to take forward, but we never do. So, in terms of the timing, we're launching it now. The deadline for councilors to get their scoring back in is 13th of August, please. Then, what will happen is that all those submissions will be uploaded into a dedicated wiki page, so there will be transparency on that, and staff will provide an overview document that gives some notes on where there's broad alignment and where there's divergence. And we'll have those consolidated results presented to us. And we will then, having had time to review and consider that, we'll plan to discuss the outcomes and discuss the overall results of the scoring and how we scored and explore with each other why we reached the decisions we reached during September. So that'll be during our September meeting.

And I think, if you'll bear with me, we'll have a look. I think we've looked at it before, but we'll have a look at the scoring document in a minute. But first, just a little bit more information. What it has in there is some background information on the different projects, just to give everyone the same sort of consistent approach and the same considerations that they're taking into consideration when they're doing the scoring. There's an intent, essentially, for everyone to just start from a kind of common baseline. And the material isn't meant to predetermine the scores or replace individual judgments. So the idea is that those of us who are filling in the document should be using that background information and then using obviously our own knowledge and the perspectives of our groups where we're needing to vote on behalf of, with the input of our constituencies or stakeholder groups. We'll be taking all of that together, and we'll be applying it to the different projects. For each one, we have five criteria. We've certainly, I think, mentioned these before. They've been shared before. But the criteria, and it may be on the next slide, I think, are importance, community demand, complexity, resources, and deliverability. I'm not sure who's running the slides, but maybe it's on the next one. Yes. There we are. And we're scoring on a one to five scale. On this slide it says one is very low and five is very high, but actually on the scoring sheet, which we'll come to in a minute, and Steve will run through, there's more information and a bit more guidance on what that one to five scale means for each of those five. Because it isn't quite each time it's low, each time it's high. But so we've got examples so that you've got a better understanding for each criterion what a one score means and what a five score means.

And I think the other thing to flag at the moment is one of the projects that we are prioritizing is DNS abuse. And it's important to flag that we need to distinguish that there'll be two levels of prioritization on DNS abuse. So for this exercise, we're asking participants to consider DNS abuse related policy work as a kind of single Council project, alongside the other projects, RPMs, UDRP. You know the ones, but again, when we look at the sheet, we'll have a reminder of them. But that doesn't mean that if folks are prioritizing DNS abuse, that we're treating that as one single PDP covering everything in the issues report. That's not the idea. So don't score it on that assumption, because I think that would sort of skew the results and be misleading. What we're really doing is just prioritizing whether we feel the idea of doing further work on DNS abuse as a priority. And assuming it reaches a, when it has a priority level, we'll then look at a further dedicated prioritization exercise of the individual items within the DNS abuse sphere. Because obviously there are a number of them. The idea of trying to pull them all out and do them as a single prioritization exercise, I think we felt was too complex, especially for this kind of test run. So we would have, on the assumption that further work on abuse is prioritized, what we'll do is there'll be a second run, if you like, just on the abuse items. And again, I think just a reminder, it's just about us trying to prioritize work. We know there's a lot of work on our plate. There's a lot of work being called for by the community. We have, to some extent, we're a finite Council, we're a finite community resource. And so, it's working out, based on those criteria, what we go forward with first. It doesn't mean other things don't get dealt with, it just means we all, in all of our lives, have to prioritize what we do first. And frankly, that is what we're doing.

So yes. I think I already covered this, but basically everything will be captured in a wiki space. There'll be a consolidation into a sort of master matrix. We'll have the opportunity to look at that and to discuss it. I don't know if I said, but I think one of the things we can do in addition to the scoring is there's also the opportunity to add comments and further information that gives a bit of guidance to why you scored in a particular way. And I actually would really encourage folks to do that if you can, because it will help others to understand where you're coming from. And frankly, if you're trying to gather the feedback from your respective groups and collect that together, it's helpful for you as well to be able to have that record of a week or a month down the line. Like, "Why did I score it three?" Or, "Why did I score it four?" So if you can, I think that will be helpful for us all. I don't think it's essential, but certainly I think it would be very preferable if you can do that in addition to the actual scoring. And then I think at this point, I'm probably going to hand over to Steve maybe, to kind of just run through the scoring doc. I think it's Steve. Is that right, Steve? Yeah. Perfect. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Thanks, Susan. This is Steve from staff. And thanks, Feodora. All right. So this is the scoring sheet. There are four tabs, and we'll quickly run through what is in each of them. The first tab is really just the basic overall instructions, and I think it doesn't really cover anything that

Susan hasn't already just covered in the slides. The only thing I think I would emphasize here is, I guess two things. One is that there's a link to the step-by-step guide if you need further guidance or background and context. And then also the deadline is captured here, which, as noted by Susan, is 13 August.

So quickly moving to the second tab. I think this one's a little more important. Susan mentioned this too. So I think the really important thing to highlight on this tab is the scoring scale, which, as Susan hinted at, is not immediately intuitive. And the reason for that is, what we try to do is make sure that the scoring scale is uniform in the sense that one is a low score in all cases, and five is a good score in all cases. And this is to make it a little bit easier to aggregate scores and have them... I'm trying not to use the word ranked, because that's not what this exercise is, but to be able to give the Council a better uniform sense of where all the different projects line up. And so what this means in practice is things like importance, demand, and deliverability, those fit into the one to five scale intuitively. One is low and five is high. And so the two where it is maybe not as clear is for something like complexity and resources, where I think it is maybe going to seem a little bit backwards. So one means high complexity or high level of resources, and then five is the opposite, so low complexity and low resources. And so, like I said, the idea was to try to make sure that it was a uniform one to five, where one is low and five is good. So that is all I want to highlight on that tab. I see a hand from Lawrence, and maybe if you don't mind, I'll just try to run through the end, if that's okay. I see a thumbs up.

All right, so the third tab, this should look familiar. Susan also mentioned this one as well. This, like I said, should look familiar. This is very similar to, I guess, the series of briefing documents that staff produced on the different sets of potential projects to include in this prioritization exercise. What we've done, and we just scrolled past it, that timeline that was just shared right there, that has been refreshed, so that is current. And then the bottom section that Feodora was just going to, it has also been refreshed, and the text in green is what has been added and what is new. But like I said, or like Susan said, actually, the idea in refreshing all this is to hopefully ensure that the councilors all have a common understanding of the projects. And you'll see that includes things that try to spell out the next steps, and therefore understanding what the next steps are, what the presumed level of effort is. And so this is very similar to the documents that have been shared in the past, but like I said, just refreshed with the current state of affairs.

Lastly is the fourth tab, and so this tab is where the scoring will take place. We will distribute Excel versions to all the groups, to all the councilors, so the groups can do this as an offline exercise. And then, as Susan mentioned, all of the results will be aggregated for the Council to review as a whole. But the other information on this slide is sort of duplicative of some of the previous tabs, and it's really just included here for your convenience, so you're not flipping between tabs to remember what the scale is and what the scoring means. But what you'll see here is all the projects that are considered within scope, and then a line item for each of them to be scored individually. So that is the very brief run-through. As mentioned, this will be shared as an Excel sheet so that groups can go through the scoring exercise. And I think that is all I had, and going immediately over to Lawrence, who had his hand up earlier.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Steve. You answered my question already. It was basically around our ability to measure how complex or what resources will be needed for any particular issue, but I see that that's taken care of, I think, in the third slide. I mean, third tab. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Great. Thanks, Lawrence. Back over to you, Susan, unless there's any other additional questions.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks very much, Steve. Yeah. So again, just pausing to see if there are any hands. Otherwise, yeah. We're kicking this off where I don't know if I've got a sort of summary slide left, but 13th of August, so I think we all have a few things we now have to do by that same deadline, which is fun. Once you get your scoring in, then it will all get shared. There was a question from Volker, and I think I answered correctly. I don't think we're all inputting into one dynamic document that's changing as we're doing it, but we'll do our own scoring, and then we'll report back. And obviously for most of us folks here, that requires us to get the input from our groups as well. So, do get on that as quickly as you can so that we can try and take that forward. And then we'll be in the position, once we've had some time to look at the aggregated outcomes, for us to have that deep dive into sort of what this means and to better understand each other's scoring and why folks are maybe prioritizing something that you think is not a priority, and vice versa. Benjamin.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Yeah. Thank you, Susan. Benjamin. So I was just reacting, first off, to Jen's notes on the chat where she said the scoring is not really scoring. So it's difficult to deal with scoring when you have the word scoring or ranking. So I was thinking, maybe it's too late now, but if there's going to be a secondary iteration of it, if we don't want us to think about scoring or ranking the way it is, maybe you could call it weight or use another word, but that word will always... And because you also care so much about us not sabotaging, screwing the results. Because typically, too, I want this issue to be discussed, then I'll probably give it all the weight it matters, even without looking at others' views. But I just want the value, the weight of the word. The next thing I wanted to say was about the Excel sheet. Is it going to be online, and at what time? Are we all just going to be punching in our rankings or whatever weight we give to any topic, or we're going to have the Excel offline individually? So that's just my question, because if we're all putting it in at the same time, at what point will be the cutoff such that... I know that August 13th is the deadline. But at what time would they be captured, or would the leadership have some time to review it later to come to conclusion and say, "Okay, this is weighing more or the other," or is it just going to be instantaneous? That's my question.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Benjamin. So I'm going to answer, and if I get it wrong, Steve will tell me. The idea, I think, is that this is going to be something that you work on offline. So it's not like one single massive document that we're all trying to input into at the same time. And so it's kind of, you do your thing, that allows you then to share it with your colleagues and so on, and get the necessary input, and then sort of send it in, basically. And then staff will do that exercise of combining the weightings. I quite like your weighting word. And then that's the second step of the process. We then have the kind of composite weightings from everyone who's completed it, and we then have the opportunity to review it, have that discussion, kind of try to reach a better understanding from folks of why they think something is more important than others. And it might even, that might even have you go, "Oh, that's a really good point. I take that on board. That's something I hadn't thought about." So that's the kind of exercise we're going to try and do once we've had that first pass on the weighting marks. Tapani?

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Yeah. Thank you, Susan. Tapani here. I think this may well actually work pretty well, as long as we do not put too much value on the aggregated scores, at least after the first round. Because as long as it's starting for discussion, it may work quite well. But I think it will be useful to also, as I think they said last time, play with the, analyze how much more small differences in the individual inputs will affect the total outcome. So as long as it's for discussion and not for determining winner, as I think Jen said already, then it will be maybe pretty good.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Tapani. Absolutely not a sort of list of winners and losing projects. It's kind of a starting point. I think, me making assumptions here, I think, if everyone put the same item as the highest weighting, and it came out by far and away above everything else, then probably there's relatively less discussion to have about that one. But that will come out when we have the discussion as well. So it's, no, the discussion part, as Jen is saying, is absolutely part of the process, and this is just to try and give us a framework so that we're going into that discussion with an understanding of where each other are viewing things on these different criteria. Yeah. I'm loving pretty good, actually. I got very encouraged by that from Tapani. Okay. I'm pausing. I'm not seeing any more hands at the moment. So, if there are no more hands, I think, just to say, let's give it a go. And hopefully we find that it is of some benefit to us and that it allows us to move that prioritization of our workload forward. All right. Thanks, everyone.

Okay. I think we're now onto AOB, and we do have a couple of items. Just before we start, I did just want to mention, we always get a few attendees and observers in our Council meetings. It's always really gratifying. And we've got 13 who have stuck with us for this long, and really pleased to see that a number of folks who are due to be joining Council in October are taking the opportunity to follow the course. So, just great. It's really nice to know that folks are interested and are observing what we're up to, and really pleased to see some of the incoming councilors who've been able to join this call. So thanks, guys.

All right. AOB. First up, I think we have the IGO-INGO Curative Rights IRT. We had a nice update from Damon on that at our last meeting, I think. And since that time, this AOB item is on the agenda just to flag to folks that the output from the implementation effort has gone out for public comment. So that's open for comment now. It just went out in the last sort of week or so. Typically, Council tends to defer to the SGs and Cs to develop their own public comments rather than commenting at a GNSO level. But this is the opportunity to see if any councilor does think that this warrants a Council comment. If anyone believes that there's an element which, where perhaps the whole GNSO would coalesce and it would benefit from a comment at the GNSO level as well. This is kind of the chance to raise that. And I'm seeing Damon's hand. So Damon.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure, Susan, thank you very much. Yeah, typically Council wouldn't make a comment on something like this. The reason for a potential exception in this circumstance is that Council had submitted a comment or submitted some advice back in the winter. But frankly, it just wasn't really taken by the IRT, but I think the end result is probably acceptable to folks. So if the decision would be, if we want a comment just to sort of ratify and say, "Hey, we think what you're doing is okay." I think we could probably also stay silent as well, but if we wanted a comment, if we're all okay with kind of the end result that was reached, we could submit a very short comment just saying, "Hey, we understand we submitted, gave you some advice, and you took a different path, but we're okay with that." So that would be it.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks for that, Damon. That's a good point. I don't know whether folks are in the position yet to know whether on an SG and C level that they would agree that it's okay. But perhaps this is one for if there's no one with strong thoughts on this yet at the moment, perhaps this is one that we can leave with folks to maybe take a look at this with your groups. And if, as Damon says, the kind of slight divergence from the instructions that we gave is okay with everyone, then maybe that is something where we would want to put in a GNSO level comment. And maybe I can voluntell Damon, if you don't mind, to perhaps circulate like a couple of lines just to the Council mailing list, kind of explaining, at a super high level, what it was we said, and what the direction the group has taken, if that's not too difficult an ask.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Sure. Not a problem. I will go ahead. I will get that out. It will probably be next week, but not a problem.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thank you. Okay. All right. Not seeing any further hands then. The next item is on the Review of Reviews. Again, this is similar to the last item. The Review of Reviews have now put out their draft recommendations for what a reviews framework would look like. It's gone out again for public comment, and it's really the same issue. Are there any councilors on here who are of the view, and would like to share that, that they feel that Council should be putting in a comment at a sort of GNSO level? Or would the preference be to rely on the individual SGs and Cs and their own discretion, on putting a comment in? I think a few of us have heard from some of the co-chairs who maybe would welcome a comment from the GNSO. But obviously, in order for there to be a GNSO level comment, it would require there to be elements of the recommendations that we all coalesce around and, or elements which seem sort of maybe incontroversial and folks feel it's welcome for the GNSO as a whole to comment on. So again, this is a just putting this on people's radars. If anyone has views now, then great. Otherwise, again, perhaps this is one to take back with your groups and see whether there's a feeling that this is one that GNSO should comment on at a GNSO level. And then I will just also, while I'm not seeing any hands, flag the email that I just sent out a little bit before our call started, flagging that there are two webinars coming up next week on the 14th of July, one at a sort of early UTC time slot and one sort of a kind of late afternoon, early evening time slot. So hopefully, one of those is not too awful for everyone. So just flagging that and again, encouraging you to share that with your groups if folks would be interested in having that overview of what these recommendations say. And Terri is sharing that very kindly in the chat as well. And Berry is reminding me there's quite an early deadline for this one. It's 4th of August. So actually, only a few weeks, for folks, maybe not quite a month to get something put together, which may also be a factor.

Okay. And then I think I'm not seeing any other hands, so I'm leaving that one with you all as well. And so our third item here of AOB is, oh, this is going to be a mouthful. So this is the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team liaison to the new Input Group for the Law Enforcement Agency Authentication Mechanism. That is a mouthful. So that input group, looking at the law enforcement agency authentication mechanism, is going to support the development of a kind of proof of concept that will be operationally effective for authenticating law enforcement agents using the RDRS system or whatever the successor system that we're currently working on is. And the group is intended to provide input on the workflow design, the technical requirements, authentication processes for a proof of concept. It's not a policy body. It's not developing policy recommendations, but its role is very much operational and to provide that operational and technical input. There was a call for volunteers for that group that went out a couple of weeks ago. It's intended to start meeting sometime in July and to meet probably every three or so weeks, right through till about February 2027. As always, I think all those meetings will be recorded, there'll be materials, and things will be publicly available and so on. But because obviously we have our own SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team that's currently working on revising the policy recommendations, and they will also include policy recommendations relating to authentication, there's some relationship, if you like, between these two groups. And so as a consequence, org has asked for there to be a liaison from the Supplemental Recommendation Team into the input group. So really, this is us looking for a volunteer. Leadership have had some chats about this, and what we'd like folks to consider is hopefully it should be someone who's active in the SRT. Ideally, one of the councilors, because the SRT is a Council group, so we think it would be preferable if it's a Council volunteer. Ideally, the term for that councilor would extend beyond October, since this work is running through beyond that. Technical knowledge would be a real benefit if you have it. I don't think it's an absolute essential, but certainly given what the input group is doing, it would be very beneficial to have someone with some tech knowledge. And I think on this week's SRT call, we heard some requests for that liaison to report really quite regularly to the SRT, perhaps even on all calls or most calls to try and ensure that there's the necessary coordination. So this is a call to kind of encourage a volunteer to come forward, and I've got two hands, so I'll go to Gaurav first.

GAURAV VEDI: Thanks, Susan. Yeah. I would like to volunteer for this liaison position, but just for full transparency, I'm also a member on SSAD team, so I'm not sure if that's going to create any conflict of interest, but happy to hear thoughts and opinions from other Council members.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Gaurav. I will say that the SSAD, I think that's the idea, is it would be someone who's in the SSAD SRT, and then they serve as a liaison into that input group. So I would say no, that's exactly what we do need, and thank you for putting your hand up. And then I think, Farzi, you say you're not volunteering, but you do have a question, so go for it.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes. Susan, I just wanted to raise this issue with the Council for the future. Honestly, I don't buy it that this group is purely operational and it only talks about technical issues. If you look at their mandate, if you look at what they are talking about, there are some of the things that they say it goes into the territories of policy. Now, I don't want to block anything or do anything like that, but we need to be wary of ICANN being creative in coming up with these groups and sometimes going over our head, not doing the policy through the Council. And in the registration data policy, we have that in section 3.9, authenticated requester means a law enforcement requester that is authenticated through an authentication mechanism implemented pursuant to ICANN consensus policy. Now, we are working on that at the SRT SSAD, but I think that this group was also like some of these things goes into the territories of policy, and I think that the Council should pay a little bit of attention to what, in the future, what we are getting into, and talk to ICANN org more about these technical groups.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks for that, Farzaneh. Yeah, I'm noting your comment. I think it's probably one where we'll want to keep an eye on it. I think it's very clear that the policy is being set in that SRT group, not set, you know what I mean. That is where, and the policy sits with the GNSO, but at the same time, this whole issue of the SSAD fell apart because of operational considerations. And so maybe with hindsight, I'll turn out to have been naive, but I'm hoping that this group is there to try to address the concerns that we had previously where policy recommendations were all well and good, but they couldn't be operationalized for any sort of reasonable cost or workable solution. So, I think that input group's open to all and kind of encourage you maybe to volunteer for it. And it's on us to keep an eye on it and make sure it does stay in its lane. Thank you. Yeah. And thank you to Gaurav. I didn't really fully acknowledge, but thank you very much for volunteering and not hearing other volunteers. I'm thinking you may well be it, so thank you very much for stepping up and being willing to do that. It will be super to have that communication back and forwards and is another important mechanism to ensure that there's not some straying into policy. Okay. Thank you.

All right. Well, we are a little ahead of schedule, but I think we have reached the end of our agenda for this month. So, unless anyone has any last words they want to say, I will be able to give you about 18 minutes of your day back, which is fantastic.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Thank you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Okay, perfect. Thank you all very much, and have a good rest of day.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Thank you. Bye-bye.

VIVEK GOYAL: Thank you. Take care, everybody.

TERRI AGNEW: All right. As you heard, the meeting has concluded. I will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care. Thanks for joining, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]